Shri L. N. Mishra: I am very sorry for the delay. I will find out and let you know.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: He has laid the paper on the Table, but he does not know.

13.29 hrs.

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

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri H. N. Mukerjee on the 1st August, 1966, namely:—

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

Shri R. G. Dubey to continue his speech.

The Minister of State in the Department of Parliamentary Affairs and Communications (Shri Jaganatha Rao): What is the time left now?

Mr. Speaker: The time left is 3 hours and 15 minutes. We have 3 hours and 30 minutes. How long would the Prime Minister take?

Shri Jaganatha Rao: 30 to 40 minutes.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Mukerjee will require 10 minutes, I suppose.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): 15 to 20 minutes.

Mr. Speaker: Then, I will call the hon. Prime Minister at 4 o'clock. Shri Dubey.

13.30 hrs.

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

Shri R. G. Dubey (Bijapur North): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I would not go into the details of the points that I made yesterday. I shall place before this hon. House a gist of what I said.

We heard many important speeches yesterday. Mr. S. K. Patil made a very important and effective speech and raised the standard of the debate. So also Mr. Frank Anthony; he also made a very impressive speech. We also heard Mr. Krishna Menon.

Now I would like to say a few words regarding our foreign policy. There is a tendency to decry what Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru did for this country and to humanity. Regarding his non-alignment policy, I would say that it is an open thing. Prior to this, I may say that the Opposition, as Mr. Frank Anthony rightly said, are following an opportunist policy and excepting PSP, Swatantra and Jana Sangha, I believe they have no faith in democracy. Dr. Lohia follows a policy of anarchism; I do not think that he stands for any specific principles.

The non-alignment policy followed by this country has paid dividends. In fact, the non-alignment policy has created a profound impression in the world, particularly in the Afro-Asian countries.

Regarding the policy of China, I may say that China does not stand for peace; they want to carry the war to the doors of other countries; they believe in bloodshed. China has cut a sorry figure in Indonesia and in some neutral countries. But the fact remains that the major powers do not want war and they want peace.

Mr. Kamaraj, the President of the Congress Party, is visiting important countries and he has created a very good impression and I believe that it will go further to strengthen the bonds of friendship between India and those countries. Also I would like to refer to the article written by Frank Moraes, Editor of *The Indian Express*. He has said that if North Vietnam is left by itself, then it will be another Yugoslavia; Vietnam will be forced to embrace China. It is an interesting article for the consideration of the House and of the world.

About the economic policy, I have already said something. But then it seems, as Mr. Patil has rightly said, that if you want to have a freeze on wages, prices must be frozen first and then there can be a freeze on wages.

Something must be done drastically to bring down the price level. Essential commodities which are necessary for consumption should be made available at cheap prices. One Super Market is not enough. There should be co-operative stores almost in every village and there should be effective control; this will go a long way in helping us to bring down the price level. I am told that in Yugoslavia they adopted some measures to effect economy and these could serve as useful suggestions for us.

Regarding our food policy, as hon. members of this House have rightly emphasized, although development of industries is essential, it is much more essential for us to increase our food production so that we become self-sufficient in food. The price structure depends on the production of food. That is the major thing and if food production is attained at a certain level, then it will have a healthy effect on the price structure.

What happens at the district level? The district units must be activised. At the district level, they should be given some discretion; some funds should be placed at their disposal. At the district level, now they have no authority.

We all talk about increasing food production. Now the time has come to stop giving advice to cultivators. They are wise now and they want fertilisers and other help. The district levels should be activised and the Deputy Commissioner and other officers and the social workers—whether they are in the Opposition or in the Congress Party, that is immaterial—should be given adequate funds, so that they become effective.

There is another thing. At the district level there is hardly any co-operation between the district officers. At the secretariat level also, sometimes the correspondence is stuck up and does not reach the bottom. All these points must be considered.

With these few remarks, I take the leave of the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Mr. Ravindra Varma.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): Yesterday I was told that the time of the independents was exhausted and that somebody had taken the whole time allotted for independents. I was never informed that I had been bracketed with somebody. I was told that I would be given an opportunity to speak.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All the time allotted for Independents has been taken away.

Dr. M. S. Aney: I would not like to mention the name of the hon. Member. I would not like to complain against him. If I had been told before, I would have gladly surrendered my time.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The time allotted for Independents is over.

Dr. M. S. Aney: Under what rule can I be ruled out?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The time is strictly allotted.

Dr. M. S. Aney: For whom?

Shri Shinkre (Marmagoa): He should be given some time.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): He is the father of the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: All right; I shall try to give him some time. Mr. Ravindra Varma.

Shri Ravindra Varma (Thiruvella): For the last three days this House has been debating a motion of No-confidence. This motion has been expressed in terms which would enable the members of the Opposition to rally behind the request that the motion should be entertained. This is not the first time that a ruse of this kind is being resorted to, is being made use of by the Opposition which realises fully well that if the motion is to be a substantive one, if the motion is to list the errors of omission and com-

[Shri Ravindra Varma]

mission of the Government, if the motion is to put before the House a set of valid and viable alternatives, it might be that sponsors of the motion would not be able to muster enough support in this House to see that the motion is taken up for discussion.

