

66 laid on the Table on the 25th March, 1966. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-6332/66].

(3) A copy of the Khadi and Village Industries Commission (Amendment) Rules, 1966 published in Notification No. G.S.R. 590 in Gazette of India dated the 23rd April, 1966, under sub-section (6) of section 26 of the Khadi and Village Industries Commission Act, 1966. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-6333/66].

(4) A copy of the Coffee (Second Amendment) Rules, 1966 published in Notification No. G.S.R. 629 in Gazette of India dated the 30th April, 1966, under sub-section (3) of section 48 of the Coffee Act, 1942. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-6334/66].

(5) A copy each of the following Notifications under sub-section (6) of section 3 of the Essential Commodities Act, 1955:—

(i) The Textile (Production by Powerloom) Control (Amendment) Order, 1966 published in Notification No. S.O. 1217 in Gazette of India dated the 23rd April, 1966.

(ii) The Cotton Textile Control (Amendment) Order, 1966 published in Notification No. S.O. 1217 in Gazette of India dated the 23rd April, 1966.

(iii) The Woollen Textiles (Production and Distribution Control) First Amendment Order, 1966 published in Notification No. S.O. 1218 in Gazette of India dated the 23rd April.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-6335/66].

12.49 hrs.

DEMANDS FOR EXCESS GRANTS (GENERAL)

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Finance (Shri L. N. Mishra): On behalf of Shri Sachindra Chaudhuri I beg to present a statement showing Demands for Excess Grants in respect of the Budget (General) for 1966-67.

12.49 1/4 hrs.

MESSAGE FROM RAJYA SABHA

Secretary: Sir, I have to report the following message received from the Secretary of Rajya Sabha:—

"In accordance with the provisions of sub-rule (6) of rule 189 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to return herewith the Finance Bill, 1966, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 5th May, 1966, and transmitted to the Rajya Sabha for its recommendations and to state that this House has no recommendations to make to the Lok Sabha in regard to the said Bill."

12.49 1/2 hrs.

PETITION RE. PLAN ALLOCATIONS FOR EDUCATION

श्री प्रकाशचौर शास्त्री (विजनीर) : मैं शिक्षा तथा सम्बद्ध मामलों के लिए योजना वाशंटन के बारे में प्रश्न भारतीय माध्यमिक शिक्षक संघ की एक याचिका जिस पर देश के विभिन्न भागों के पचास हजार से अधिक कच्चापकों के हस्ताक्षर हैं, पेश करता हूँ।

12.50 hrs.

STATEMENT RE. PLANNING MINISTER'S VISIT TO U.S.A. AND CANADA

Mr. Speaker: Shri Anoka Mehta.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): From what we heard

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee] yesterday and from the fact that you could not immediately refer the privilege matter in regard to the PTI to the Committee of privileges, it shows that a *prima facie* case has now been made. Yesterday what the Minister said amounted to an acknowledgement that certain parts of the statement which we are going to hear have got clearance from a foreign agency. Outside the House the Minister speaks such vulgarities as 'India opening up her womb'.

The Minister of Planning and Social Welfare (Shri Asoka Mehta): I strongly object to this kind of words. Who is he to tell me? I have not been asked what words I have used. You are defending the rights of Members outside. I have not been asked what words I have used. Still this gentleman has the temerity to say these things! . . . (Interruptions.) I object to the word 'vulgarity' should be withdrawn. The word 'vulgarity' should be withdrawn.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: The special correspondent of *Statesman* in today's number in the leader page writes a special feature article where he ascribes to Mr. Asoka Mehta the words which I have quoted. If you give me the time, I can find out from the other newspapers also.

Mr. Speaker: What does he want to say?

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I say this vulgarity outside and the inflicting of indignity on the House by giving us a statement which is partly okayed on his own admission by a foreign agency is something which we should not tolerate. If you permit him to make a statement which it seems you are . . .

Mr. Speaker: Certainly I would permit him to make a statement, whatever he wants to make. Yesterday the other question was decided by me and there was no occasion to make these observations. . . . (Interruptions.)

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I will not be a party to this.

Shri Daji (Indore): We do not want to listen to this statement. . . (Interruptions).

Shri Mohammad Elias (Howrah):**

Shri H. N. Mukerjee, Shri Mohammad Elias and some other hon. Members then left the House.

Shri Asoka Mehta: I hope you have heard the words. These words must be withdrawn. Over and over again I have been abused in this House. I am a Member of Parliament and unless my rights are protected, I do not want to proceed further. I am not prepared to be abused in this House. I am discharging my duties and I am answerable to the House and to the Prime Minister. I am not prepared to be abused. . . (Interruptions.) You must say something about the personal abuses that are being showered on me.

Mr. Speaker: He must bring it to my notice. I should be allowed to take action. Why should he get upset in this manner? The words that had been used when they were going out are very objectionable and they should not remain on records.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Which are those words?

