[Shri A. M. Thomas]

in Notification No. G.S.R. 1337 dated the 9th August, 1963.

(ii) The Bihar Foodgrains (Movement Control) Amendment Order, 1963 published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1338 dated the 9th August, 1963.

(iii) The Madhya Pradesh Rice (Movement Control) Amendment Order, 1963 published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1339 dated the 9th August, 1963.

(iv) The Uttar Pradesh Foodgrains (Movement Control) Amendment Order, 1963 published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1340 dated the 9th August, 1963.

(v) The Rice (Northern Zone) Movement Control (Amendment) Order, 1963 published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1341 dated the 9th August, 1963.

(vi) The Punjab Paddy (Export Control) Amendment Order, 1963 published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1342 dated the 9th August, 1963.

(vii) The Delhi Rice (Export Control) Amendment Order, 1963 published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1343, dated the 9th August, 1963.

(viii) The Rice (Eastern Zone) Movement Control Amendment Order, 1963 published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1344 dated the 9th August, 1963.

(ix) The Rajasthan (Rice Import Restrictions) Amendment Order, 1963 published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1345 dated the 9th August, 1963.

(x) The Rajasthan Rice (Export Control) Amendment Order, 1963 published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1346 dated the 9th August, 1963.

[Placed in Library, *see* No. LT-1511/63].

AMENDMENTS TO THE DISPLACED PERSONS (COMPENSATION AND REHABILITATION) RULES

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Works, Housing and Rehabilitation (Shri P. S. Naskar): I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following Rules under sub-section (3) of section 40 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954:—

(i) The Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Fourth Amendment Rules, 1963 published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1096 dated the 29th June, 1963.

(ii) The Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Fifth Amendment Rules, 1963 published in Notification No. G.S.R. 1212, dated the 20th July, 1963.

[Placed in Library, *see* No. LT-1512/63].

12.14 hrs.

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

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now proceed with the further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri J. B. Kripalani on the 19th August, 1963, namely:—

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

Shri Ansar Harvani was on his legs.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): Sir, may I request that the debate may go on for the whole day

today and the Prime Minister may reply first thing tomorrow morning?

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I think he is willing.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We have had a sufficiently long debate.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: He is the Leader of the House and he can oblige the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Yesterday he agreed to extend it today.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: We want two hours more, that is all. Not much more. If he is willing that can be done. The Leader can say.

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House is not willing.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: If the Leader is willing why should the followers not agree?

The Prime Minister and Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shri Jawaharlal Nehru): Sir, I am in the hands of the House. I understand that we had gladly agreed to the hon. Member's suggestion yesterday to extend it by another day, so that we have the discussion today also. But many Members have arranged to leave tonight...

The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs (Shri Satya Narayan Sinha): They were to have left yesterday.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: It would be inconvenient for them if they would have to stay for another day. I think that if the discussion is extended to tomorrow, it will be awkward and inconvenient for them.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall call upon the hon. Prime Minister to reply at 4 p.m.

Shri Ansar Harvani who was in possession of the House may resume his speech now.

Shri Ansar Harvani (Bisauli): Yesterday, I heard the speech of my right hon. friend Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia with amazement and not with shock.

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri S. K. Patil): He is a leftist.

Shri Ansar Harvani: He has been a very old friend of mine, and I have great respect for him. I have known him from the days when he used to stay in Swaraj Bhavan and Anand Bhavan and used to get his lessons in socialism at the feet of one of the greatest socialists of our time. I have known him from the days when both of us worked in the August revolution of 1942 as underground workers. But destiny had ordained that this gentleman who had learnt his lessons on socialism at the feet of the greatest socialist of India should adjudge him as the greatest socialist of extravagance and nepotism.

I want to know this from him. Has it been nepotism that in 1945, when myself and Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia were both in jail, the great Prime Minister—then, he was not Prime Minister—sent his most talented sister Mrs. Vijayalakshmi Pandit as a non-official representative to the UN to secure our release from jail, and to convince the people for the freedom of the country? Has it been nepotism that he sent his sister as our first Ambassador to Stalinist Russia, to convince them that India today is free and is no more a slave, and she laid the foundation of Indo-Soviet relations, which have resulted in the massive economic aid to this country? Has it been nepotism that he sent that great lady of this country as our Ambassador to the USA, and she laid the foundations of Indo-American relations, and today Americans are giving us military aid? Has it been nepotism that he sent that lady as High Commissioner to Britain, and

[Shri Ansar Harvani]

she carried on the useful work that was being carried on by Shri Krishna Menon? Has it been nepotism that he has done all these things?

Then, he talked awout Kashmiris. There are certain Kashmiris who hold very high positions, and they have been holding high positions from the British days in various Indian States, and they have been administrators in various States. In various Indian States, there have been Prime Ministers who were Kashmiris. Even some of the high officials are Kashmiris. They are not there because the Prime Minister was born in a Kashmiri family, but they were there even long before the Prime Minister assumed his office. I can say that the beneficiaries of this regime have not been the Kashmiris, but the beneficiaries of this regime, if there have been any, belong to the community of my hon. friend Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia, that is, Marwaris.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखाबाद) : मारवाड़ी सेठ प्रधान मंत्री के रिश्तेदार हैं, मेरे नहीं।

Shri Ansar Harvani: Now, if this motion is passed—although it is a big 'if'—what will happen? If this motion is passed, then the President of India will ask the liberator of this country to resign from the post of Prime Minister. Then, instead of the legal heir of Mahatma Gandhi, the self-appointed heir of Mahatma Gandhi, namely Shri J. B. Kripalani will be called upon to form the Government. He will appoint Shri M. R. Masani as his Finance Minister, and Shri M. R. Masani will by a stroke of the pen withdraw controls and will allow big business to loot the country. He will appoint Shri Surendranath Dwivedy as his Industries Minister, who by a stroke of the pen will nationalise all industries, and will nationalise banks and insurance companies.

An Hon. Member: Not Shri Kamath?

Shri Ansar Harvani: Not Shri Kamath.

He will appoint Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia as his Education Minister who will order that all the books written in English on science and medicine in the Madras and Bangalore colleges should be completely burnt. He will appoint Shri U. M. Trivedi as the Home Minister, whose first task will be to liquidate Shri M. R. Masani, Shri Kapur Singh and myself because we belong to minorities. His Cabinet will be a mad house. What will happen? Right from the Himalayas down to Cape Comerin, this great ancient country of ours, this country of the Buddha and Gandhi, this country of Asoka and Akbar, this country of Subas Bose and Jawaharlal Nehru, will be reduced to a lunatic asylum (*Interruptions*).

Reference was made to our foreign policy. I say that never before in the history of any country has a sounder foreign policy been pursued than has been pursued by our great Prime Minister.

Shri Priya Gupta (Katihar): An insoluble red suspense in a Congress mixture!

Shri Ansar Harvani: The impression is being created that India will surrender to China. As long as this Parliament, as long as this country and as long as its people are led by this undaunted soldier of India's freedom, who faced British imperialism, who went to jail for India's freedom, is there any man in this country who will believe that India will surrender to China?

Another reference was made by Dr. Lohia, to his extravagance. The man who was born with a silver spoon in his mouth, who could have draped himself in brocade and velvet, went to jail, faced British imperialism, and made sacrifices and dedicated his life to Mahatma Gandhi. Today he is the Prime Minister. Does he have any personal life? From six in the morning till twelve in the night, he is busy.

He comes to office in a small, tiny, little car—which many Members of Parliament have purchased and sold: He works throughout the whole day. Unlike any other Prime Minister of other countries, he does not have any country home. Unlike other Prime Ministers, he does not enjoy holidays. He hardly spends anything for himself. Reference has been made to his expenditure per day being Rs. 25,000. It is a fantastic lie. If some money is spent on his security, it is absolutely necessary. But I may tell you that unlike other Prime Ministers, he does not have any personal guard. Some policemen, some security men, who are in the pay of the Home Ministry—who can be sent even to the rescue of Dr. Lohia if he was going to be lynched by angry Congressmen—look after his security. But I say here and now that for his security, not only Rs. 25,000 but even Rs. 25 crores will be sanctioned by this House and by the country, if necessary....

We have seen that such propaganda and such campaign have been carried on by Dr. Lohia and the Jan Sangh. We lost the life of the father of the nation. We are not prepared to take that risk.

In conclusion, may I say that as long as this country is led by the Congress, as long as this country is led by Jawaharlal Nehru, as long as this country is led by this Parliament, this country will march towards prosperity, towards freedom, towards peace? Destiny has ordained that one of the greatest men, one of the noblest men of this age, should lead us. India is Nehru, Nehru is India. Long live Nehru, long live India!

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shrimati Renu Chakravartty.

Shri J. B. Kripalani (Amroha) *rose*—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has the right of reply.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I want to give a personal explanation.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Not now.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I know I have the right of reply. But I have also the right to contradict a Member then and there by rising on a point of personal explanation. He has talked about me and institutions with which I am connected. So I want it to be done now.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): You have the right of reply.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: But I have also a right to rise on a point of personal explanation. I only want to know from you if I have the right of personal explanation or not. If I have, I want to exercise it now.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am not denying that right. But you have got the right of reply. At that time, you can do it.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: But I have also this right.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: You have both and they can be combined.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Then I want to exercise it now, unless you order that I must necessarily combine it.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am suggesting that both of them may be combined so that there may be no disturbance in the continuity of the debate.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Unless you order like that, I would like to reply now and give a personal explanation.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I am suggesting that Acharya Kripalani may add this also at the end of the debate when he is replying, so that there is continuity in the debate.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): There has been a very serious charge made against Acharya Kripalani by Shri Harvani yesterday about the funds relating to the Gandhi Ashram. As a

[Shri Hem Barua]

matter of fact, Acharya Kripalani has a right to explain his position. He must be given the earliest opportunity to explain his position. I beg of you to revise your ruling in the interests of fairplay and justice.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If the hon. Member has no right of reply, I would certainly allow it, but when there is a right of reply and sufficient time is there, my suggestion to Acharya Kripalani is that both of them may be combined, so that the continuity of the debate may not be broken. I have never denied that right. In fact, yesterday I allowed Shri Dwivedy to give a personal explanation because he had no right of reply, but here he has got the right of reply. Let him refute it at that time.

Shri Hem Barua: Day before yesterday you were very kind in your wisdom to allow Acharya Kripalani to reply to Shrimati Subhadra Joshi, although he had a right of reply.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: On a point of order. I invite your attention to rule 357 which governs the right of a Member to give a personal explanation. It is different, quite different, from the rule governing the right of reply to a motion moved by him. Rule 357 reads as follows:

> "A member may, with the permission of the Speaker,...."

—Of course, you are supreme, how can we deny that?—

> "...make a personal explanation although there is no question before the House...."

—that is important—

> "....but in this case no debatable matter may be brought forward, and no debate shall arise."

Therefore, it is different from the rule which permits or entitles him to reply to the motion.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have never denied his right.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: But you said he could combine.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Because he has got an opportunity to reply to the debate, he might reply to this point also. That is all I am saying. That is why I am suggesting to him that he may reply at the end. That right is not taken away.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Barrackpore): I begin my speech by drawing attention to the great Bombay strike which has just ended. It will be a great mistake to think that this strike has been broken, and the derisive way in which some Ministers spoke yesterday would be a dangerous trend of thinking. It is symptomatic of the depth of suffering and the mass discontent of the people, but unfortunately in many of these strikes, legitimate strikes, strikes which the workers have every right to take up when all other means of redress have failed, we have seen the callousness of the Government. The attitude of the Governments in the States and even at the Centre we find is that of the Grand Moghul: come down on your knees, withdraw your strike, and then we shall consider.

What I want this House to consider is that the rise in prices, in the cost of living, and the suffering of the people—both sides of the House have to admit that the poor are getting poorer—creates a situation leading to frustration, which is a fertile ground for reactionary forces to find a hearing, and hiding their real face with the use of demagogy, they really try to find some means of sowing their reactionary policies.

Similar conditions were there in Germany. My hon. friend the Food Minister laughed about it and said that because the Prime Minister has said, because Pravda has said it, because Dange has said it, there is no need for us to consider it. I think students of history know about it, and I think that even if Shri Patil

were to consider it, he would also realise the truth of it. High Ministers of State who profess socialism are working against it, and this is what has led to the rise of the forces of Fascism.

I am glad the Food Minister made a speech which, of course, drew loud applause from the other side of the House. It was good because also it was so revealing. According to him, the Swatantra Party leaders like Shri Masani, even though they sit in the Opposition, are "one of ourselves". I think this is one of the most revealing statements in the whole of that speech. It was one of the most revealing statements in the whole speech. Every action of the Food Ministry during the course of the last few years has proved that he has been an inveterate enemy of controls. I hope that nobody on that side will take what I mention about the Food Minister in a personal way. I have nothing against him personally; everything that we say will be only from the political point of view. He is an inveterate enemy of controls; and on this point he is one with Mr. Masani. His opposition to the Planning Commission is now no longer hidden. He has defied and ignored it on more than one occasion. It again makes him the action bearer of the ideology of Mr. Masani.

My hon. friends on the other side were led away by the wonderful oratory of my hon. friend Shri S. K. Patil. But has he been so successful in action? I do not want to enter very much into details about acreage, etc. I think Dr. Lohia has smashed his arguments quite clearly and on this point he was very clear and I do not think that it was a weak debate when he spoke regarding the Ministry of Mr. Patil. The point which is to be considered by all sides of the House is this. Are we debating whether production has gone up or not from the time the Britishers left us till to date. Would we then not be debating whether freedom is better or slavery is better? What we have to debate is: what is the rate of growth? Can it be greater? What is the path you have chosen? Whatever production has been there, has it been equitably distributed? These are the points to be considered. Let us take the record of the Ministry. In the first years of his ministership, he came on the creast of a very luck wave; he came in the year of record production. But in the next two years, except in the case of wheat and bajra, in the other principal crops, rice, jowar and gram, production has fallen. I am giving the figures given by his own Ministry. The production index for rice for 1960-61 was 136.2 and for the year 1961-62, it is 136. It has remained stagnant. He has admitted that. But let us take jowar; from 134.6 in 1960-61, it comes down to 111.9 in 1961-62. Let us turn to grams: the figures are 162.3 and 152 respectively, while in fact the Food Minister gave the impression that everything was well and production was increasing. I thought that my hon. friend Shri Morarji Desai was taken in by some of these figures and seemed to feel that except for rice everything was absolutely all right. No doubt the Food Minister will blame the cyclic theory. But I want to ask: did not the Planning Commission take into consideration that there were years of drought or that we have this much acreage under irrigation, otherwise, let there be the laissez-faire economy and allow Mr. Masani to rule the roost; we need not talk about planning. The target was 100 million tons for the Third Plan. Shriman Narayan's own statement clearly states that the rate of progress of agricultural production was much below the mark. Are we to believe him or are we to believe Mr. Patil? We are told that we Communists are trying to divide the Congress. You are already divided.

Let us take the question of prices; they are even more revealing. Take the index of production and prices in rice. In 1955-56, the beginning of the

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

Second Plan, we find that production was 131.3 while price was 72. I am taking this index from his own Ministry figures. In 1961-62 the production was 174 but the price rose to 91. Take jowar. In 1955-56 production index was 96.7 whereas price index was 67. In 1961-62, it rose to 111.19; the price rose from .67 to .112. Take bajra. In 1955-56, the index of production was 108.3 and the price was 84. In 1961-62, it rose to 111 and the price index rose from 84 to 132. Sometimes I am amazed at one thing. Of course, I do say and I admit that it is really delightful to listen to Shri Patil. He is a wonderful orator and we were carried away by his speech the other day. But, if you take the trouble of looking into his own records, the records of his own Ministry, then something different from what had been put before the House comes out. Probably the Food Minister will say that "it is an incentive to the farmer; that is what I have done. Pat me on the back." He asked, "does the Communist party want me not to give the incentive to the farmer?" When did we say he should give incentive to the farmer? Then again he spoke of failure of collective farms in Russia. Did the Communist party of India ever say that we must have collectivisation? We only said have land reforms. However, I am glad that the Food Minister has made one admission. He has shown that in Russia one acre produces more than what a collective farm does. So, what we have been saying is, reduce the ceilings, let the poor agricultural labourer and the smaller people have some bits of land—than go in for co-operatives first. It is the right step. But what have the Government done? Co-operatives was our slogan also. We supported it. It was the slogan also of the Congress in the Nagpur resolution. Did Shri Patil give effect to it? No. What is the record? It is a dismal failure.

Shri Patil said that incentive has been given, but to whom has it been given? To the trader, the *mahajan*, the middlemen and not to the primary producer. We have seen what is happending in the interior of the villages. In the case of jute, they said that it is Rs. 30 when they bring it to the mill gate. The same thing is the case in regard to sugarcane. I am told. About jute, I know myself, because my constituency is one of the jute-growing areas. Do they get Rs. 30? You will find that Ralli Bros, the subsidiary of Birla company and other companies get it. Go to the primary producer who is dying to sell his produce. He cannot wait long. He does not get Rs. 30. Therefore, I say that the incentives have been given but they have been given to the trader and not to the primary producer.

What is the real position? My hon. friend Shri Patil is an orator but sometimes he is led away by his oratory and he forgets what he said before. I follow him each year, year by year; I have followed his speeches. In 1961 he said—I would like the House to listen to this—that "so far as rice is concerned, the figures are even more significant than wheat. We have an all-time record—because every year is going to be an all-time record—because every year the agricultural production is bound to be more than in the previous year." But what has happened? When he came, it was 80 million tons a year; the next year it was 79 million tons, and this year it is even less. In 1961, we went on to say:

> "I do not see in the near future, that is, three or four years, any difficulty whatsoever on the agricultural or food front and our economy will be as sound as it is expected to be during this period."

In 1962, he made another wonderful statement which is as follows:

"Wheat is better this year than last year. Instead of 10 million tons possibly we have 11 million tons. Rice also remains at 33.5 million tons. Therefore things are not bad. The look of things is very encouraging indeed.

The food situation today is as it never was in the history of India. All our granaries are full of things. If anybody starts mischief by raising prices, whether it is retailer or wholesaler, I shall blow out these things into the market and see that that can never be done."

Then, what he said recently in 1963 is a wonderful thing. He said that "the last three years, which were not good years, which were the years in a cycle, were really bad years." What are we to say to our Minister? It is delightful to listen to him, but having once been a teacher of English, I was reminded of Shakespeare who said: "A tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing."

I must say that my hon. friend Shri Thomas has been much more honest. We were told by our Food Minister,—which was echoed unfortunately by the Finance Minister because he felt they were in the same boat together and he had better depend on his statistics—that the prices have not gone up very much and that we need not worry very much. Shri Thomas was more forthright. He said:

"The prices of cereals had risen by 3.4 per cent during the last three weeks. The price of rice was today 14 per cent higher than it was last year. In the last six weeks alone the price of rice had gone up by eight per cent against a two per cent increase during the whole of last year."

He said something which we would have liked the Minister of Food himself to say. Shri Thomas told the traders: "You have to realize that the maintenance of the price-line is basic to the concept of planning." If our Food Minister had believed this, he would not have told us during the Question Hour, "What can I do? I cannot do anything. If there is drought and production is less, I connot do anything. The price will go up." Is it the policy of the Government? I say he is consistently opposed to the policy and the promises of the Government: in a country which is under-developed, which has suffered from shortages, whatever the production may be in a long time, we shall have shortages in that period. You must hold the price-line then. If you have to do it in a period of shortage, then certain measures have to be taken. Then arises the question of control. The people dislike it. Why? My hon. friends Shri Masani and the Food Minister are right in utilising that fear of the masses, because the machinery is corrupt. Why cannot we do something about the machinery? Because the machinery is corrupt, you utilise that fear, that rightful fear, and you say you cannot have control. Why cannot you take stringent measures? I remember the voice of the Prime Minister when he said that "we will hang the black-marketeers from the lamp-posts." What has happened today?

Take the case of sugar. What is happening about sugar? We had over-production; I think it was an over-production in 1960-61. But immediately we had a 10 per cent cut in production because the mills wanted it. I believe Shri Thomas has written a letter to Shri S. M. Banerjee that there has been no cut in production as far as Uttar Pradesh is concerned. But as far as I know there was a cut in production. It came down to 27 lakh tons or something like that. Production failed. The Food Minister talks of incentives but the peasant who grows the sugarcane was in a desperate situation. What happened to the free market *laissez faire* theory? The peasant did not get the help from the

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

policies of the Government and he did not sell the sugarcane. He went and burnt his sugarcane. Therefore we have now just 21 lakh tons. That is the point, and everybody knows it. Fortunately or unfortunately the Food Minister kept silent when he was giving that long inventory of his achievements and asked us to pat him on the back. I have read the full text of his speech. He said that he has been very successful. He only failed to mention how successful he was on the sugar front (*Interruption*). He used some words; I do not use them just now.

Certain political points have also been raised. I am glad that Shri Patil raised a political point. He tried to discover some unjustified motives for our wanting his removal. Anyway, as I have said, we have wanted his removal firstly because of his failings and secondly—we do not hide it—we feel that as Food Minister he has followed the policies which are reactionary, which help the traders, which help the profiteer and which do not control the prices. That is not the way to socialism at least for bringing about a socialist society. If we are to have controls, let the poorest of the poor take only one chattak of rice and the richest of the rich should also take that one chattak of rice. Let us have that kind of control. Let us clean the machinery of Government not only of the Food Ministry but of all the Ministries.

I said that we do stand for a leftist Government. Why should we hide it? We have thought that the aim of the Congress was also socialism. What is harmful about it? Shri S. K. Patil says that the communist party wants to choose as though they are the people to choose left or right. We may not be choosing the Government, but we will have the right to say that if you want socialist Government it must be a leftist Government. What is wrong in it?

Sir, we stand for socialism. I request the Prime Minister to speak about this and we should like him to say this. Does he consider that rightist policies are going to take the country to socialism? The trouble about the Prime Minister has been this. He has been one of our heroes. We have heard about socialism from him first. But later on we find that although he had proclaimed socialism, he had not defined it, he had not given a direction to it. That is why we are asking for it. Sir, this can be done even within the framework of the mixed economy. We have heard so much of mixed economy. Mixed economy can be there in the first stages of socialism. But growing monopolies cannot lead to socialism. There must be efforts for curbing concentration of wealth and holding strategic heights, and checking prices. That is why we have put forward the idea of State trading in foodgrains.

Sir, ruthless measures to control prices have to be taken. There must be no continuing dependence on imperialism. (*Interruptions*). Mr. Masani and I can never agree on most points. There may be certain points with which many congressmen and I do agree but between Mr. Masani and I, we are as far removed as the heavens are from hell.

Sir, I now come to the question of Mr. Morarji. We stand for development and for defence. We do agree that resources are needed. That is why we differ from Swatantra party which says that there is no need for raising resources but that we can depend on United States and western aid. We say, we do need resources. We want independent defence and for that we have to have resources. But, Sir, we do not agree with the taxation polices which have been followed. We say, 'Curb concentration of wealth'. Has he given direction to this concept? He has not given it.

I do not want to explain what has been explained on many occasions, namely, the question of ratio between direct and indirect taxation but we do say, why is it impossible for the Finance Minister to take the evaded income-tax? Why is it impossible? I want to ask him another question on gold policy. Why does he say: 'I do not want the resources of gold?' I want to ask him this question. When you allow all sorts of ordinary items like kerosene to be taxed, why is it that you come to Parliament any say: 'I do not want the resources of gold'? The gold is there in the banks and in the vaults and even that you do not want to use. Why? We say that you should use it. We say: why should you not ask the Rajas and Maharajas who must be very "patriotic", to give up their privy purses? Why cannot you say, we shall give privy purses 50 years hence; now the Chinese and the Pakistan are giving us troubles. They should not want to give their privy purses. Why don't you put a ceiling on profits, tax bonus shares etc? We now hear another dangerous thing that even LIC funds and State Bank funds are going to be utilised to push up the stock market. Is this the way to curb concentration of wealth? About nationalisation of banks, yesterday I heard what the Finance Minister had to say about this matter. I am not an economist but I tried to understand why is it that he is not agreeing for nationalisation of banks? Is it only a doctrinnaire approach? Sir, we find that almost the one or the other big industrial house controls the banks. You will be surprised to read what the ex-governor of the Reserve Bank of India said about it. Shri H. V. R. Iyengar had remarked:

> "One of the structural features of the Indian Banking is the concentration of Power which in some cases is enormous in relation to the capital employed. From time to time, we come across cases in which a family or a group has got full controlling interest in a Bank."

I will read out the list. Take the case of the biggest commercial banks like Central Bank of India, Bank of India, Punjab National Bank, Bank of Baroda, United Commercial Bank, etc. All these are controlled by the Tata, Khatau, Mafatlal groups, Dalmia-Jain group, Walchand Hirachand group, Birla group and J. K. group.

Shri Raghunath Singh: Finished?

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: The Secretary of the Congress party should permit me to educate him a little while.

In spite of the Reserve Bank of India directive, concentration of advance in the hands of a few borrowers has increased by 47.7 per cent in 1961 over 1960. In one year there is 47.7 per cent increase of concentration of advance.

Another very interesting point about concentration is this. It is very revealing and I should not believe that the paid-up capital is so very low as it is found now. As a matter of fact, Rs. 29.28 crores of paid up capital controls deposits of Rs. 1428 crores. The All-India Bank Employees Association have pointed out that according to them the profits of all the banks will come to Rs. 35 crores; then there are secret reserves. But not only profits, but deposits are utilised by the banks. The main question is, where is it that this money is utilised? This money is utilised in various ways. They use it against foreign exchange, in bullions, they use it for hypothecation of goods, and they use it against food articles. The money is thus utilised, in the wrong way. We have seen time of harvest. You have mahajans who cornor the grain market. Therefore we said that banks should be nationalised and this money should be invested for planned development and defence so that we could produce all these commodities and also

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

be in a position to face the enemy. Therefore, we said that it is not only a question of paying compensation which is not much. Compensation if it is computed according to the compensation paid to the State Bank and the Imperial Bank when it was nationalised. I think the amount is about Rs. 42 or Rs. 45 crores. The private banks are commanding a detionalised, I think the amount is that this has not been utilised? We found no straight reply from the hon. Finance Minister.