Sir, we had the privilege of listening to the hon. friend Opposite, Prof. Mukerjee, who is well known in this House and outside for his brilliant eloquence. I like to listen to the learned Professor. When I listened to him the other day, I wondered whether I could recall another occasion on which his affluence of adjectives was so perfectly matched by poverty of arguments as on this occasion. He put on a drama which was devoid of a plot, and indulged in a melodrama which did not ever have the relieving feature of catharsis about it. It was interesting, amazing and even distressing to watch the quivering indignation with which the learned Professor, the pretender that he is to the heritage of Jawaharlal Nehru, lashed out on the Government. Many reasons were mentioned.

Shri Shinkre: You will please agree, Sir, that for listening to such a brilliant speech. there should be quorum in the House

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The bell is being rung.

Now there is quorum. The hon. Member may continue.

Shri Ravindra Varma: As hon. Members who spoke before me from this side pointed out, it was strange to see that my hon. friend opposite, Shri H. N. Mukerjee wanted this Government to be censured not primarily on what was happening in this country, but on the basis of what he thought it had failed to do in Viet Nam. My hon. friend worked up much emotion, and at a point said, "you are Viet Nams, we are Viet Nams, and all of us are Viet Nams." I understand very well the spiritual identification of the hon. Member with certain causes. But was it right on his part to say that this Government, the government of this country, has been equivocal on the question of Viet Nam? The professor knows very well that India is the chairman of the International Control Commission. He knows that while India is the chairman of the International Control Commission, it is impossible to expect that the chairman should give evidence of partisanship. If that is the idea that Shri H. N. Mukerjee entertains of chairmanship and of impartiality, it need not astonish the House that he entertains such norms, but it is very difficult for him to expect that this Government would accept those norms.

Sir, he said that the Prime Minister first observed silence, then she insisted on finding a solution within the framework of the Geneva Conference, she did not even whisper the name of the South Viet Nam Liberation Front as a factor in the situation, she had shown unwillingness to name the aggressor, and that in fact she peddled an alibi for the American imperialists. What is the fact of the situation? As chairman of the International Control Commission, have we not attempted to discharge our duty? Have we not concondemned bombing? Have we not condemned bmobing? Have we not condemned the escalation of the war? Have we not condemned that all parties to the war must be willing to take steps for de-escalation? Have we not said that a peaceful settlement should be found, which is not a military solution but which would be a political solution? But these are not enough for Shri H. N. Mukerjee. He was piqued by the fact that our Prime Minister had the audacity or shall I quote his favourite phrase, temerity to make a suggestion without giving thought to what she was suggesting. He was perhaps implying that she had the audacity to make an impermissible suggestion without so

much as consulting the nations that mattered in his eyes.

He referred to the horrors of the war in Viet Nam. No one on this side of the House is willing to condone the horrors of war. But is it right to say that horror in a war is perpetrated only by one side? The other day, my hon. friend the Member for Gadwal referred to the quotation that was published in a Czechoslovak newspaper from the *Le Mon de* which catalogued the horrors and the methods of terror employed by the Viet Cong forces in Viet Nam, and he asked Professor Mukerjee to say whether he would characterise the Czechoslovak news agency and the Czechoslovak press as agents of imperialism, whether he would characterise them as running-dogs of imperialism, or whether he would say that they were publishing untruth to serve the interests of the imperialists.

Sir, when describing the proposal of the Prime Minister, Shri H. N. Mukerjee had the temerity, if I may say so, to refer to the Prime Minister's proposal as an evidence of kindergarten diplomacy. I appreciate the flavour of the phrase that Shri H. N. Mukerjee has used. Perhaps Shri H. N. Mukerjee condemned this as kindergarten diplomacy because what would have satisfied his way of thinking would have been a diplomacy which might have been more aptly described as the diplomacy of Mary's Little Lamb, or perhaps I should have said in deference to Shri A. K. Gopalan, the diplomacy of Mao's maverick yak. If we were willing to adopt a partisan role and line up with the Powers from whom some people in this country derive inspiration, if we were willing to shed our nonalignment and our non-partisan attitude then perhaps Shri H. N. Mukerjee would have said that there was no element of kindergarten diplomacy but that there was mature, adult diplomacy.

Sir, Shri A. K. Gopalan who is unfortunately not present here might perhaps have gone one step further than Shri H. N. Mukerjee, and might, perhaps, even have wanted that this Government should administer a mild rebuke to Ho Chi Minh and warn him that since he had not put the American fliers on trial as war criminals and executed them, he was in danger of being regarded as a renegade and a paper-revolutionary. Unfortunately, this Government believes in nonalignment and, therefore, it is not possible to expect of this Government that they would line up behind one Power or another.

Sir, my hon. friend opposite then referred to imperialism and said that the Prime Minister was showing unwillingness to define imperialism, was revelling in ambiguity about the connotation of the word 'imperialism'. It does not lie very well in the mouth of my hon. friend opposite to talk of the definitions of imperialism. This country has seen how these definitions can vary with the changes and the shifts in the policies and the interests of certain nations of the world. It was not long ago, I think, in 1939, when this country was suffering under the yoke of foreign domination and when this country was engaged in a fight for its freedom, that we saw the strange spectacle of Shri H. N. Mukerjee and his party justifying an imperialist war as a people's war because imperialism had become something else by virtue of association and the waters of the Jordan or the Volga had been sprinkled on it and imperialism had been baptised as something else.