Mr. Speaker: The words Mr. Elias has said. I object to that.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: This is a carbon copy of what he has given to Mr. Woods—that is all that he said.

Mr. Speaker: He is interrupting the proceedings. I will ask him to go out.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: You ask him to go out.

Mr. Speaker: I am asking whether he is prepared. . . (Interruptions.)

Shri S. M. Banerjee: There is no question; you ask him also to go out.

**Expunged as ordered by the Chair

Mr. Speaker: I am asking Mr. Banerjee to go out.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I have been duly elected; he has been nominated.

Mr. Speaker: He may go out now.

(Shri S. M. Banerjee then left the House)

Mr. Speaker: Shri Asoka Mehta.

श्री अबु लिमरे: श्री बनर्जी की गलबरी बात सही है कि आप पिछले दशक से प्राये हैं।

Shri Asoka Mehta: I rise to report to Parliament on my recent visit to the United States of America and Canada for discussions on economic aid. The principal purpose of my visit was to have discussions with Mr. George D. Woods, President of the World Bank, which is the sponsor of the Aid India Consortium, and with the United States Administration. During my stay in Washington, I had the opportunity to meet President Johnson, high officials of the United States Administration and leading members of the United States Congress. In Ottawa, I had very useful discussions with members of the Canadian Government. All these talks were marked by a spirit of warm cordiality and understanding.

2. As the House is aware, one of the principal problems we face in regard to giving a proper shape to our Fourth Plan is the uncertainty regarding the extent of assistance which we should hope for and which we could legitimately expect from friendly countries in support of the development programme we have in view. We have, in this connection, had discussions with the Soviet Union and other countries who are not members of the Aid India Consortium sponsored by the World Bank. Following the Prime Minister's visit to the United States of America and other countries in March, we found it essential to discuss further with the World Bank and with the United States Government, as one of the principal mem-

bers of the Consortium, their ideas about aid commitments to fulfil the objectives of rapid economic development of India in the next plan period, which is crucial to the strengthening of the economic structure in such a way as to ensure early attainment of self-reliant growth.

3. Within this broad context, the discussions I had with the President of the World Bank centred around the steps we intended to take in the next two plans on such questions as agricultural development, population control, acceleration of the programme for fertilizer production within the country, enlargement of export earnings, facilitating more intensive and more efficient utilization of the productive capacity we had already built up in several sectors such as machine-building, chemicals, industrial raw materials, etc.; and the importance in all these contexts of providing assistance, in a quantity and in a manner conducive to the best interests of economic development of India.

4. Both in the World Bank and in the United States Administration, I found an appreciation of what we had achieved in the last fifteen years of planned effort, as also a desire to assist us in what we were seeking to achieve in the next two plan periods. I made it clear to them that we considered the next five to ten years as crucial for India's economic development; that, conscious of this climacteric in our economic history, we were determined to put the utmost effort we were capable of into the task of assuring a structural revolution; and that there was a dynamism in Indian society today which we were resolved to harness in such a manner as to satisfy the requirements of economic development, social justice and politics; democracy. In this great task, there is much that could be made easier, not only easier but more fruitful, if our own efforts could be supplemented by the knowledge and resources which developed countries were in a position to provide us. I am happy to say that the response I

[Shri Asoka Mehta]

found in the World Bank, the United States and Canada has been such as to enable us to move forward with greater confidence and greater speed towards the realization of our objective of structural transformation conducive to self-reliance and self-generating growth.

13 hrs.

5. Against this general background, I discussed with the World Bank the question of support, in terms of external assistance, both for the Fourth Plan period as well as for the current year. The House will appreciate that in view of the fact that the Fourth Plan formulation has not yet reached a stage at which its outlines are definite, the discussions I could have with the World Bank could only be in qualitative terms. While the precise quantitative discussions on the measure of aid from Consortium countries had to await the decisions on plan magnitudes and plan allocations on our part, there was a clear appreciation of the fact that, over the next five years, substantially greater assistance than in the past would have to be provided both for more efficient utilization of the productive capacity already built-up and for addition to such capacity.

6. In my discussions with the World Bank and the United States, I emphasized the need for larger financing of maintenance imports, which would be needed by us in the next few years to make full use of the potential that already existed. In this context, I emphasized that one of the serious impediments to effective utilization of existing capacity and to the pursuit of a policy of freer and optimal allocation of available resources—internal and external—was the constraint imposed by the foreign exchange shortage. If sufficient non-project aid was available to us in a form which permitted greater flexibility in the allocation of foreign exchange—whose scarcity necessitates the elaborate use of administrative controls today—it

would be to our advantage to secure the proper direction of resources through the more generalized instruments of tariffs, fiscal and credit policies than those of detailed administrative allocations. Such a policy would, while providing adequate protection to domestic industry, also generate forces conducive to modernization of the economy and reduction in costs of production. It is this theme that I emphasized in my discussions with a view to securing greater support from Consortium countries for adequate provision of non-project assistance.

