

न करें। इसलिए मैंने मांग भी की थी कि कम से कम जरा 'ग्रेसफुली'—ये अंग्रेज लोग हैं इसलिए अंग्रेजी शब्द का प्रयोग कर रहा हूँ—माफी तो मांग लें कि गलती हो गई। लेकिन इनकी खराब आदत है, इसलिए यह विशेषाधिकार का भंग इन्होंने जानबूझ कर बूर्यालगम साहब को बचाने के लिए किया है। हमारी समझ में नहीं आता है, अध्यक्ष महोदय, कि अपनी सत्ता का दुरुपयोग करके ये जो लफंगे लोग हैं और जो कि जनता को लूटने का, सरकार को लूटने का और विदेशी मुद्रा की चोरी करने का काम करते हैं, उनको यह क्यों संरक्षण देते हैं। आज तो यह वकील नहीं हैं। आज तो यह मन्त्री हैं। वकीलों की एक आदत होती है वकालतनामा या ब्रीफ लेकर बोलने की जिसको हम छुड़वाना चाहते हैं... (इंटरप्रांज)

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh (Parbhani): I very strongly object to this.

श्री मधु लिमय : इनकी यानी वित्त मन्त्री की इस खराब आदत को छुड़वाने के लिए ही आप मेरे इस विशेषाधिकार के प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार करें।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : ये लफंगे लोग, आपने किन को कहा है ?

श्री मधु लिमय : इनको नहीं कहा है। शचीन्द्र चौधरी साहब को नहीं कहा है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : तब किस के लिए इस शब्द का आपने प्रयोग किया है ?

श्री मधु लिमय : सत्ता का जो दुरुपयोग करते हैं। पी० ए० सी० ने सब बातें आपके सामने रखी हैं। अब दांडेंकर साहब एतराज करके अगर मैं तफसील में जाऊंगा तो। तब कई लोगों का मुझे नाम लेना पड़गा।

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: I have heard those points, whether they are an inquisition or a privilege motion is something which I do not know.

You have heard the entire matter. I have not got any paper before me, and therefore I cannot with exactitude tell this House exactly what happened. I am speaking from memory.

श्री मधु लिमय : कल कहिए। कोई जल्दी की जरूरत नहीं है। होम वर्क करके कहिए।

Mr. Speaker: If he wants time, he can study the statement that he has made and he can make the statement later on.

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: So far as the statement is concerned, I can certainly give you the statement, no difficulty about that, but I will tell you what happened. I am saying this from memory.

Mr. Speaker: Would it not be better if he studies this statement and then gives a reply?

Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri: Certainly.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: The entire thing has been printed in Current in the front page and sent to us with red pencil marking along with the jeep deal case. May I know whether that is also included in the privilege motion before the House?

13.31 hrs.

MOTION OF NO-CONFIDENCE IN THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS

—Contd.

Shri Rameshwar Rao (Gadwal): Four Members of the Opposition, Prof. Mukerjee, Prof. Ranga, Shri Trivedi and Prof. Hem Barua have spoken at length on this no confidence motion. I have heard their interventions with care and attention. Normally I like to listen to my hon. friend Prof. Mukerjee speak because of his chaste English, classical Sanskrit and lyrical Bengali, but I wonder what happened to him yesterday.

[Shri Rameshwar Rao]

Be that as it may, none of the learned leaders said anything tangible, apart from saying that the Government was incompetent or the policies Government was following were wrong.

13.32 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

Surely we know the difference between an intervention in this House and a speech which does not have to take into consideration arguments to convince other Members here.

This Government has been in office for less than a year. The hon. Members who spoke did not list the sins of commission and omission of this Government. However, they averred that the Congress having been in office for 18 years, the circumstances the country faces today are the cumulative result of governmental action over the years and that the present Government, being a Congress Government, should shoulder the blame. This I can understand, and yet the hon. Members not only contradicted each other, but contradicted themselves.

Prof. Mukerjee was at pains to emphasize that this Government was veering away from past policies and should be castigated on that account. Not only did I carefully follow the learned professor's speech here yesterday, but I went home and tried to analyse what he had said to make sure that I did not miss anything worthwhile. He said devaluation had been a stab in the back, he said we had not taken a moral stand on Vietnam and had not condemned those on whom, according to him, there should be damnation. Apart from this, he appeared to attack countries and governments other than our own. I shall deal with the points the learned professor made a little later.