Then, my hon. friend opposite Shri H. N. Mukerjee, referred to foreign aid and accused this Government of becoming increasingly dependent on foreign aid, of becoming an addict to foreign aid. He said that the Planning Minister believed in the philosophy of foreign aid as the prop of our plan. We know that foreign aid is not

[Shri Ravindra Varma]

something on which we should depend for building up this nation. But it is true too that we believe that it is possible for us to secure assistance from other nations without compromise of our sovereignty, for our interest and in our interests. Shri H. N. Mukerjee certainly cannot hold the view that all foreign assistance is anathema and that all foreign assistance is sinful. I do know that in the case of certain types of foreign assistance from certain sources. Shri H N. Mukerjee will have no objection to this country's asking for even more. The objection then is to assistance from certain quarters. Now, the question that this House has to consider is not whether foreign assistance is permissible but whether the kind of assistance that we have sought and the kind of assistance that we have received and the sources from which we have received assistance are such that there has been any compromise of national interest or of national self-respect.

Obviously, Shri Mukerjee knows that if each of these projects is examined, if each of these proposals is scrutinised, it will be very difficult for him to pinpoint anyone item on which he can accuse this Government of having betrayed the interests of the nation. When it is difficult to be precise, it is advantageous to be ambiguous, and Shri Mukerjee gave a superb demonstration of the advantages of ambiguity.

Sir, he referred to the spirit of *swadeshi*. Many members on this side of the House would have found it very difficult to suppress a smile when the hon. leader of the Communist Party, Rightist though he is today, extolled the virtues of *swadeshi* which was condemned by them when Mahatma Gandhi preached the gospel of *swadeshi* in the days of our struggle against the British and was described as a Plan to serve the interests of the capitalists of this country. Be that as it may, I shall not enter into that question.

Sir, no one is more aware of the fact that foreign assistance should be used sparingly, when necessary, in conformity with national interests, and only to build up the basis of a system which will make it unnecessary for us to depend on anyone else. Our Prime Minister herself said the other day that if we believe in assistance, we believe in aid to end aid, so that we may reach a stage in which it might not any longer be necessary for us to depend on other countries for aid.

Sir, aid is not an altruistic phenomenon in the world today. No one is foolish enough to think that nations are offering assistance as an essay in altruism or as a pious exercise in Christian charity. If nations are offering assistance, it is because such assistance is necessary for them to build up the absorptive capacity and the power of consumption in other areas of the world, so that there may be stability in their economy and there may be amenability to their ideas, so that the systems to which they belong and the systems that flourish in their own states may be safe from violation. The USA is no exception to this; the USSR is no exception to this; China is no exception to this. No one in this country who has been witness to the spectacle of the Chinese revolt against the USSR, of the Chinese castigation of the USSR when assistance was withdrawn from China, no one in this country who has witnessed the spectacle of Cuba being subjected to political and economic blackmail by China, needs any words of wisdom from the hon. Member opposite to convince him of the fact that no self-respecting nation can depend totally on foreign assistance.

Sir, it is very strange to recall that China which had offered massive assistance in terms of food to Cuba halved its assistance earlier this year.

At that time, Fidel Castro, who is not a non-progressive, if I may say so, referred to it as a "hard and unexpected blow, a brutal economic reprisal for purely political reasons." Therefore, this is not a brush with which only one nation in this world is tarred or is likely to be tarred.

Sir, I shall not refer to other instances for lack of time. But I know that this Party, this Government, is well aware of the dangers of dependence on foreign assistance and addiction to foreign assistance.

Now, there was reference to the fact that things have gone wrong in this country because of the "sky-rocketing" expenditure on defence. The hon. Member for Kasergod, who is not present here (Shri Gopalan) accused the Government of increasing the expenditure on the army and defence, suggested that Rs. 1,000 crores was too much for a poor country like India and said that this expenditure was being incurred at the cost of developmental programmes. What was his solution? His solution was that we should try to make up with China, that we should take the initiative to find out methods of peacefully solving our differences with China and our other neighbour Pakistan. Now Shri Gopalan put the cart miles before the horse when he said that we were responsible for increasing our defence expenditure. Did we spend so much on defence before 1962, when we were lulled into a false sense of security by the malicious, hypocritical propaganda of China? This country took a grave risk with its own defensive apparatus because it was dedicated to the idea that the last penny of the poor man in this country must be spent for the economic development of this country. Who was responsible for rudely shocking this country into the realisation that hope alone does not rule reality? It was China. But for the fact that, in 1962, China attacked this country viciously and fraudulently, it would not have come about that India would have voluntarily decided to spend huge sums on bolstering her defence.

Now, Shri Gopalan suggested that we should reduce this expenditure on defence and be vulnerable, compromise with China, compromise our honour. But Shri Gopalan is not the only one who suggests such a course. It is sad to see sometimes that there are strange bedfellows in the world. Our hon. friends of the Swatantra Party, Prof. Ranga and others, sometimes sing a more or less similar tune. They say that this country cannot afford this huge expenditure on defence, and their solution is that we should join a pact and seek security. One puts before the country the ethics of delinquency, dependence on some other country for the protection of this country, so that India might be reduced, in the bargain, to a protectorate of the United States of America; another puts before the country the philosophy, the unrepentant, unashamed philosophy of "compromisation" in the belief that the acceptance of the socialist suzerainty of a big brother will give security to this there is an erosion of self-confidence,

Sir, as far as this country is concerned, this country no longer wants to take a risk with its defence. It knows that even if it has to bear the burden of a heavy defence expenditure, it will rather lead a spartan life to defend the sovereignty and integrity of this country than be at the mercy of any other country in the world. It is true that this defence expenditure is huge. But when we see what is happening in East Pakistan, when we see the collusion between China and Pakistan, when we read every day in the newspapers reports of the augmentation of the strength of the Pakistani army and of the joint moves, manoeuvres and tactics of Pakistan and China, for a Member of this House to rise here and say that the expenditure on defence must be reduced and this country must go on its knees to find a pea-

[Shri Ravindra Varma]

ceful solution of the problem of aggression, whereas this country must take a bellicose attitude and rattle sabres and talk in the language of blood thirstiness and so on as far as the freedom of Vietnam is concerned, shows an utter disregard of what elementarily and commonly is known as patriotism.

