

- (Codes) Insurance Act, 1962. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1158/63.]
- (b) The Emergency Risks (Factories) Insurance (Amendment) Scheme, 1963 published in Notification No. S.O. 886, dated the 30th March, 1963, under sub-section (7) of section 3 of the Emergency Risks (Factories) Insurance Act, 1962. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1159/63.]
- (c) S.O. No. 887, dated the 30th March, 1963 under section 20 of the Emergency Risks (Factories) Insurance Act, 1962. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1160/63.]
- (d) S.O. No. 888, dated the 30th March, 1963 under sub-section (2) of section 3 of the Emergency Risks (Goods) Insurance Act, 1962. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1161/63.]

Shri Ansar Harvani (Bisauli): Yesterday the hon. Finance Minister said he would place a personal letter written to him by me on the Table of the House. Since I have been very much misrepresented by the monopolist press, I would request....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. He can write to me. That is the answer I have given to Mr. Hem Barua also.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE

THIRTY-FIRST REPORT

Shri Dasappa (Bangalore): I beg to present the Thirty-first Report of the Estimates Committee on action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the Hundred and Thirty-second Report of the Estimates Committee on the Ministry of Food and Agriculture (Department of Agriculture)—Indian Central Tobacco Committee, Madras.

12.24 hrs.

STATEMENT BY MEMBER

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Kasergod): Mr. Speaker, Sir, with your permission I would like to make the following statement. In the course of his reply to the debate on the demands for grants for Home Affairs, the hon. Home Minister, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, referred to a certain Bengali pamphlet and what he said created the impression that the Communist Party or at least some of its Members were responsible for its publication. We asked for proof.

The hon. Speaker also observed as follows:

"...The hon. Minister must have satisfied himself or he should—as he has said—satisfy himself that he believes or has reason to believe that the author is a Communist. At least that much he must satisfy himself."

Thereafter, the hon. Home Minister stated:

"I have never said that I shall not give the necessary information. I have never said that...I thought I shall take her (i.e. Shrimati Renu Chakravarty) into confidence".

Following this, the hon. Home Minister was pleased to meet three Members of our Group.

All that we wish to say now is that the Home Minister did not produce any evidence to prove that this pamphlet was written or published by the Communist Party or by any of its members. Naturally, we could not be satisfied.

We have sought your permission to make this statement only to set the record straight.

Mr. Speaker: Does the hon. Minister want to say anything?

The Minister of Home Affairs (Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri): Sir, I had

[Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri]

discussed this question a few days back with Shri Gopalan, Shri Kar and Shri Indrajit Gupta and after a free and frank talk with them, I felt that the matter could be closed. I did not, therefore, expect that Shri Gopalan would like to bring this up before the House, and I am indeed surprised about it.

It is, Sir, now widely known that the Communist Party of India was divided when its National Council determined the Party's attitude to the Chinese aggression against India towards the end of October last. I have nothing to say against the official line which was adopted by the National Council of the Party—in fact, I have complimented them publicly on it, including in my speech in the House on 1st April. But the fact remains that a sizeable body of the Communist Party's membership has not accepted the official line. It is also well-known that a group in the Communist Party has been acting at variance with the official line, and in a manner which suggests that it is outside the discipline of the Party leadership. We have a number of examples of such actions which include the publication and circulation amongst Party circles of material pro-Chinese in content. For example, an article by Shri R. Palme Dutt questioning the validity of the McMahon Line, which was published in the *Labour Monthly* of Great Britain and which was proscribed by the Government of India, was found to be circulating in West Bengal. There was again the case of a pseudonymous pamphlet entitled *The Inevitable Nemesis of a Right Wing Socialist*, a vicious attack on the Prime Minister, which was found circulating in the same circles.

There are other papers of similar tenor known to us, but I will not take the time of the House in listing them. All of them were found without the names of printers and publishers,

which, as the House knows, is an offence. The intention obviously was to circulate them surreptitiously. The publication I referred to in my speech on the 1st April was one of these publications, and was found in the Howrah, Calcutta and Nadia Districts.

The House will recall that in my speech I made it clear again and again that I did not want to accuse or charge the hon. Members of the Communist Party or those who openly and unequivocally adopted the official line of the Party. But I was only pointing out that certain members of that Party were still continuing anti-national activities. I gave an English translation of certain portions of the pamphlet in my speech, but I hope the House will bear with me if I give again a translation of a few other brief extracts from the pamphlet. In one of the other pamphlets it is said:

"Having declared a state of emergency, the steps taken by the rulers directly and indirectly amount to stoppage of all kinds of democratic movements and class struggle....the rich will be afforded the opportunity of high profits and more ruthless exploitation of the general masses. In fact, it is no war against China, it is war against the people of the country."

Then, another one is:

"Is a settlement of the border dispute impossible? Has China become mad to swallow other's territories? If so, why has China stopped fighting and withdrawn unilaterally? Is this a sign of weakness?...The Chinese Government offered to negotiate without imposing any conditions and without a conqueror-complex. Repeated proposals were made by the Government of China for negotiations, but the Government of India rejected them....There were no conditions in the Chinese proposals. In spite of this, India is

not agreeable to have discussions. But there was no objection for discussions with Pakistan".