I should have thought that a debate on a motion of no-confidence is an opportunity for Members of the Opposition to analyse Government policies,

show that they are unsuitable to solve the problems that we face, and propose an alternative set of policies, arguing the while that they could be more advantageous to the country. This, surely, is the job of a responsible opposition. None of the learned leaders put forward an alternative set of policies. All they said was that the Government was incompetent and should go. Even the most learned professor, Prof. Mukerjee, I am sorry he is not here, did not offer an alternative set of policies. I wonder why they are afraid to offer an alternative set of policies. Is it because they have none, or are they afraid that whatever policies they offer, suggest or accept, would bind them to certain consequential decisions and obligations by which they would have to stand committed before the people of this country and to ask everyone for disciplined observance of such consequential decisions? Are they not willing then to stick their neck out and say to the people that this, this and this will be done, and that the consequential privations and hardships have to be endured? Of course, they are not.

I am glad our learned professor is back. Not even he is willing to say this, because even he wants to run with the hares and hunt with the hounds.

Let us not forget that only a responsible opposition which can hope to win at the polls and form a Government tomorrow will find it necessary to outline alternative policies, argue them out and try to justify them. We are all painfully aware that none of the parties that the learned Members who spoke from the opposition benches yesterday represent, have the faintest hope of winning at the polls, and so they have no reason, not even to appear to be reasonable and responsible. I can only feel sorry for them, and warn my countrymen not to be misled by those who have no policies or programmes to offer. They believe only in character assassination and if possible in creating conditions of anarchy, because they are

convinced that out of order and orderly progress neither they nor their parties can benefit.

Prof. Mukerjee referred to Vietnam and accused the Prime Minister of not condemning aggression, not taking a moral stand and attempting to bring the parties to a conference table. On the same analogy, the learned professor should condemn the U.S.S.R. The U.S.S.R. did not condemn Pakistani aggression against India. Or, does my hon. friend, Prof. Mukerjee, believe that Pakistan did not commit aggression against India, as he and his colleagues thought China had not committed aggression?

Shri Indrajit Gupta (Calcutta South West): You are more learned than the professor.

Shri Rameshwar Rao: Or, does he think that the U.S.S.R. did wrong in not condemning Pakistan, or is he willing to agree that if one is seriously interested in the solution of a problem like Vietnam, nothing is gained by condemnation of either party, that she must bend one's energies to bringing the opponents to a conference table? Surely, that is what the U.S.S.R. worked for and achieved at Tashkent. And if India attempts something similar, it becomes influenced or pressurised by interested parties!

My hon. friend, Prof. Mukerjee, also spoke about the National Liberation Front. He mentioned that there had been no mention about the National Liberation Front in South Vietnam. I would like to draw his attention to a reference that has been made. Would he kindly look up yesterday's *Times of India* centre page? I quote:

"In Prague, about a week ago *Literani Noviny* republished a series of articles from the conservative French newspaper *Le Monde*. These articles, dealing with Vietnam, for the first time told readers of a Communist newspaper in a Communist nation

that the Viet Cong commit atrocities against villagers of South Viet Nam. Up to now, Communist audiences have been told only that atrocities were committed by Americans and their South Vietnamese allies. The Czechoslovak paper and a broadcast of the articles as well carried *le Monde's* account of how the Viet Cong cause destruction and suffering among the rural Viet Nam population, how they kidnap, murder and torture village chiefs and local officials, . . . how they commit executions, repressions and terror. *Le Monde's* stories gave grim episodes of Viet Cong terror and pointed out that all the people and not merely the collaborators, undergo steadily increasing pressure. It told of forced conscription of villagers for Viet Cong guerilla services, including the drafting of young boys. It told of oppressive taxes levied on villagers by the Viet Cong and collected at the point of the machinegun. This must have come as a shock to an audience accustomed for years to only one side of the story . . .".

as it must have come as a shock to the learned professor. It is probable that preparing for his blistering attack, he did not see the newspaper report yesterday or would he like to say that this newspaper of monopoly capitalism, colonialism and imperialism is misquoting or would he like to join, when the occasion arises, his equally learned colleagues in China and North Viet Nam in calling the Czechoslovak communist party the running dog of imperialism? So are the Soviets in Chinese eyes, revisionists and lackeys of imperialists. In the eyes of our friends anything that anyone does that they think is wrong is a result of outside pressure or is being done either by the lackeys of western exploiters or revisionists or by the running dogs of U.S. imperialism. It is time that our friends opposite appreciate that we on this side of the House are aware of their attitudes and plans.