Sir, I shall not dwell more on this question. But the demand that the expenditure on defence should be reduced would come from many quarters, as I said I would not be surprised if the United States of America and the World Bank too demand that expenditure on our defence should be reduced as a condition for aid. If this happens, I think our Government would be put to the severest test; if it reneges on the primary responsibility of this country for ordering its own defence, it will be betraying the interests of this country for a mess of pottage. The people of this country today want the Government to defend security and integrity of this country, with the sympathy and assistance of the whole world, if possible, with such assistance as it can receive but without assistance if the alternative is surrender to the enemy.

I shall not dwell on this question longer. My hon. friend opposite referred to what he called a revision of policy regarding the public sector. He tried to give the impression that the Government had panicked and surrendered to private interests, to international monopoly capital—choice phrases which I have learnt at the feet of the master. He tried to give the impression that the public sector is being folded up, that our hon. Minister of Planning has offered a doormat for American capital to wipe its feet on before entering and settling itself in this country.

14 hrs.

It is all very well to use a plethora of phrases, but what exactly is it that the Planning Minister has done or the Government has done? Well, my hon. friend opposite may talk of gynaecological jargon and phrases used by the Minister of Planning. The hon. Member from Farrukhabad may say आपकी शक्ल से हमको दुश्मनी है शिकायत है but the question is where exactly has there been a change or abridgement or reversal of policy? It is necessary, when this House is asked to condemn, to censure, and to send out this Government, at least to say where exactly there has been change. Has the public sector been abridged? Has the Industrial Policy Resolution been amended? Has the Government said that it is not in favour of strong measures for the control of the concentration of wealth? It is not enough if a blanket allegation is thrown at the person of the Minister.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair (Quilon): What have they done?

Shri Ravindra Varma: It is for you to say what they have not done. Whatever has been done in this country, unfortunately my hon. friend from Quilon will know, has been done by this Government.

An hon. Member: Including devaluation.

Shri Ravindra Varma: When the hon. Member opposite has chance to be in Government, we will have the opportunity to watch how he functions. Perhaps he will not give us an opportunity because he might not believe in democracy.

Sir, the hon. Member opposite, Prof. Ranga, cut a very sorry figure. He is the leader of a very important party in this country.

An hon. Member: Not an important party.

Shri Ravindra Varma: An important democratic party. Well, if you say it is not important, I may agree with you to an extent but as one of the democratic parties in the opposition, his party is important, and that is why his party is the main party there.

Shri Solanki (Kaira): There is no other party except your party.

Shri Ravindra Varma: My hon. friend can dispute later. Unfortunately, what Prof. Ranga said boiled down to this: we know that you will be there, we cannot get you out, we cannot turn you out, we are going before the electorate but we know that you will be returned, but please for Heaven's sake ensure a place for us too in your Government. You need not nod your head. I have got the script of Mr. Ranga's speech with me. He said: I am willing to accept the present Prime Minister; I know you will come back, I am willing to accept the present Prime Minister, but let there be a national Government. What does it mean? It means: you rule, but let me also have a finger in the pie.

Shri Solanki: Certainly not.

Shri Ravindra Varma: If Mr. Ranga wants a finger in the pie, then there are other means of petitioning for a pie, and petitioning for a finger in the pie is not done by asking the House to censure the Government.

Sir, the opposition should be respected in democracy. We believe in democracy. In spite of what the opposition sometimes says, we believe that they also believe that we believe in democracy.

Shri Solanki: Very generous of you.

Shri Ravindra Varma: Not very generous, honest.

If we do not believe in democracy, the hon. Members opposite may be somewhere else, might have been somewhere else. But we believe in democracy. Therefore, it pains us to see that the opposition has to indulge in this periodic parliamentary acrobatics. There is no agreement among the opposition on what to condemn. There is no alternative policy or set of policies that the opposition has to place before the House. There is no alternative focal centre of thought, action or leadership. Every one of them is agreed that they are aggrieved that they are not in power, and each of them is anxious to be in power.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: We agree you are in power.

Shri Ravindra Varma: You are disillusioned by your repeated failures to receive public support. Disarrayed by their own differences, they talk of the fact that when we go to the General election at the end of this year, it might be that they still may not come back in a majority. As the election approaches, it seems that they themselves are sensing that their antics have not paid any dividends for them with the people, that they are not likely to be returned. Hence the glimpse of disillusionment in them, disillusionment with the process of the ballot box and of democracy and the threat, no longer surreptious or vieled, but open threat to use other means to come to power.