Sir, the Food Minister said that the Communist party is trying to balance. No, Sir. We are not trying to balance. We are very clear in our mind. We want the Food Minister and the Finance Minister should go, there may be some other Ministers too who may have to go. What we say is this. It is not a question of balancing. They are to be judged by their policies. As soon as the Kamaraj plan came up, I have not been an admirer of it and I agree with my friends here who say that it is only an eye-wash—as soon as it came, some people said, 'Oh, Mr. S. K. Patil is going' and immediately, I don't know why, some people said, Mr. Nanda must also go. Let us see what their policies are. My friend Mr. Nanda with all his vacillations, with all his evasive replies, has given a direction to planning. The point is that we are not trying to balance at all, because these questions, we believe, are judged by policies. Mr. K. D. Malaviya was a man who has saved us so much foreign exchange. He has got us out of the imperialist oil monopolists cluches and he has saved so much of foreign exchange. We do think he has done a good job. We think that it was unfair not to have had a proper open enquiry, judicial enquiry, and then judge him. If the congress believes in socialism, all those who in the name of mixed economy oppose curbing monopolies or who want to make our country dependent on foreign aid or who are against checking price manipulations are acquiescing in crushing the backs of our people and we have asked that they should be left out of the Cabinet. What is wrong in it? It is a matter about which we have to ask for an answer from the Prime Minister. Sir, he also said, we are ideologists. It is better to have an ideology than just to have an ideology of self-interest and corruption. It is good and we stand by it. I would like to ask: What is the ideology of the Congress? And I remember the wonderful words uttered by the Prime Minister in Lucknow—we were young then—in 1936 when he first enunciated the idea of socialism on the platform of the congress. In *Whither India*, what does he say?

> "Leaders may come and go; they may compromise and betray —but the exploited and suffering masses must carry on the struggle —for their drill sergeant is hunger. Is our aim human welfare or the preservation of class prejudices and vested interests of pampered groups? The question must be answered clearly and unequivocally by each of us."

We say, it is time for the Prime Minister to answer. We are sure when he replies he will in his own way shield the Food Minister, the Finance Minister and all the policies of his Government. He will say, we have made a few mistakes here and there but on the whole we are all right. We say, Sir, it is time that the Prime Minister must answer, the Congress Party must answer these points. We the Communist Party and the Congress stand very much nearer to each other if this is the aim. And, if this is the aim, and if the Prime Minister even at this late stage not only proclaims socialism but defines it by saying what he means by socialism within a mixed economy, and if he really not only defines it but

gives a direction to it, I am sure the whole country will bless him.

Shri Krishna Menon (Bombay City North): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the matter before the House is in form a Motion of 'No Confidence' in the Government made by the hon. Member from Amroha. It would be impertinence on my part to say that none of us would have quarrelled with it because there is that right that vests in Members of Parliament, but with great respect I submit that right is what vests, the exercise of it is a matter which is left to the discretion of the person who exercises that right and therefore, other poeple are entitled to have their say about.

We are also told by the mover of this motion that he represents 73 others. If the limit had rested there it would have been very easy, but he goes on to say that he also represents the majority of this country. We happen to live in a system of parliamentary government.

Acharya Kripalani: We are not able to hear.

Shri Krishna Menon: We happen to live in a system of parliamentary government (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: They say that they are not able to hear. He may come before the mike.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: And, do not drop at the end of a sentence.

An Hon. Member: Come to the front bench.

Shri Krishna Menon: But although it is in form a vote of 'no confidence' in the government, I take the liberty of saying that it has enabled us to know the degree and extent of this lack of confidence, how far it goes even into the minds of the worst critics of our party and our government. Also, it has enabled Ministers of this Government and Members of this party to be able not only to listen to the criticism but it has also provided an opportunity to them to think about the various things that they have said.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, in our system of government, it would be a great mistake to state—I am sure we would not fall into it—that whatever ideas are given, from whatever quarter they may come, they are of no value. It stands to reason and truth that there is no one on this side of the House, so far as I know, the Prime Minister included, who will say that everything the Government does or the party does is right and he agrees with it in every particular. It so happens that we agree with them on a larger number of things and very many more than we are able to agree with the other side. It is possible to find something that one does not agree with.

Then comes this question of social mathematics and the election. They were saying about 50 per cent votes and 60 per cent votes. It is like saying, where five people run a one mile race and four people are left half a mile behind, that all the four of them together have run two miles in the same time and therefore they should be declared the real winner. There has been only one instance in history where a person who did not win a majority of votes was elected to office, and that was the Presidency of the United States just before Andrews Jackson. That was because there was an arrangement made between him and Henry Clay who was made the Secretary of State.

[Shri Krishna Menon]

Anyway, to go on to this matter of the motion of no confidence in the Government, being a student of history I have been trying to find out what it means. Normally, in Parliament, a motion of no confidence in government is a motion of no confidence in the government of the day. But this discussion has wandered not only to the period after 1947 but even to the period before. It is almost like an incident in the fables: "if it is not you it must be your grandfather". So, the attack has been not only on the policy of this government or its predecessors but the basic policies and the whole orientation and ethos of the national movement of ours which was responsible for displacing the mightiest empire of history and enabled this country to march forward to its historic destiny.

13 hrs.

Therefore, we look to the constructive side of it. The proposals that are made are based on the two gravemen of the charge—firstly, we are not a representative party and the Government is not representative, and secondly all the doings and actions of the Government are bad. These are the two things.

I will take the first one. The remedy is proportional representation. This is nothing new. It has been discussed for 200 to 300 years in Latin America and in the Latin countries of Europe by a gentleman called Victor Considerant and in the Anglo-Saxon countries by John Stuart Mill. When it came for discussion before the British Parliament, Edmund Burke said: "Parliament would then be a congress of ambassadors of conflicting interests" That is what it would become. But Parliament, on the other hand, is a deliberative assembly of the nation with one interest. I hope no one will say, this is a man who has been christened by my friend, Shri Masani, to whom I will come in a minute, and for 40 years he has been doing this thing. As I said, it is a deliberative assembly of the nation with one interest. Parliamentary government cannot function until there is a commonality of thought, a general commonality of interest between the Government and the Opposition and the different parties of the country. The purpose of a party system of government is not so much as in the days of proportional representation to project the differences so as to divide the people but to find the large body of interest that the majority people can follow. That is the only way parliamentary government can function.

I will take some time over this question of proportional representation, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, because this has all the appearance of being a very good solution. Parliament is not a municipality, it has to deal with national and international policies. Proportional representation was introduced in Germany under the Weimar Constitution from 1919 to 1933. It brought in parties with small votes as powerful minorities and ultimately led to the emergence of Hitler. In 1945 France adopted this as a very good measure; she had adopted it before also, and in that period of crisis the average life of a French Government was five weeks. It meants the formation of groups inside the legislature and a great deal of horse-trading, so that in every Cabinet there will be six or seven ex-Prime Ministers. Therefore, it means weak governments. What is the present history? It was given up in 1950 in France, it was given up in 1951 in Italy and in 1952 in Greece under the advice and request of the American Government. I say this because it is the fact that we are

not speaking only to this House and to this country but to the whole world, and it does appear that 55 per cent of the people are in a small minority. Is it suggested that every one who has been defeated should be considered as having won and his votes should be added up to that of another successful candidate and the person who had the majority declared not elected. Again, out of this 55 per cent, 20 or 26 percent—I do not remember which are the votes of independent candidates who, in a sense, do not represent anybody but themselves in this House. There is no organisation, there is not ideology, there is no power that can call them to account in the electorate. There is no restraint. It is the essence of all governments that there must be restraint on those who exercise power in one form or another. So, we have to face the gamut of attack from all sides, over a period, and it has been concentrated, if I may submit, on the three main bases of our national policy, and I say national policy deliberately because the foreign policy of this country, the socialist society and national integration, which are the three or four bases of our policy, have been time and again, endorsed by this Parliament, not less than three or four times in each session, and when the Parliament endorses it, it is ended. So far as the actual records of the Government are concerned, when the Government and the party are returned in the general elections, there is nothing more to be said about it.

Now, sometime ago, an attempt was made to move a vote of no-confidence, which incidentally was the first time it has happened in our Parliament, and seven members stood up in their seats. What has happened since then? There have been Congress defeats in two or three bye-elections. If I may say so, it is not a lame excuse. [illegible] of the characteristics of parliamentary government that the electorate has a hit at the government at the bye-elections because they know they can strike and not wound; they know the government would not be displaced. It is merely a corrective being administered; that is to say, there are no other considerations. Therefore, if the governing party lost two seats in the bye-elections, is it a reversal of the general elections which took place earlier?

We do not live in a system where there is either referndum or, what is called, recall or a plebescite or anything of that kind. We live in a system, different even from that of the Anglo-Saxon countries, for here Parliament has a definite period of life unless dissolved by the President earlier. We are not a body of delegates but a body of representatives, which makes a lot of difference.

We hear this attack by the opposition on two or three matters. Even among the three or four bases of our policy, national integration itself has come in for assailment from one section of that composite group which even yesterday protested, though too late of course, against the Constitutional amendment which prohibits any propaganda or any promotion of policies or anything else for the further dismembership of this country. Also, it is represented by my hon. friend, Shri Masani, whose leader said only the other day that the only solution for Kashmir was to give it away, a dismenberment of the country. Therefore, these attacks on our basic position, apart from the fact that by propagation of ideas like proportional representation, whereby dividing the forces that make for unity than those forces that make for conflict, works against national integration. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, even though you in your generosity may or may not give me more time, the time at my disposal is short and, therefore, I will go on to the next item, and that is the direct attack on the policy of non-alignment. Subject to correction by the Prime Minister afterwards I would like to submit that non-alignment is not our

[Shri Krishna Menon]

foreign policy. Non-alignment is part of our foreign policy, an instrument, a method we use. Our foreign policy is world peace, co-operation and co-existence. Non-alignment is dictated by the conditions of our history, by the pragmatic considerations that obtain in this world and, what is more, by our desire to keep our skin comparatively entire.

Therefore, I will try, if I may, in the short time at my disposal, to see what the content of this non-alignment is. If I may read out:

> "They are of neighbourly goodwill and of universal peace. They postulate peaceful co-existence of nations holding different ideologies so that they may order their internal affairs according to their own light and according to what they consider to be good for themselves. We also stand for the banning of the use of nuclear weapons that threaten the very existence of human beings on this globe. We also want a substantial reduction in conventional armaments. We have kept before the international world the principles of Panch Shila. These principles are in conformity, if I may say so, not only with our recent traditions but also with our old traditions. They are in conformity with the teachings of our Master. They are also principles that flowed from the manner in which we achieved our Independence. They are useful principles. They have been enunciated from time to time by political theorists. They are at the basis of the United Uations Organisation."

Then it goes on to say:

> "Therefore, I have no hesitation to say that I support the general principles of our foreign and international policy. Our Prime Minister has enunciated the principles that should guide all nations in their dealings with each other if world tensions are to be reduced and if peace is to prevail."

These words—I could not read them so well—were uttered by Shri J. B. Kripalani on the 28th of March 1956. Then he tells us on the 28th March, 1962, about six or seven years after—and I think the Finance Minister said that there is a healthy interval in between —on the 28th of March, 1962—I do not know why this laways happens on the 28th of March each time.

> "African and Asian countries have a better appreciation of our rights and the stand that we take in international affairs. Why should we not have even closer relations with them...."

This also by the hon. Member from Amroha. I think writing gives one more inspiration, for he says next:

> "What is successful diplomacy? I use the word in a good sense and not in a bad sense. It is that through it we may be able to safeguard our interests without recourse to arms."

I have a considerable amount of literature on this subject, mainly statements by the Prime Minister in regard to the non-alignment policy. That policy simply means that we will maintain our sovereignty and respect for other people, we recognise the world as a world of diversities and we have to co-exist and there is no escape from this planet; even if we go to the moon, we will be controlled from here. So, we may say in modern times the

biblical doctrine has been controverted and the troubles of this world are no longer solved in heaven. Rather, the troubles in heaven are solved on earth. The troubles between two countries in regard to space are not solved in heaven but here. Therefore, we believe in peaceful co-existence, not getting involved in other peoples' controversies.

While I have no time to elaborate on this, I do not agree with those who say that our policy is the same as America adopted soon after her independence. It is not necessary for us to go into the beginnings of American history, but we have an entirely different position. We have derived it partly from the legacy of our national movement and the inspiration and the guidance of Gandhiji in regard to that; secondly, we are peace-minded people; thirdly, our economic and industrial conditions are such that even if we want to be quarrelsome, we cannot afford it. So, when we look at it from the point of view of the cynic, or the statesman or the philosopher, or just the man in the street, this is the only policy which we can pursue. Like Chesterton who had a very heavy body and is reported to have said, "I have to be cheerful because I can neither fight nor run". I will not take the time of the House on this.

There have been a large number of affirmations of our policy in regard to non-alignment. But we are not here in an academic discussion of this policy. The policy must stand justified by results. And what are those results. Perhaps, we might go from the immediate to our past, backwards. The most crucial and pressing problem is our conflict with China and Pakistan. After the invasion by China, and I make no apologies for it, as a result of the policies that we have pursued—not just non-alignment alone; as a result of the policies that we have pursued—the friendship that we have cultivated, the capacity we have created, in antogonistic interests against us to trust us, for these reasons, China found isolated in this world. The Republic of Albania and the two big countries of North Korea and North Viet Nam were stand on China. And today, probably it was day before yesterday, ninety nations were standing in quene to sign the nuclear test ban treaty at the United Nations, a majority of whom are countries called uncommitted countries.

Then, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, this country became independent in 1947, not in 1945. In 1944-45, those who founded the United Nations spoke on one world government. Wendel Wilkie fought the elections on that issue, but Roosevelt did better than even Wilkie on this and won. By 1947 the world has been divided into two. We had to make up our mind on a large number of question. It would be a common sense view that if we find ourselves involved in a quarrel, then we will meet it as the situation arises. So, then, as today, our policy has been objectively decided by the circumstances, by the capacity, by what is possible and what is necessary and we have not in this matter either been bedraggled or subjected to ridicule, it is a strange irony that while the rest of the world is beginning not only to understand non-alignment but to appreciate it, some of our countryment seem to understand it less and less—I do not mean the generality of our people, but some of them.

What are the dividends or accomplishments of this non-alignment policy? As the hon. Prime Minister said in Parliament or somewhere else on more than one occasion, while this country could not have done it singlehanded, and even if it did it is not wrong for us to proclaim it, we have been instrumental in making essential contributions to peace in a situation which might have resulted in the world war. After three years of serried ranks embattled in Korea where 16 nations on one side and the

[Shri Krishna Menon]

North Koreans and the Chinese so-called volunteers on the other fighting on a 150 or 160 mile run and not a 2,000-miles run, killing nearly three million people and leaving both countries devatsted, for two years they could find no method of bringing this to an end. Even though an armistice had been drawn up, fighting was still going on. The position that this country occupied enabled it to make a contribution to bring it to an end.

The same thing happened when Egypt was invaded by France and Britain in violation of the Convention of 1888. The same thing happened when the colonial countries were trying to annex Cyprus in one way or the other. The same thing happened in regard to the liberation of the Arab and the African countries. Then, there is our contribution to confine as far as possible the uses of atomic energy for peaceful purposes. I could go on reciting these things as much as was necessary.

If the records of the United Nations were read in the way they should be read and not in the way in which Shri Masani has read, it will be found that without claiming credit or ownership of resolutions, time after time, year after year, week after week when we were there, we have tried to bring about a lowering of tensions and our policies have very largely been dictated by this approval.

Even if it is argued that this was all right in 1947 or whatever it was but now we have changed our mind about it, the quotations I have read out to you are from 1956 and 1962. The hon. Member from Amroha told us only two days ago that the Chinese had violated the five-fold agreement before 1954. Then why did he say that in 1956? The Chinese had already shown that they had the least consideration for it. They had violated our sovereignty; they had certainly become moral violaters of the agreement with us even in 1956.

So, if you look at this non-alignment policy, it has gained us a very large number of friends and I hope it will not be regarded as an attempt at effortless superiority that it had assisted other under-developed countries even more than it has assisted us. When this country was known to be following this policy, it was called neutral. Now, I will submit to you that this giving of a name is a very time-honoured but a very ineffective method of describing something. We were called neutrals but we were not neutral because we were not in a war. What these people meant by the word 'neutral' was that if we were not with them we were against them. That situation very soon changed.

It is argued that we do not have friends as a result of the non-alignment policy. I submit that that is not the position. In spite of the fact that China has a very considerable propaganda machine and Pakistan, whatever people may say about the desire of the Western countries to assist us, at no time in our history either before or after independence have the Western powers even befriended us when it comes to an issue between Pakistan and ourselves; therefore, whether it be in this matter or anything else, our position has been that we stand independently in this way. We were alone in those days. Burma joined us afterwards. Today, I suppose, there are some 50 or 60 countries who do not belong to these great power blocs which means to a certain extent that expressed the dignity of nations. They are no longer dragooned. No one can go to the United Nations and say, "I have got so many votes in my pocket" today as they used to do. It has helped the world to go on.

It is said in newspaper stories which come from the other parts of the world mostly and by their poor relations over here that we are the image of India. The image must be made by somebody. We do not make

images ourselves. The image is made by somebody else. The image of India is distorted by whom? There was occasion some three years ago, I think, when on analysing the voting register of the United Nations it was found that the United States had voted with the Soviet Union far more times than we have done. They are the great powes; they speak the same language.

Also, non-alignment has enabled the promotion of anti-colonial policies. It has enabled economic, technical and other assistance to flow into this country. It has enabled us when certain policies are followed which some people may not like to tell our people, "It is only incident; our main policy is non-alignment". This debate has done nothing else but has enabled us to proclaim in this House and to the world—and the voice of the hon. Prime Minister in this House reaches far more than the confines of this Chamber—whether it came to the question of our recent air agreement with the United States and Great Britain or anything else or the Voice of America deal. In one case he says that there are limitations in regard to this. The purpose of the common air exercise is to familiarise ourselves with certain instruments and equipment. But it is in no way a violation of our sovereignty. It will not be permitted to violate our sovereignty. Whether taking advantage of it, anybody who differs from Government policy either on our side or the people who are ambitious on the other side, violate it, that depends upon our national character.

Here I refer to Shri Manubhai Shah. He is the god of licences. He can license imports but he cannot license the import of character. It depends upon our national character. So long as this country stands by its threefold basis of this policy which includes a number of things—the foreign policy of our country as I said in the beginning is not dismissed by this word 'non-alignment'—it is not sufficient, and it will probably be misunderstood, for us to say that we have done well. We do not do well unless we make a contribution topeace and co-operation in this world. Just as none of us have any dignity or existence apart from the independence of this land, this land has no existence worth the while except in a peaceful world. Peace is the most local of all issues, even more local than the prices of food, milk or anything else, because it affects every person born and unborn under modern conditions where it is possible to destroy 16 million people in six hours, where it is possible to lay this planet not only denuded of population but incapable of being inhabited thereafter. It is incumbent on every country, particularly a country like ours, which is a peace-minded country and not a pacifist country, which has a great advantage of very able and imaginative leadership, where the Prime Minister's personality is not only not exhausted by our national commitments and national obligations and who should be the President of this Congress Committee or that—that is all part of the chickenfeed—the main thing is that the great moral, emotional and spiritual backing of the parties of peace is assisted by the position which he takes up. So, there is nothing to apologise for in the non-alignment policy. I make bold to say that when this Party or when this country abandons non-alignment, it will have started on the road to perdition; we will have sacrificed our independence. Non-alignment is only the other side of the medal of independence. It means, there are no foreign policies. I have repeatedly said on some platforms that foreign policy is only the expression of national policy in the context of international relations. Therefore, if you are independent at home, if you are democratic at home—if you are tolerant at home—that will be reflected in co-existence.

It has now come to this position that three days ago the Secretary of State of the United Kingdom, Lord Home, spoke on the television to mil-

[Shri Krishna Menon]

lions of people, not from Broadcasting House in London, but from Moscow on a television work to millions of Russian people. Apart from the fact that this itself is an epoch-making fact, what he said, speaking to the British, was, " I just do not want merely to co-exist with the Russians; I want peaceful relations and I want to be able to work for common causes".

Only the other day a scientist who was invited by the Russians and shown all the space research establishments came out and said, "I am the only human being who has seen them on both sides". What because his mission after this visit? The mission entrusted to him by the Soviets to go to the American Aeronautical Institute on the one hand and to the Ministry of Scientific Affairs in the United Kingdom on the other was to seek to establish cooperation in space research between the two sectors. So many things have happened in this way. Sometimes concessions are made. There may be very strong feeling, still it is put on one side.

I give the latest instance. The Russians have said to the Americans, "We are not going to jam the V.O.A. broadcasts". So, then here is a statesman who for the last 15 years had been indulging in, what the Carnegie Foundation publication calls, gamesmanship, that is to say, finding some way of not agreeing, but not as in the present instance with the Opposition. So, the dividend, the harvest that we have reaped from non-alignment is very considerable. That is the balance-sheet of non-alignment. I make bold to say—I am not making any comparisons—that there is no country, the world today especially having regard to our low economic, military and diplomatic ability and power, in that can command the same degree of confidence of opposing factions; but under certain circumstances they may pour oil on troubled waters. At the same time we do not meddle in others' affairs. When we are wanted, we go.

Now, years ago, they were asked to render service during the days of Korean War by Britain, by all the Commonwealth countries. We accepted it; we stood by it. We never canvassed. Non-alignment has distinguished itself in history. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I ask: what is the alternative? Take alignment. Alignment with whom? Certainly, the Opposition cannot mean alignment with China or with the Soviet Union. It can only be alignment with the West. It would be very embarrassing for them if we had added to the causes which make for international friction.

It is not necessary for me to elaborate this point. This country not only has stood by non-alignment—the reiteration of it here by the Prime Minister here is quite unnecessary—but has also been able to proclaim to the world that air exercises or no air exercises, this country would maintain its independence in foreign policy. We will not surrender our sovereignty. We will negotiate, but will not negotiate on any basis of surrender of sovereignty. That is our position.

It is quite true that in the vast administration, especially manned by personalities who have the acquaintance of previous systems under the great pressures of the world and have examined the capacity of politicians and of civil servants—what you call the home-work—there can be errors and our Government has been the first to come forward to say so. The Opposition has taken advantages. They quote a part of the statement to the Finance Minister, a part of the statement to the Food Minister and a part of the statement to the Prime Minister and say this is what you said. Why don't you read the whole thing? It only shows that we are in a situation where our great men are able to criticise themselves in public or able to think aloud. While it is quite true that we have no system whereby the will of Parliament is discussed in our constituencies, it is also equally

true that they are politically mature. Why do 2,000 or 3,000 people come to meetings? People say that they just come for a *darshan* to see somebody. That is not so. Sociologically, politically, this is an expression of the sense of participation to which they want to belong. So, when an attack is made, it is not made on this Party, on all sections of the Government over which the Prime Minister presides, but upon the whole of this national movement, on the purposes for which it stands. It is only right that we should accept that challenge, so that at the end of this debate there will be certainly more understanding—there are some who find an understanding—for the people concerned.

Now, I come to perhaps the most important part of this foreign policy, namely, the defence, for defence is part of foreign affairs. No longer holding the portfolio of defence, it is not right for me to go into various current matters, but as Member of Parliament, a citizen of this country, one is rather concerned about the facts. People who do not wish us well give an impression that the morale of this country is low and that there are divisions amongst ourselves. This is what has happened else where. This is what happend during the days of War in Europe. Therefore, whatever I say, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, will be conditioned by the circumstances which I submitted to the Prime Minister when I resigned my office. I say, public statements even within the Party must necessarily be conditioned by considerations of security, by the view that one may not involve one's colleagues of the services except by way of useful factual information in one's knowledge, one may not help our adversaries and finally one may not affect the morale of the troops. Those things were borne in mind.

Now, we are not dealing with a small charge of party criticism. What is being said is that this country is not able to defend itself. I think we must go back to the beginning of the transfer of power. This land of ours had no army of its own. What it had was the armed forces of Britain. And we are told that they fought against Rommels and so on and so forth. I am not going to compare this fighting with that fighting. But they fought with the powerful might of the empire. After Independence, the British left. In 15 months practically every British person in command was allowed to go. A new national force come into being and then we had those periods when there were troubles largely under the impact of Independence, the idealism generated by struggles and national emancipation and the aftermanth of the partition. Under the great impact of Gandhiji this land of ours, even today it is so, was moving into an anti-military direction.

I do not have the liberty, that much freedom—and I would not assume it either—to disclose figures. If the army of this country was 'X' at that time, our ambition then was to run it down to 'X' minus something. For some years we succeeded in doing so; we cut down military budgets. Ultimately came the year of 1956-57 or so when we realised we could not rest in peace with Pakistan intruding and menacing us everywhere. Five weeks later our Independence the Pakistani army walked into the Indian territory and committed rapine and plunder and killed a large number of people many of whom were Muslims since the majority of the population of Kashmir is Muslim. This army since 1939 has known no rest. They were engaged on many fronts. There are troops in Jammu and Kashmir standing guard on our frontiers. It must not be forgotten. It is not that because there is a cease-fire line somewhere that will be an adequate protection for us. The frontiers of our land are protected even today by the might of the army of our country.

We had troubles also in eastern India—the Naga trouble. It is the form of help to the civil power. During the last few years, by the use of the might of the armed forces, not so much for killing purposes or otherwise, we have more or less sterilised

[Shri Krishna Menon]

the field in which the Chinese and Pakistanis would have sown the wind in the hope of reaping the whirlwind. So, our troops have been occupied in this way. We have also got into the habit which—for the Government and particularly the Prime Minister must bear some responsibility—of sending our army to do civil work where there is trouble, whether it is the flood problem of the Jamuna river or the trouble at Kumbh *mela* or something of that kind or in the matter of dropping foodstuffs to the trouble-stricken people. But in spite of that, the size of the army which was 'X' was cut down to 'X' minus something and though the size 'X' minus something went on in Planning Commission's mind, it went up, shall we say, from 1 to 1½ size in a short time. So much has the increase gone on until it multiplied again and reached its present size somewhere in October last year. That is an increase of armed forces of a very considerable size. May I say, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, it is not as though the Gandhi Ashram or the Prime Minister form the public opinion in this country. The United States, the United Kingdom, the Russians, the Italians, everybody else, particularly those people who are very conversant with our economic affairs say that we are spending too much money on military affairs. They were always referring to the large proportion of expenditure on military matters. So, that was the condition of the world at that time. In the short time, up to 1959, this thing went on.

In 1959 the Chinese brought their act of betrayal more to the surface. From that time onwards it would be not a bold but an ignorant or reckless man alone, who has no regard for history who can say that we were inactive. During 1959 to 1962 thousands of square miles of territories which have been under the exclusive dominance of China was brought, not under our occupation, but in such a way as our presence was establish and Chinese aggression was checked. This was in Ladakh. And so in the north-eastern frontier. It is quite true that we also suffered reverses in the north-eastern frontier. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, we were not the only country in the world to suffer this. Mighty Britain, after not being prepared for war for a very long time, having entered into offensive and defensive alliances with Poland to guard its integrity, and not being ready, tried to stave off war by selling Czechoslovakia a few years before that. But they were rolled out of the whole continent of Europe. And so was France. As Hitler used to say, "France for breakfast, Belgium for lunch, Holand for dinner". that was the position. But they came back and their national character enabled them to rally and to fight the battles. (*Interruption*). May I finish? And in 1942, when the tide of the war was against the alied powers with not a victory to their credit, and their armies were rolling out everywhere, it was at that time that at Casabalanca the allied leaders spoke to the world. And that was to establish a world of peace. Those who were defeated in the war also joined in it. That was the position.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): Did Britain accept a unilateral treaty even by Hitler?