[Shri Rameshwar Rao]

I would like here briefly to recall to my friends' minds what happened in Telangana about 18 years ago when 9,000 people were murdered in the name of people's liberation movement . . . (An Hon. Member: By communists). That is understood. I have not forgotten it; I come from that area; facts and figures have been given in this House. He calls devaluation a stab in the back. Does he not realise that this country had concealed devaluation for over a decade! It is natural that the question of devaluation and the consequential steps that need to be taken should receive important mention. Government has been accused of having resorted to devaluation under pressure. It has been suggested that even Parliament has been misled by a denial in this House of intentions to devalue. Surely, Prof. Mukerjee does not suggest that Government should have given advance notice of devaluation. Devaluation is nothing more and nothing less than the correction of the par value of the rupee. While motives have been attributed to various sources of advice on devaluation, it has surprisingly been overlooked that the present devaluation of the Indian rupee is a direct result of a fall in the internal value of the rupee over many years . . . (An Hon. Member: Why did it fall?) I shall come to it. Even in countries like the U.S.S.R. and Yugoslavia in particular and even in Germany before war where there was the strictest possible control over exports and imports and foreign exchange dealings, this connection between the internal and external value could not be prevented. Many reasons can be advanced for the fall of the internal value of the rupee. Mainly it is the result of total production not increasing in proportion to the increase in money supply. This has been the result, not necessarily of faulty planning as my friend Mr. Masani tried to make out the other day, but mainly due to lack of growth in the agricultural sector. Agriculture forms the major sector of

production in this country. Increased non-developmental expenditure, so called, which means more expenditure on health services, schools, social services and the like are certainly not the main factor. In a country like India; with our massive poverty it is natural that we should want to go forward with development rapidly. This cannot be called ambitious planning. Accentuated by two wars and two years of drought inflation has increased and has led to the diversion of exportable goods to home consumption as also increased pressure on imports and a decline in the incentive for import substitution. Inflation at home would naturally lead to wage increases and cost increases which in turn made our exports difficult and uncompetitive. All these led to the entire gamut of export incentives, tax credit certificates, direct subsidies, etc. Would the hon. Members deny that these are all forms of concealed devaluation? It can be argued that devaluation was not the only remedy or solution to the present imbalance in our economy. It will however be conceded that whatever policy we try to follow to prevent these imbalances, there will be a measure of concealed or selective devaluation. It is a question of judgment whether open devaluation is not better than concealed or selective devaluation. Concealed or selective devaluation, apart from administrative difficulties has an element of the whole society, which means the public exchequer, subsidising individual importers or exporters and in a manner where a certain amount of arbitrariness cannot be avoided. This in itself leads to uncertainties and distortions in the economy. The only other way in which we could have avoided devaluation is the manner in which the hon. Member from Rajkot laboured to point out the other day: we should cut development, and cut growth and—according to him—live within our means. Without putting pressure on foreign exchange, by not importing large quantities of capital goods for development and meeting our require-

ments of imported components and scarce raw materials through our normal earnings of foreign exchange and in other words, according to him, stagnating. No Government and certainly not this Government can embark on a policy of stagnation. Prof. Mukerjee and his friends want us to do away with aid. I for one and this Government would be very happy to do away with aid as soon as possible. But would the Opposition be willing to join in demanding in this country a lowering of consumption, freeze of wages and profits and not insist on adequate food rations so that we can build this country without aid. It does not happen. The moment, there is talk of possible fall in food ration in any part of the country, our friends are the first to lead demonstrations against any such move. If there is the slightest price rise because of import difficulties, we have immediately processions. If a factory cannot function because some spare parts are not available which have to be imported, our friends are the first to threaten all kinds of consequences... (An Hon. Member: That is the only language you understand). Whatever policy we follow, whatever controls we have, we cannot avoid shortages in this country because our requirements are so massive and the process of production is going to take so long that we have to live with shortages with privations and with hardships and it is necessary that Members on this side of the House or on that side will have to jointly accept this particular fact. Otherwise, we would only be undermining the confidence of the people in this country, in the democratic process and confidence in their own future.

Shri Umanath (Pudukkottai): In the Government.

Shri Rameshwar Rao: It is not the responsibility of the Government alone. It is the responsibility of every Member of this House who believes in democracy and the democratic process of development.

1099(ai)LS—8.

Sir, I am concluding. I shall not take very long. But I only hope that the contradictory slogans, deliberately confusing slogans that our friends try to put forth will stop. It is time that we realised that whatever processes we follow, we have to accept limitations on consumption, and without limitation on consumption there can be no surplus for investment and growth.

13.50 hrs.

ARREST OF A MEMBER

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have to inform the House that the Speaker has received the following telegram:

"Shri Indulal Kanaiyalal Yagnik, M.P., resident of Ahmedabad, detained today at Ahmedabad, under section 3(1)(A)(II) P. D. Act and sent to Baroda prison. Letter follows. Police Commissioner".

An hon. Member: Is it under P.D. Act?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Yes.

13.51 hrs.

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

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Kasergod): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, it was good that before I started my speech, I heard the news of the arrest of an hon. Member of this House under the P. D. Act. So, that is the way in which the problems are going to be solved.

There have been many motions of no-confidence before this House during the recent past. The policies of the Government have been sharply criticised during these debates but the Government blatahtly refused to pay any heed, with the result that the country is on the verge of bankruptcy. This motion is however different from all the other earlier motions. The