Sir, I am concluding. When the hon. Members of the opposition, some of them at least, therefore, say that they hear the voices of the people in the different parts of the country ,that the people want this Government to go, that therefore it might be necessary to organise the discontent of the people to ensure that democracy is aided to assert itself, one wonders what is behind this. Perhaps, the no-confidence move, this period exercise of bringing no-confidence motions before the House is indulged in by the opposition only to prevent an erosion of self-confidence. Periodically it appears to them, each of them, that they have no chance and there is an erosion of self-confidence, and then to bolster each other's self-confidence, they all get together and say: let us condemn this Government, let us condemn this Government so that we may convince ourselves that there is much that is wrong, much to hope for in the future. Perhaps hearing others in similar plight bewailing their woes and promising retribution will have a tonic effect on the opposition and help them to face the forthcoming election and the impending disillusionment that awaits them at the hands of the poeple. Sir, I urge the House to reject his motion.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (बिजनौर) : उपाध्यक्ष जी, अर्थ तन्त्र चाणक्य के शब्दों में किसी भी देश की रीढ़ की हड्डी होती है और उसको हिलाना देश के भविष्य को अंधकार में डालना है । स्वतन्त्रता के पश्चात् दो बार हमको रुपये की कीमत कम करनी पड़ी है । पहली बार 1949 में जब हमने रुपये की कीमत 44 प्रतिशत घटाई । 20 सितम्बर, 1949 से ले कर 31 मार्च 1965 तक जो हमने आयात और निर्यात दूसरे देशों के साथ किया उसकी कुल मिला कर कीमत 25,306.5 करोड़ रुपये बैठती है । अगर तसवीर के इस पहलू को देखा जाये कि 44 प्रतिशत कीमत रुपये की उस समय न घटाई गई होती तो इस 25,306.5 करोड़ के ऊपर जो हमें लाभ होना था वह बहुत अधिक होता । लेकिन 44 प्रतिशत रुपये की कीमत घटाने का परिणाम यह हुआ कि पिछले इन वर्षों में 11,134·86 करोड़ रु० की हानि देश को हुई ।

अब दुबारा हमको रुपये की कीमत 1966 में घटानी पड़ी है और इसकी कीमत 57.5 प्रतिशत कम की गई है । अगर इन दोनों का जोड़ लिया जाए 1949 के 44 प्रतिशत को और 1966 के 57.5 प्रतिशत को, जो रुपये की कीमत कम की गई है तो इन दोनों को मिला कर जोड़ बैठता है 82.8 प्रतिशत । अगले पांच वर्षों में सरकार ने जो आयात और निर्यात के अपने आंकड़े तैयार किये हैं उनको आप लीजिये । हर साल हम विदेशों को लगभग 15 हजार करोड़ रुपये का निर्यात करेंगे और लगभग इतने ही करोड़ रुपये का हम आयात करेंगे । सब मिला कर पांच वर्षों में 22,500 करोड़ रुपये का आयात और इतने का ही निर्यात होगा । यानी सब मिला कर यह 45 हजार करोड़ रुपया बैठता है । परन्तु दो बार रुपये की कीमत घटाने का दुष्परिणाम यह हुआ है कि अब रुपये की कीमत केवल 17.2 ही रह गई । आज हम सौ रुपये की कोई भी चीज़ विदेश को निर्यात करेंगे तो उसके बदले में हमें 17.2 विदेशी मुद्रा मिलेगी और जो हम आयात करेंगे उसका परिणाम भी यह होगा कि 17.2, इतने रुपये के बदले में हमको सौ रुपये देने पड़ेंगे । परिणामस्वरूप अगले पांच वर्षों में 14,647 करोड़ रुपये सालाना का घाटा इस देश को होने वाला है । इस हिसाब से देखा जाये तो पता चलेगा कि तसवीर का यह इतना अंधकारमय पहलू है जो प्रत्येक देशवासी के लिये यह चिन्ता का विषय बन जाता है और इस पर हमको गम्भीरता के साथ कुछ सोचना चाहिये ।

इससे भी बढ़ कर देश के लिये जो एक बड़ी और भयंकर बात है और जिसके कारण बड़ा भयंकर भविष्य दिखाई दे रहा है वह है, इन सब की पूर्ति करने के लिये हमें नोट भी अधिक मात्रा में छापने पड़े हैं । 1949 में जब हमने रुपये की कीमत घटाई थी उससे पहले आठ अरब रुपये के नोट हमारे देश में चलते थे लेकिन रुपये की कीमत घटने के बाद नोटों की संख्या बढ़ कर बारह अरब रुपये हो गई । उसके बाद जब गोल्ड कंट्रोल हुआ 1962 में तो उनकी संख्या बढ़ कर पच्चीस अरब हो गई । और अब 1966 में 48 अरब रुपये के नोट इस देश मे चल रहे हैं । इन सत्रह सालों में यह संख्या बढ़ कर लगभग छः गुनी हो गई है ।

देश के अर्थ तन्त्र को अन्धकार में डालने वाली इससे भी एक बड़ी बात यह है कि हम जो खर्च करते जा रहे हैं, वे प्रायः इस प्रकार के हैं जिनसे रिटर्न बहुत कम हो रही है । उदाहरण के लिये हैवी इलैक्ट्रिकल्ज, भोपाल, में हमने 63 करोड़ रुपये की पूंजी लगाई है, लेकिन हमको उस से प्रति-वर्ष जो आय होती है, वह केवल 6 करोड़ रुपये के लगभग है । इसी प्रकार रांची के कारखानों पर भारत सरकार ने 124 करोड़ रुपये के लगभग पूंजी लगाई है, लेकिन उससे रिटर्न होता है 14 करोड़ रुपये के लगभग ।

सरकार की पूंजी किस प्रकार के कार्यों में लगती है, इसका एक बहुत बड़ा उदाहरण अभी कुछ दिन पहले परिवहन मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री श्री पुनाचा, ने विज्ञान भवन में अपने कर्मचारियों की एक सभा में दिया। उन्होंने बताया कि इस देश की निजी हवाई कम्पनियों का राष्ट्रीयकरण करके 1953 में जिस इंडियन एयरलाइन्ज कारपोरेशन का निर्माण किया गया, 1961 तक उस कार्पोरेशन को 5.08 लाख रुपये की हानि हुई और वह हानि सरकार ने ऋण दे कर पूरी की। इस प्रकार के कार्पोरेशन्ज और अन्य संस्थायें अब भी बराबर इस देश में चल रही हैं। इन अनुत्पादक व्ययों के आधार पर हम किस प्रकार अपने देश के अर्थ तन्त्र को मजबूत रख सकेंगे ?