Shri Krishna Menon: I do not keep Hitler's confidence, either now or then. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let there be no running commentary.

Shri Krishna Menon: And so the army was provisioned, was trained, was regulated from White Hall, not from here. At the beginning of our Independence we made no military equipment in this country; we repaired some of them. And thanks to the world war they had to send something over here. During that period, and in the first ten years, we improved on them and went on.

Then came a period when in 1956 our advance factories we carrying large surpluses of men, because we were in the phase of wanting to cut down

military strength. We gave them work, and while in 1956 they produced Rs. 14 crores worth of military goods, in the year ending March 1963 they produced military goods worth about Rs. 62 crores. I have seen in some newspapers that these are concocted figures. Which Minister can escape the scrutiny of the Finance Ministry and audit? And, what is more, in these latest figures is included a very considerable rise in warfare goods as such, because the proportion of the other ones even for military purposes was much smaller. So, the actual proportion, after the increase in military goods, in the twelve months ending March 1963, as I said, is somewhere about Rs. 50 or 60 crores. And if you add the output of other factories like dockyards, Hindustan Aircraft etc., it would come to somewhere about Rs. 70 to 80 crores. At the same time, military establishments multiplied their intake, and Government and the party was not at any time neglectful that tomorrow has to be built by the preparations of today. And so, the NCC and military colleges, all these were expanded to a very considerable size.

Then it has been said that the army ran away from these places without offering battle. There has been no part of our territory for which a supreme, great sacrifices had not been made by our fighting troops. There is no doubt that we were facing overwhelming numbers. I have not got the time to deal with this item by item. But during this period since Independence we have produced vehicles for transport and vehicles for fighting purposes. And there is no country of our dimensions which produces heavy fighting vehicles. They produce guns, guns of various types, and also long-range weapons and automatic weapons. We hear a great deal about automatic weapons, and it is not for me to go into the details of them; but this country from its own factories and without any assistance from anywhere have not put them into production, with a licence to manufacture automatic rifles, it took Australia a year and a half more than we took. Then, it has the neswpapers, it is said by some of our people—I do not quite follow because the speeches are in Hindi—that the Government machine makes coffee-pots and therefore cannot make guns. I was reading the other day an account of the defence production in Australia where they turned out of their ordnance factories not only coffee-pots but something else also; but the number of coffee-pots was exactly twelve. Secondly, they were made out of metals and other things thrown away and in order to keep the people who are rifle-makers and who cannot be sent away. So, whatever it is I think this is not the time to go into these matters, whether we take equipment or anything else.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Britain rules this country for at least a hundred years before it transferred power to us—some people say it three hundred years or three hundred and fifty years —whatever it is, they did not build an inch of road in the territories which have now been attacked. They believed in the idea of somebody fighting here or there and their ruling India.

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): But they kept Tibet as a buffer State. You have handed it over to China.

Shri Krishna Menon: During this period communications were built in these impassable areas, not by foreign assistance. So we opened these places up. Now, it is quite true—I do not know whether it can be said without reservation—there was the expectation, with the reservations, that China, having regard to their own commitments, having regard to international obligations, having regard to her interests, would not attack. It might be fashionable to say so; China might have hurt us, but she has hurt herself more than anything else.

Shri Nath Pai: That is the only satisfaction we have.

Shri Krishna Menon: And therefore that was not expected without reservation. We were prepared for it. From 1959 onwards that preparation was going on. But let it not be forgotten that the Chinese army has been fighting for the last thirtyfive years, and it consists, as far as we know, of 150 divisions of men. It is not a factor which should frighten us; because, a country, large or small, whether it has strength or otherwise, must resist.

It was said the other day that political decisions have been taken to resist the Chinese in NEFA. I beg with great respect to you, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, and to the House, to ask, who else could make the decision to fight against a country except those who can make political decisions? It is for soldiers to decide which country they will attack and which country they will defend against? The limitations, or the autonomy of the soldier is in regard to operations. And for myself, and I feel sure the Government will make no apologies for the assertion of civilian control over the army. The attack on this score fits into the pattern and the approach of the speech made by the hon. Member from Rajkot.

Shri Nath Pai: Let us have the NEFA report.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Let us have the NEFA debacle report.

Shri Krishna Menon: No instructions.... (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Let him not be disturbed.

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): We have a right to ask him. Is it not a fact that you superseded the advice of your Generals in the matter of tactics and defence line.... (*Interruption*).

Shri Krishna Menon: No instructions were given....

Shri Frank Anthony: It is true. You superseded the advice.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Guilty conscience.

Shri Ranga: His Government has dismissed him, his party has dismissed him, the whole nation has dismissed him.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. When a Member is on his legs he should be allowed to go on.

Shri Nath Pai: Occasional interruptions should be allowed.

Shri Ranga: He has the cheek to say this. It is the Prime Minister who has dismissed him; it is the country which has dismissed him. He owes an apology to the nation an dthe Prime Minister.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He can refute the arguments. This is not the way to go on.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: How can I do so when half of it I don't hear?

Shri Ranga: Three-fourths.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: He wants to know my opinion. I shall give it.

Shri Ranga: He says he makes no apology. He has to apologise to you and to the whole nation.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: What the hon. Member says has nothing to do with the facts. He just gets excited.

Shri Ranga: Why did yoy dismiss him then?

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Take him back!

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. You may leave it to the Prime Minister and Mr. Krishna Menon. Let there be no distrubances.

Shri Nath Pai: He has the check to come and say this.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: He ought to be ashamed of himself.

Shri Krishna Menon: At no time, to my knowledge, has any member of the Government or the Government collectively or the administration given any instructions to any Commander or any military element, of any kind which is not legitimately in his sphere. At no time has anyone had the stupidity to interfere with the deployment of troops or with what angle they should hold the gun or anything of that kind. It is ridiculous. As the Prime Minister stated the other day, it is entirely baseless to suggest that the campaign, good or bad, was conducted from Delhi. It is conducted from Delhi in the sense that the Army Headquarters is situated here, and it is the business of the Chief of Army Staff and the Chief of Air Staff who are concerned with it.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Publish the report.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): It was specifically mentioned in the report that there was too much of political interference from Delhi. So, let it be placed on the Table of the House. And the report although a secret document till now, has apportioned blame on General Kaul also.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: He is shilly-shallying and dilly-dallying. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member will get his own time and then he can speak. Then, he can meet his argument.....

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Within ten minutes, how can we do that?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker:....So, let the hon. Member who is on his legs not be disturbed. The hon. Member Shri Kamath may refute his argument when he gets his chance.

Shri Ranga: This is the fag end of the debate. How can we refute? (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: May I submit that this is not fair that the Members of the Opposition should make such a lot of noise because they do not like something that is said?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Do not lecture to us. Let there be no sermons here. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Let him go on. The hon. Member may not agree with him. But let him go on in his own way. The hon. Member may refute his argument later. Now, let there be no disturbance.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: We have heard him with patience for more than half an hour already.

Shri Krishna Menon: Then, it was said:

> "I think it would disturb the soul of the Father of the Nation that in recent years.....".

—this was said in 1958—

> "there has been an increase of about Rs. 100 crores in the military budget. Why are we increasing our military establishments? We have no designs on any country. We have declared that tragic as has been the division of the country, we have no intention of cancelling this Partition by means of arms. I do not suppose many nations on our borders have any designs upon us.".

Then, he goes on to say:

> "When we acknowledge Mahatma Gandhi as the Father of the

[Shri Krishna Menon]

Nation, all that we can do is, and our effort should be, to put a ceiling on our defence expenditure. Let us, for instance, say that....".

Shri J. B. Kripalani: You were calling the Chinese bhai-bhai then. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: We do not want traitors here.... (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I do not see why tempers should be lost.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): He has called him a traitor. He should withdraw his remark. It should be expunged. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: What is the use of saying 'Order, order'?....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. I do not see why tempers should be lost like this.

Shri Nath Pai *rose*—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Nath Pai may please sit down. This is a cool deliberative body. There is no need to lose tempers. Let not hon. Members lose their tempers. (*Interruptions*) I do not say that every Member will agree with what Shri Krishna Menon says. They may differ. But let him go on in his own way. Just as every other Member has a right to speak, he has also got a right to speak.

Shri Ranga: We did not disturb him when he was supporting the Prime Minister on his policy of non-alignment. We did not disturb him then...

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Why disturb him now?

Shri Ranga:....But then the man comes here and has the temerity and the cheek to say that he has no apologies to make to this House. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I do submit that this behaviour that is going on here is neither fair nor creditable to anybody who indulges in it. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Ranga: You dismissed him. You should also be dismissed.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I would submit that a certain hon. Member is speaking. It may be that the Members opposite do not agree with him. As a matter of fact, he was reading a quotation. I do not know where the quotation is from. But I have an idea that it was from the speech of Acharya Kripalani. I think he was reading from that. Now, if Acharya Kripalani gets irritated at his own speech, it is nobody's fault.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: It is the defence of his defence. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order, Now, let us proceed calmly.

Shri Nath Pai: May I make a submission?.... (*Interruptions*). Please have some patience. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: You are controlling us... Why don't you control them also?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: If an hon. Member stands up like this in the midst of a speech by another hon. Member, naturally any hon. Member will feel disturbed. Let the speech go on now.

Shri Nath Pai: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I would beg of you to allow me. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. Member who has rightly the floor, but let me say one sentence only. I fully

recognise.... (*Interruptions*). May I say that the Prime Minister yesterday made an appeal to us that let us try to have decorum here?.....

An Hon. Member: We have not followed you.

Shri Nath Pai: You have not followed what I have said?

अगर आप फ़ालो नहीं करते हैं, तो क्या मैं हिन्दी में बोलूं ?

I have to make a submission, because we want to conduct the proceedings properly. The hon. Prime Minister has again renewed his appeal. What happened was that Shri Kripalani had just said:

"भाई भाई" के दिनों में मैंने यह कहा था।"

But the Prime Minister completely forgets his responsibility, bangs the table and waves his hand and so on... (*Interruptions*).

श्री नाथ पाई : वह इन बातों को प्रारम्भ करते हैं, शुरू करते हैं। उनके लिए यह उचित नहीं था।

Shri Tyagi: They are not angry. They are deliberately saying this.

गुस्सा नहीं है, बल्कि वे जान-बूझ कर गुस्सा दिखाते हैं।

Shri Krishna Menon: Then, it was said:

> "When we acknowledge Mahatma Gandhi as the Father of the Nation, all that we can do is, and our effort should be to put a ceiling on our defence expenditure. Let us, for instance, say that this is the maximum level we have reached.....".

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द (करनाल): उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरी प्रार्थना सुन लीजिए।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आर्डर, आर्डर। आप बैठिए।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : आज वह लम्बे-चौड़े भाषण देते हैं। उनको कम से कम शर्म तो आनी चाहिए।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आर्डर, आर्डर।

Shri Krishna Menon: He said further:

> "Let us for instance, say, that this is the maximum level we have reached, and we will not think of increasing it. Rs. 275 crores is not a small sum. Let us try to adjust our defence expenditure within that limit.".

This was said by Acharya Kripalani in this House in 1958.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: That was when you were talking of China as *'Chini-Hindi-Bhai-Bhai'*. I did not talk of 'Chini-Hindi-bhai-bhai'. It was they who were talking of 'Chini-Hindi-bhai-bhai'.

Shri Krishna Menon: If the House desires, I can read out this portion or just mention it, and I can read out what he said further. What the hon. Member said was since China is 'bhai-bhai', therefore, there was no need for us to defend ourselves. That was what he said. It was not Government that said that we could depend upon this bhai bhai business.

Shri Frank Anthony: On a point of order, Sir. My point of order is this. Is it permissible, and is it in conformity with parliamentary decorum or tradition that a Minister who has been indicted, and who has been found guilty by him own party.... (*Interruptions*).

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: No.

Several Hon. Members: No. He should withdraw that remark.

An Hon. Member: Why dismiss him then?

Shri Frank Anthony: Sir, I am not giving way. I must formulate my point of order.... (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. Let the hon. Member resume his seat.

Shri Frank Anthony: You must allow me to formulate my point of order. I have not yet formulated it. I have absolute right to formulate it. (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Please withdraw that remark that he has been found guilty.

Shri Frank Anthony: All right.... (*Interruptions*).

Shri Ranga: Why should he withdraw that remark? What is the justification for saying that?

Shri Frank Anthony: I want to know whether a Minister who was indicted for reponsibility for this debacle—and the Prime Minister has confirmed that indictment—could get up here and say that he does not apologise for his policies which led to that debacle. How can he do that.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There is absolutely no point of order in this. (*Interruptions*). It is a question of decorum. An hon. Member of this House has got every right to explain his position.

Shri Hem Barua: But he does not have the right to tell lies.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We are losing time this way.

Shri Hem Barua: A Minister had resigned from the House of Commons for telling a lie.

Shri Krishna Menon: The leader of the Swatantra Party, with his vast exeprience in many fields, tells us:

> "The genius of India is shanti, transquillity and her mission in the world is the conquest of fear by the strength of the spirit within".

He goes on sometime after:

> "Not content with the purchase of an aircraft carrier, the Defence Ministry of India is contemplating the purchase of guided missiles from Moscow. We are told that without such equipment the IAF will not be able to utilise the Russian MIGs with full effectiveness.
>
> "From one thing to another and from that to yet another, the claim of ruinous commitments will go on. It is easy and even pleasant to begin a course. But soon the tragedy gets unfolded. Where are we going to be landed with this military expenditure pattern?"

Again:

> "A war psychosis is now being created on the basis of information about China and Pakistan retailed by the Government to the public...

An Hon. Member: Is there no time-limit?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member has taken one hour.

Shri Krishna Menon: Is the time they take to be deducted from my time?

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya (Raiganj): This is a matter for the Congress Party. Why should the Opposition say it?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Still, there are some other Members from the Congress Party who want to speak.

Shri Krishna Menon: My submission is that for a country that emerged from colonialism, when its arms were in the hands of its masters, it has built up its defence production and is continuing to do so under the guidance of this Government.

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : जब आप इतने बड़े सज्जन हैं, तो आप से इस्तीफ़ा क्यों ले लिया ।

Shri Krishna Menon: Our policy has never prevented us from procurring arms from elsewhere because from the day of our independence, we have procured whatever arms and equipment we required from the UK, from the USA, from European countries and from Russia and various other places. Non alignment has never come in our way. I myself had the experience of personally having spoken to the Secretary for Defence of the United States and have been given weapons and other things with permission to make them—which were normally not released. The idea that our policy has been of a character which has what is called an ideology is something that cannot stand examination. Talking of ideology, I would take a few minutes to explain.

Shri Hem Barua: Did you not say in London in 1931:

"I would like the ship that carries Mahatma Gandhi to go down to the bottom of the sea"? (*Interruptions*).

Shri Krishna Menon: It is being said that on account of our ideology, the country is being adversely affected. What is the position? Russia and China are both communist countries. Today we have the situation that Russia is denouncing China for her attack on India. We have no ideological affiliations with Russia, but still weapons of war and equipment are not being withheld for that reason. The United States and Pakistan have ideological affiliations and yet Pakistan is an ally of China. So in this game of alignments and blocks, to say that non-alignment is putting us in two separate pockets is just the limit of absurdity.

We come to the last of these things. The main burden of Shri Masani's speech has been the attack on our social policy. We are told about free enterprise, the free world, free initiative. Freedom for whom? Freedom for the exploiter, for the profit-maker, for the tax-evader..... (*Interruptions*).

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Freedom for the traitor.

Shri Ranga: Freedom for controls, licences, Ministers and their hangers on. (*Interruptions*)

Shri Krishna Menon: What are these freedom from? Freedom from tax, freedom from integration..... (*Interruptions*).

This Party, whatever may happen, stands pledged to a policy of a socialist democracy. And the reason is not to win an election or lose one.... (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. We cannot go on in this way. Let us go on calmly.

Shri Krishna Menon: It is, again, purely practical. That is to say, from the days our Prime Minister was President of the Congress some 33 years ago on the banks of the Ravi—which is no longer with us—proclaimed the independence of this country. He said it was not only for the removal of the foreign invader, but the product of toil shall go back to the toiler. That was implemented to the toiler. That was sought to be implemented by the Karachi Resolution. It was continued by the national movement in its pre-independence days and in 1950, with the inauguration of the Constitution, we distributed political power equally, without distinction of man or woman, rich or poor, tall or short or anything of the kind. And having released that vast quantum of aspirations into the minds of people in the hundreds of thousands of our villages, are we going to say that those aspirations have not to be met by economic content, because independence means more food, more sanitation, more shelter, more dignity for our people? And that is the basis of our socialist society. It is not an

[Shri Krishna Menon].

ideology, it is not a religion. We are not going to be frightened if any names are called. Shri Masani has the kindness—he has been very kind to me for 40 years—to say that it was very worng to have as Defence Minister one who is a crypto-communist.

Shri Ranga: Are you not?

Shri Krishna Menon: Please listen.

Shri Frank Anthony: Look at the applause he gets from the communists.

Shri Krishna Menon: A crypto-communist can only mean two things, either a person who is not a communist—eitherwise why call him 'crypto'; call him communist—or it can have another meaning; it can mean a concealed communist. If the latter is meant, it is an attack not on my political faith but on my character. If that is so, I treat it with the disregard which it deserves.

14 hrs.

Therefore, it is this socialist society that they are attacking. Here is Rajaji who advises his partymen, 'Do not take any notice of the proletariat'. Here is Shri Masani saying, 'We belong to the middle class'. There is no middle, unless there are two ends on either side. Rajaji advises them not to have anything to do with the proletariat, whoever they are. We are told by Rajaji that any attempt by the Government, either by way of the Finance Minister's taxes or by way of anything else, is tantamount to robbing the country. He says it is stealing people's goods, taking everything away. Obviously, you cannot get something unless you take it away—whether it is taken legitimately and so on. He says it is legal robbery. It is no more legal robbery than committing a man to death sentence for a capital offence.

Therefore, here the attack is on the one hand on our national integration, against the unity of this country, which enabled us to dislodge the mightiest empire of our time. It was not our might as such in that way which achieved it. Then it is an attack on our foreign policy in which is included defence. Whatever may be the failings of this country or of this Government or of the Opposition, are we to allow someone else to profit by them?

Shri P. K. Deo (Kalahandi): Mao, the Chinese.

Shri Krishna Menon: We are told that production for Defence should be done by people who know how to manufacture, the private industrialists, here or abroad. There is no industrial base in this country for defence production outside the governmental establishments. Therefore, whether you take one side or the other, we stand full committed to this position for the establishment of a democratic socialist society, not because it is better than somebody else's but because without it we cannot survive. The mass poverty of this land is such that the weight of that poverty will pull down this polity. Therefore, relief on the one hand, the stability of our society, the maintenance of our parliamentary institutions, and what is more, our position in the world, are dependent upon this threefold policy of this party which, I say, is not a political party in the western sense of the term. It is a vast national movement which has gathered to itself the emotion of our people, deep-roted in our racial memories, so to say. it is a vast projection, respected by the Opposition when they go out of this country. What is more, it is not just an alternative. It is an indispensable inevitability in this land. Shri Masani spoke about, 'half slave, half free'. There is no slavery now in the international sense except what is called in the free world in Portugal. But no country can live half slave and half free, when Mr. B. R. Sen tells us that 250 million of our people live below what is considered in modern times as the normal level of subsistence.

It is the policy of the Government to raise standards of life. Hindrance has come from what was said by, I think, the previous speaker, that we proceed on a basis of what is called revolution by consent, that is the parliamentary method. And when you do that, and especially the hon. gentlemen opposite want to exhibit differences by proportional representation and what not, the pace is not that of the slowest, but somewhat slowed down. So, the price of peaceful change is sometimes delay and gradualism. But there can be no return from this, because the masses of this country have been endowed with political power. The world is awake. The millions of Africa who ten years ago were harassed, who were beyond the pale of civilisation, are now members of 30 independent nations laying down the law in regard to the march towards peace and the eclipse of colonialism. Today Portugal stands shivering, not as Shri Masani said, who criticised the Government for unifying Goa with this country. He said our army has other things to do. And Shri Rajagopalachari said the "image" of India.... I am amused at these words "the image of India"—is darkened in the Security Council.

We are told that the Tibetan question went to the Security Council. This is news to me. I never heard of the Tibetan question going to the Security Council or being on its agenda. This is the way information is being given by those people who have got at their disposal funds for democratic research.

We are also told that Government has done something wrong about Hungary. What did we say about Hungary? It is time that the people who criticise us about Hungary read the proceedings in that debate. What we said is that our Government would not be a party to any decision which enabled the United Nations to conduct elections or to interfere in any other way in a severeign territory without her consent. And who moved the resolution? Pakistan, which wanted foreign interference in Kashmir.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: You said it was like a riot in Ahmedabad streets. What are you talking?

Shri Krishna Menon: I will read out what I said.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: He said it was like a riot in Ahmedabad streets. Why have you forgotten those things?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I must correct him. He did say that. Let him deny that. (*Interruptions*).

Shri Tyagi: He said he is a traitor. Those words should be expunged.

Shri S. K. Patil: Nobody has heard him.

Shri Krishna Menon: This is what I said:

> "My Government feels that we ..... place the responsibility where it lies, analyse the facts as they are, and call upon the Secretary General to enter into direct discussions with the Governments of the Soviet Union and of Hungary in order to bring about the withdrawal of foreign troops, the cessation of intervention, the recognition that the masses of the Hungarian people do not want that arrangement, while at the same time it is our information that they do not want a dictatorship or a form of government of the other kind."

And then, in the course of the discussion, the resolution was passed which was moved on behalf of the Indian Government with two votes more than a similar resolution moved by the West. It opened up the way for observers going into Hungary, and the policy of this Government has been.....

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I will want 1½ hours to reply to this man.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The Congress Party has its own time. Even one Member can take the time.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: But yesterday you did not give Dr. Lohia time.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member knows the procedure. Whatever time is allotted to a party can be taken up by one Member or half a dozen people. It is left to the party to decide it.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: How can I reply to him?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: When the Congress Party has got time, I have to allow it.

Shri Krishna Menon: Therefore, this debate, so far as I am concerned, has enabled the Government to clear some points, and what is more, to draw sustenance both from the dimensions of the criticism and the other points that have been raised, but this party and this country will not resile from the policies of independence in external and internal affairs from its determination and endeavaur for the establishment of a democratic society for and in the pursuit of peace and world cooperation.

Shri P. K. Deo: It is a tribute to Indian democracy that this Parliament discusses today a vote of no confidence, so ably tabled by my hon. friend Acharya Kripalani. It is a unique occasion to see the Council of Ministers in the dock, replying to the various charges made by the Opposition. We feel that whatever may be the outcome of the voting, we sincerely hope, it will have the desired effect of correcting the Government and creating healthy conventions for posterity.

Many speakers have pointed out from the side that the Government has failed in its policies at home and abroad. A persistent pursuit of platitude and appeasement in foreign relations has brought us to this mess. In spite of our condemnation of colonialism in other parts of the world, we were the first to put our seal of approval on the colonisation of Tibet by China.

Some Hon. Members: Shame.

Shri P. K. Deo: We are the persons who approved of the individuality, the severeignty, the culture and religion of Tibet being sacrificed at the alter of *Hindi-Chini bhai bhai.* Thousands of Tibetans were butchered and were subjected to cruelly torturous methods; I charge the Government of being abettors in that genocide.

In the first international agreement with Tibet in 1954 we criminally failed to define and demarcate our northern borders. The previous speaker has stated that the question of Tibet was never raised in the United Nations. With all the emphasis at my command, I would like to state here that when El Salvador raised the question of Tibet in the Steering Committee of the General Assembly of the United Nations, it was the Jam Saheb of Nawanagar, who was the representative of India, said that the Tibetan question would be solved most peacefully and that India stood guarantee for it.

Some Hon. Members: Shame.

Shri P. K. Deo: Then, the first cartographical aggression started, it was followed up by naked and unprovoked aggression on this country, and today 20,000 square miles of Indian soil are under the illegal occupation of China. A party and a government which cannot defend the territorial integrity of this country has no business to rule, and I submit that they have forfeited all claims to rule this country.

It is not a question of adjustment of a few square miles this side or

that side. The game is much deeper. It is not the 38th paralled in Korea that has solved the problem, it is not the 17th parallel in Viet Nam that has settled the matters. The communist game is much deeper. It is infiltration, it is subversion, it is creating chaos, it is all part of their game of world domination. And still our Government is complacent, and they want to bring the matter to the negotiating table. I do not know what will happen. All those communist friends and those friends inside the Government who still think that the avenues of negotiation are open, want to see this country as a defeated and humiliated nation. It is the vacillating policy of the Government, its weak-kneed policy in inforeign affairs, which has been responsible for the surrender of these 20,000 square miles.

14·14 hrs.

[SHRI KHADILKAR *in the Chair*]

My hon. friend Shri Masani gave a list of those allied countries which the communists will not dare to attack. They will not dare to liberate even the 29 square miles of Hong Kong or the eleven square miles of Portuguese Macao. Still they come here to liberate this country. forcibly occupy 20,000 square miles. However one good thing has happened. The Chinese offensive of the 20th October, 1962 has shaken the Government from slumber and has jolted everyone to a new awareness.. (*Interruptions.*) We adopted a solemn resolution of November 11th to drive out the aggressor from the sacred soil of India, however hard and long the struggle may be and it generated a new enthusiasm and a new determination to fight till victory is won and the nation stood as one man behind the Prime Minister. But the Prime Minister failed to utilise unique opportunity to forge a united nation and to have a more efficient administration by having a national government of talents. These eventful nine months were utilised for clapping down many a patriot like Dr. Satya Narayan Sinha and others for their patriotic criticism of the various lapses of the Government and many trade union workers have been clapped in jail for exercising the fundamental right of collective bargaining.

After Dunkirk, what did Churchill do? He took the entire house into confidence and he placed all the cards. After the discussion, Mr. Churchill emerged from the House of Commons as a taller man with reassured confidence of the nation. But here the Prime Minister hides things from the House. If the Prime Minister hides things from the House. If the Prime Minister has no confidence in the House what capacity he has got to demand the confidence of the House. If General Henderson Brooks report is published, probably the responsibility of the reverses in Sela and Bomdila would be squarly placed on our former Defence Minister, Mr. Krishna Menon. It is this reason that prompts the Prime Minister to keep the entire report secret. Similarly justice Das's report has been kept a secret and the Prime Minister throws his mantle of protection to protest his favourite Mr. K. D. Malviya.