7. While stressing the need for larger non-project assistance for purposes of a quick and efficient utilization of the capacity already in existence, I have informed the World Bank that for achieving our developmental objectives we shall have to secure planned additions to productive capacity from year to year. In other words, I have made it very clear that the larger assistance we require by way of non-project aid in this year—as well as in the Fourth Plan period—would have to be in addition to the project assistance we shall need for enlarging and diversifying the production structure over the next few years. Here again, the response I found was not only sympathetic but reassuring. Admittedly, any quantitative formulation of what assistance we need or we should expect, from the aid-giving countries will have to depend on our formulation of the Fourth Plan. As soon as we do so—and we hope to be able to submit the Draft Outline of the Fourth Plan to the National Development Council and Parliament in the next few months—we propose to invite the World Bank, as leader of the Consortium, to arrange for its appraisal and consideration by the Consortium well before the end of this year.

8. Against this background, we had detailed discussions with the World Bank on our aid requirements for the

current year and we reached a meeting of minds on the quantum of aid that would be required if India is to move ahead rapidly and decisively in her own chosen directions. The President of the World Bank has agreed to take up our substantial requirements for non-project assistance in the current year with the member countries of the Indian Consortium and to intimate to us their response in the near future. His efforts in this direction will have to be strengthened and supplemented by our own approaches to aid-giving countries on a bilateral basis. In addition, the President of the World Bank will also urge the Consortium countries to give assistance to our projects over and above the substantial and higher level of non-project aid that would be necessary. He has also assured us that the World Bank and its affiliate, the International Development Association, will participate in a substantial manner in the provision for our non-project aid requirements besides continuing to entertain requests for project assistance.

9. The United States Administration have indicated that subject to the action of the Congress they will meet their appropriate share of our non-project aid requirements for the current year as assessed by the World Bank. In addition, they would be willing to finance projects, including the projects which we had posed to them prior to the suspension of new US economic aid commitments to India in September last.

10. In my discussions the possibility of cooperation between India and Pakistan on economic projects which could be beneficial to both the countries came up. I pointed out that India for her part had always been willing to explore the feasibility of such projects on their merits. We did not, however, discuss details of any specific projects.

11. The highlight of my discussions with the United States Government

was, naturally, my meetings with President Johnson. The United States President expressed his deep personal admiration for the Prime Minister and his sympathy and understanding for the many difficult tasks that lay ahead for the people of India. He understood well what we were trying to do in India and he was most appreciative of the manner in which we were approaching our problems. He said that, subject to the overriding authority of Congress, the United States would play its part in supporting the programme of Indian economic development. He did not wish to make any demands on India; all he desired was that the resources India raised herself and the resources made available to her were spent for her economic benefit and for the well-being of her people. He hoped it would be possible for India to enjoy peace and so to lessen the burden of defence which she was now compelled to carry.

12. During my visit to Canada, I had the opportunity to meet Mr. Paul Martin, the Foreign Minister and Mr. Mitchell Sharp, the Minister for Finance. I could not, unfortunately, meet Prime Minister Lester Pearson as he was indisposed. My visit to Canada was primarily a goodwill visit. Canadian aid to India, over the years, has been not only most generous in quantum but also most understanding in its terms. I was therefore anxious to convey to the Canadian Government our deep appreciation of the understanding which we have always had from them. Honourable Members will recall that recently the Canadian Government announced the cancellation of the repayment of 10 million Canadian dollars due to them in the current year. The Government of Canada have also substantially increased their shipments of wheat aid to India. I was assured by them of their continued interest in supporting our developmental efforts during the Fourth Plan period and I expressed our appreciation of the spirit and the quantum of Canadian assistance to India.

Several hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: I would allow one Member from each party.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): I wrote to you this morning, Sir.

Mr. Speaker: Yes; I know. I shall allow one Member from each party to put questions. **Shri Ranga.**

Shri Ranga (Chittoor): It is such an important statement that I should think that the House should be given an opportunity of discussing it carefully at least for one day. because, now, at best, we can ask only one or two questions each, and that is not going to help us.

Much concern was expressed by one of our hon. friends about the central article in the *Statesman* in such disparaging terms. I am myself in agreement with the general line taken in that special article. I do not want my hon. friend **Shri Asoka Mehta** to feel that the House is generally not appreciative of his efforts on behalf of the Government and on behalf of the country as well. We need a mission like this and he must have gone through a lot of trouble, and he has taken enough trouble and has risked his own reputation, the reputation of the Government as well as the reputation of India, for her capacity to develop self-reliance. I do not know how far he has succeeded, and I do not know how far he himself thinks he has succeeded. All that I can say is, we hope for the best. We do not know anything more than that.