रिजर्व बैंक का कहना है कि निजी उद्योग-पति एक रुपया लगा कर साल के बाद उस से 1 रुपये 20 पैसे का लाभ कमाते हैं, लेकिन सरकारी कारखानों में जो रुपया लगा हुआ है, उस में एक रुपये के बदले केवल 50 पैसे का लाभ होता है। जिस समय देश में ऐसी स्थिति है, तब श्री अशोक मेहता चौथी पंच-वर्षीय योजना में पब्लिक सेक्टर को 1600 करोड़ रुपया और देने जा रहे हैं और वह अनुमान यह करते हैं कि 1966 में जो रुपये की जो कीमत घटानी पड़ी, उसके बाद शायद रुपये की कीमत नहीं घटानी पड़ेगी।

देश में उत्पादन का इस से अधिक अंधकार मय चित्र और क्या हो सकता है कि पिछले दस वर्षों में भारत के उत्पादन की गति इंडोनेशिया को छोड़ कर एशिया के देशों में सब से कम रही है। सब से ज्यादा उत्पादन जापान में हुआ, जहां 10 प्रतिशत की वृद्धि हुई।

हमारे पड़ोसी राष्ट्र, पाकिस्तान ने भी हमसे अधिक उत्पादन किया, अर्थात् पिछले दस वर्षों में उसके उत्पादन में 4.4 प्रतिशत की वृद्धि हुई, जब कि भारत में केवल 3.3 प्रतिशत की वृद्धि हुई। मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि आखिर इन तीन योजनाओं से हमारे देश को क्या लाभ हुआ।

हमारी इच्छा है कि हम अपने अर्थ-तंत्र को संभाल पायें, हमारी यह रीढ़ की हड्डी किसी तरह न हिले और हमारा देश आगे बढ़ता चला जाये। मेरा अपना विचार यह है कि सरकार ने यह जो अवमूल्यन का तूफानी और गम्भीर निर्णय लिया है, उसके बाद अगर हमने अपने आयात को नहीं बढ़ाया, और आयात को बढ़ाने के लिये देश में उत्पादन के साधनों को नहीं बढ़ाया, और उत्पादन के साधनों को बढ़ाने के लिये टैक्सों और लाइसेंसों की पद्धति में परिवर्तन नहीं किया तो मेरा यह निश्चित मत है कि देश में एक भयंकर स्थिति फिर उत्पन्न हो जायेगी और भविष्य में उस समय जो सरकार होगी, उस को फिर उसी प्रकार का निर्णय लेने के लिये विवश होना पड़ेगा।

ऐसी स्थिति से देश को बचाने का सब से अच्छा उपाय यह हो सकता है कि सरकार अपने खर्चों में कटौती करे। अच्छा तो यह था कि जिस समय अवमूल्यन का प्रश्न देश के सामने आया, तो यह सरकार उन देशभक्तों से इस बारे में विचार विमर्श करती, जिन्होंने इस देश को स्वतन्त्र कराने में अपना योगदान किया था। इसके साथ साथ सरकार श्री देशमुख से लेकर श्री टी० टी० कृष्णमाचारी तक देश के पहले तीन वित्त मंत्रियों से, जिन्होंने अवमूल्यन का विरोध किया, और कांग्रेस अध्यक्ष, श्री कामराज से, जो इससे सहमत नहीं थे, उन से भी बातचीत करती और उनकी राय से लाभ उठाने का प्रयत्न करती। इसके अतिरिक्त सरकार इस देश की जनता के प्रतिनिधि संगठन, लोक सभा, से भी इस बारे में पूछ सकती थी। जिस

[श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

प्रकार कोई और विपत्ति आने पर सरकार लोक सभा के सामने आती है, उसी प्रकार सरकार अवमूल्यन के प्रश्न पर भी लोक सभा के सामने आ सकती थी। सरकार संसद के सदस्यों से कहती कि हमारे सामने दो विकल्प हैं : एक तो यह है कि रुपये की कीमत घटाई जाये और दूसरा यह है कि जिस तरह देश ने चीन के साथ लड़ाई में और पाकिस्तान के साथ संघर्ष में त्याग किया, उसी तरह अब भी देश त्याग करने के लिये तैयार हो। इसका परिणाम यह होगा कि कुछ मदों और कामों में कटौती करनी पड़ेगी। मैं आपको विश्वासपूर्वक कहता हूं कि अगर सरकार ने खुले मन से देश के सामने यह प्रश्न उपस्थित किया होता, तो देश त्याग करने के लिये तैयार हो जाता, लेकिन वह रुपये की कीमत घटाने के लिये कभी तैयार न होता।