Coming to the home front, the speaker of my group Mr. Masani has very creditably drawn the attention of the House towards gold control and taxation, the holding of the price line, etc., and I do not like to repeat those remarks. The Constitution from which our Government has drawn its authority has been treated with scant respect. The Fundamental Rights guaranteed under the Constitution have been treated as pie-crust to be broken at convenience to give practical shape to the whims and fancies of the Government. If any adverse decision has been passed by the Supreme Court, instead of changing Government policy. Constitution is amended. In a period of thirteen years 16 times it has undergone change: it is going to be amended the seventeenth time to rob the poor peasant of his right over the land. Government may hoodwink the people by socialist

[Shri P. K. Deo]

slogan. But we know what socialism means in this country. It is perpetuation of the licence permit-quota raj. It has created monopolies of State capitalism and the only beneficiaries are the congressmen. Nationalisation in this country means 0·2 per cent. return on investment; it means wasteful expenditure of the public exchequer and rehabilitation of the defeated congressmen. Some people say that if they are men of talent why could not they be utilised in the service of the country. With all humility, I say that there is a special process for recruiting people. The employment exchange cannot the in the Jantar Mantar road; nor can the High Command become the U.P.S.C. If you want a list of various defeated congressmen who have been employed in the various national undetakings, I have a long list starting with Satish Chandra, Joginder Singh and others. I do not want to waste my time in repeating those names.... (*An Hon. Member*: General Kaul also).

Somebody referred to the motely crowd in the Opposition. But what is Congress today? It is an assortment of idealogically divergent groups of men in pursuit of self-interest, the common tie being fishes and loaves. The provocative speech of my hon. friend Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad makes it an imperative necessity for me to speak of corruption which has corroded the moral fibre of the nation. Persons in glass houses should not throw stones at others. Businessmen are made to part with money and expect something in return. Knowingly corruption is given shelter. This is revealed by the statement of Shri Naba Krishna Chowdhury, the former Chief Minister of Orissa and President of the Sarva Seva Sangh. His statement appeared in the Daily *Samaj*, which is a paper of the people of India society and a translation of that appears in the *Current*. I shall read a few passages from that:

"Starting disclosures regarding collection of party funds by top congressmen for conducting election campaigns were made recently in Balasore by former Chief Minister of Orissa and Sarvodaya leader Mr. Nabakrishna Chaudhury. Securing funds from big businessmen for winning the elections not only resulted in the filing of false election returns when actual expenses were much higher than permissible statutory limits, but also led to the keeping of duplicate accounts to conceal such transactions from tax collectors."

Mr. Chairman: Where is he reading from?

Shri P. K. Deo: I am reading the translation.

Mr. Chairman: Of the original statement? I would permit him to read from the original statement. No commentary of the editor.

Shri P. K. Deo: This is not a commentary of the editor; this is the original statement.

"Mr. Chaudhuri said that the late Rafi Ahmed Kidwai also indulged in this practice. When at last it was condemned as corrupt, Congress appointed a sub committee in 1953 to investigate the matter and Chaudhury was appointed a member. The Committee, according to Mr. Chaudhury has not met even once."

Sir, he has further stated that the Kondu leaves contractor have to pay Rs. 30 lakhs to the revenue of the Government. At the same time they were paying Rs. 12 to 13 lakhs a year to the Congress chest. We know what the Kendu leaves scandal in the Orissa State is; how the favourites of the Government were given the monopoly for the collection of leaves at the cost of the tenants' rights.

Besides this, how the Congress men indulged in trade with Government has been admitted by no less a person than the present Chief Minister of

my State in his press statement which was often quoted by Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad. In page 29, he says regarding Shri Biren Mittra, the Deputy Chief Minister of my State that "I put him into business in 1959. In four years the firm's gross profits, I hear are over Rs. 16 lakhs for the period ending the 31st March, 1963." Uptil now, Shri Biren Mittra has not paid a single pie of Income tax. All my remarks would be corroborated if I quote something from the statement of Dr. Hare Krushna Mahtab. Dr. Mahtab, in his own paper 'The Eastern Times', has said:

> "That it was 'highly objectionable' that a Minister (of Government of Orissa) should carry on business with the Government and make huge profit."

Shri Ranga: Hear, hear.

Shri P. K. Deo: He stated that the Chief Minister has made a startling admission that "Sri Mitra even while he is the Deputy Chief Minister now is carrying on business (which is mostly with Government of Orissa) and has made a profit of Rs. 16 lakhs in the course of the last three or four years".

Shri Ranga: Through his wife.

Shri P. K. Deo: He (Shri Hare Krushna Mahtab, an hon. Member of this House and a former Chief Minister) has stated that "the Chief Minister's remarks concerning Dr. Mahtab while defending the acceptance of money by Mr. Mitra and Mr. K. D. Malviya that if it comes to this that Malviya or Mitra is to be defended at my cost, then I would demand a judicial enquiry."

Shri Ranga: Hear, hear.

Shri P. K. Deo: So, we all demand a judicial enquiry. A non-official motion is being tabled in the Orissa Legislative Assembly.

Shri Ranga: Hear, hear.

14.38 hrs.

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

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

Shri P. K. Deo: I have to get 35 minutes. Five minutes are taken by the noise. I beg to submit, Sir, that it is this clique who are at the helm of affairs of my State and exploit this State resources for their own end. They have corrupted the public life in Orissa. They are responsible for purchasing the M.L.As.

Shri Ranga: Hear, hear.

Shri P. K. Deo: An artificial majority was created in 1957 when the Congress was returned in a number of 56 in a House of 140. It is Shri Biju Patnaik who is the Kingpin of corruption. The Prime Minister always threw his mantle of protection to save the blue edged boy of his.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad criticised that my friend Shri Surendranath Dwivedy accepted some money from Shri Biju Patnaik but, sir, there is a difference between his accepting money from Shri Biju Patnaik and of Shri Malaviya from Mr. Sirajuddin. Shri Biju Patnaik parted with the money for Shri Surendranath Dwivedy for a different purpose. But Serajuddin parted with the money for Shri Malaviya with the intention of getting some favour from him who was a Minister. Sir, it is true that Shri R. N. Singh Deo, my leader, refused to probe it because he did not want a repetition of S. K. Dass' Report who has acted on a private letter written by the Prime Minister. He wanted the statutory powers under the Commission of Enquiry Act so that he can have access to all the Government papers and of the papers of the Kalinga Tubes and Orissa Agents. When they were refused, he rightly declined to probe into that. We all demand that nothing short of a judicial enquiry is going to satisfy the country. Under these circumstances, I beg to submit that the

[Shri P. K. Deo]

Congress Party has forfeited the right to rule this country. After all, time and again, I have said that this country is not the zamindari of an individual or of a party.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad (Bhagalpur): There are no Maharajas now.

Shri P. K. Deo: Before I would conclude, I would like to quote a line from Mahatma Gandhi. Mahatma Gandhi had said:

> "The real Swaraj will come not by the acquisition of authority by a few but by the acquisition of the capacity by all to resist the authority if it is abused."

In other words, Swaraj is to be obtained by taking the masses to that capacity to regulate and control authority.

Thank you, Sir.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): Let me thank you for giving me an opportunity for participating in this debate. I did not think it proper to record a silent vote on this motion.

The motion before the House is one of no confidence in the Ministry. There are no special reasons given for this. Therefore the motion is rather a unique one. It is unique for this reason that in the last fifteen years the Congress Party has been in power, ever since the Parliament has been in existence. During this long period there was no occasion for a motion of this kind to be moved by anybody. It is for the first time that the motion is coming up here. The Congress can as well claim that for the last fifteen years it has been carrying on administration and after fighting three elections it has been returned to power. That, in itself, is a matter of which the Congress can legitimately be proud of. But at the same time it should also consider why at the end of fifteen years, after staying in power and having all the opportunities of administration, there should arise an occasion particularly for them to see that opposition parties have allied themselves for the purpose of moving a motion of this kind. That is a matter which, I believe, should be carefully considered by the Congress.

I am speaking in this House on this motion with a heavy heart, because I am a person who has association with this side and that side of the House. I am associated with members on this side and that side some of whom are prominent members occupying the highest position in the Congress organisation. I was myself a humble member of the Congress Party and as such I have had the good fortune of being associated with them.

Now giants are poised against each other in this case. Therefore, I feel I am rather in a delicate position. Nonethe less I consider it my duty to bring certain points for the consideration of both the parties in this case.

I have stated just now that after fifteen years of administration, we have got a motion of this kind. You see what the position is. I believe that there is a general agreement in the country and in this House that if there is any danger to this country, it is from the growth of Communism. On that point there is general agreement. Of course, some persons hold a different view. The country as a whole feels that the growth of communism in this country should be curbed. Care should, therefore, be taken to keep the country away from the international communism. What I find is this; I am not against communists as such. This Communism has been growing to such an extent that in one State, only a few years ago, this party attained a majority and therefore formed a Government there. Of course, later something took place and that Government was removed by using the extraordinary powers given to the President under the Constitution. That was another matter. But you see sooner or later on that a coalition Government had to be formed and the

Congress joined it. Not only that. Communism has come to such a position as this. I want to tell the party in authority or any group of party that if they want to bring about any trangible result within a short time, then it would have to have the help of the communists there, and without their help they would not be able to carry on the dynamic programme which they propose to launch. That is the position to which communism has come in this country.

I want to make an important point, and that is the Congress has been governing this country for all these 15 years. In your administration of the country, you have allowed several political parties to grow to such an extent that the Government itself thinks that it is better to take their cooperation. And today, many times you find that the spokesmen of the communist party sitting on this side seem to be very thick with the Government on the other side. When a dynamic party of such a nature is in this position, in my opinion, from the national point of view, it is a serious point for the consideration of the Government. I want the House to take that fact into consideration and give a final vote on that point.

Secondly, we are meeting at a time when we are not only in a state of emergency which we have already declared but, to be frank enough, as Shri J. B. Kripalani said, we are in a state of belligerency. For technical reasons, we have not taken all those steps to declare a state of hostility. It may be a matter of convenience. But let us be true to ourselves and know that we are in a state of belligerency with China. Unfortunately, on account of the attitude of Pakistan, the situation has been aggravated.

Now, what about China? China is a communist country and we have to carry on the fight with her. But long before this fight had come in, we have been thinking of fraternisation and integration. The Chinese started coming into this country at a time when there was already a party of theirs in India which is growing in dimensions. When the Chinese aggression came, the people learnt for the first time that our Government has not been very vigilant about making arrangements for the protection of our borders. Every time when statements were made, questions were asked and information was supplied, they led the people to think that although our Government was engaged in the pursuit of the industrial uplift of this country, still, arrangements for the protection of our frontiers and other army measures had not been ignored. That is understandable. Actually, last year, when China entered our country, the eyes of the people were opened. A kind of awakening came. Under these circumstances there was a kind of wave of indignation in this country. But fortunately, the patriotic instinct of the people had taught us to ignore the feeling of humiliation which was caused by the sudden invasion of China and the defeats which they have inflicted on us successively. The people made up their mind that we must anyhow pull together and make arrangements first to fight on the side of the Government. That was done.

We know in this very House all Members met together and took a solemn oath under the chairmanship of the Speaker and a new picture presented itself to the world. Even the whole world recognised that India, in spite of handicaps and difficulties, had made up its mind to present a united front against China and make a supreme effort for the sake of saving the country. In this, all political differences had gone and disappeared. That was a unique thing.

In regard to this matter, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru himself has mentioned in a particular speech—I do not remember the exact occasion—that the Chinese invasion was in a way a Godsend and a blessing in disguise. Because, only a few months before this invasion they had been talking about the necessity of integration, how to dispel the

[Dr. M. S. Aney].

mistrust and the mutual suspicion about each other and how to bring about harmony among the different parties and so on. All these matters were seriously considered and brought to the attention of the people of the country. And then it was done and naturally a new incentive was given, namely, an introspection of our own mind. It was a big thing. That was done. It brought forth a great enthusiasm. The National Defence Fund was opened. We were reading in the papers how small boys and old women came out with all kinds of help. Almost several Ministers had the opportunity of having themselves weighed against gold and the contributions were made liberally. A wonderful response was made by the country. It was our duty to see that the spirit which was roused and the solidarity which was created, without which our preparations for war and fight against China will not be successful, was maintained. Therefore, steps should be taken to see that we do such things which shall not divert our attention from those new conditions that were created.

But what do we find today? Let us look at the whole thing. Where do we stand today? Almost all parties have joined together to bring in a motion of want of confidence. That is their stand today. It is no use quarrelling with it. We must know why it is that such a thing has happened, when we want to carry the nation with us, when we want everyone's support. It is a serious point which we have to consider so that things can be improved and the spirit of a united India to fight China will remain there.

Shri N. R. Ghosh (Jalpaiguri): You cannot carry the communists.

Dr. M. S. Aney: I do not know. The communists can be excluded if they have any pro-Chinese feelings. But you have to do something in that direction. I have got a small solution. During this period, the consciousness of India in a state of belligerency has to be maintained. Various measures are being concentrated upon by the Government. I know it is the duty of the Government to harness their resources. What is incumbent for the Government now is that they should not do anything which would create enmity or indignation of such a nature which will give rise to a feeling that the Government is taking advantage of the opportunity of the state of emergency to exploit the people more and more. That is the impression in the country. Therefore, the real problem before the country is this. A number of hon. Members have spoken including leaders of parties. Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia has also spoken. But anyhow a senior Member of the House who was a Defence Minister, for whom I have respect, rose to speak. In the course of his speech he made certain points about defence which he was not allowed to administer, as a Minister, for one reason or another. And, in the course of that, he made certain observations which spoiled the whole atmosphere. Certain remarks had been made by my hon. friends in the opposition also. Instead of bringing into effect a peaceful and harmonious atmosphere and an atmosphere of honourable settlement between this party and that party, an undesirable atmosphere has been created. Whoever has done it has committed a strategic blunder in putting him as a speaker on this motion, particularly on the question of defence. The whole atmosphere changed on both sides. There were certain thumping of tables even on the front benches on both sides.

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

Dr. M. S. Aney: I only want three minutes more. My suggestion is this.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: There are other Members also waiting.

Dr. M. S. Aney: Please give me three minutes more. I wish to make this appeal to the House. Let us not forget that our enemy is on the soil of India. Let us not forget that we

have to make an effort to drive him out. So long as government has that aim in view, cooperation of every party should be sought by the Prime Minister. We must make a move to drive the enemy out of position. The Colombo plan and all such events have given an impression as if there is no war. I appeal to my friends here that we have to perform the common duty to see that the enemy is driven out of the land. That can be done only by drawing us together and not by dividing the House. I appeal to the Prime Minister to consider this. In his reply I think he will tell us how he is anxious to have the cooperation of our friends. I would like to make a suggestion that he should form a joint war council in addition to his cabinet to consider the common questions of war in general, to repel the attacks of the enemy. I request my hon. friends to withdraw the No-confidence Motion to create a better atmosphere for a better approach among all sections of the country. With these words, Sir, I finish. I would like to say only one thing before I sit down.

परस्परविरोधे तु वयम् पंच ते शतम् ।
अन्यैः सह विरोधेतु वयम् पंचोत्तरम् शतम् ।।

In fighting with each other we are 5 and they are 100, but in fighting with others we are 105. May this spirit and advice of Vyasa guide us and lead us on the path of duty.

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, श्री राम मनोहर लोहिया जी का नाम राम शब्द से आरम्भ होता है । इसलिए मैं रामायण से ही अपनी बात को आरम्भ करना चाहता हूं . . .

श्री हरि विष्णु कामत : आप भी रघुनाथ हैं ।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : लोहिया जी कहते हैं कि मैं पंडित जी के घर आनन्द भवन में एक कुटुम्बी की तरह से रहा । मुझे रामायण का एक प्रसंग याद आता है कि जब राम जी के सम्मुख सीता जी के आभूषण रखे गये तो लक्ष्मण जी से कहा गया कि इन आभूषणों को तुम पहचानो । इसके जवाब में उन्होंने कहा कि मैं जो उनके बाद के आभूषण हैं, उनको ही केवल पहचानता हूं, दूसरे आभूषणों को पहचान नहीं सकता हूं । यह हमारी संस्कृति रही है, यह सभ्यता रही है । हमारी बहनें, मातायें और कन्याय श्रद्धा की पात्र रही हैं, सभी समान रूप से पूजनीय रही हैं, न कि लोहिया जी के शब्दों में मुझे सुबह को अखबारों में एक खूबसूरत चेहरा देखने को मिल जाएगा . . .

कुछ माननीय सदस्य : शेम, शेम ।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : हमारी मातायें और हमारी बहनें इस तरह से पेश करने की सामग्री कभी नहीं रही हैं । भारत की यह परम्परा कभी नहीं रही है, यह सभ्यता कभी नहीं रही है, इस तरह की संस्कृति कभी नहीं रही है । यह लोहिया जी की परम्परा हो सकती है . . .

श्री भू० ना० मं ल (सहरसा) : कोई नई बात इसमें नहीं है और न ही कोई गलत बात है ।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : भारतीय सभ्यता और भारतीय संस्कृति आपकी समझ में कभी नहीं आएगी । हमारी मातायें, हमारी बहनें, हमारी कन्यायें पेश करने की सामग्री कभी नहीं हो सकती हैं और इसको हम कभी स्वीकार नहीं कर सकते हैं । आप जरूर कर सकते हैं, हम नहीं कर सकते हैं ।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I think you will be doing a greater service to the country if you do not quote from that book.

Shri Raghunath Singh: I am not quoting. It is not worth quoting, not worth reading also. सहस्रबाहु की बात उन्होंने कही । तुलसीदास जी की रामायण लोहिया जी पढ़ते हैं । उनको मालूम होगा कि तुलसी दास जी ने अपनी रामायण में एक जगह कहा है :

[श्री रघुनाथ सिंह]

वचन बज्र जाहि सदा पियारा
सहस नयन परदोष निहारा

वह तो सहस्रबाहु की बात कहते हैं लेकिन सहस्र नयन से पर दोष देखते हैं। महाभारत का एक प्रसंग मैं आपको सुनाना चाहता हूं। महाभारत में एक जगह पूछा गया कि दुर्योधन में और युधिष्ठिर में क्या अन्तर है और इसके जवाब में कहा गया कि सबसे बड़ा अन्तर यह है कि दुर्योधन तो सारे दोष देखता है दुनिया के और युधिष्ठिर जो धर्म राज हैं, वह हर चीज में गुण देखते हैं। यह जो अन्तर है, यह अन्तर यहां भी बिल्कुल इसी प्रकार से लागू होता है।

मैं पहले कह चुका हूं कि लोहिया जी कहते हैं कि वह कुटुम्बीय की तरह से आनन्द भवन में रहे, भाई की तरह से वहां रहे। मुझे महाभारत का एक और प्रसंग याद आ रहा है। शिशुपाल श्रीकृष्ण जी का फुफेरा भाई था। लेकिन उसका काम क्या था? जहां श्रीकृष्ण जी जाते थे, उनके पीछे पीछे जाता था, उनकी शिकायत करता रहता था और उनके दोष ही देखता रहता था, गुण नहीं देखता था। इसका परिणाम क्या हुआ? इसका परिणाम यह हुआ कि आज श्रीकृष्ण को पूजा जाता है और शिशुपाल का कोई नाम तक भी नहीं लेता है। हमें शिशुपाल की तरफ देखना है या हमें श्रीकृष्ण की तरफ देखना है? अगर श्रीकृष्ण हमारे आदर्श हैं, तो शिशुपाल को हमें नहीं देखना होगा। शिशुपाल की तफ देखना है तो महाकवि माघ काल के शिशुपाल के वध को देखना होगा।

उन्होंने एक बात और कही कि हिन्दुस्तान में २७ करोड़ आदमी ऐसे हैं जिनकी तीन आने आमदनी रोज होती है। उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि हिन्दुस्तान ने कोई तरक्की नहीं की है, कोई तरक्की नहीं हुई है। मैं केवल उनके सामने एक आंकड़ा रखना चाहता हूं। केवल इनकम टैक्स देने वालों को देख लीजिये। १९५६ से लेकर १९५९ तक इनकम टैक्स देने वालों की तादाद लगभग ५ लाख ७९ हजार थी। १९६० में अर्थात् दो बरस के बाद यह तादाद ९ लाख ५२ हजार हो गई। अर्थात् दो बरस में इनकम टैक्स देने वालों की तादाद दुगुनी हो गई। लेकिन लोहिया जी की समझ में यह नहीं आता है। वह कहते हैं कि २७ करोड़ आदमी हिन्दुस्तान में सिर्फ तीन आने पाते हैं और उसमें गुजर बसर करते हैं। मैं नहीं समझता कि इतने में वे अपनी जीविका किस तरह से चलाते हैं। इसमें वे जीवित नहीं रह सकते हैं मुश्किल है नामुम्किन है। ईस्टर्न यू० पी० की बात कही जाती है। हम भी वहीं से आये हैं। उधर के जो कुछ भाई हैं, वे बतायें कि आज देहात में मजदूर नहीं मिलता है और अगर मिलता है तो उसको वे क्या देते हैं? आज कहीं भी देहात में मजदूर को एक रुपया आठ आने से कम नहीं मिलता है।

अब मैं श्री प्रकाश वीर शास्त्री जी की तरफ आता हूं। पंडित जी को लक्ष्य करके उन्होंने कहा "तक्षकाय स्वाहा—इन्द्राय स्वाहा।" अर्थात् पंडित जी को उन्होंने इन्द्र माना और कांग्रेस वालों को तक्षक माना और उनका कहना था कि अगर हो सके तो दोनों का स्वाहा हो। लेकिन अगर प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री जी महाभारत पढ़ेंगे तो उनको पता चलेगा कि न तो इंद्र का नाश हुआ और न ही तक्षक का। इंद्र का इंद्रासन तो बरकरार रहा और तक्षक किंवा नाग बंश को काश्मीर का राज्य मिला। कारकोटक नाग वंश काश्मीर का था, नागों ने हजारों वर्ष तक काश्मीर पर शासन किया है। यह तक्षक का वंश था।

दूसरी बात प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री जी ने पंडित जी को लक्ष्य करते हुए यह कही कि यादव प्रवृत्ति यहां बढ़ती जाती है। यादवी प्रवृत्ति वाले जैसे यादव वंश का नाश हुआ, इसी प्रकार से कांग्रेस वालों का भी नाश

होगा । मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि शास्त्री जी संस्कृत के बड़े विद्वान हैं । मैं चाहता हूं कि वह शांति पर्व जरा उठा कर देखें । शांति पर्व में यादवों का संघ था उसको वृष्णि गणराज्य कहा जाता था । उस के अध्यक्ष वासुदेव थे । भीष्म से जब युद्धष्ठिर ने पूछा कि लोक तन्त्र का नाश कैसे होता है । लोकतंत्र में अवगुण क्या हैं, जिन अवगुणों के कारण लोकतन्त्र का नाश होता है, तो भीष्म-पितामह ने उस पर एक गाथा सुनाई । उन्होंने कहा कि वासुदेव और नारद में सम्वाद हुआ था वासुदेव से नारद भगवान ने पूछा कि महाराज आपके संघ की क्या अवस्था है, हमने सुना है कि यादवों का शायद संहार हो जाय । यादवों का नाश हो जाए । उस वक्त वासुदेव ने कहा कि मैं अपने जाति के लोगों की सेवा करता हूं । किन्तु कठोर वचन सुनना पड़ता है । हे देवर्षि उन लोगों के कठोर वचन मेरे हृदय को अरणी तुल्य दग्ध करता है । वे वचन मेरे हृदय को दग्ध करते रहते हैं । भगवान नारद ने कहा । आपने ठीक कहा लोकतन्त्र में ऐसा होता ही है । लेकिन साथ साथ नारद ने कहा कि दो कारणों से लोकतन्त्र का नाश होता है । वे कारण हैं, वाह्य और अत्भ्यांतर । ये आज दोनों ही कारण यहां उपस्थित हैं । वासु कारण चीन का हमारे ऊपर आक्रमण है, वह हम को दग्ध करता रहता है और आन्तरिक कारण है आप शब्द वाण से दग्ध करते हैं । एक एक विषय पर, एक एक स्थान पर दोष गुण को बिना देखे हुए चूंकि विरोध करना है, इसलिये विरोध करते रहते हैं । निन्दा, निन्दा, निन्दा करते करते मनुष्य निन्दा का पात्र हो जाता है ।

प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री जी से मैं एक और बात कहना चाहता हूं । भीष्म से भी यही प्रश्न युधिष्ठिर ने किया था । उन्होंने पूछा था कि गणतन्त्र का नाश क्यों होता है । उन्होंने कहा था कि लोभ और अमर्ष, दो चीजें हैं । इनके कारण गणतन्त्र का नाश होता है । आज हम क्या देखते हैं, लोभ है और अमर्ष भी है । लोभ राज्य सत्ता लेने का है द्वेष है कि क्यों हम सत्ताधारी नहीं बने हुए हैं । यह अनुचित बात है ।

एक और उदाहरण मैं देना चाहता हूं । भगवान बुद्ध से अजातशत्रु के महामात्य वर्षकार भेंट करने गये और उन्होंने पूछा बज्जिगण राज्य का जो गणतन्त्र है, इसका हम कैसे नाश कर सकते हैं । भगवान बुद्ध ने तीन वचन कहे । उन्होंने कहा कि महामात्य तुम बोलो कि बज्जिगण प्रक्षप्त को अप्रक्षप्त अर्थात विदित को अविदित करते हैं या नही ? वृद्धों का सत्कार करते हैं या नहीं ? तीसरे करणीय को अकरणीय करते हैं या नहीं ? महामात्य ने कहा कि नहीं वज्जिगण राज्य के वृद्धों का सत्कार करते हैं । अपने नेताओं का सत्कार करता है और अकरणीय को करणीय नहीं करते हैं और न करणीय को अकरणीय करते हैं । इस पर भगवान बुद्ध ने कहा कि वज्जिगण राज्य का नाश नहीं होगा जब तक वे अपने नेता का आदर सत्कार करेंगे, वृद्धों का आदर सत्कार करेंगे, जब तक वे विहित को अविहित नहीं करेंगे । मैं कहता हू कि जिस प्रकार के आक्रमण हमारे नेता के ऊपर किये गये हैं : वह उचित नही हैं । आप लोग अपने विचारों को प्रकट कीजिये, लेकिन लदियाजी की पुस्तिका क्या है ? यह करणीय को अकरणीय करना है । यह प्रज्ञप्त को अप्रज्ञप्त करना है और वृद्धों का अनादर करना है । जो देश अपने नेताओं का निरादर करता है वह देश, अगर भगवान बुद्ध की वाणी ठीक है तो, बच नहीं सकता है ।

एक माननीय सदस्य : हम उन की जय बोलेंगे । (*Interruptions*)