Shri Surendranath Dwivedy (Kandrapara): I want to know whether it is not a fact that in the matter of giving aid to our country, it was indicated by the United States Government that it is not only conditioned by maintaining Indo-Pak peace but also conditioned by the fact that we must maintain peace in our own country. Is it not a fact that during the discussions with **Dean Rusk**, the Secretary

of State, it was emphasised that India must maintain peace in its own country, and that the Planning Minister explained to him about the present troubles in Nagaland, about the division of Punjab on a linguistic basis—all these things he has had to explain to him—and if that is the position, is it not beneath our dignity and self-respect to go and explain our internal conditions to America in order to get this aid? I want to know whether it is not a fact, and whether these things were discussed or not.

Shri Asoka Mehta: I have made it clear in the statement that I have read before the House that no conditions were made; that no conditions were asked for and no conditions were made. As to what I was discussing with a particular person, well, I do not know whether it is necessary for me to go into the details. One cannot talk to a spokesman without touching on various questions. On the various questions, if one has to go into the precise details, I do not know; all that I can say is this. My hon. friend **Shri Dwivedy** has also gone to the United States; he has met very distinguished people there and had an exchange of views, of what is happening in America. They like to know what is happening here. I also put them questions as to what is happening there. When two persons meet, apart from the purpose they have in mind, they also try to have what one might call small talk. I do not understand how the question of any kind of dignity of the country gets involved in this.

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Mandsaur): Sir, I should like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to paragraphs 3 and 10 of his statement.

In para 3 he says:

"Within this broad context, the discussions I had with the President of the World Bank centred around the steps we intended to take in the next two plans on

such questions as agricultural development, population control, acceleration of the programme for fertilizer production . . .".

It is very good that he discussed all these things with them, because so far as the question of economic aid is concerned, it is necessary to discuss them. But in para 10 he says:

"In my discussions the possibility of cooperation between India and Pakistan on economic projects which would be beneficial to both the countries came up."

Did the Minister at the time this discussion cropped up, bring to the forefront our relations with Pakistan and the obduracy on the part of Pakistan vis-a-vis India as also the hateful campaign carried on by Pakistan against our country? Was he able to make any further progress in the direction of moulding the opinion of the World Bank and also of the United States regarding the attitude of Pakistan towards us?

Shri Asoka Mehta: The World Bank provides economic assistance to Pakistan as well as India and it does not go into political matters. With them we discussed the question in so far as it relates to economic development and economic cooperation. As far as the United States is concerned, whenever the question of Pakistan came up, it is needless to add that I put forward our point of view. But that does not form part of the broad understanding or appreciation that we were able to reach about our economic cooperation. They know our attitude towards Pakistan. Wherever it was necessary, I reiterated it, but that was not the principal purpose of my visit.

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखाबाद) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, हम मारे प्रश्न को दो विपरीत दृष्टियों ने उत्तर रक्खा है : एक तरफ तो बाहरी मदद को इच्छा और दूसरी तरफ आत्मसम्मान को बचाये रखने की इच्छा। मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि द्विधा में दाना

गये माया मिली न रात। न दान मिला रहा है न मदद मिल रही है और न आत्मसम्मान मिल रहा है और उस का सबूत यह है कि सारा बयान जो मंत्री महोदय ने दिया है सुन लेने के बाद कुछ भी पता नहीं चलता कि बाहरी मदद भारत को कितनी मिलने वाली है? वह सिर्फ गुण के ऊपर बोल रहे हैं तादाद के ऊपर नहीं बोल रहे हैं। अस्सर यही हुआ है कि बाहरी मदद के लिए भाषा तो पहाड़ जैसी बना दी जाती है और अन्त में वही एक कहावत साबित होती है कि छोटा पहाड़ निकली चुड़िया। ऐसी स्थिति में मैं मंत्री महोदय से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या इन प्रश्नों को सुनमाने के लिए वह कभी 10-5 दिन बंठ कर अकेले में सोचेंगे और देश को बताएंगे कि क्या विदेशी मदद हम आत्मसम्मान के साथ ले सकते हैं? क्या है आत्मसम्मान, कहाँ है, किस दशा में है, किस हद तक है और कितनी विदेशी मदद हम को मिल सकती है?