लेकिन प्रश्न यह है कि क्या इतना गम्भीर निर्णय लेने के बावजूद अब भी सरकार की नीतियों और कार्यों में किसी प्रकार का कोई परिवर्तन हुआ है। सरकार ने ख़र्चों में कठौती करने का प्रस्ताव रखा है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी ने इतनी बार विभिन्न मदों में बचत करने के जो सुझाव दिये, क्या सरकार ने उनके अनुसार कार्यवाही की। उदाहरण के लिये पिछले पांच वर्षों से पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी बराबर अपनी रिपोर्ट्स में यह कहती आ रही है कि सोशल वैलफेयर बोर्ड पर अंधा-धुंध पैसा ख़र्च किया जाता है। अब तक इस बोर्ड पर 20 करोड़ रुपया ख़र्च किया गया है। यह बोर्ड न तो कहीं रजिस्टर्ड है, न कहीं मान्यता-प्राप्त है और न ही इसका कोई वैधानिक स्वरूप (स्टेटस) है। पब्लिक एकाउंट्स कमेटी की पिछली रिपोर्ट के बाद सरकार ने इस बोर्ड को अपना वैधानिक स्वरूप निश्चित करने के लिए कहा। बोर्ड ने इसके लिए जून, 1966 तक की अवधि मांगी और बाद में इस अवधि को दो महीने के लिए और बढ़ाया गया। लेकिन आप यह सुन कर आश्चर्य करेंगे कि जिस बोर्ड की अवधि अगस्त, 1966 तक की है, उस के चैयरमेन की अवधि अप्रैल, 1967 तक की है, अर्थात् जब बोर्ड नहीं भी होगा, उस वक्त उसका चैयरमैन जरूर होगा। क्या इस आधार पर और इस नीति पर चल कर सरकार अवमूल्यन से होने वाली हानियां को रोक सकेगी ? इसी प्रकार सामुदायिक विकास मंत्रालय की स्थिति क्या है ? क्या हम यह नहीं जानते कि इस मंत्रालय द्वारा इस ग़रीब देश की जनता का पैसा बुरी तरह बरबाद हो रहा है ?

इसके अतिरिक्त मुझे अच्छी तरह से जानकारी है कि आज से तीन साल पहले आडिटर-जनरल ने आडिट रिपोर्ट में एक पैरा दिया था, जिसको किसी प्रकार हटवा दिया गया। आडिटर-जनरल का कहना था कि जिन मिनिस्टरों को 1500, 1700 या 2200 रुपये तन्ख़वाह मिलती है, उन की तन्ख़वाह 5000 या 6000 रुपये कोई एक तन्ख़वाह निश्चित कर दी जाये और उसके बाद उनको कह दिया जाय कि इससे ज्यादा उन की कोठी, कार, बिजली और पानी आदि पर कोई ख़र्च नहीं हो सकेगा। लेकिन आज क्या स्थिति है ? त्याग का नाम लेकर कहा जाता है कि मिनिस्टरों को केवल 2200 रुपये मिलते हैं, लेकिन एक एक मिनिस्टर पर इसके अतिरिक्त नौ, दस हजार रुपये महीना और ख़र्च होते हैं।

सरकार इस देश की ग़रीब जनता से त्याग करने की अपील करती है, लेकिन इससे पहले स्वयं उसको देश के सामने त्याग का उदाहरण उपस्थित करना पड़ेगा। अगर श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी में किसी प्रकार का साहस है, तो देश से त्याग करने की अपेक्षा करने से पहले वह त्याग का प्रारम्भ अपनी सरकार से करें और उन्होंने जो 59 आदमियों का मंत्रिमंडल

बना रखा है, उस के स्थान पर नौ दस आदमियों की छोटी केबिनेट बनायें । वह यहां से खर्च को घटाना शुरू करे । सरदार प्रताप सिंह कैरों जब 27 आदमियों की केबिनेट को नौ आदमियों की केबिनेट बना कर पंजाब का प्रशासन मजबूती के साथ चला सकते थे, तो मैं नहीं समझता कि श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी इस प्रकार का आदर्श क्यों नहीं उपस्थित कर सकतीं ।

सरकार देश से तो त्याग की आशा करती है, लेकिन स्वयं त्याग का कोई कार्य नहीं करना चाहती और अपने खर्च को कम नहीं करना चाहती । इसका परिणाम है कि आज हम पर विदेशी ऋण का इतना बोझ लद गया है कि मुझे भय है कि यह देश गिरवी न रखा जाय, हालांकि एक भूखे और बीमार हाथी को गिरवी रखना भी कौन पसन्द करेगा । आज जो स्थिति देश में उत्पन्न हो रही है, उसका फल अगली पीढ़ी को और न जाने कितनी पीढ़ियों को भुगतना पड़ेगा ।

विदेशी मुद्रा की स्थिति के सम्बन्ध में मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि आज जो 48 अरब रुपये के करेंसी नोट चल रहे हैं, अगर सरकार समझदारी से काम करे, तो इसमें 18 अरब रुपये की बचत वह एक महीने में कर सकती है । इसका उपाय क्या है ? योजना मंत्री यहां पर बैठे हुए हैं । मैं आपके द्वारा इसका उपाय उनको बताना चाहता हूं ।

आज हमारे दूतावासों पर जो खर्च की भरमार हो रही है, जिस के बारे में इस लोक सभा में और आडिट रिपोर्ट में बार बार कहा गया है, सरकार को उसको पहले चैक करना चाहिये । इसके अतिरिक्त सरकार अनावश्यक विदेश-यात्राओं पर प्रतिबन्ध लगाए । और भी इसी प्रकार जिन चीजों के बिना यह देश अपना गुजारा कर सकता है, विदेशों से उनके आयात पर सख्ती से प्रतिबन्ध लगाया जाना चाहिये । मैं समझता हूं कि इस प्रकार से सरकार को कम से कम छः अरब रुपये की बचत हो सकती है ।