I leave it to the House to judge whether a document with those observations and views could have emanated from any group of people other than the pro-Chinese members of the Communist Party.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): Surrender to China.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: It had been suggested by the C.P.I. friends that this pamphlet might well have been the work of some other extremist party. I might even accept for a moment what they say about this pamphlet, but the difficulty is that the other extremist parties in West Bengal, whatever their different views, are agreed on one matter, i.e., that China has committed aggression and that this country should stand up against the aggressor. It is true that there is no mention of the author, printer or the publisher on the booklet, but in the trend of arguments in the pamphlet there is a marked resemblance to an article recently appearing in the *World Marxist Review* of February 1963. The whole trend of the pamphlet and the activities of the left wing are proof enough about the truth of my observations.

In fact, prominent leaders of the Party have, on occasions, openly referred to the existence within the party of persons who do not accept the official line. The difficulties that the party leadership have been facing in West Bengal are only too well-known to them.

When I had quoted from the pamphlet in my budget speech, I had repeatedly made it clear, Sir, that I was referring to the activities of the so-called pro-China group, and not to the Communist Party as a whole. Is it possible for the Communist Party of India to take full responsibility for, and exercise control over, the activities of the left wing? They have not

succeeded so far. Why should they, then, speak on their behalf? I can only say that the role of those who speak and propagate and carry on whispering campaigns, or think in terms of underground work, is a danger to the country.

The hon. Members who met me told me that the pamphlet in question had not been issued by any members of the Communist Party. I would very much like to accept a statement coming from the hon. Members, but I hope that in the circumstances I have explained they, and the House, will appreciate my difficulty in doing so.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: Sir, I wish to make a submission because he has already said that he was surprised why it was again brought up here. Also, I want to make one clarification. Firstly, when we had discussions with him the other day, as he has stated, we explained to him that the Communist Party and members of the Communist Party have nothing to do with it, and we thought that he was convinced of it. I do not know why the hon. Minister did not say so now. He has told us that since he was going to Calcutta after some days, he will say that in a public meeting. After that, perhaps he thought that instead of saying that in a public meeting, because it was earlier publicly stated inside Parliament, it would be better for him to make this statement also inside Parliament.

The other question is whether the pamphlet mentioned by him is written or published by the Communist Party as an organisation or by a member of that Party. On that point, instead of trying to substantiate his charge, he has brought in so many things which are not at all relevant. As we all know, inside the Congress also, there are two sections, rightists and leftists. We also know their opinions. Suppose tomorrow a leaflet is published, which brings in more or less the opinion of a certain section inside the Congress, can we then say that leaflet was certainly written by some section inside the Congress? Would that be

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

correct? If there is some proof that either the leaflet is written by some member of a particular party, or printed by some press belonging to a particular party then that charge is justified and he can certainly level it. But there is absolutely no proof that it comes from an organisation or from any member of that organisation. What are the reasons that he has brought forward? He has quoted certain opinions, certain paragraphs from some pamphlets or leaflets and said that from these opinions it can be said that they originated from a particular party. So, I take this opportunity to say again quite categorically that he has not been able to prove that it has emanated from any member of the Communist Party. I am only sorry that instead of giving proof to substantiate his charge, or confessing that he was convinced that the charge that he levelled was not justified, he went on quoting from pamphlets and levelled further charges by saying that the opinions expressed thereon resembled the views held by some members of the Communist Party. I once again deny the charge that these pamphlets have anything to do with the Communist Party.

Mr. Speaker: Both the statements are before the House now. Both of them have given their reasons for making their own inferences and reaching their own conclusions. The best I could do was to ask both of them to make their statements. Now, hon. Members can judge for themselves whether the grounds for their conclusions are justified for both of them or not.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: With your permission, Sir, I only want to clear up one matter to which a reference was made by Shri Gopalan, namely, that I was convinced that this leaflet was not published by some members of the Communist Party. I never said that. What I said was that

I was prepared to accept his version if he said that this had not been published by the Communist Party or by the left wing of the Communist Party. I said, "You know much better than myself. I may be willing to accept your version." But I did tell him that there were many things, to which I have just now referred in my statement, which go to show that this kind of views are being propagated and that not one but a number of other leaflets have also been published. He said that he will be making a statement in the House and I suggested to them that there was no point in making any statement saying, "I have heard you and I have explained my point of view." Then, Shri Gopalan was somewhat insistent and I said, "If you want me to say that this particular pamphlet has no print line and that no names are there, I shall certainly say it publicly; I do not mind it, but if you raise the question in Parliament, in Lok Sabha, I shall have to make a fuller statement." So, they had agreed that they will not make any statement in the Lok Sabha.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: No, Sir.

Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri: But Shri Gopalan all of a sudden wrote to you. Therefore, in that context I have made that statement.

Mr. Speaker: Now these statements are before the House. That is all.

12.37 hrs.

APPROPRIATION (No. 2) BILL*

The Minister of Finance (Shri Morarji Desai): Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the services of the financial year 1963-64.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to authorise pay-

*Published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 2, dated 18-4-1963.