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : जरूर जय बोलिये ।

एक माननीय सदस्य : एक अध्याय खत्म हो जायेगा तो शंख बजायेंगे ।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह: दूसरी जो बात मैं कहना चाहता हूं। कम्यूनिस्ट भाइयों ने ज्वायेंट एक्सर्साइज का बहुत विरोध किया है। कहा है कि ज्वायेंट एक्सर्साइज नहीं होनी चाहिये। मैं उन से तीन बातें कहना चाहता हूं। क्या कभी उन्होने ध्यान दिया है कि तीन पानीपत के युद्ध हुए और उन तीनों महायुद्धों में हम क्यों हारे ? पहला पानीपत का युद्ध सन् ११९२ में हुआ, जब कि शहाबुद्दीन गोरी ने चढ़ाई की। शहाबुद्दीन गोरी के पास ४० हजार फौज थी जब कि पृथ्वीराज के पास करीब ८० हजार फौज थी लेकिन फिर भी पृथ्वी राज को हारना पड़ा। द्वितीय पानीपत का युद्ध १५२५ में हुआ जब कि बाबर ने इब्राहीम लोदी पर आक्रमण किया। बाबर के पास १२ हजार सिपाही थे जब कि इब्राहीम लोदी के पास १ लाख सेना थी। राणा सांगा और बाबर में फतेहपुर सीकरी के पास लड़ाई हुई सन् १५२६ में। राणा सांगा के पास १ लाख से अधिक फौज थी और बाबर के पास १२ हजार आदमी थे। तृतीय पानीपत का युद्ध १७६१ में हुआ जब कि अहमदशाह अब्दाली अफगानिस्तान से आया। पेशवा सारे हिन्दुस्तान की फौज इकट्ठी करके पानीपत में आये लेकिन पेशवा को हारना पड़ा। तीनों पानीपत के युद्ध में हमें क्यों हारना पड़ा ? इस वास्ते कि युद्ध की जो नई बातें थीं, जो नई टेकनीक थी, उसको हम सीख नहीं सके। ११७५ में शाहबुद्दीन गोरी का पहली बार हिन्दुस्तान पर आक्रमण हुआ और अन्तिम आक्रमण ११९२ में हुआ। अन्तिम आक्रमण के वक्त उसके पास कैवेलरी थी। अश्वारोही सेना थी। वह उस युद्ध को जानता था। हम व्यूह रचना जानते थे। उसकी नई टेकनीक की वजह से भारतवर्ष को हारना पड़ा। बाबर के पास फायर आर्म्स थे। इब्राहीम लोदी और राणा सांगा के पास फायर आर्म्स नहीं थे। हम जमाने के पीछे थे। इसके कारण यह हुआ कि हम द्वितीय पानीपत का युद्ध हार गये। द्वितीय पानीपत के युद्ध के समय हमारे पास जमजमा टाइप की भारी तोप थी जिसमें पन्द्रह मिनट तो निशाना लगाने में लगते थे। बीस मिनट घुमाने में लगते थे और तीस मिनट चलाने में लगते थे। दूसरी तरफ अमहदशाह अब्दाली के पास फायर आर्म्स थे। उसने लाइट फायर आर्म्सेसे बड़े जोरों के साथ युद्ध किया। और हम लोगों को उसमें पराजित होना पड़ा।

इसलिये अगर हमें हिन्दुस्तान की रक्षा करनी है तो हम को जमाने के साथ चलना पड़ेगा और नई टेकनीक युद्ध की सीखनी पड़ेगी। अगर हमने अमरीका से सहायता ली, अगर हमने दूसरे मुल्कों से सहायता ली, अगर हम नई बात सीखते हैं और सीख कर अपने देश की रक्षा की तरफ आगे बढ़ते हैं तो उसमें कोई हानि नहीं है। देश नहीं रहेगा तो रक्षा किसकी होगी। इसलिये मैं इस बात से बिल्कुल सहमत हूं और मेरा मत है कि कम्यूनिस्टों की जो ज्वायेंट एक्सर्साइजेज न करने की बात है उसको नहीं मानना चाहिये और ज्वायेंट एक्सर्साइज करनी चाहिये।

श्री मनोहरन ने एक बात कही :

"सेपरेट कंट्री अन्डर दि इंडियन सन"।

इस लोक सभा में आकर और संविधान की शपथ लेने के बाद भी वे डिमान्ड करते हैं कि उनको सेपरेट कंट्री चाहिये। लेकिन मैं उनको याद दिलाना चाहता हूं कि हिन्दुस्तान में आज लोकतन्त्र की स्थापना हुई है। उस लोकतन्त्र की स्थापना महात्मा गांधी के आशीर्वाद से हुई है। महात्मा जी ने कहा था :

> "राष्ट्र का सम्बन्ध मनोभावना से है, उसका सम्बन्ध जातीय एकता से है। राष्ट्र की राष्ट्रीयता आध्यात्मिक, सामाजिक और सामाजिक एकता का द्योतक है।"

मैं श्री मनोहरन के सामने तीन देशों का उदारण रखना चाहता हूं । पहला है संयुक्त राज्य अमरीका । अब्राहम लिंकन ने सिविल वार के समय में .....

एक माननीय सदस्य : आप सतयुग की बात कर रहे हैं आज कलयुग है ।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : हम कलियुग में नहीं हैं, कलियुग से सतयुग में जा रहे हैं । आप कलियुग में हैं । जब संयुक्त राज्य अमरीका में सिविल वार हो रही थी उस समय अब्राहम लिंकन ने कहा था कि इस सिविल वार में केवल हब्शियों का ही सवाल नहीं है, यह सिविल वार हमेशा के लिये तय करेगी कि फेडरेशन अमरीका रहता है या नहीं । इसी प्रकार जर्मनी में बिस्मार्क ने ब्लड और आयरन की पालिसी से जर्मनी का एकीकरण किया । जापान का एकीकरण, ईटो ने किया सब लोगों को मिला कर। लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान का एकीकरण हुआ है सहिष्णुता के आधार पर, प्रेम के आधार पर और त्याग के आधार पर। महात्मा जी ने कहा है कि हमारे लोकतन्त्र की यह आधारशिला है । मैं याद दिलाना चाहता हूं । भारतवर्ष में जो गणतंत्र स्थापित हुआ है वह छिन्न भिन्न होने वाला नहीं है, हमारे गणतन्त्र की आधारशिला प्रेम है, त्याग है और सहिष्णुता है । मैं श्री मनोहरन से कहूंगा कि वे हमारे भारत के इतिहास को देखें और समझें । भारत तभी एक हो सकता है, तभी एक राष्ट्र रह सकता है, तभी यहां एकता हो सकती है जब कि सारे भारतवर्ष के लोग एक साथ मिल कर चलें ।

भाषा की बात भी मनोहरन जी ने कही । मैं उन्हें एक उदाहरण देता हूं । इजराइल राष्ट्र जब बना तब वह इजराइल ६० भाषायें बोली जाने वाला देश था । लेकिन १७ वर्ष के अन्दर इजराइली भाषा भाषी लोगों ने एक भाषा सीखी और अब वे हिब्रू बोलते हैं जो कि आज से दो हजार वर्ष पहले बोली जाती थी । इस वास्ते मैं कहता हूं कि भाषा के प्रश्न को जो इतनी रगड़ दी जाती है वह ठीक नहीं है । अगर यह हमारा देश है और हमें एक राष्ट्र बनाना है तो हमें एक राष्ट्र की दृष्टि से सोचन होगा । अब्राहम लिंकन की डिमाक्रेसी की परिभाषा, रूसो की डिमाक्रेसी की परिभाषा पुरानी हो गई है । आज डिमाक्रेसी की परिभाषा यह है :

"democracy is a means to change the government by peaceful means"गवनमेंट को पीसफुल मीन्स से चलायेंगे । यह डिमाक्रेसी की परिभाषा है । सरकार का विचार बदलकर गवर्नमेंट को बदल दे । (*Interruptions*) विचार को बदलना है । गवर्नमेंट चाहे आप की हो या हमारी हो उस को रहना है । गवमेंमेंट विल रिमेन, दि ब्यू इज टू बी चेन्जड । यह डिमाक्रेसी की परिभाषा है । इसे आप को समझना चाहिये । गवर्नमेंट तो रहेगी चाहे आप की हो या हमारी हो । गवर्नमेंट के विचार को बदलना डिमाक्रेसी की परिभाषा है । इस लिए मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि सन् ५५० ई० में भारतवर्ष में गणतंत्र का लोप हुआ था, सन् १९४७ में लगभग १२०० वर्षों के पश्चात् हिन्दुस्तान में यह समय आया है कि गणतंत्र की फिर स्थापना हुई है । हमें इस की कामना करनी चाहिये कि यह गणतंत्र इसी प्रकार से फले फूले ।

मनोहरन जी ने यहां मद्रास का सवाल उठाया । मैं कहता हूं कि महमूद गजनी ने हिदुस्तान पर १००१ में आक्रमण किया और १०२७ तक उस ने हम पर १७ बार आक्रमण किये । लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान में गजनी का शासन नहीं जम सका क्योंकि हिन्दुस्तान की सहायता के लिए एक छोटा सा प्रान्त

[श्री रघुनाथ सिंह]

सामने आया और वह था काश्मीर । कितने लोग हम में से जानते हैं कि महमूद गजनी को काश्मीर ने दो बार लोहकोट में पराजय दी । क्यों दी ? काश्मीर पर आक्रमण नहीं हुआ था, हिन्दुस्तान पर हुआ था । यही कारण था कि १००९ में तो यहां महमूद गजनवी आया था और ११९२ में शहाबुद्दीन आया, इस के बीच के संकड़ों वर्षों में हिन्दुस्तान आजाद रहा फारेन इवेन्जन से । उस समय काश्मीर के लोगों ने इस आवाज को उठाया कि चाहे कोई भी हो, अगर वह हिन्दुस्तान पर आक्रमण करता है तो हम उस से युद्ध करेंगे ।

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Mr. Deputy Speaker, as I rise to support the motion moved by my hon. colleague, Acharya Kripalani, it is indeed hard for me to conceal or disguise the sense of sorrow and tragedy at the spectacle of a once great leader, a man whom the father of our Nation dubbed his political heir, a man who in the hey-day of his youth, spurning pleasure and comfort, had ruthlessly and ceaselessly fought the British regime, the British imperialism, a man who hand in hand with that heroic warrior statesman, Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose, had blazed a new trail for the youth of India, this great leader, once great leader, this almost charismatic leader, who, when the enemy was on our door step fainted and faltered and could not give the same ringing challenge to China as he did to Britain, to British imperialism, "Quit Ladakh" and "Quit NEFA" like "Quit India", he who has played a notable part in the removal of British imperialism from India, has now almost kowtowed to a new and filthier imperialism, the yellow imperialism of China, the leader whose government is sought to be censured today, by another great leader, Acharya Kripalani, who joined Mahatma Gandhi a few years before the Prime Minister joined him, if I am not mistaken, I cannot conceal, as I said in the beginning, my sense of sorrow and tragedy at this spectacle. By a curious coincidence, the motion moved by my hon. colleague, Acharya Kripalani, against the 73 year old Prime Minister, against the Government, secured at the outset the support of 73 members in this House, but I am sure it will secure more support at the end.

It has been said against us by our colleagues on the other side of the House, that the opposition has failed the country. Assuming for the sake of argument that it has failed the country, is it such a tragedy? It should be more the concern of the Government, of the party in power, that it should not fail the country. The Government should not fail the country. If the opposition fails the country, the opposition stands to lose, but if the Government fails the country, then the country loses, the people loses and the nation loses.

Yesterday we were on the verge of national humiliation. It has been said on the other side that Opposition will be opposition, and that the opposition parties are disunited. But, may I ask whether the opposition parties are more disunted or less disunited than the Guptas and Tripathis, than the Sens and Ghoshes, than the Patnaiks and Mahatabs, than the Shankars and Govindan Nairs, than the Balwatrai Mehtas and Jivaraj Mehtas, than the Nandas and Patils?

An. Hon. Member: Or Kamaths and Kripalanis.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Is this a demonstration of unity? Then, I beg to submit that we are as united as the party opposite. Today the party in power has been brought to a sorry pass and the Chief Minister of a neighbouring State, not satisfied with the brute majority of embattled cohorts in this House, not satisfied with this, has threatened to lead a rally of 1,40,000 people to Delhi, *julus* as they call it, culminating in a rally presided over by the Prime Minister's daughter. I wish them well and let them proceed. Let her make a speech and, I hope, it will be a heartening and an inspiring

speech that she will make. But is this the way that the Government or the ruling Party who have got the solid support, the phalanx, behind them should go about this business? Why should the Chief Minister of Punjab, Sardar Pratap Singh Kairon, take upon himself to lead it to the Capital at the cost, maybe, of the Party or of the people? How many lakhs of rupees it will cost, God only knows. This money could be given to the widows or the orphans of those who died in NEFA fighting the Chinese. That money could have been given to them. Is it worthy of the hon. Prime Minister to permit such a thing, in the first place, that Shri Kairon should lead Congressmen and also the Home Guards and the Raksha Dal of the Punjab to the Capital and the State machinery of the Railways to be prostituted for Party purposes? It was in the papers that special trains would be run for this purpose.

Shri Ansar Harvani: You can also do it.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: May I ask if another Party wants to do the same thing the same facilities will be given? Here is the circular issued by the President of the Punjab Congress Committee fixing quotas for every District. For lack of time, I will not read the whole circular, but the last sentence is very significant.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: Will it be laid on the Table of the House?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: It reads

"जिला कांग्रेस, महिला, यूथ, इंटक सेवा दल और किसान, और दीगर भागों के इन-चार्ज साहिबान को इस जलूस में पूरा हिस्सा लेना चाहिये।"

This, I think, is very unworthy of the Chief Minister of Punjab to bring a rally here at the expense of the Railways.

I remember that the hon. Prime Minister himsef, when a few years ago he was in Amritsar at the time of the Congress session, I believe, described a similar procession or *julus* led by a rival party as *ajab tamasha*. I member that phrase.

In all times and in all climes the government of the day, the ruling party, has been judged by three criteria. They are: first, the defence of the country's freedom and integrity; second, a clean and efficient administration; three, a formulation and implementation of socio-economic policies so that every man, woman and child may have life and have it more abundantly. We will judge this Government by these three criteria. Have they succeeded? Do they stand the test of these three criteria?

The ex-Defence Minister in a sort of challenging remark at the end of his one and quarter hour speech said that they stand by the policy of independence in foreign affairs and the establishment of democratic social society. That exactly is the issue that we join with them. Have they done it? These 17 years the Congress Party has been in power. What steps have they taken and what achievement have they to their credit in this regard?

Independence in foreign affairs I will briefly dispose of because I am racing against time. It has been aptly described that the policy of independence in foreign affairs is like the leaning tower of Pisa. Very recently we had a demonstration of how independent our foreign policy is like. One of my predecessors on this side of the House referred to the so-called neutrality and the independence of the Government policy in foreign affairs. While we are maintaining and continuing diplomatic relations with China even when we are at war with China—what exactly is the meaning in not having even reciprocal consular relations with Israel? We do not have even reciprocal consular relations with Israel. They have a consulate in Bombay but we do not have a consulate in Jerusalem or elsehere in Israel-

[Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath]

The other day the hon. Minister of State for Foreign Affairs was good enough to say when she was in Amman, Comparing the democratic government of Jordan with the surrounding dictatorships, that all the surrounding countries had dictatorship government and only Jordan had a democratic government. That is what she is reported to have said. I hope she was misreported.

Coming to the democratic socialist society of which the ex-Defence Minister spoke at the end of his speech, my charge against the Government is that even after sixteen years of uninterrupted, continued power they have not made a beginning towards the establishment of real socialism in the country, and today the administration is in the doldrums. Without a clean and efficient administration there cannot be democracy, and without democracy there cannot be democratic socialism. The first and foremost task before the Government is to establish a clear and efficient administration in our country. If they fail in that, democracy goes by the board and when democracy goes by the board there cannot be any democratic socialism in our country. If, God forbid, there is no democracy left in this country because of an inefficient, corrupt administration, the bleak and black night of totalitarian tyranny will descend upon this land. I am sure, none of my hon. colleagues on the other side of the House want such a bleak and black night of totalitarian tyranny to descend upon our ancient but ever new India. That is what we have been charging the Government with.

Even today look at things. There are no values and standards in public life or in the administration. That is the original sin. That is the root of the malady. There are no values and no standards in public life. The hon. Prime Minister says one thing. He lays down a standard and that for the time being is the standard. The next day he may change his views about that thing and again for the time being that will prevail. Right from the day when in spite of Parliament's Public Acounts Committee's repeated demands, once, twice, thrice that there should be a high-level judicial inquiry into the jeep transaction—I will not use the word 'scandal'—to the other day when in spite of holding that ex-Minister of Mines and Fuel was not guilty of any lack of integrity that there was no aspersion on his integrity, in spite of that the hon. Prime Minister dismissed him or accepted his resignation, right from that day to this the hon Prime Minister—I am sorr to say that; it breaks my heart to say that—has not established those standards of public life which characterise a truly democratic society. Therefore today this administration is in the doldrums.

The Party to which I have the honour to belong has all along, all these years, pleaded, with all the earnestness at its command, for an anti-corruption commission empowered as the Election Commission and the Supreme Court are under the Constitution. I am sure, any of my hon. colleagues on this side of the House, if they are called upon to shoulder the task, will shoulder the task of heading this anti-corruption commission in this country and see to it—if they on the other side have not the heart to do it, my colleagues on this side of the House, those who have supported the motion will see to it—that this task of eradication of corruption is taken well in hand, provided three things are done. They are, first, this anti-corruption commission must be completely independent of the Government and of the executive; second, whoever is asked to head the commission must be given a free hand to choose his own colleagues; and, third, they must be given full powers to deal with the miscreants and to mete out drastic penalties. Remember that Kemal Ataturk of Turkey as soon as he came to power, for a small reform like stopping spitting in the streets prescribed flogging and after he made an example of six

people, only half a dozen people, in Istanbul that habit of spitting in the streets completely vanished. I have been pleading here that if you want to stop corruption, you must establish sound standards and values in our public life and administration and mete out drastic penalties for violation.

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

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: In three minutes I will finish.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He was entitled to 12 minutes. I have given him 15 minutes.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: In three minutes I will finish. I am cutting down most of the things. I am racing against the time. Now, before I close, I would like to say this. The Congress is talking of the Kamraj Plan. Mahatma Gandhi in his own days dreamt of *Ram Raj* plan for India, for the whole country. Today the Government is reduced to such straits that they have to think of a Kamraj Plan for the Congress Party alone.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya: Why do you bother with Kamraj?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: They have forgotten that the *Ram Raj* plan was for the whole country. Now they have put Party above the country.

Shri Tyagi: I am afraid this is purely a Party matter.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Now, I feel the Prime Minister who is heading the Government—he has written a great book, more than one book, *Glimpses of World History*; I am sure the Prime Minister is made of noble stuff—even now abandoning his policy of too late and too little should take up the reins firmly in his hands. If he does that, I shall welcome it. I do not want that he should go down in history, or be remembered as a great leader, who almost made his country over to corruption, chaos, and to China, from while imperialism to yellow imperialism, I am sure he does not want that. history should so regard him. I am sure, if he wants to fulfil the task that awaits him, there is only one way open for him. And that is the Gandhi plan, not the Kamraj plan. And what was that plan? Mahatma Gandhi delivered, imparted, his advice—I believe my hon. friend and colleague Acharya Kripalani was also in the Congress at that time—to the Prime Minister, to Acharya Kripalani and to other colleagues two days before he passed away. And that was: wind up the Congress; realign political parties on socio-economic lines. Sir, that is the only remedy.

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

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: I will conclude with this. As regards the defence debacle, I would like to say that he did not heed our warning. The President himself has said that it was due to credulity and negligence.

In the end, may I, with your permission, Sir, read what the Mahayogi of modern times, Aurobindo, predicted when China invaded Tibet? And China invaded Tibet a few months before he passed away. This is what Mahayogi Aurobindo wrote then:

> "The basic significance of Mao's Tibetan advanture is to advance China's frontiers right down to India and stand poised there to strike at the right moment and with right strategy...."

He went on to say:

> "The gesture that can save is to take a firm line with China, denounce openly her nefarious intentions, stand without reservation by the U.S.A., and India as the spearhead of an American defence of democracy can easily halt Mao's machanised millions".

[Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath]

The Prime Minister did not listen to this. But Acharya Kripalani warned against China. We too did it. But it was not heeded. Today when we criticise the defence policy, the Defence Minister gets up and has the hardihood to say that he does not even apologise for his wrong policies. I am sorry to say, if this is the manner in which the ruling party is conducting the country's affairs, and they do not revise it, then God save India.

श्री बिशनचंद्र सेठ (एटा) : आदरणीय उपाध्यक्ष महोदय. . .

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य दस मिनट ले लें ।

श्री बिशनचंद्र सेठ : आज चार रोज से जो बहस सदन में हो रही है, उस को मैं ने गम्भीरता से सुना । जहां तक मैं समझा हूं, कांग्रेस वालों की तरफ से यह एक मौलिक आक्षेप है कि ऐसे समय में इस प्रकार का रेजोल्यूशन हमारे सामने नहीं आना चाहिए था । इस भावना का मैं भी स्वागत करता हूं, परन्तु जब किसी घर, प्रान्त या देश का बड़ा किसी बात को सावधानी के साथ सुनने के लिए अपने आप को तैयार नहीं करता उस स्थिति में दूसरे सज्जनों को मजबूर हो कर उस के सामने आना पड़ता है ।

हमारे मित्र, श्री रघुनाथ सिंह, ने अभी नेताओं के सम्मान के सम्बन्ध में कहा कि सब को उन का सम्मान करना सीखना चाहिए और इस सम्बन्ध में उन्होंने कुछ धार्मिक उपमायें भी दीं । मैं बड़ी विनय के साथ निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि हम सभी को यह पता है कि हमारे देश में सम्मान का स्तर क्या होना चाहिए । परन्तु प्रश्न यह है कि जिन्हें सम्मान लेना है, उन का स्तर क्या होना चाहिए, इस बारे में माननीय सदस्य ने कोई प्रकाश नहीं डाला । उन को यह भी बताना चाहिए था कि नेतागण अपने सम्मान को सुरक्षित रखने के लिए इस प्रकार का व्यवहार करें कि किसी को उनके सम्मान पर बट्टा लगाने का अवसर न मिले । जिस प्रकार सम्मान करने वालों का उत्तरदायित्व है, उसी प्रकार सम्मान कराने वालों का भी उत्तरदायित्व है, परन्तु हमारे मित्र ने केवल एक ही पक्ष को लिया था ।

मैं यह बताना आवश्यक मानता हूं कि आखिर इस संकट-काल में यह रेजोल्यूशन क्यों आया । यह अकारण नहीं आया । मैं तो इसे देश का सौभाग्य मानता हूं । कांग्रेस के माननीय सदस्य चाहे कुछ भी कहें, लेकिन इस प्रस्ताव के कारण उन के मन में जिस प्रकार की बौखलाहट पैदा हुई है, उस को मैं शुभ चिह्न समझता हूं । मैं एक निश्चित पार्टी का हूं । मेरे लिए सिर्फ दस मिनट रखे गए हैं जब कि श्री कृष्ण मेनन साहब सवा घंटा बोल गए । मैं इस का कारण समझ रहा हूं । कांग्रेसियों की बौखलाहट की फिर भी मैं शुभ चिह्न इस लिए मानता हूं कि इस के कारण शायद भगवान् उन को सद्बुद्धि दे दें और वे देश की व्यवस्था में जो दोष इस समय आ गये हैं, उन को दूर कर सकें ।

भारत में जब से पार्लियामेंट चली इस प्रकार का प्रस्ताव कभी नहीं रखा गया । मैं इस दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण प्रस्ताव को पेश किये जाने के मौलिक कारणों को बताने के लिए उपस्थित हुआ हूं । समय की कमी की वजह से मैं तफसील में नहीं जाना चाहता । दोनों पक्षों के मित्रों ने इस बहस के दौरान में अनेक बातों को कहा । मैं केवल उन प्रश्नों पर बोलना चाहता हूं, जिन का मेरी भावना से सम्बन्ध है । आदरणीय पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू और कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट चाहे अतने मन में कुछ भी कल्पना करें, लेकिन इस रेजोल्यूशन के आने के बाद उन को भारी आघात पहुंचा । अगर ईमानदारी से देखा जाये, तो मेरे दिल को भी चोट लगती है । आखिर मेरे दिल में भी एक भावना है, लेकिन यह देश का दुर्भाग्य है कि देश के माननीय वयोवृद्ध नेता, पंडित

जवाहरलाल नेहरू, इस सदन में ऐसी गंभीर मुद्रा में बैठे हैं, जो असहनीय हो रही है और हमें बुरी लगती है। इस प्रस्ताव का आना देश का दुर्भाग्य है, लेकिन पंडित जी ने उसे स्वतः बुलाया है, वर्ना कोई वजह नहीं थी कि चाइनीज एग्रेशन के बाद इस प्रस्ताव को लाया जाता। अब मैं उन कारणों की तरफ सदन का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूं।

मैं समझता हूं—और सभी अपने हृदय में मानते हैं—कि पाकिस्तान और चीन के खतरे के बारे में सारा देश चिल्लाया, लेकिन हमारे नेताओं ने समाधि ले ली और शान्ति की माला जपते रहे, उन्होंने यह नहीं समझा कि देश की सीमाओं की सुरक्षा उन का पहला कर्त्तव्य है। यदि चीन और पाकिस्तान के साथ लगे बाडर सुरक्षित होते, तो इस प्रकार का कोई रेजोल्यूशन सदन में न लाया जाता। चाइना और पाकिस्तान के असंख्य सहयोगी देश में मौजूद हैं, लेकिन आज तक उन के खिलाफ ऐसी कोई कार्यवाही नहीं की गई, जिस से देश की सुरक्षा के सम्बन्ध में जनता को भरोसा हो जाता। अगर कल को पाकिस्तान इस देश पर हमला करे, तो आप समझ सकते हैं कि क्या स्थिति होगी, परन्तु कोई भी कांग्रेसी मुस्लिमपरस्ती के कारण इस बात को सुनने और समझने के लिए तैयार नहीं है। मैं इस को देश का दर्भाग्य मानता हूं।

जहा तक आसाम का प्रश्न है, मैं एक कमेटी का चेयरमैन हो कर वहां गया—सरकार की तरफ से नहीं, बल्कि हिन्दू महासभा द्वारा नियुक्त एक कमेटी का चेयरमैन हो कर। मैंने उस कमेटी की रिपोर्ट में साफ लिखा था कि यहां पर भाषा का प्रश्न नहीं है, बल्कि सत्य स्थिति यह है कि ईसाइयों और मुसलमानों ने मिल कर संगठन बना कर हमारे देश के एक कोने को लेने की चेष्टा की है। यह एक खुली सी बात है कि आसाम के दो मुसलमान मिनिस्टरों ने सारा आसाम खा लिया थोड़े ही दिनों में यह प्रश्न पैदा होगा कि वहां पर मुसमानों की आबादी बढ़ गई है। अगर पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू के हाथ शासन रहा, तो वह बड़ी सुगमता के साथ वह क्षेत्र पुनः पाकिस्तान को अर्पण कर देंगे।