अन्त में मैं एक चीज और कहूँ। उस वक्त मंत्री महोदय जरा गुस्सा हो गये थे। मैंने कुछ कहना नहीं चाहा। लेकिन उन्होंने एक शब्द कह दिया कि मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी से और अपने दोस्तों से तो नथ कुछ सुनने को तैयार हूँ तो मेरा कहना है कि हम नाचीज लोग भी अगर उन को कुछ सुनायें तो उसे भी सुनने के लिए उन्हें तैयार रहना चाहिए। अब वह जरा टंटे हो गये होंगे तो वह अपनी शक्ति के बारे में कुछ कहेंगे।

श्री ज्योत्सक मेहता : मैं ने कल यह नहीं कहा बल्कि मैंने यह कहा था कि जा जिम्मेदारी मेरे कंधों पर है वह इस बजट में है कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब और मेरे गणधर्यों का ऐतबार मुझ में है। डाक्टर साहब की मुहब्बत मैं मानता हूँ आज भी हमारे ऊपर है लेकिन उनकी मुहब्बत की

[श्री अशोक मेहता]

बजट से न तो मैं मिनिस्टर बन सकता हूँ और न मिट सकता हूँ

श्री अशु लिये : इसी लिये तो आप यहां से उठ कर वहां चले गये ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : श्री अशोक मेहता यह भी खयाल रखना कि मेरा गुस्सा तुम्हें नहीं लेकिन तुम्हारे प्रधान मंत्री को मिटायेगा ।

श्री अशोक मेहता : ठीक है । जहां तक यह बात रही कि डा० साहब जो कुछ कहना चाहते हैं तो वह मैं सब सुनने के लिए तैयार हूँ और उस के ऊपर सोचने के लिए तैयार हूँ ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : श्री अशोक मेहता जरा ठंडे बनिये, इतनी गर्मी से काम नहीं चलेगा

अध्यक्ष महोदय : धांडर, धांडर ।

श्री अशोक मेहता : डा० साहब ने वो सवाल उठाये । एक उन्होंने कहा कि हमें धातमसम्मान के साथ कैसे मदद मिल सकती है उस के बारे में सोचना चाहिए । डेढ़, दो साल से जब से हम फोरथ प्लान को तैयार करने के काम में लगे हुए हैं और मुक्तलिफ सवालों के ऊपर सोच विचार कर रहे हैं । इस बारे में मैं डा० साहब को यकीन दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि एक हफ्ते के लिए नहीं बल्कि महीनों तक उस के ऊपर और हर पहलू से हम ने उस पर सोच विचार किया है । मैंने अपने स्टेटमेंट में साफ़ धंदाजा दिया है कि षड प्लान में जो मदद हमें मिली उस से ज्यादा मदद हमें मिलने वाली है । नौन-प्रोजेक्ट ऐंड काफ़ी बड़े पैमाने पर मिलेगी । धांकड़े देना मेरे लिए नामुमकिन है और वहां धांकड़ों का फैसला करना मुक्तलिफ़ हकूमतों के ऊपर है । अगर वर्ल्ड बैंक भी जो कुछ देता है वह अपना हिस्सा छोड़ कर देता है बाक़ी का हिस्सा उन्हें 10 गवर्नमेंट्स के पास से विमाना पड़ता है । इन गवर्नमेंटों को

तय करना पड़ता है कि कितना देगी और उन्हें इस के लिए अपनी पार्लियामेंटों के पास जाना पड़ता है और इन की पार्लियामेंटों की राय ले कर ही वह धांकड़े बतला सकते हैं । डा० साहब तो यह जानते ही हैं कि 10 हकूमतों की तरफ से और उनकी पार्लियामेंट्स की तरफ से बोलने की इजाजत मुझे नहीं है इसलिये मैं धांकड़े नहीं दे सकता हूँ लेकिन धांकड़ों के बारे में मुझे काफ़ी अच्छा धंदाजा है ।

Shri Frank Anthony (Nominated—Anglo-Indians): The Minister has, perhaps rightly, pointed out that until he formulates our requirements for the fourth plan, he cannot give us any details nor can he say to what extent the World Bank will be prepared to help us. But there was one part of his statement which intrigued me. According to the Press, the US has frozen approximately 475 million dollars of aid that was already pledged. There was some reference to this pledged aid prior to September. Surely he is in a position to tell us what the attitude of the US administration is to that aid already pledged. Because of that pledged aid, we had undertaken certain commitments. Are they prepared to, I would not say honour that pledge in respect of which they had already made a commitment, unfreeze not only the aid that was pledged during the war which was forced on us by Pakistan, but aid pledged before that? The British had more than made it up. Is America going to unfreeze that pledged aid?

Shri Asoka Mehta: I was informed a couple of days back after I returned here that the US Government is ready to commence immediately negotiations on four loans for the Dhuraran Thermal Project, the Durgapur Thermal Project, the Beas Dam Project and Operation Hardrock. These were among the things that were there waiting for them. It indicates that the whole relationship has been normalised.

Shri Frank Anthony: I do not know the precise amount . . .

Shri Asoka Mehta: I will explain. It is divided into two parts—non-project aid and project aid. As far as project aid is concerned, a number of projects had been posed before them. The four projects I just mentioned are likely to move forward. As I said, they are willing to take up for consideration other projects that we have posed. About the non-project aid, what happens to the non-project amount which would have been given in the last year—obviously the last year is not there—and in what way it is to be related to what we are going to get for the current year are matters under discussion.