गोल्ड कंट्रोल और कम्पलल्सरी डिपाजिट स्कीम ने आज देश की आत्मा को हिला दिया परन्तु यह देश का दुर्भाग्य है कि हमारे फिनांस मिनिस्टर महोदय कभी भी सद्भावना के साथ उस बात को सुनना नहीं चाहते। उन्होंने बहुत लाइटली कह दिया कि कुल १७ आदमी देश में बारे। क्या १७ आदमी थोड़े हैं? जब एक कांग्रेसी को फांसी होती थी— हम भी कांग्रेस में थे— तो सारा देश हिल जाता था। आज १७ आदमी मरे, तो उन्होंने यह कहते हुए एक नुक्ता और लगा दिया कि वे किसी और कारण से मरे। चूंकि बहुत लोग यहां पर तारों के बंडल ला चुके हैं, लेकिन मैं बंडल तो नहीं केवल एक ही तार आपने साथ लाया हूं। वह इन्दौर से आया है और कोई साहब वहां पर आमरण अनशन कर रहे हैं। (*Interruptions*) मेरे पास समय थोड़ा है, इस लिये मुझे बोलने दिया जाय। मैं बताना चाहता हूं कि चाहे एक आदमी मरा, या अनेक उस से सारे हिंदुस्तान की आत्मा हिल जानी चाहिये। पर यह दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण भारत है कि इस के बावजूद वह मिनिस्टर महोदय आज भी हमारे सामने बैठे हैं। अगर कोई दूसरा होता तो जहां वास्तविक प्रजाततंत्र की मान्यता होती, तो सम्बद्ध मिनिस्टर अपनी बात की पुष्टि के हेतु, कि उस ने सही काम किया है, अपना पद त्याग देता। हम मानते हैं कि श्री मुरारजी ने अपनी भावना से सही काम किया है, परन्तु उस के कारण देश में एक अविश्वास और तीव्र विरोध भावना फैली हुई है। इस लिये उनका का फर्ज था कि वह चले जाते। हम ने दुनिया के अनेकों मिनिस्टरों के बारे में सुना, लेकिन उन के बारे में नहीं सुना कि वह भी पब्लिक वर्क के लिये जा रहे हैं।

[श्री बिशन चन्द सेठ]

जहां तक भ्रष्टाचार का सम्बन्ध है, अगर देश के आदरणीय वयोवृद्ध नेता ही नहीं, बल्कि पूरे एशिया के नेता, पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू, अपने मिनिस्टरों की खराब बातों को गलत तरीके से छिपाने की चेष्टा न करते, तो आज हमारे देश का वातावरण दूसरे प्रकार का बन गया होता । लेकिन दुर्भाग्य है कि पंडित जी ने अपनी कोमल भावना के अन्तर्गत मिनिस्टरों को इस प्रकार से अनुचित प्रश्रय दिया कि उसके परिणाम आज सारे देश में ऊपर से लेकर नीचे तक भ्रष्टाचार फैल गया । जो भ्रष्टाचार देश में फैला हुआ है, पंडित जी वहां बैठ कर-उस की कल्पना नहीं कर सकते । मैं भी उन डीटेल्ज में ही नहीं जाना चाहता, लेकिन मैं जिम्मेदारी के साथ बता सकता हूं कि आज यह स्थिति हो गई है कि बड़े बड़े आफिसज का क्लेरिकल स्टाफ खुली जुबान में कहता है कि एक कागज को एक मेज से दूसरे मेज तक खिसकेने के लिये पहिये लगाओ । पहिये कैसे ? नोटों के पहिये । तब एक फाइल दूसरी जगह पहुंच सकती है ।

अगर चीन की गतिविधियों में तेजी न आती और नान-एलाइनमेंट की पालिसी असफल न होती, जिस की श्री कृष्ण मेनन ने बड़ी जोरदार अभी वकालत की, तो यह प्रस्ताव यहां न लाया जाता । आप चाहे विश्वास न कीजिये, लेकिन मैं आप को बताना चाहता हूं कि देश को इस प्रस्ताव लाने में गौरव नहीं है और न हम में कोई आत्म-संतोष है कि हम मंत्री-मंडल के विरुद्ध अविश्वास-प्रस्ताव लाये । लेकिन हमारी आत्मा दुख गई, हम परेशान हो गये, इस लिए यह प्रस्ताव लाया गया है ।

जहां तक पाटिल साहब की स्पीच का सम्बन्ध है, मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि एक बार श्री मोरारजी देसाई यहां पर एक दिया-सलाई ले कर तशरीफ लाए थे और उस को दिखाया था कि मुझ को इतने मूल्य में मिली है । उन को चाह वह धेले में दी दे गई हो, लेकिन प्रश्न यह है कि हम को किस कीमत पर मिलती है । उसी तरह आज स्थिति यह है कि शक्कर डेढ़ रुपये, दो रूपये सेर के हिसाब से मार्केट में बिक रही है । सरकार को इस बात की जांच करनी चाहिये, लेकिन कुर्सी पर बैठने के बाद गवर्नमेंट की कमियों को नित्य छिपाने से यह सरकार देश की रक्षा नहीं कर सकती ।

अगर हमारी सरकार केवल एक प्रश्न को ले लेती, तो खाद्य समस्या को हल करने में बहुत सहायता मिलती । हमारे देश में कुछ भोज्य पदार्थ छोड़ने की परिपाटी है अगर किसी होटल में जाइये, तो इतना खाना आ जाता है जितना खाया नहीं जाता, उतना फेंक दिया जाता है । अगर यह मान लिया जाये कि एक आदमी एक दिन में केवल एक तोला भोज्य पदार्थ फेंकता है, तो एक दिन में और एक साल में कितना भोज्य पदार्थ फेंका जाता कभी विचार किया गया – एक दिन में दस हजार टन और एक साल में ३६ लाख टन बनता है ।

अकेले दिल्ली में किसी होटल में आप जायें और देखें कि कितना अन्न और भोज्य पदार्थ नित्य फिकता है । हमारे फूड मिनिस्टर महोदय का यह कर्तव्य था कि देश के अन्दर घुस कर, उसके भीतर जाकर यह समझने की चेष्टा करते कि वस्तुतः स्थिति क्या है ? परन्तु, नहीं, वह एसा नहीं कर सकते । एक तरफ तो अनाज फिक रहा है और दूसरी तरफ विदेशों से अन्न का आयात किया जा रहा है । प्रधान मन्त्री जी ने एक से अधिक बार अपने मुखारबिन्द से कहा था कि हमारा देश आने वाले दो सालों में या तीन सालों में अन्न के मामले में आत्म निर्भर हो जाएगा । परन्तु वह आत्मनिर्भरता, भगवान् जाने, कब आएगी ।

इंग्लैण्ड और अमरीका के सम्बन्ध में एक सख्त शिकायत मैं आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूं । मैं इन दोनों देशों का हिमायती रहा हूं । परन्तु मुझे आज इस बात का मलाल है कि ये दोनों देश इस समय भारत की कमजोरी का फायदा उठा हमें दबाव में लाकर पाकिस्तान से कोई फैसला करवा लेना चाहते हैं । मैं प्रधान मन्त्री जी से कहना चाहता हूं कि इन दोनों देशों को बता दिया जाए कि कोई भी तुम्हारी इस तरह की बात भारतीय शासन मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं । हम पाकिस्तान के साथ कोई भी उस प्रकार का समझौता जो कि अमरीका और इंग्लैण्ड के दबाव के अन्तर्गत होगा, करने को तैयार नहीं हैं । हम अपने सम्मान की रक्षा के साथ देश की जो व्यवस्था है, उसको देखते हुए जो आवश्यक प्रतीत होगा, उसे ही करने के लिए तैयार होंगे ।

हमने कुछ प्रश्न किए थे, जिनके जवाब हमारे पास हैं । मैं उनकी तफसील में जाना नहीं चाहता हूं क्योंकि समय कम है । परन्तु इतना कहना चाहता हूं कि गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से जो उसका उत्तर हमें आया उसमें कहा गया हमारे १२ अफसर केनिंग फ्रण्टियर डिवीजन में ३१ मई, १९६३ को मारे गये हर रोज़ जूते खाते खाते हिन्दुस्तान की दशा खराब हो गई आपका शासन न हुआ, हमारी बइज्जती का वह दैनिक कार्यक्रम बन गया । किसी भी जगह हमारी इज्जती इज्जत नहीं है । कोलम्बो जो एक समय हमारा था, वहां हम नहीं रह सकते, वर्मा जो एक वक्त हमारा था, वहां हम नहीं रह सकते । हमें सोचना होगा कि आखिर बात क्या है ? फारेन पालिसी जिसके ऊपर कांग्रेस वालों को बड़ा गर्व है और बहुत जोर से उसका समर्थन किया है, क्या उसमें कहीं कोई कमी तो नहीं है । आप देखें कि हमारे देश में तो दुनिया भर का हर आदमी आकर रह सकता है लेकिन हम किसी भी देश में जाकर इज्जत के साथ नहीं रह सकते । यह आपकी कमजोर नीति का ही नतीजा है कि हमारी यह हालत हो गई है । अगर यही सफलता की हमारी नाप तौल है तो मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूं कि हम कहीं के भी नहीं रहेंगे । मैं चाहता हूं कि आप तस्वीर के इस पहलू को भी देखें और देखने के बाद इस निष्कर्ष पर पहुंचें कि कौन सच है और कौन झूठ है ।

श्री कामराज नादर रेजोल्यूशन के सम्बन्ध में एक बात कहना चाहता हूं । आप देखें कि देश के अन्दर आज क्या भावना है । आदरणीय प्रधान मन्त्री जी का ध्यान मैं इस ओर आकर्षित करना चाहता हूं कि जिस तरह से शास्त्री जी ने पूर्व में रेल मन्त्री पद का त्याग किया था, वह त्याग नहीं था बल्कि जनता की भावना को साथ लेने हेतु आपने उनको रेल मन्त्री पद से हटाया था, ठीक वही स्थिति आज देश के सामने है । लोग समझते हैं कि यह भी कांग्रस का एक जाल है इस के अन्दर अब की मर्तबा दुनिया नहीं फंसेगी, देश नहीं फंसेगा । अगर आप ईमानदारी के साथ यह कहते हैं कि आप लोग शासन से बड़े बड़े प्रमुख नेताओं को निकालना चाहते हैं तो इस में एक बड़ा भारी प्रश्न उठता है । आप निकालना चाहते हैं, उनको कांग्रस पार्टी के लिए, यह दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण बात है । जिनको आप निकालें, देशहित में निकालें, आज जो भ्रष्टाचार फैला हुआ है, उसका अन्त करने के लिए निकालें । अगर आपने एसा किया तब तो यह बात मान्य हो सकती है, अन्यथा नहीं । परन्तु, आप तो आदरणीय मन्त्रियों को इसलिए निकाल रहे हैं कि कांग्रस का केवल सुधार करें यह शोभालेक्त बात नहीं है । आपका यह काम होना चाहिये कि जो बड़े बड़े मन्त्री हैं, नेता हैं, जो पद का त्याग करके जाना चाहते हैं, उनको देश की रक्षा तथा देश के हित में जाने दें, न कि पार्टी के हित में ।

अन्त में मैं केवल एक बात कहूंगा । अगर चार बातों की तरफ आपने ध्यान न दिया, चार बातों की शासक वर्ग ने परवाह न की और

[श्री बिशन चन्द सेठ]

साथ ही साथ देश ने चिन्ता न की तो यह देश दुर्भाग्य के गर्त में चला जाएगा । चार बातें कौनसी हैं, यह मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूं ।

पहली बात तो यह है कि कम्युनिस्टों की ओर से सतर्क रहा जाए ।

दूसरी बात यह है कि पाकिस्तानी मनोवृत्ति जो देश के अन्दर फैल रही है, उसकी तरफ गम्भीरता से ध्यान दिया जाए, विचार किया जाए ।

तीसरी बात जो विदेशी ईसाई मिशनरी देश में हैं उनकी गतिविधियों की तरफ ध्यान दिया जाए, एवं कड़ी नजर रखी जाए ।

चौथी बात यह है कि देश के सन्तुलन को कायम रखा जाए । केवल डंडे से हकूमत नहीं चला करती । यह प्रजातन्त्र का युग है । आप किसी को दबा कर देश का राजकाज नहीं चला सकते हैं । अगर ऐसा किया जाता है तो यह बड़ी ही दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण बात होगी और कभी भी विस्फोट हो सकता है ।

मैं इस बात के लिये आपको बधाई देता हूं कि जो हड़ताल चल रही थी, उसको आपने दबा दिया । हड़ताल चलाई तो सोशलिस्टों ने थी लेकिन कम्यूनिस्ट इस अग्नि को पंखा दे रहे थे, देश का यह सौभाग्य है कि वह समाप्त हो गई और कम्यूनिस्टों को मुंह की खानी पड़ी । कम्यूनिस्टों का क्या तरीका है, इसको आप देखें । बाहर बाहर तो ये जवाहरलाल की नेहरू की जयजयकार करते हैं, उनकी जयजयकार का घंटा बजाते हैं, लेकिन अन्दर ही अन्दर पंखा कर रहे थे और इनकी हार्दिक कामना थी कि यह आग देश में फैल जाए ।

चूंकि आपने मुझे कम समय दिया है, इस एक शिकायत के साथ मैं अपना भाषण समाप्त करता हूं और अपना स्थान ग्रहण करता हूं ।

Shri M. Muhammad Ismail (Manjeri): Sir, some friends on the other side have been expressing wonder and scepticism about the Muslim League, the P.S.P., Jan Sang, Swatantra and other opposition parties coming together. I do not know why they think that these parties can never come together, even as they have now come, on this important occasion. Perhaps it is their sheer wishful thinking that makes them think that these parties can never come together. If they think so it is a serious mistake, almost a fatal one that they are committing.

So far as the Congress party is concerned, whenever it suits them they find that the Muslim League is agreeable and sweet, as in Kerala or at times in Madras. But when their taste and temper changes, the Muslim League becomes disagreeable at other times and other places. For this change nothing in the Muslim League is responsible. It is due to the change in the mind and the mood of the Congress.

Having said this, I want to say a few words on one or two things that have been debated in the House on the no-confidence motion. The difference between the professions and the practices of the Congress regime is evident in many of their actions. At the beginning, for example, after Independence, various parts of the country were brought together, and the country was consolidated in a wonderful manner and in a short time. This achievement is really a historic and a unique one. And I may add that if any one person can be said to have been instrumental for this achievement, that credit goes to the late lamented Sardar Patel. At that time, when the country was consolidated, when there were talks of realigning the country on a lingustic basis, the Government resisted it and declared, on the basis of the JVP report and the report of the Dhar Commission, that there could be no talk of linguistic provinces for at least twenty-five years. But did Government stick to

this declaration and resolve of theirs? Step by step, but very soon, they lost their steadfastness of purpose and there came the reorganisation of the provinces on a linguistic basis. In the formation of the linguistic States, an intense emphasis was given to the regional languages. Language has got a tendency to go straight to the very heart and emotional depths of man. Even before this re-alignment of the Provinces of the country, politicians began to meddle with and dabble in the system of education and after the ushering in of the linguistic States, this process of interference increased, and experiments with the education and the life of children were made one after another. Now, they have come upon the three language formula, but one cannot say where all this will end. By the way, in all these processes, Urdu has been ignored or taken casually.

Now after having intensified the emotional emphasis on the regional languages which go to the very bottom of the people's heart, they are intensifying the process of making one of the regional languages the official language of the country.

Sir, I want to ask whether such a procedure is conducive to the national and emotional integration of which we are concerned very much. National integration or emotional integration is not made to order.

Another instance of the difference between profession and practice of the Congress regime is provided by the way in which the concept of a secular State is operated. It is claimed that the Government is carried on secular lines. But the difference between the position of the minorities and others is persisting. I do not want to make this an occasion for voicing the grievances of the minorities. For that there have been other occasions and there will be still further occasions. But the thing is that no concern is shown about this question and no atempt is made even to enquire into it.

Again, take the case of evacuees that come into our country. Are they being treated alike? There are lakhs and lakhs of our people who have been sojourning for a long time in countries like Ceylon, Burma and Malaya. Now, countries such as Ceylon and Burma are deliberately squeezing out the population there which is of Indian origin. The condition of these people is miserable. Tens of thousands of them are coming into our country, mostly to the Southern States like Madras, Kerala and Andhra, because most of these people who have been sojourning in those countries belong to South India. But the voice of those people or the voice of those States is not heard in Delhi, No serious attention or consideration seems to be given to their suffering or their condition.

Now a few words about the policy of non-alignment pursued by our Government. If it has benefited the world we must indeed be really happy about it and proud about it. Non-alignment has got its own good. But what I want to know is, what is the good that it has done to our country? In spite of our non-alignment and in spite of our desire to be friendly with all in the world, we have been attacked by our neighbour, the Chinese. Now, under these circumstances I do not understand the manner in which this policy is being followed. I have gone to the extent of saying that it is a salutary policy. But it is to be executed, implemented, as is being done by the Government of India? That is what I do not understand. There can be non-alignment when we are having peace in the world or even two other nations are fighting among themselves. We may say, 'We belong to no party; we support neither'. That is understandable. But when we are ourselves attacked and are in a war, is it not in our interest to get the friendship of as many nations as possible? Now, even when a friendly nation comes forward with help, are we to say, 'Please wait. We do not take aid

[Shri M. Muhammad Ismail]

from you unless we get similar aid from the other side also'. Is that the way in which the non-alignment policy is to be pursued? The result would be that those countries who are friendly towards us and who want to help us would come to have second thoughts and their desire to help us would become cooler. I want to know whether this attitude would really serve the interest and purpose of this country.

There is another instance of divergence between profession and practice. An emergency has been proclaimed in the country. People, all of us, rose as one man. That was a historical event. They brushed aside all their differences—such differences by the way exist in every country. They rose as one man in defence of the motherland. But then what happened? The Government have been taking certain measures which are not usually taken at the time of emergency and which are taken during normal times. One such measure was the Official Languages Bill. Was it necessary to bring forward that Bill which created controversy among people during this time of emergency? Is it how other countries carry on when they are in a war? Our Congress Government say one thing and do something else.

15.58 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair.*]

I want to say just one or two words about production. There has been a factual increase in production. Figures were quoted on the other side in support of this. There has indeed been an increase in production in agricultural as well as in the industrial field. But the Government should also have given figures for the money and effort which went into this, that is the total investment involved and the percentage of the return obtained.

Finally, I want to dissociate myself with one or two things which were said by one or two friends. There was a charge of nepotism levelled against the Prime Minister of India. I do not associate myself with that, because I know by nature and by character, he is not capable of nepotism. Certain names were mentioned in the course of the debate. I consider such disparaging references improper and unfair as those persons are not here to defend themselves. One particular name was mentioned, the name of a lady. I have been following with great admiration her remarkable services. I mean Shrimati Vijayalakshmi Pandit who has been rendering highly distinguished service particularly in the international field. Her services have brought encomiums for her and our country not only from people here in India but from amongst the great statesmen of the world. She has been rendering that service with great ability and success and one cannot but be proud of that. That we should have such a leader in our country is our fortune. In her own right, on account of her own capacity, not because of her relationship with the ruling party or with the Prime Minister of India, she is entitled to and capable of occupying the highest position in the land. I have to say these few words and they do not affect my support to the no-confidence motion.

16 hrs.

श्री शिवमूर्ति स्वामी (कोप्पल) : इस महा मुल्क के इतिहास पुरुष के खिलाफ जो अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव चल रहा है उसका समर्थन करते हुए बहुत दुःख होता है। सरकार बहुत सी गलतियां करती है, लेकिन जब वे गलतियां उनके सामने लाई जाती हैं तो उनकी तरदीद सही तौर पर नहीं होती यही एक अफसोस की बात है।

मैं इस वक्त ज्यादा न कहते हुए श्री मोतीलाल जी नेहरू का एक कोटेशन यहां

पढ़ कर सुना देना चाहता हूं जो कि उन्होंने अपने बेटे के बारे में कहा था यह श्री मोहनलाल जी ने अपनी किताब में लिखा है। वह इस प्रकार है : (*Interruptions*). I want to quote here what Pandit Motilal Nehru has said about his own son to Shri Mohanlal Saksena. I want to remind our Prime Minister about what is parliamentary practice.

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Sivamurhi Swamy: He says:

> "He is a jewel of a man and a perfect gentleman. He trusts everybody, for he thinks others are like himself. Remember Mohanlal, people will take undue advantage of him. He will be duped and deceived often". After a perusive pause for a moment or two, he concluded: "But he is not to blame. He has led a sheltered life and not seen the seamy side of it".

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Mr. Speaker, Sir, for four days we have had this debate, and I believe 40 Members have spoken; I am the 41st. I have tried my best, respectfully and with patience, to follow the speeches—to listen to them myself and follow them. Sometimes it has been a little hard but, on the whole, I believe I have succeeded.

It has been a strange experience to see this varied assembly of the Opposition speak in different terms. Only just now we heard a representative of the Muslim League, a little before, of the Hindu Mahasabha, and a little earlier—yesterday, I think—of the D.M.K. of Madras, all in serried ranks behind Acharya Kripalani and his fellow generals. In fact, they are all generals; there are no privates in the army.

A no-confidence motion, of course, aims at or should aim at removing the Government and taking its place. Now it is clear that in the present instance there was no such expectation or hope. And so the debate, although it was interesting in many ways, and profitable, I think, was a little unreal. Personally, I have welcomed this motion and this debate, and I have almost felt that it would be a good thing if we have periodical examinations of this kind.

Shri Tyagi: No, no.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have listened, as I said, with respect to the speeches of the Opposition Members, and tried to understand what troubled them. Some things I knew. But still, what has brought together in this curious array these various Members? It is obvious that what has brought them together is a negation, not a positive fact, not only a dislike of Government, of our Government, but perhaps, if I may say so, it is more—I am sorry to say so—a personal matter against me, both as leader of the Government and otherwise. I do not mean that everybody feels that way. Certainly, it is a negative matter that has brought them together. That takes away a great deal from the strength of the Opposition, and it reduces it. What are they after?—there might be something in it; just to remove this Government; and that too is not within their expectation. So, it really comes to this. They were too full of feelings, huff and anger and dislike, and they wanted to express themselves in forcible language. It comes to that ultimately.

I must confess, and I say so with all respect, that the Members, leaders of the Opposition including, of course, the hon. Member who proposed this motion, have not done justice to this motion or to themselves. I have been rather disappointed at the charges they made. I do not mean to say that all the charges they made had no substance. Of course, you might divide their attack into four heads, namely domestic policy, foreign policy, defence and general corruption, etc. I am not prepared to say, and nobody can, that

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

corruption is not a most serious matter to be inquired into, to be eradicated and to be crushed out. There is no difference of opinion about that. There may be a difference of opinion as to the extent of it, and possibly, sometimes, it is exaggerated, and thereby, perhaps, an atmosphere is created which instead of putting an end to corruption gives it a certain licence. However, these are the four main subjects dealt with.

Now, we have been debating a matter of high State policy. Whether the Government comes or goes, the matters we have debated are important matters for the country, for the State. I should have thought that most of the debate would deal with high matters of State policy. Sometimes, they have been referred to, undoubtedly. But, generally, the debate has proceeded on rather personal grounds, personal likes and dislikes, personal criticisms and attacks, which have taken away much of the force of it. The person concerned felt irritated. That is a different matter. But this was an important moment in the history of Parliament. And as a parliamentarian, apart from being a Prime Minister, I had hoped that we would rise equal to that occasion on both sides of the House and deal with the great matters that confront our country and also incidentally deal with the unfortunate Government that is in charge of many of these matters; but, to concentrate rather on the failings of individuals seems to bring the debate down to a lower level.

The three hon. Members, the three newcomers, whose speeches I listened to with great interest and care, Acharya Kripalani, Shri M. R. Masani and Dr. Lohia, perhaps, were a little excited still with their victories in the by-elections and seemed to think that they could make a frontal attack on this Government and all who are parts of it.

Dr. Lohia did me the honour of referring to me repeatedly. I do not wish to argue about myself; it is unbecoming for me; to do so, anyhow, would be wrong. But that did bring the debate down to a singularly low level of the market place.

Several Hon. Members: Shame!

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Prime Minister may be allowed to go on. We have had four days' debate.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have met Dr. Lohia here in Parliament, I believe, after seventeen years. I do not remember the exact date, but probably, it is about seventeen years since I met him last. And my recollection of him was such that when I heard him I was singularly disappointed. He did not do justice to himself. I expected better of him than merely clever phrases and personal attacks.

We were dealing with the future of India, not of Jawaharlal Nehru or Morarji Desai or somebody else who happens to be for the time being in posts in the Government. We shall go, of course, even if we do not go because of this vote of no-confidence, otherwise too; in course of time, we shall go; others will take our place. It may be—I do not know about the future—that other parties will come in. And I felt that in a moment like this, to talk in this petty and small-minded way was not becoming. However, that is for each Member to choose how he should speak, and how he should present his case, but it does affect the major case. When we are talking about what really means the future of the country, the freedom of the country, the prosperity of the country and all that, to bring it down to this low level of personal criticism and abuse is not good.

Now, sometimes, in the course of this debate, Members have been rather excited, on the whole, not very much, I should say, in the four days, but still, sometimes.

It will be my endeavour to avoid saying anything which might have the result of exciting people. Of course, naturally, I may say something which is not liked. That is inevitable. But I have no desire to carry on this debate, towards the end of it specially, on a note of resentment and anger.

So, one of my disappointments in this debate which otherwise has been helpful in many ways has been the absence of a larger vision, to which we were looking forward to, and to which we as a Government have failed to come up. That would have been something which would have raised the debate and raised people's thinking, our failure being attached to the larger vision that we should possess or we are supposed to possess. There was hardly any reference to any large vision. When many years ago most of us here, not only on our side but on the other side of the House too, were participating in the struggle for freedom, under the leadership of Gandhiji, we had that larger vision, not only of freedom or of attaining independence, but something more all the time most of us had. There was a social objective, there was a vision of the future which we were going to build, and that gave us a certain vitality, a certain measure of a crusading spirit. Now, perhaps it is true that most of us are lost, are rather tied up in humdrum politics and petty matters of the day. Whether we are in the Government or in the Opposition, we are both tied up that way, and the larger vision escapes us, or sometimes only we have glimpses of it. And yet, if India is to go ahead, as we all want to, India will have to have a vision of the future, always to think of it, and always to judge our present conduct by seeing how far it comes up anywhere near that vision, because a country which has no vision gradually goes down. A country which has a wrong vision inevitably goes down, but a country which has no vision gradually loses its vital energy and perishes ultimately. I do not think India is going to perish. It has not perished for five thousand years or more, it is not going to perish, but there is something in between, that is existing. I do not want India to exist, I want it to live a full life. I want it to advance, I want the people of India to flourish in every way, not only in the physical, material sense, but in other senses, cultural, intellectual, moral and other senses. It has much to learn from the world and also to give something to the world, because I have been convinced, I am conviced, that India does possess something which it can give to the rest of the world, although it has to learn much from the rest of the world also.