Shri S. Kandappan (Tiruchengode): The Minister has mentioned in the statement that the Governments that he has recently visited were appreciative of our plan performance. But almost all the paper reports rather carried a contrary tale that they were restive and not very happy over our past performance and it is precisely because of that they were not accelerating the aid that they have been giving so far. Is the Minister in a position to corroborate these reports in the papers?

Shri Asoka Mehta: I have not had the benefit of reading what the newspapers have said, but from what I hear from the Members regarding what was reported in the newspapers, it seems that the reporters in the US were very far from what I was doing. All I can say is this country and these international financial institutions would not have agreed to a considerable step up in the assistance that they are promising to give us if they were not broadly satisfied with what we have done and what we propose to do.

The proof of the pudding is in the eating.

Shri S. N. Chaturvedi (Firozabad): May I know whether the increased

aid assured to us will be over what was committed for the Third Plan or what was actually paid?

Shri Asoka Mehta: Well, I do not know what precisely the difference is. If you say "actually disbursed", it is a different matter.

Shri S. N. Chaturvedi: Yes; actually disbursed.

Shri Asoka Mehta: At our discussions we were not referring to the disbursement at all, we were referring to the commitment, and the understanding with which I have returned from the United States of America, after discussions with the Government there as well as with the World Bank. The total aid that will be available to us for the Fourth Plan—that is, the commitment of the aid—will be larger than what it was for the Third Plan.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad (Bhagulpur): Sir, Shri Ranga wanted to have a discussion on this statement. I would like to say that since goodwill and mutual understanding was established there with the Government of the United States by our Minister of Planning and since he has held qualitative discussion and deliberated on structural changes—these are his words—I do not think for the present there is any basis for a discussion on this statement.

While saying that, I would like to know from the hon. Minister what are the implications of the report—I won't say "conditions" because that is a bad word and many hon. friends have been protesting and saying that there are no conditions, what is the meaning of "liberalization of import" and "control in the Indian economy" after which it would be possible for the World Bank to see better prospects of the aid. I would also like to know whether the Government of the United States will be in a position, like other Governments, to have a bilateral agree-

[Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad]

ment on economics, or everything that will be given to India will be given only when the World Bank gives a certificate of soundness? What is the position in these matters?

Shri Asoka Mehta: As far as the first part of the question is concerned, there are two sets of controls that we are compelled to exercise today. One set of controls is due to the fact that we are having an acute shortage of foreign exchange. If we had somewhat more foreign exchange at our disposal we may not be wanting to exercise all those detailed administrative scrutinies and controls. There is another set of controls which we exercise because they are necessary for purposes of our planned economic development, for our regional development, and for seeing that industries operating at different levels of technology are also able to subsist side by side. As far as the later set of controls are concerned, they cannot be touched; they are something which we have to review from time to time and decide in the light of the requirements of our planned economic development. As far as the first set of controls are concerned, which have to be accepted because of considerable inadequacy of foreign exchange, we have on our own said that given the adequacy of foreign exchange we would like to review them.

The second question asked is whether the decisions arrived at after discussions with the Government of USA will be of a bilateral nature or through the World Bank. I am sure the hon. Member knows that both things have to be done. The consortium also decides what is to be done. The World Bank is the Chairman of the consortium. Bilateral discussions have also to be carried on. But, as I have pointed out in the statement, the President of the World Bank has said that as far as the current year is concerned we shall have to negotiate for the projects with the various

countries concerned. As far as the non-project part of it is concerned he is willing to discuss with us on behalf of the consortium as a whole. We had discussions on both, about non-project assistance and project assistance, with the Government of USA. I regret very much to find that the total impression I have left on the hon. Member is that there was only goodwill and goody-goody talks and nothing concrete was achieved there.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad: I am sorry I have created that impression in his mind. I have said "qualitative discussions and structural changes" also. They are very big things. I do not know how he got the impression that I said he had only "goodwill and goody-goody talks". There is something suspicious in his mind and not in my mind.

श्री प्रकाशबीर शास्त्री (बिजनौर):
सितम्बर, 1965 के द्रन्त तक भारत के ऊपर भिन्न भिन्न मदों में विदेशों का जो ऋण था, अगर मोटे रूप में उस के धांकड़े एकत्रित किये जायें, तो प्रत्येक भारतवाली आज 128 रुपये के विदेशों के ऋण से दबा हुआ है। इतना ऋण लेने के बाद भी हम अपनी कर्ट प्राजेक्ट्स को इस लिये प्रारम्भ नहीं कर सके, क्योंकि हमारे पास विदेशी मुद्रा का पर्याप्त मात्रा में अभाव था। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या योजना मंत्री ने अपनी इस यात्रा के दौरान विश्व बैंक तथा अन्य देशों के साथ बात चीत करते हुए विदेशी मुद्रा के इस अभाव की स्थिति को समाप्त करने के लिए कुछ प्रयास किया। यदि हाँ तो उस का विवरण क्या है; हम अपनी अिन प्राजेक्ट्स को प्रारम्भ करना चाहते थे, विदेशी मुद्रा के अभाव में हम उन को प्रारम्भ नहीं कर सके। क्या योजना मंत्री ने अपनी इस यात्रा में कुछ ऐसा प्रयास किया है कि विदेशी मुद्रा के अभाव को दूर किया जा

सके और हम अपनी उन प्रोजेक्ट्स को प्रारम्भ कर सकें ?

श्री अशोक मेहता : मैं धर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि हम इन प्रोजेक्ट्स को बनाने में दो तरह में मदद कर सकते हैं। हमारे देश में इन प्रोजेक्ट्स को बनाने की काफी गुंजायग है, लेकिन चूँकि कुछ कॉम्प्लिमेंट्स और ऐसेन्शाल रा मैटीरियल हमारे पास नहीं है, जिन को हमें बाहर से लाना पड़ता है, इस लिए हमारे पास ब्रिदेगी मुद्रा न होने की वजह से, प्रोजेक्ट बनाने की जो शक्ति हमारे मुत्क में है, उस का हम पूरा उपयोग नहीं कर सकते। इस हालत में अगर हमें ज्यादा मदद मिले, तो हम जरूरी इम्पोर्ट्स को ज्यादा तावादा में भंगा कर अपने देश की प्रोजेक्ट बनाने की कैपेसिटी का इस्तेमाल कर सकते हैं।

दूसरी तरफ़ जो नये प्रोजेक्ट बनाना जरूरी है, जिन को बनाने की काबलियत अभी तक हमारे देश में नहीं है और जिन को बनाने की काबलियत हम भगले पांच, सात सालों में पैदा करना चाहते हैं, उन प्रोजेक्ट्स के लिए हमें मदद की आवश्यकता है। इन दोनों किस्म की मदद के लिए उन की तरफ़ से प्राश्वासन मिला है।

Shri Kamalnayan Bajaj (Wardha): If I have understood the hon. Minister correctly, he said, that negotiations are going on for unfreezing whatever aid was promised before the Pakistan aggression and which was freed. May I know why it has not been unfreezed? When the US authorities are willing to give for the Fourth Plan more aid than what they gave for the Third Plan, whatever aid was promised before the Pakistan aggression, what is it that is holding up the unfreezing of it and why are negotiations necessary for that? It was an agreed aid and all the details must have been gone into before they agreed to give that aid. What is the

reason that negotiations are now necessary for unfreezing it.

Secondly, I would like to ask the Minister whether he is substantially and thoroughly satisfied with the outcome of the negotiation, as far as he is concerned, from the point of view of our country?

Shri Asoka Mehta: As far as the first question is concerned, I have already answered it. When my hon. friend, Shri Frank Anthony, asked me this question, I pointed out that what was committed could be divided into two parts—non-project aid and project aid. As far as the project aid is concerned, the United States Government has said that those projects which we had posed before them they are willing to consider, and I pointed out that as far as four of these projects are concerned they are willing to start negotiations immediately.

As far as the non-project aid is concerned, it should have flowed into the Indian economy last year, because these are the kind of imports we should have made. Those imports have not been made. What happens to that amount? Something that should have been imported into the country last year was not imported. Does it get added to the next year? What happens they want to give more aid during the next year—that is in the current year. What relationship will it have to that? These are details or matters on which obviously discussions have to be carried on. There is another aspect of it. This commitment was made by the United States as a member of the consortium and the President of the World Bank has also certain responsibilities before this matter is fully sorted out. These are the questions that are still being discussed and it was not possible for me to stay there long enough and to see that they are finally resolved.

Some hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: Let us proceed now.

Shri Kapur Singh (Ludhiana): Sir, the hon. Minister may take you into confidence; he has been addressing the House and not you.

Shri Narendra Singh Mahida (Anand): Sir, I rise to a point of order. I have been repeatedly getting up as an independent Member of this House, but I have not been given any opportunity to ask any question any time.

Mr. Speaker: Now every independent Member cannot be given a chance.

Shri Narendra Singh Mahida: We have got a right to ask questions.

Mr. Speaker: If there are 25 independent Members and 25 groups, how should I accommodate them? Dr. Lohia might lay his statement on the Table.

Shri Hem Barua: I am very sorry to say, Sir, that you have two sets of standards. On certain occasion you say that only those Members who write to you will be allowed to ask questions when a minister makes a statement. Another fine morning you come out with another standard and you allow only the group leaders.

Mr. Speaker: I do not think these are two standards. When groups are there I have allowed their leaders. Shri Hem Barua should not charge me with resorting to two standards.