So, I have found in this debate, I am sorry to say, a singular lack of reference to this larger vision that we are supposed to have. Looking at things in perspective, I would say even looking at things in the economic aspect, the social aspect, the planning aspect, the perspective planning aspect, to look at things in some perspective—that is the very essence of planning, where we are going and how do we go?

Shri Masani gave expression to his views about economic affairs, and I am astounded that any intelligent people should talk in the way he did. There is no sense in it, no understanding of the modern world of economics as it is understood today. He said: why have a steel plant? A more astonishing remark it has not been my bad fortune to listen to. What does he expect? We should not have that, we should have small industries? I am all for small industries. We should have what is called no capital intensive works, that take up too much capital, and therefore we should advance like this? Where do machines come from for the small industries? We can get them from Germany, Japan, Russia, wherever you like, and pay heavily for them, go on paying for them. Is this anyone's conception of industrialisation of this country? No country

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

has been industrialised in that way. It is essential if you want industrialisation, as we want it, to have a base, an industrial base. Apart from pure industrialisation, it is essential for our strength, for our military strength, defence strength, to have an industrial base. That is the trouble we have today. We do not lack men, we do not lack stout men, brave men, in this country, but all the stout men in this country are precious little good ultimately when it comes to the use of modern weapons modern industry and all that. Therefore, I say you cannot even remain free in India without an industrial base. You cannot advance, industrialise this country, without an industrial base, and an industrial base means basic industries and mother industries, heavy industries and the like. As soon as that is established, smaller industries flow from them, and the rate of progress is fast. If you do not establish that, well, you remain tried up not only not advancing fast, but you are tied up to other countries who are economically dominant over you, who can prevent your growth, who can lower down the rate of progress. You are not economically free completely. That is not a prospect which I look forward to and I imagine that is not the prospect which this House will welcome.

We want real freedom. Real freedom is not merely politicaly freedom; it is economic freedom in two senses. One in the sense that you do not have to rely on other countries. You are friends with them, you co-operate with them, you take their help, but you are not dependent upon them to carry on either for defence or anything else. And the second economic freedom I mean is economic freedom for the vast masses of our country, that is their having higher standards of living, leading a good life, not only physically, materially, but culturally and otherwise, and putting an end, as far as possible, in stages if you like, to these gross differences that exist in India, which are not good for any country from any point of view.

It is difficult to remove them suddenly. Remember that we in India have had a background which is not a good background in spite of all our great thoughts and all that. The social background we have had to deal with in India has been a bad background, ith caste and tremendous differences, and that has soaked down to millions and millions of our people, and that is why one of the big things that we have to do is to uproot that background, change the way of thinking, change the way of living. It is no good our thinking that the magnificent books we have, the Maha Bharata, the Ramayana and all that are a substitute, can cover up the evils of a bad background of thinking and action. We are backward, backward in our thinking, backward in our lives, in the way we live, backward in the way we treat others. All this caste system, and Harijans and this and that, it is a bad thing. That comes in the way even of bringing in material things. All that is changing, I know, and will change. But we have to have some idea of the demons that we have to contend against, and the problems here are much more intricate and deeper than possibly countries elsewhere might have, just fighting one demon of poverty.

So, in our domestic field, not today, but at least 30 years ago, more than 30 years ago, this Congress organisation—and many of the Members sitting opposite were Members of the Congress organisation—took a step which national organisations seldom do, took a step towards the formulation of some ideal of social justice, took a step about land reform. It did not take it, it could not do it, but it formulated a policy of land reform and social justice, and some steps towards the formulation of a public sector. This was the Karachi Congress, more than 30 years ago. Of course, the whole concept of Gandhiji,

although he did not talk perhaps in modern language, was not only one of social justice, but of social reform, land reform. All that was his. It was inevitable that Congress should begin to think that way because we became a party of the masses; even though we were not exactly proletarians or peasants and all that we were influenced by the mass of the people who became members of the Congress and so we were forced to think of agrarian reforms especialy and other things too. Gradually this idea developed and ultimately we came to Independence and we passed a Constitution. It talks of social justice. It does not talk of socialism but practically it gives the background of what socialism is in the Constitution. Later this Parliament definitely adopted the ideal of socialism, and the Planing Commission too. If any hon. Member in the opposite side criticised us for not having gone fast enough on the road to realise socialism, I would accept that criticism; we have not gone fast enough. We have been slow for a variety of reasons, some within our control and some not in our control. But I am convinced that there is no choice for India, party or no party; no party whatever it may feel can stop this march to socialism in this country, to democratic socialism. We are perhaps the only country—I would not say only; I do not know—or the outstanding country where an attempt has been made to put this idea of social democracy and try to achieve it by planning. Planning has taken place in other places; they are not democratic places. Other countries which are democratic have not accepted planning. But the combination of the two is rather unique. Of course planning is a thing which everybody talks about now. But planning in the sense of an organised, well-thought out method of going step by step, putting a goal before you and marking out the steps you have to take—that is a scientific process but rather a complicated and difficult process. Most people think that planning is to put together a number of things and schemes and proposals. They call that planning. That has nothing to do with planning; it is remote from planning. Planning is something which leads from one step to another and ultimately to the goal. It may not be quite accurate because conditions vary and there are many factors, the biggest being the human factor which you cannot wholly control. It is impossible for any one of us here to do that. Parliament cannot by any law say how 440 millions of our countrymen will work; they may create conditions for their work; they may help them and they may advise them. But you cannot force them to do something; human nature being what it is, at any rate in a democratic system you cannot do that.

So India took up this big tremendous adventure and thereby attracted attention all over the world because it was a great thing to do, especially having regard to our background of caste and other differences which we are faced with. We have been at it now for a dozen years or more; we have progressively learnt more. I think that we know more about it than we had when we started at the end of the First Plan. Not only have we collected more material in the shape of statistical material but all kinds of other ideas, discussions with all kinds of people. We have had the good fortune to discuss this matter with people from almost every major country in the world, certainly the countries of Europe, America, Russia, Japan including at one time, I believe, some Chinese people,—two or three specialists came—Scandinavia, Yugoslavia, we have discussed with them not individually but together with them sometimes. That was interesting to discuss it. There was a Soviet man apparently thinking in terms of Soviet planning; there was an American professor or somebody thinking in terms of or in the background of

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

America, an Irishman, a Frenchman, a German—was sat together and often discussed it with them. It was extraordinary that although they differed in their ideological outlook—I use a word which is so often used—when they came down to hard facts of the Indian situation, it was extraordinary to see how much they agreed between themselves. The differed somewhere here and there because they realised that it is no good discussing ideological thoughts between themselves here; they discussed here what we had to do to meet a certain situation. They drew up thousands of papers and our Planning Commission is full of the papers they wrote jointly and separately. It was extraordinary to see how much they agreed even among themselves as to what we should do, although one thought on communist lines, another thought on some kind of socialist lines and a third on capitalist lines. But being economists usually they took a problem and had to solve it; they had to come round to that process of perspective planning, of laying great stress on heavy industry and of course other light industries must come. Power perhaps is the most important thing of all. If I could do it I would concentrate on power all over India realising that with the coming of power other things will come, power meaning electric power. So, we built it up. We made mistakes. The first thing that we realised was that it was no good thinking in terms of copying America or copying Russia or any other country. The problems of India are its own problems. We can learn from America, Russia and certainly we should. But the economic problems of India are different. In our colleges, I do not know now, but some years ago the economic books of America and England were taught and there was absolutely no use for that because those countries were thinking more or less of an affluent society in which they lived and they discussed the problems of the affluent society whereas we were a poverty-stricken people and then we had to learn economics from books dealing with an affluent society. It was not much good. Of course it taught something. So, gradually the idea arose and it has arisen now, I believe, that economics is taught from the point of view of India and not from the point of view of America or Russia, learning from them of course as they have great experience. So, we have gone step by step. We always realise that the fundamental factor was the growth of agricultural production. That is basic, because however much we attach importance to industry—industry is a good thing—unless we had surplus from agriculture, if industry had no surplus, then we have nothing. We canot live on doles from other countries. So, we attach the greatest importance to agriculture. At the same time we realise that by agriculture alone India will not go forward; however much agriculture may progress, industry has to come—industries of various kinds; heavy industries are the base and we need industries even for agricultural implements; we need small industry which could be allied to agriculture. In India that is very important that you should have some auxiliary industries which should fit in with the agricultural process. I am not at the moment thinking of what Gandhiji had said about hand-spinning and the like, but that does fit in. It is no good saying that hand-spinning is no good in the modern age, that it is not economic. It is useful under certain conditions in certain parts of India as things are. I do not say what would happen 15 or 20 years later. But what I was referring to is not merely hand-spinning but some village industries, preferably with electric power and modern techniques, because whether you do small industry or big industry or the biggest industry, one thing you must be sure of: that you use the latest modern techniques. It is no good using a bad technique, an ancient technique which is out-of-date.

Thinking like this we tried to proceed. There was the first five year Plan. Then the second Plan came. We got some more statistics and some more knowledge, some more experience and some more heart-breaks. And then came the third Plan in which we are now. We started with difficulties and are still carrying on a little better than we expected. The second Plan was in a bigger scale and achieved much more than the first. The third Plan, in spite of the various difficulties we have had, will no doubt, I think, improve the conditions of the country more than the second Plan made. And so we go on.

So, if you look at this broad picture, it is a picture not of something that produces defeatism; it is an optimistic picture, in spite of the vast difficulties in India, in spite of the population problem on which Shri Frank Anthony laid great stress; it is a good picture, and I am quite sure we shall succeed.

But the basic thing, the main thing in India is the peasant: how to change his mental outlook; how to modernise, how, by making him use the modern tools and modern ideas in a certain measure, to get him out of the rut in which he is living from ages past. With that end in view, we started community development. We succeeded to some extent and then they fell into a rut. There is an enormous capacity in India for people, whatever goodwill they have, to fall into a rut. I may confess that even Governments have that habit; certainly Governments have that habit and the Opposition have it even more. I will tell you why: not that the Government are better than the Opposition; of course not. The Government after all have to deal with day-to-day problems which force them to think. The Opposition has not got to think of them, and it thinks in terms of slogans and criticisms and lives where it is. It does not advance at all.

My colleague the Finance Minister and my colleague the Minister of Food and Agriculture have spoken of their respective departments with ability and given a number of figures, etc. I do not propose to trouble the House with those points. But I would like to make clear one thing. Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia referred to something —he calculated that the income of 60 per cent of the people is three annas per day. I confess that I cannot make out how he arrived at this remarkable figure. I believe he has made various mistakes in his mathematics. First of all, the total he has given is wrong. The chief mistake he has made is, he has confused per family and *per capita* income. Therefore, he has reduced it by dividing it by five; so it comes down by the division of five. I cannot exactly state what it is. It should be at least five times that; it may be much more. I have not calculated it.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Landless labourers do not get 15 annas a day.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Mr. Kripalani may be right about some particular pocket or something, but he said that "27 crores of people have this income". That, I say, is completely wrong on the basis of the facts available in the books.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अध्यक्ष महोदय, क्या प्रधान मंत्री ने हिसाब लगा लिया है कि मैं पांच गुना ज्यादा बता रहा हूं ?

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू : जी हां । जो गलती डा० लोहिया ने की है वह यह है कि पर केपिटा इनकम को पर फैमिली कर दिया है । वह घबरा गए, और फैमिली को उन्होंने पांच का गिना और उस इनकम को पांच से डिवाइड कर दिया ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अच्छा हिसाब लगा लीजिये कि २७ करोड़ आदमियों की आमदनी ३ आने प्रति आदमी के हिसाब से

[डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया]

कितनी आती है और एक रुपये के हिसाब से कितनी आती है। इसमें प्रधान मंत्री जी बड़ी भारी भूल कर रहे हैं।

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू : मैंने हिसाब लगा लिया । इस बारे में मेरे पास एक इकानमिस्ट साहब का नोट है जो कि इस प्रकार है :

"Dr. Lohia has confused *per capita* income of Rs. 25 per month with family income and has based all his deductions on this simple fallacy drawing naturally absurd conclusions."

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : किसका नोट है ?

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू : एक साहब का है ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : तो उन साहब से शाम के वक्त बात कर लीजियेगा। बड़ा पछतायेंगे आप ।

श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू : पछतायेंगे ?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : खेती कारखानों का ज्ञान आपका बड़ा कम है ।

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have ventured to say the main approach of the Government in regard to domestic policy. Of course, excepting the main approach there may be hundred and one variations of it, hundreds of criticisms, many mistakes and faults etc. I cannot go into that. But I do submit that essentially our problem was an economic and social problem and we have tried to look at it in perspective. We are thinking in perspective. We are thinking in terms of 15 years ahead (Interruption). Because Acharya Ranga does not believe in planning he thinks it is a laughing matter for us to look at it. Enough for the day is the evil thereof. But I suggest, if he reads even the Third Five Year Plan Report he will get some glimpses into our thinking; he will get more, do doubt, if other papers are placed before him.

The planning itself involves very important aspects. There is education which is essential. People grow by education and all other social measures. One of the happiest things that has happened in India is the growth of education. At present 70 per cent of the boys and girls of school going age are going to school and it will be 76 per cent in two years' time. That is what is expected to be. Unfortunately, this emergency and menace from China has, here as elsewhere, slightly impeded the progress we are aiming at. So, if you look at India, you will see many things which break one's heart, poverty, misery and all that, and yet you will see something which is heartening and that is this. All stagnation has gone, or is going, and a certain dynamism has some into life in India. I do not at all wish to miss the fact of the poverty and horrors of the Indian scene even now. but it is changing; that is the main thing. It has got out of the old rut and I think it will change pretty soon. The rate of the change will become faster and faster than in the past.

And all this has been done with the democratic structure of Government. In fact, if I may say so with all respect, the very fact of the no-confidence motion that we are debating today is a proof of that structure. It will be a good exercise for us to look round a little to the other countries of Asia and elsewhere, specially the newly independent countries and compare what we have done with what they have done or are doing. A few of them have maintained democracy. But, even apart from that, let us see how far they have progressed on the economic and social plane. I am not

going to compare India with China now, partly because I do not know enough about China, about the progress made by China because the reports are often conflicting. But I do know that the cost that they have paid for this economic progress has, to some extent, been a very heavy one in individual and personal liberties. I do not want to take that kind of cost into account while comparing us with other countries. When we compare us with other countries excluding China, the rate of our progress has been heartening. It is no good comparing our rate of progress with, let us say, Germany, Russia or Japan. Shri Masani talked of the miracle of Germany. It is all very good to speak about the miracle of Germany, but Germany was a highly industrialised State before the war with everybody almost an engineer, a trained person, so that when they sat down after the war to build up there was material on which to build up. So, they built on it. Japan did the same. Russia, which is a socialist or communist State, did almost the same, because it had the background, the industrial complex behind it and the trained people behind it. We have to suffer because we have not got that complex. We are trying to build it. We have built it up partly. So, I would submit that in spite of the poverty in India, there is no doubt, it does not require much in the way of statistics to see it, there is greater welfare in India, except in some pockets, than ever before. We can see that in the food they eat. In fact, they eat more and they eat better food. They wear more clothing; they had precious little previously. They have better housing. Schools are growing everywhere and health facilities are growing. Some people have even the temerity to talk about the miracle of India. They talk of the foreigners, what they have seen of the changes in India during the last dozen years which laid the base for future growth.

We have to choose always, whether we are going to give some benefit to people on our ter- benefit today, or keep it for tomorrow or the day after. Looking at from the country's point of view, by spending the money we have we can get some petty benefits today. But that will not yield any permanent benefit. That is obvious. And one has to find a healthy balance between today's benefit and tomorrow's. All this business of heavy industries we have put in is for tomorrow's benefit, though it brings in some benefit today too. But it takes some years before it yields fruits.

So, the strategy of economic development is first and essentially agriculure, modernisation of agriculture, the training of our rural masses to use new tools and new methods and, at the same time, to lay the foundations of an industrial structure by building the basic heavy industries and, above all, to produce electric power. Middle and small industries inevitably come in their train.

If you got to the parts of the Punjab today, you will see the industrial revolution coming on as you watch it. The revolutionary change that is coming over the Punjab is amazing. The Punjab at the present moment is the most prosperous province so far as *per capita* income is concerned. It is not I—I have no great experience—but Americans coming as tourists who say that it is remarkable how this rapid growth of industrial revolution creeping up resembles what they have themselves experienced in some parts of America. So all these things are happening.

One thing that we have to lay great stress on, apart from this, is that we cannot only think of tomorrow and the day after. People who have not even got the minimum standard of living have to be thought of today. That we all agree. It is always a question of our resources and how we spread them out. It is a complicated question. Some of our advisers have told us, "Forget today, think only of tomorrow." That cannot be done. On the other hand, if

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

we think only of today, we do not make any progress.

The broad picture is that the rate of progress has increased progressively after every Plan. I have no doubt that the progress of the Third Plan period will be substantially higher than that achieved in the Second Plan. In terms of the key growth potential, that is, the infrastructure, the progress has been creditable. National income over ten-year period has risen by 42 per cent as against the growth of population by 21 per cent. *Per capita* income has increased by 16 per cent. That is not enough, I admit, but it is not so bad as somebody would think.

I think, Shri Anthony talked about production and thought that it will all be overwhelmed by the growth of population. He said that. But the principle thing is that foundations have been laid now by this infrastructure for a rapid rate of growth in the future. I hope that by the end of the Third Plan or in the Fourth Plan we shall progressively, approach that stage when we grow ourselves, if I may say so, without too much pushing from outside.

The hon. Minister of Food and Agriculture has said that foodgrains have gone up from 52 million tons to 80 million tons and I expect it to go up in the next three years to 95 million tons or even to 100 million tons. Industrial production has shown remarkable progress. There is no doubt about that. So, has transport and so has power.

In technical education, the degree level intake which was 4,100 in 1950-51 is nearly 14,000 now and is likely to be over 21,000 in 1965-66. For the diploma level the intake has risen from 5,900 to 25,000 and will be 46,000 and so on.

One thing about population. Shri Anthony thought that we should follow Japan's example and encourage abortion. I might mention that even in Japan this has not been looked upon with favour as it is found that this method adversely affects the health of the mother. The Lady Rama Rao Committee definitely gave its opinion against abortion as a method of population control after examining all the evidence. As a matter of fact, the other methods are growing in use in India. There are at present over 3,000 family planning clinics in the villages and in the towns. The progress of voluntary sterilisation has been much more than expected. Up till February 1963, 334, 477 persons are reported to have been sterilised. This may not appear to be a big number considering the population but it is a steadily growing number. We think these methods are safer than abortion or anything like it.

I do not think I need say much about non-alignment. It has been adequately discussed and Shri Krishana Menon spoke a great deal about it with ability.

But I would ask Acharya Kripalani to consider whether he was right in saying—I believe he said it—that Panch Sheel was Panch nonsense. Now, I should like him to tell me which part of Panch Sheel is nonsense. I will repeat to him: the first is independence; the second is non-aggression, non-interference; then, about the third—what it is. . . .

Shri Nath Pai: Mutual respect.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Territorial integrity.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That is No. 4 or No. 5.

Shri Nath Pai: We know it better than you.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I was surprised to hear him using the word 'nonsense'. I submit that Panch Sheel is the only basis for international relations. Anything else is not civilised relationship and leads

to trouble, conflict and war. The fact that China after subscribing to Panch Sheel breaks it and attacks us does not make Panch Sheel wrong. Obviously, the fault is of China, if you like to say so. But the Panch Sheel is not wrong, the principles underlying international relationships.

Shri Hem Barua: There cannot be no unilateral implementation of Panch Sheel.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I am submitting that Panch Sheel is a right principle to lay down. The implementation may be wrong from one side or the other. That can be examined. But it is a principle that is not only right but a civilised principle which must exist between countries unless they are mutually at war and so to some extent the present major conflict between Soviet Union and China is based on that. China does not believe in peaceful co-existence. It says so and Russia says, it does. Of course, behind that lie national conflicts between the two.

Now, there is one thing more. It was said by Acharya Kripalani as well as by others that I hid from Parliament the fact of Chinese aggression for a long time. I have dealt with this in the Lok Sabha previously and I do not want to go into any detail because it can easily be seen—my previous speeches and answers. And I do submit that this is entirely a wrong idea. What happened was that in 1958—it was end of 1958, late autumn—we first heard of the Aksai Chin road being made. We did not know where it was exactly. We sent two sets of people separately to find out where it was, whether it was in our territory or not because Aksai Chin road spreads out behind that. It took months for them to come back because all these are real mountaineering expeditions. One of them came back after some months and the other was captured by the Chinese. All this took months. We wrote to the Chinese to say that we had sent some people on our territory and whether they knew anything about them, and that they had not yet come back. Thereupon, they replied, "Oh, yes. They transgressed our territory and we arrested them. But now as we are friends with you, we are releasing them." That was the first regular information we had that Aksai Chin road had been built in our territory. That was in 1958. In October 1958 I think we sent a protest about this matter to the Chinese Government. About this time—end of 1958, beginning of 1959—the Tibetan rebellion took place against the Chinese rule and our attention had been rather diverted. The Tibetan rebellion took place; people came from Tibet; later the Dalai Lama came; many refugees came. And in our subsequent communications to China those things took rather the first place. But reference was continued to be made about this Aksai Chin road.

17 hrs.

We first informed Parliament about this in 1959—I forget the exact date at the present moment, but it was in 1959. It might be said that we might have informed them three or four months earlier. We must have been waiting for the reply from them; and as soon as the reply came the Tibetan rebellion and other developments took place, and we informed Parliament. There was no long delay in it, and there was obviously no desire to hide anything from Parliament.

Now, Acharya Kripalani has said that we should break off diplomatic relations with China. He asked: why don't we declare war? All I can say is that it would be very unwise for us to do so. It may be a brave gesture. But in our opinion it would be unwise; it will not help us in any way, and it may hinder us in many ways. Nothing comes in the way of our strengthening our defences, as we are trying to do to the best of our ability, and at the same time always to keep the door open, whether it is Pakistan or whether it is China, for peaceful settlement, provided it is honourable and in keeping with our thinking.

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

Now, Acharya Kripalani said something about our defence, and I asked our Defence Minister to give me a note on this question and I shall read that note. I wanted to be sure that what I said was correct.

"Shri Kripalani has alleged that the decision taken to drive away the Chinese Army as announced by the Prime Minister on his way to Ceylon was taken without any consultation whatsoever with the officers incharge of the Army in NEFA, that it is a political decision arrived at in Delhi and that it was astounding that military decisions of the battlefield should be taken without consulting the Army Headquarters at the spot by civilians. He has challenged the Government to publish the NEFA Enquiry Report as people have reason to believe that there has been treachery.

The Enquiry Report cannot be published in view of the secret nature of its contents and the security risk involved. But the Defence Minister intends to make a statement relating to the contents to the extent they can be disclosed on the floor of the House during the session.

The allegations made by Shri Kripalani are absolutely without foundation. Decisions on important matters —and decision with regard to the attitude to be adopted in case of attack by China was an important matter—could only be taken at Delhi. There could not be one decision; a number of decisions had to be taken as the situation developed from time to time. Those decisions were taken by Government in full consultation with the Chiefs of Staff and other senior Army officers concerned and in the light of their expert advice. This applies particularly to the decision that the Army should not withdraw in October-November 1962 from its forward positions in NEFA. While decisions of a certain nature can only be taken ultimately by Government, it is incorrect to say that decisions were taken without consulting the appropriate army authorities. The charge of treachery is of course baseless."

This note the Defence Minister has given me. I may mention this, because it was on my way to Ceylon that I was asked by the press correspondents about the frontier situation. I told them that we intend pushing them out. I do not see anything wrong about it, and that, as a matter of fact, was our decision, our military decision; the date was not fixed; and that was the only thing that I could say at that time, and I refused to say anything else.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: The press report then was that Government had ordered the Army in NEFA to push them out, not that it was intended to push them out, but they had ordered the Army to push out the Chinese.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That may be so; it might have been that. We had told the Army to push them out.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: You had issued instructions to the Army.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: But my point is that that was not a sudden inspiration which I had. That was the result of talks with the Army generals and others, and on their advice—not their advice that I should say it to the press.

Shri Krishna Menon had said something about the kind of Army that we have inherited. It is a good Army from the point of view of the soldier, but it was not a modern Army. It is all very well for it to go and function as a part of the British Army in the Great War; and they did well. All our efforts have been concentrated on gradually modernising it. The modernising process is so expensive; if we take the whole Army, it would involve about Rs. 1000 crores, taking the Army even as it was. And with the continuous pressure on us, on not spending too much, I know, and my

colleague the Finance Minister knows very well how repeatedly demands were made from the Defence Ministry or the Army Headquarters for more expenditure, but we discouraged them; sometimes, we might have cut them down too; they were in such fantastic figures, in geometrical proportion, or in astronomical figures that if suddenly somebody asks for Rs. 500 crores it will be difficult to give it, and it is always difficult except when you are faced with a war situation, when the country and Parliament and everybody thinks differently. That is what has happened now. As regards the amount we are spending now, the taxes that the Finance Minister has put would probably have met with much stronger opposition if there had not been this war or semi-war situation facing us. Even so, the process of modernisation was given some start.

There is one thing that I must say, and that is that I am surprised at Acharya Kripalani talking about the Army and saying it has no clothes and no shoes, as if we send them naked to the field: I do not understand this. I think my hon. friend said in his speech that they did not have shoes or boots.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I said that it did not have shoes for those high altitudes; I was referring to mountain boots with which they can work in snow. I have made my point very clear. I did not say that they had no shoes.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Everyone had stout boots.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: But stout boots do not work there.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: They do work; but it is true that for going in the snow, you do want snow boots.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: That was my complaint. That was all my complaint. They did not have snow boots.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Everyone had blankets, shoes, clothing etc. What happened was this; they did not take more blankets because they had to carry them. So, they said 'Send them by air afterwards'.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: But there is a Government communique asking from the people all those things, such as blankets, pull-overs, and everything else.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Of course.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: That was after the debacle.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: That is perfectly true, because. . . .

Shri J. B. Kripalani: You had nothing.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We were giving these not only to those people at the front but also to others, even to newcomers, because new people were also joining the Army. But everyone of them had two blankets, plus two more which they had to take but which they had left over, because they did not want to carry them and they had said 'Send them by air'.

Shri Ranga: That was not enough.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I have not said anything about Pakistan. In fact, very little has been said about Pakistan by hon. Members who have spoken, except that some reference has been made to Shri Rajagopalachari's kind offer of Kashmir to Pakistan. Our policy consistently will be, will continue to be, to seek some settlement with Pakistan. It is not a question of settlement about Kashmir or some other matter, but a settlement which removes our bitterness against each other and brings a feeling, which creates cooperation between the two countries. There can be no other objective to aim at.