श्री हनु लिमये (मुंगेर): कई कांग्रेस के लोग बोले, क्या वे भी पार्टी लीडर थे।

Shri Bhagwat Jha Asad: The Congress is a party and they are groups; that is the difference.

Shri K. D. Malaviya (Basti): May I have a word? It is obvious that there cannot be two standards and two considerations. I thought that an important document placed on the Table and the statement made by the hon. Minister will, naturally, attract a lot of attention from all hon. Members of the House. So, this procedure

of yours that you allow one Member from each party and a few Members from the Congress benches to put questions, perhaps may not satisfy the curiosity or the urgency. Therefore, I was suggesting for your consideration that either you give another time to put questions or you may set aside some time for discussion.

Mr. Speaker: Ordinarily, under the rules, when a statement is made no questions are allowed.

Shri K. D. Malaviya: Then you should not have allowed any question.

Mr. Speaker: But certain clarificatory questions are permitted. I have permitted so many and more than half an hour has been spent over this.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hosangabad): He could give a separate notice of a motion for discussion.

Mr. Speaker: That will be a separate thing altogether.

Shri K. D. Malaviya: I think, you should give some additional opportunity....

Mr. Speaker: How can I go on with this? I do not know whether I will have that opportunity.

Shri K. D. Malaviya: Then, perhaps, you should have stopped at the point where the Minister made that statement. That was perhaps better.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member would appreciate whether it is possible to allow all Members to have an opportunity to put questions.

श्री के० डे० मालवीय : प्राप ही बताइये, स्पीकर साहब, ऐसे ग्रहम मसले पर प्राप लगाकर, अब प्राप बुझाना चाहते हैं, यह तो मुनासिब नहीं है। मैं समझता हूँ कि या तो प्राप इस को न चलने देते or you should have allowed a proper number of Members to ask questions.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : प्राप जैसे सीनियर प्रादमी भी मुझे कहते हैं कि प्राप लगाकर बुझाना चाहता हैं ।

I would advise Dr. Lohia to lay his statement on the Table.

Shri Narendra Singh Mahida: May I seek a clarification?

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Every independent Member cannot expect that he would be allowed an opportunity.

Shri Narendra Singh Mahida: Other independent Members were not getting up. I was the only person who got up.

Mr. Speaker: That does not matter.

Shrimati Savitri Nigam (Banda): Congress Party is a very big party.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): I want to make one point. It is the right of individual Members of this House. The Constitution does not recognise Members who are in a party and who are not in a party. You have to see the importance of the question put by the Member and give him an opportunity independently of his being a member of a party or not.

Mr. Speaker: Then I should not recognise any of the groups and proceed like that... (Interruption).

13.35

STATEMENT RE. CERTAIN INFORMATION GIVEN BY FOOD MINISTER ON FAMINE CODE AND REPLY THERETO

Mr. Speaker: Would not Dr. Sahib lay his statement on the Table?

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखाबाद) अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं प्राप से प्रार्थना करूँ कि प्रकाश संहिता का सवाल पूरे सत्र पर मण्डराता रहा है। अगर इस को सदन के पटल पर रख दिया जायेगा तो इसका कोई मतलब नहीं रहेगा।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : प्रापका तीन-चार सफ़े का स्टेटमेंट है और फिर मिनिस्टर साहब का 8 सफ़े का है।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : वह अपना सदन पटल पर रख सकते हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : प्रच्छा प्राप पढ़ लीजिये।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : माननीय अध्यक्ष महोदय, प्रापके बार बार कहने पर भी प्रकाश संहिता सदन पटल पर नहीं रखी गई, इस से बड़ कर सदन का और प्रापका क्या अपमान हो सकता है।

अंग्रेजी जमाने में प्रकाश संहिता का एक पहलू बुरा था, क्योंकि दुभिन्न मुख्यतः प्रादेशिक जिम्मेदारी माना गया था और इन्तजाय प्रचुरे रहे और दूसरा पहलू प्रच्छा था क्योंकि इन्तजाय चाहे जितने प्रचुरे रहे हों, हर एक तफसील के लिये कानून और दफ्ता ये तथा कायदा सटीक था। ऐसी प्रकाश संहिता के बारे में वर्तमान सरकार हाँ और ना दोनों में बात कर रही है।

मंत्री महोदय ने प्रकाश संहिता को अकरतोन परस्पर विरोधी बातें कही हैं:—

1. नवम्बर, 65 में कहा कि प्रकाश संहिता है, जिस के अनुसार प्रकाश मुख्यतः सूबों की जिम्मेदारी है।

2. फरवरी, 66 में कहा कि पुरानी प्रकाश संहिता खत्म हो चुकी है और नवी लागू हो चुकी है। बार बार सदन में और प्रापकी तरफ से भी मांग होने पर प्रकाश संहिता को सदन-पटल पर न रख कर।