One of the Members of the Opposition Parties talks, I am sorry to say,

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru]

very irresponsibly about things like Akhand Bharat and the like. They do talk about that. That is in the programme which they issued. They may not have said so here. That is very harmful. It is not merely folly, but it does harm, because it frightens the people in Pakistan, that people here want to upset Pakistan. Nobody here wants to do that and can do that, and it would be extreme folly if India ever tried to do that; it would ruin India, ruin Kashmir and ruin Pakistan.

I feel we may have been wrong in minor things. But I think that throughout these many years since Pakistan came into existence and the Kashmir trouble arose, we have always looked forward to a settlement of it. But a settlement does not mean our doing something which is completely wrong from our point of view, Kashmir's point of view and the people of Kashmir's point of view. That is a different matter. We shall continue to do that.

Indeed, I may say even about China that we shall always leave the door open for an honourable settlement with China, whenever it may come. It may not come soon; it may come later....

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: It must not be too wide open.

Shri Hem Barua: They may walk in if it is too wide open.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Only a little open. Keep it a jar.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: We are living in a strange world, and if I may submit, our foreign policy—that is a test of it—has succeeded in putting us *vis-a-vis* other countries in a far more advantageous position than China is. It is no small matter that we have not only the goodwill but the active help of great powers like the United States and the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has been helping us in various ways and, as the House knows, in regard to Kashmir, it has been our staunch supporter.

Shri Prakash Vir Shastri delivered a 15-minute address to the House in which he managed to put in as much condemnation and vituperation as it was possible within 15 minutes. I was surprised and pained to hear it, because many of the things he said had no basis. But he was evidently angry and he expressed himself. It is now too late to talk about the subject of corruption. It is obvious nobody here can have any two opinions about corruption. It must be rooted out and it is a tremendous headache to all of us, how to deal with it.

Shri Jashvant Mehta (Bhavnagar): Question.

An Hon. Member: Question.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: If they say question, I do not know what they think. It is, if I may say so, a result of the democratic process, and I am a little afraid that as this process grows, for instance it is going down to the villages, it may bring with it its painful accompaniment. We have been trying to deal with it, and we have dealt with it. Hon. Members are probably thinking more and hearing a lot about Ministers and the like. Many of these complaints that are made come to me, or are sent to me, and we, first of all, have them thoroughly examined. We get some kind of explanation, that is the procedure adopted, from the person concerned, from the Minister concerned, and if there is anything even *prima facie* worthy of an enquiry, we first have private enquiries. Thereafter, we decide whether any other enquiry should be made or not. As a matter of fact, most of these complaints that have come, and which are talked about in the newspapers, have provided no ground at all after examination. They are exaggerated.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Was it an impartial examination?

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: Impartial, of course. The man who examined was impartial, he had nothing to do with that.

Some are still under examination, some I am examining myself, having got reports from both concerned, the one who accuses and the accused himself.

Then there is the Serajuddin matter. There has been, of course, Mr. Das's enquiry, but apart from that, there are four or five cases that are going to the courts, and I think, I am not quite sure whether they have actually gone there or are going in a day or two. It will deal with all the Serajuddin affairs. Then there is some connection of Orissa people with Serajuddin. As a rule, these matters should be dealt with by the State, but we, nevertheless, sent for papers etc., and my colleague, the Finance Minister and I examined many of them. Some of them have been, I think, as some one said, referred to the Public Accounts Committee. First they were referred to the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee and the Leader of the Opposition. After accepting that work he rejected, he would not do it. Then it was sent to the Public Accounts Committee as a whole, and I think that the Public Accounts Committee is a very suitable body. It contains Members of several parties, and the Accountant-General is there to help them, and it is right they should go into this matter. It affects governmental moneys also.

For instance, the present Deputy Chief Minister of Orissa, right from the beginning, almost *suo moto*, sent me and the Home Minister a long list of moneys he had received from Serajuddin, he was not a Minister then, and he said: these I have received, these were received by me for the Congress; every month he sent me Rs. 3,000 or Rs. 4,000 or something like that, and I have spent it for two purposes, for Congress and for giving scholarships to poor students. And there it is. It has been examined, and it fitted in with some entries in Serajuddin's books too. There was nothing to examine because he admitted the thing, and he was not a Minister at that time at all. The only question was whether it was properly spent or not.

So, all these things are being looked into as far as we can, but the main thing is what process we can devise to deal with this major problem. It is not an easy matter and I hope we shall devise some process There is of course, for officials, the special police establishment and every month I receive a report from them giving me a list of cases examined, cases started in a court of law or cases in which departmental action has been taken. It is a good and substantial report. Quite a number of people are punished that way.

But as I pointed out that something if possible has to be done. Of course mere measures like this may not succeed in routing out such an evil. In this matter we naturally want the co-operation of the public and of Members, Opposition and others.

Before I finish, I should like to say one thing. We have got a very hard task which is not only internal—that of course it is—but I am now talking about the menace on the border, a very difficult one. We must stand up to it, face it and strengthen ourselves. But everybody knows how strength in such matters depends not only on arms, armies and armaments but on the morale of the people, on the unity and morale of the people. We saw some evidence of this unity and morale in November, December and January last. I would beg of the hon. Members to consider how far this morale is strengthened, the sense of unity is strengthened by this motion of no-

[Shri Jawaharlal Nehru.]

confidence or by the strikes that had taken place in Bombay. As a matter of fact if hon. Members had occasion to read the Chinese Press which I see every day; how they gloat over these things. How they gloat over this motion of no-confidence.....

(*An Hon. Member*: Pakistan too). Of course. It encourages them. I believe one of the reasons, perhaps a major reason, they attacked us last October was the feeling in their minds that India was faced with many disruptive tendencies and if they gave us a blow, we will split up into fragments. They were mistaken of course. The opposite has happened. The fact is there that apart from what they may think, what effect we may have on our Army and our own people if they feel that we quarrel too much among ourselves; it must demoralise them. Anyhow, personally I am grateful for having had this motion of no confidence and I think it has done us some good to hear speeches and to make them. Thank you.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अध्यक्ष महोदय, एक ऐसा सवाल उठाया गया है तीन आने और पन्द्रह आने का, जिसके बारे में मैं एक बात कहना चाहता हूं .....

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं आप से ...

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : तीन आने और पन्द्रह आने वाली बात अगर सही है तो मैं इस सदन से निकल जाऊंगा और अगर व गलत है तो उनको प्रधान मंत्री बने र ने का कोई हक नहीं है । हिन्दुस्तान के २७ करोड़ आदमियों .....

अध्यक्ष महोदय : इस वक्त तो बैठ जाइये ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : प्रधान मंत्री ने मेरे दिमाग को ओछा क ा है । मैं उनके दिमाग को ओछा, बन्दा और डरपोक कहता हूं ।

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I am sorry—with your permission and with the permission of the House, if you do not mind, I will sit and reply.

Mr. Speaker: Yes.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have to apologize to you and to the House for having even for a little while lost my temper. I considered the ex-Defence Minister's performance as an insult to my country; yet I think I should have kept my temper. I am sorry for that.

However, it has been a long discussion and it will require of me some time to be able to answer all the criticisms that have been levelled against me personally and against this no-confidence motion. I had not mentioned in my speech even one name, even in connection with bribery and corruption. My speech was in general terms. I wanted to keep the discussion on this motion on a very sane level. And it seems some of the Congressmen did not give me credit for my preliminary remarks when I said that it was with great sorrow that I was obliged to move this motion. It was a call of duty and it was a call of conscience, as I said, and I tried to represent my country people here. I brought in no personalities at all, but a very senior member of the Cabinet taunted me with the wisdom of Mrs. Kripalani.

Some Hon. Members: Shame, shame.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Why was Mrs. Kripalani's name brought in? I will tell you. Because I do not keep my wife under a purdah and I do not object when she disobeys me, and I am not ashamed to take her with me when I go out in company. There are people who may be doing

all these things. I believe that my wife has a vote; she has a brain and she has the right to exercise that vote as she likes. To ridicule me and say that my wife is wiser, comes to this: that every Member who is in the Parliament and sits on the Congress side is superior to me. It used to be said by some people that whatever may be the goodness of Mahatma Gandhi even the worst muslim was better than he.

Mr. Speaker: Probably only the ladies; not the gents;

Shri J. B. Kripalani: If the husband of an Indian wife is attacked because of her views, you can understand what her position would be. She would not be able to exercise her independent judgment. I did not marry to keep my wife in the kitchen or add to the mouths that are already existing in the country and raising the prices. If this is the way that senior members of the Cabinet talk about the politics of the husband and the wife, then I think many women would think twice before they come in the political field. I think the Congress people said that Dr. Lohia talked of Mrs. Gandhi and that was vulgar. I say this is more vulgar.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : कृपालानी जी, मैंने कब इस तरह की कोई बातचीत कही। वह तो मुरारजी देसाई ने कही थी।

Acharya Kripalani: Here is something which one hon. Member of the Congress has said:

> "Acharya Kripalani represented the most reactionary and the most backward and conservative sections in the Congress Organisation."

He is not talking of today, he is talking of the pre-independence days. He says:

> "I still remember that Acharya Kripalani was one of the Congressmen responsible for hounding out Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose at Tripura Congress . . .".

An Hon. Member: That is the whole point.

Acharya Kripalani: It is a fact that some of the members of the working Committee did say to Netaji that we were not willing to go into his Working Committee because we stood against his policies, and it was proved that his policies were different from ours, and Gandhiji had said that the defeat of Pattabhi was his own defeat. I cannot be made responsible for these things. Even if I did do it I did not do it as a reactionary. There were others who were not so. Anyway, here is another piece of wisdom:

> "I want to ask him" (meaning Acharya Kripalani) "what happened to the huge funds that he received for the relief of the Tibetan refugees from Dalai Lama?"

I wonder the intelligence of this friend of mine who thinks that Dalai Lama contributes to the Tibetan funds. Most of the Tibetan funds came from America, from independent organisations. And, I may tell him that Shri Morarka of the Congress was the Treasurer. I am not even the Secretary. I am only the Chairman of the Committee. That Committee also I wanted to dissolve after one year and half, but I was told that our Prime Minister wanted that such a Committee should exist. I have not handled at any time any funds of this organisation. It is the work of the Secretary and it is the work of the Treasurer. Apart from that, I must tell you, every pie in this organisation has been spent through government agency. We have not spent one single pie directly on their industrial or agricultural establishments.

Shri Hem Barua: I think Shri Harvani thinks every body is Serajuddin. That is the trouble (*Interruptions*):

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Then he talked about the Gandhi Ashram. He said that I have spent the Gandhi Ashram money for my elections. He does not know the constitution of the Gandhi Ashram. Our Prime Minister was a trustee of this. As long as Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant lived, he was a trustee of this organisation. Every year the trustees are supplied with the balance sheet. The accounts of this organisation are audited not only by an auditor appointed by the Chairman but also by an auditor attached to one of the associations of Government, the Khadi and Village Industries Commission. If I go to a bank and issue a cheque for withdrawing one pie of the Gandhi Ashram, the bank manager would simply tell his peon to drive me out. Not a single pie of this organisation is in my name and never had it been. Because we have political differences, because some Congress Ministers are accused, therefore, this hon. Member pounces on me. Never have I said one word about this hon. Member, nor about another hon. Member, who calls himself Azad. He is *azad* to say anything.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: What are you saying, Shri Kripalani? You have said many things in this House (*Interruptions*).

Shri P. K. Deo: He is making so many faces.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. How smoothly have we been going on up till now? Acharyaji is replying to the debate. There are certain explanations which he wants to give about himself, about the observations that have been made by certain hon. Members. Whatever he has to say must be heard patiently. So, I would request hon. Members on both sides not to get excited.

Shri Hem Barua: Sir, it was started by them, members belonging to the party of the Prime Minister. So, you should request those members to keep quiet, not the others.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. What does he mean by that? Am I not entitled to ask members on both sides not to get excited?

Shri Hem Barua: You are.

Mr. Speaker: What offence have I committed by making a request to both sides?

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Never, not even once, did I mention the names of these two hon. Members, but I know why they are angry with me, because I criticised the ex-Defence Minister. That is all my fault.

Shri Ansar Harvani: Yes.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: You see, he says "Yes".

Shri Hem Barua: The Prime Minister should pull up members belonging to his party.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: So far as the ex-Defence Minister is concerned, I can say with confidence that whatever I said about him has come true and it has received the seal of the Prime Minister on it. It has the seal of the Prime Minister himself (*Interruptions*). I did not accept his resignation. The man who thought him to be the cleverest person not only in India but in the whole world, he accepted his resignation and put his seal on the incompetence of the ex-Defence Minister. I did not do so.

Shri Frank Anthony: Only incompetence?

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Not only incompetence, but may be other things also. Whatever it may be, I did not do it. I did not dislodge him from Bombay. I say he would have been served well by the electorate if I had been able to dislodge him in

Bombay so that he might not have been obliged to leave in disgrace. At the call of the whole-country—the whole country rose against him. . .

Some Hon. Members: No.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Yes.

Some Hon. Members: No.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Then, I ask: Why did the hon. Prime Minister accept his resignation? If the hon. Prime Minister's instructions were being followed, if the hon. Prime Minister's policies were being followed, whatever may have been the outcry of the people, he should have said, "I resign" and not an innocent man should have been made to resign. This is politically mortality. What I say is consistent with political morality!

Mr. Speaker: The Acharya wanted that he should be allowed to speak sitting. I thought, he did not want to get excited.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I am very sorry, but they have given me the occasion. What to talk of me—if they had only said that I am dishonest—they have maligned organisations which have been existing for 40 years.

Mr. Speaker: He might say that in stronger words. But in his own interest I was reminding him.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: I am afraid, the hon. Prime Minister though he gave us the whole history, of course in brief, of the independence movement, about the specific questions that we had asked there was no reply. For instance, he said, "I want my people not only to exist but to live a full and free life". But I pointed out in my spech that they are not able to live even today. Leave aside good living, they are not able to live. Our masses do not require radio sets and television sets. They do not require any of the gadgets which people get in other countries of Europe or America. Our people require, in the words of Mahatma Gandhiji—I have to quote him—two square meals a day, clean clothes, neat houses, seven year's education for every child that is born, medical aid and employment to get these things. In 15 years we have not approached any nearer to these requirements of theirs. I gave instances of that. It is written in the Third Five Year Plan. Let him go and read that. Let those who criticise me go and read it. They say that landless labourers get less wages; they get less work. If they get less wages and if they get less work, what is going to happen to them? I do not understand that.

Here is what Professor Galbraith says :—

> "Ultimately, however, the purpose of economic advance is not investment and economic growth. Rather it is the ends that these things are meant to serve and that is improvement in well-being and popular enjoyment of life. This, the well-being or enjoyment of life by the average person, is the ultimate goal. Moreover, a poor country must make good on this premise with considerable promptness. The basic comparison in human affairs is always the present with the recent past. The average person does not compare his economic position with that of the remote rich. He does compare his position this year with his position last year."

I have talked of landless labour. But I say, the condition of all those who have uneconomic holdings is also as bad because they have to purchase things from the market and the prices are rising. Nobody can question these.

Then, I gave the evidence of the ex-Congress President who said that rich are getting richer and poor are

[Shri J. B. Kripalani]

getting poorer. I also gave the evidence of the hon. Prime Minister and he also said that rich are growing richer and the poor have not advanced in any way. I say, this is neither socialism no democratic socialism. In 15 years, other nations have gone much ahead of us and in the estimate that was made by the U.N.O., out of 25 countries that were examined, our number comes 24. I am not inventing these things from my brain. They do exercise my brain when I think of these things.

What does the Prime Minister say about his Government? He says:

> "The real thing that is out of joint is our whole mentality, our whole Government, the way the Government is run here. We have to get out of that rut".

It is the Government that has to get out of that rut and the people are willing to get out of that rut. I was in the political field during the days when politics was generally taboo to all gentlemen. I have seen what the condition of my people was before Gandhiji came to the political field. They used to tremble before an Englishman and in six months time, this man gave them such a strength that they defied the Englishmen and defied the police and called the British Government as a satanic Government. I went with him to Punjab and in Punjab O'Dwyer had made people to crawl on their bellies. After three months I accompanied Gandhiji and as soon as he was there, every child began to say that the British Government was tyrannous and must be driven away; that it is our *dharma*. Even the children were saying that. If people had proper leadership, I am sure people will do the same thing now. It is the leadership that has failed.

I hope my hon. friend Mr. Patil will remember that as soon as we came out from jail I made a speech in the AICC meeting and there I said: I see clear signs that our leadership will fail. It is rather leadership that has failed. Poor people do as even the great people do. There is no question but the country has been betrayed not in one way but in every-way. We are being told repeatedly that we are better than our neighbour. We should be ashamed to say that we are better than our neighbour. Our neighbour got their freedom on a silver platter. We got our liberty by hard work, by sacrifice, by suffering and we had an exceptional man, a man who comes in centuries. We had Gandhiji with us. I told you on that day that even our second rank leaders were of better calibre than any first-rate leaders in any colonial country. What has been done to us? Where are we going? Why cannot we see these things?

Then, the Prime Minister said that I consider the *Panch Sheel* as nonsense. Now, I ask you this. One of the items is; respect for each other's sovereignty. If I know anything about political science, then I say that when we were under the British, the sovereignty belonged to the British. Can anybody doubt it? In political science, in the international law India's sovereignty was not recognised. If all countries were to recognise each other's sovereignty, many colonial people will have no chance at all. I can go about and talk about every item, say peaceful co-existence, etc.—peaceful co-existence between the lion and the lamb! I say peaceful co-existence of the lamb will be in the belly of the lion. All these things state the *status quo*. Therefore I did not call it nonsense for the first time, but I have done it before also. And who today talks of *panch sheel*? Nobody. It has gone.

Shri Frank Anthony: China talks of *Panch sheel*.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: China talks; nobody else.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty: The entire Afro-Asian world talks of it.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: The Prime Minister has accused me and says that he did not conceal the fact of Chinese aggression. Now, the aggression, as I have pointed out and as the white papers have pointed out, took place in 1954, just when Barahoti was occupied. And in his own letter to Chou En-lai the Prime Minister has difinitely said, "I kept this fact back from my people because I did not want to excite them". I say, Sir, in the world, if there is an enemy and who has aggressed in our territory, we excite our people. Gandhiji excited the Indian people against the British. He wrote in one of his articles about "shaking the mane of the British lion". If he had not excited us, we slaves as and as we were and would have remained so. How are we going to build up the strength of our people if we do not excite them even after aggression? You conclealed these things not only from the people but this House—Sir, you will excuse me, "you" comes in, you are very innocent about it; The Government concealed it, and it is in the white paper.

Then in the white paper it is written that the only fault that the Chinese committed in building the road in our territory was that they came without proper visas. Go and read your papers. I ask the Prime Minister to go and again study his white papers. Can there be such indifference to what concerns the very vital interests of the country that the Department can write to an enemy that "you entered our territory without a visa"? And then what did the Prime Minister say about the road. About this road he said that it was an old caravan road and stones were kept here and stones were kept there. This is the way that the Prime Minister treats the country. I say he treats it with contempt, because he has got the supreme power, because he has the steam-roller majority behind him. I say in any country these things would not have been tolerated. Because we have universal vote with universal ignorance, therefore it is being tolerated.

Then, what do they say? They say the opposition has failed—as if the opposition is in charge of the Government. They have been abusing the opposition as if the opposition is in charge of the Government and they are not in charge of the Government. Whatever may be the faults of the opposition, whatever may be the drawbacks of the opposition—and I have criticised them—but we are not in charge. However we may be, rogues, rascals, dishonest people, we do not bring that dishonesty in the Government. It is they who bring that dishonesty in the Government. And I say it is wrong to say that the opposition has failed the country—except in one thing, that is they are divided in so many parties. And if you are talking of the division I can tell you that no one member of the opposition party has accused another opposition member of bribery and corruption. That means the Government's own people everywhere accuse each other of corruption, bribery, nepotism. These are not my words; these are their words, and I have quoted them.

I am very sorry that I have to talk all these things because *'Kal ke bachche'*; they are here to abuse me. And not one voice was raised by Congressmen to tell this man that this Gandhi Asharam has been in existence since 1920. How could a corrupt organisation live so long? We have lived on Rs. 5 per month . . .

Shri Ansar Harvani: On a point of personal explanation . . . (*Interruptions*)

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. The hon. Member may resume his seat. He can have that opportunity afterwords

Shri J. B. Kripalani: This is not the first time. This is not the first time that our Prime Minister has said that those who talk of corruption accentuate corruption. He has said it before. I may tell him that we are not living in the *Aesop's Fables* times when the boy said 'wolf' 'wolf' and the wolf comes when there was no wolf. I say, go among the people, listen to them and hear what they say; do not sit in your chairs and talk of the condition of the poor. Go to them. Go to the villages and see them and hear what they say. I may tell you that I am ashamed to hear what they say, our people saying that the British Government was better than this Government . . .

Some Hon. Members: Shame!

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Can there be a greater shame for a country? I ask this question. I am ashamed. I want to bury myself in the ground when I hear such things . . .

Several Hon Members: No, no.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: You say 'no, But I say that I have heard it with my own ears.

Shri Ansar Harvani: You have heard that from the British stooges.

Shri Tyagi: He is insulting the whole party.... (*Interruptions*).

Shri Hem Barua: The Prime Minister should control his party members.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order, I have asked hon. Members to desist from this temptation. I hope that there will be no more interruptions now.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Whatever the Prime Minister may think of me, I again say and I repeat what I have said that I am one of his greatest friends. I am not one of those who go and flatter him, not one of those who say 'ditto', and who when they go out of his place—his own people—go and say 'What can we do? He is sitting on our heads?'. It is a fact that I am telling you. Take it from me that I am not used to telling lies, and I have no interest in it at all. After all, what interest can I have? I have no family to look after; my wife can support me and many others also. I can tell you that I lived at that very same . . .

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member assured us that he had not been making personal references. But has made many references to Mrs. Kripalani.

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Did I?

I can tell you that it is the nature of our Government that induced China to attack us. Those who dared not go to the east came to the west, because they knew what the condition of our Army was. They knew the condition of the equipment that the Army had, the armaments that they had; they knew what our Army had. Every thing was known to them, because their agents are here, and those agents go about and are patronised by Cabinet Ministers. I am sorry to say this. How can you keep any secret here? I may tell you that they knew what we had and what we lacked. If really the Prime Minister wants proper information, he will get it from armymen; they will tell him that everything was known to the Chinese. So, it is the nature of this Government that had brought us into this condition. I am sorry, and I apologise to this House for getting excited, but it is not a personal question; it is a national question, and I see my country going down every day, day after day.

18 hrs.

There is nothing to check it, to arrest this downward process. I appeal to you all to be with me in this. Let us sweep away all sectional loyalties, all party loyalties. Let all of us be for the country and let those who are not for the country be thrown out.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : मैं तीन आने और पन्द्रह आने वाली बात बताना चाहता हूं (interruptions) यह क्या मजाक है ? मैं इस झंड का हुक्म नहीं मानूंगा । तीन आने और पन्द्रह आने वाली चुनौती को स्वीकार करो । प्रधान मंत्री ने मेरे दिमाग को ओछा बताया है । उनका दिमाग ओछा है, गन्दा है, डरपोक है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अच्छा बैठ जाइये ।

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

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

Lok Sabha divided:

Shri J. B. Kripalani: They have played some mischief with my switch, the Congress people. The machine has not worked or wrongly worked.

Mr. Speaker: It has not worked? He wants to add one to Ayes?

Shri J. B. Kripalani: Yes.

Shri Tyagi: I protest. His vote should not be recorded. He has not voted.

Some Hon. Members *rose—*

Mr. Speaker: I find one more Aye and four Noes have to be added. The result of the division is that Ayes have 61, Noes 346. The Noes have it, the Noes have it. The motion is lost.

Division No 1 [18·5 *hrs.*

AYES

Badrudduja, Shri
Bagri, Shri
Barua, Shri Hem
Barua, Shri R.
Basant Kunwari, Shrimati
Berwa Shri Onkar Lal.
Bhawani, Shri Lakhmu
Bheel Shri, P.H.
Brij Raj Singh, Shri
Buta Singh, Shri
Chatterjee, Shri H.P.
Chaudhuri, Shri Tridib Kumar
Deo, Shri P.K.
Dwivedy, Shri Surendranath
Gayatri Devi, Shrimati
Gokaran Prasad, Shri
Gounder, Shri Muthu
Gulshan, Shri
Gupta, Shri Kanshi Ram
Gupta, Shri Priya
Himmatsinhji, Shri
Jha, Shri Yogendra
Kachhavaiya, Shri
Kamath, Shri Hari Vishnu
Kapur Singh, Shri
Kohor, Shri
Koya, Shri
Kripalani, Shri J.B.
Krishnanal Singh, Shri
Lohia, Shri Ram Manohar
Mahato, Shri Bhajahari
Mandal, Shri B.N.
Manoharan, Shri
Masani Shri M.R.
Mate, Shri
Mehta, Shri Jashvant
Mohan Swarup, Shri
Muhammad Ismail, Shri
Nair, Shri N. Sreekantan
Nath Pai, Shri
Omkar Singh, Shri
Rajyalaxmi, Shrimati
Ranga, Shri
Reddy, Shri Narasimha
Seth, Shri Bishanchander
Sezhiyan, Shri
Shashank Manjari, Shrimati
Shastri, Shri Prakash Vir
Singh, Dr. B.N.
Singh, Shri A.P.
Singh, Shri Y.D.
Singha, Shri Y.N.
Sivasankaran, Shri
Solanki, Shri
Swamy, Shri Sivamurthi
Swell, Shri
Ulaka, Shri Ramachandra
Utiya, Shri
Vijaya Raje, Shrimati
Vishram Prasad, Shri
Yashpal Singh, Shri

NOES

Abdul Rashid, Bakhshi
Abdul Wahid, Shri T.
Achal Singh, Shri
Achuthan, Shri
Akkamma Devi, Shrimati
Alagesan, Shri
Alva, Shri A.S.
Alva, Shri Joachim
Anjanappa, Shri
Ankineedu, Shri
Arunachalam, Shri
z ad, Shri Bhagwat Jha
Bakliwal, Shri
Bal Krishna Singh, Shri
Balmiki, Shri
Barupal, Shri P.L.
Basappa, Shri
Basumatari, Shri
Baswant, Shri
Besra, Shri
Bhagat, Shri B.R.
Bhagavati, Shri
Bhakt Darshan, Shri
Bhanja Deo, Shri L.N.
Bhargava, Shri M.B.
Bhatkar, Shri
Bhattacharyya, Shri C.K.
Birendra Bahadur Singh, Shri
Bist, Shri J.B.S.
Borooah, Shri P.C
Brahm Prakash, Shri
Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri
Brij Basi Lal, Shri
Brij Raj Singh-Kotah, Shri