जो भारतीय व्यापारी विदेशों में जाकर व्यापार करते हैं, वे अपनी पूंजी को इस देश में लाना चाहते हैं, लेकिन सरकार ने इस बारे में जो शर्तें लगाई हुई हैं, उनके कारण वे ऐसा नहीं कर पा रहे हैं । सरकार ,उनको अपनी पूंजी यहां लाने के लिए उचित सुविधा नहीं दे रही है । अगर सरकार उन लोगों को उचित सुविधायें दे, तो लगभग छः अरब की पूंजी हमारे यहां आ सकती है ।

जो विदेशी व्यापारी यहां पर काम करने के लिए अपनी पूंजी लगाना चाहते हैं, अगर उनको मुनासिब सुविधायें दी जायें, तो छः अरब रुपये की मुद्रा हमारे देश में और आ सकती है ।

अगर सरकार ये पग उठाने को प्रस्तुत हो, तो कुल मिला कर 18 अरब रुपये की करेंसी के नोटों का प्रचलन बन्द हो सकता है और इस प्रकार हमारे देश में भारी मात्रा में कैसे करेन्सी के नोट 48 अरब से घट कर 30 अरब रुपये के रह सकते हैं ।

जहां तक हमारी विदेशी नीति की असफलता का प्रश्न है, मैं समझता हूं कि उसके लिए कोई बहुत बड़ा उदाहरण देने की जरूरत नहीं है । उस का सब से बड़ा नमूना सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह हैं । उस देश की विदेश नीति कैसी होगी जिसके विदेश मंत्री सरदार स्वर्णसिंह हैं ? उसी से उसका अच्छा अनुमान लगाया जा सकता है । अब इस सरकार की स्थिति क्या है ? सरकार करने क्या जा रही है ? उपाध्यक्ष जी, सरकार ने अवमूल्यन किया पश्चिमी राष्ट्रों के चक्कर में आ कर के और मैं अपनी निश्चित सूचना के आधार पर यह आपसे कहना चाहता हूं कि यह सरकार रूस और दूसरे देशों के चक्कर में आकर के काश्मीर का समझौता अब करने जा रही है । केवल चुनाव तक रुकी हुई है । रुपये की कीमत घटायी पश्चिमी राष्ट्रों के चक्कर में आकर और काश्मीर का सौदा कर देंगे रूस और दूसरे देशों के चक्कर में । आखिर, जयप्रकाश नारायण शेख अब्दुल्ला से क्या बातचीत करने के लिए गये हैं ? वह आकर क्या कहेंगे ? यही न,

[श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री]

कि शेख अब्दुल्ला के विचारों में परिवर्तन आया है । जय प्रकाश नारायण आकर के यह कहेंगे और उसके बाद शेख अब्दुल्ला को यह छोड़ेंगे । उस का परिणाम काश्मीर में क्या होने जा रहा है ? कल कांग्रेस पार्टी की मीटिंग में क्या हुआ ? मुझे खुशी है कि कांग्रेस पार्टी के मेम्बर भले ही यहां दब कर कहें लेकिन सेंट्रल हाल में कुछ खुल जाते हैं और वहां बैठ कर कभी कभी अपनी आत्मा की आवाज कह देते हैं । आज से छः महीने पहले कहा गया था कि बख्शी गुलाम मोहम्मद और गुलाम मुहम्मद सादिक के झगड़ों को निपटाया जाये । एक ओर काश्मीर के ऊपर अरबों रुपया बहाया जा रहा है और दूसरी ओर काश्मीर के अन्दर राजनीतिक संघर्ष चल रहे हैं । मेरे पास यहां कई एक पुस्तकें हैं । एक पुस्तक कल गुप्ता जी ने दिखायी । यह पूरी की पूरी पुस्तकें वहां क्लासों के अन्दर पढ़ायी जाती हैं जिनके माध्यम से वहां के बच्चों को सिखाया जा रहा है कि काश्मीर हिन्दुस्तान का नहीं है, इस के ऊपर जबर्दस्ती हिन्दुस्तान वालों ने कब्जा किया है और यहां आ कर के काश्मीर को बराबर लूटते रहे हैं और इन पुस्तकों के अन्दर रूस के और न जाने कहां कहां के गीत हैं । ..... (व्यवधान) रखवा लीजिये टेबल पर । इससे क्या स्थिति बनने वाली है ? इसके बाद क्या हम अपनी स्थिति को बचा सकते हैं ? अब अगर देश को बचाना है, तो सरकार अपना निश्चित मत बनाये । इस प्रकार की गलतियों को रोके और रोकने के बाद उस दृष्टि से चले जिस दृष्टि से देश के भविष्य को बना सकते हैं और जिससे देश को स्वतन्त्रता संभल सकती है, मैं उम्मीद करता हूं कि मैंने जो बातें कही हैं, उन पर सरकार गहराई के साथ सोचेगी ।

Shri Jashvant Mehta (Bhavnagar): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I stand before the House to oppose the no-confidence motion. I have been hearing the speeches of the hon. Members of the Opposition and I feel like speaking out, "what a problem of paradoxes and what a bundle of contradictions?" We heard Prof. Mukerjee, his party was never tired of abusing Mahatma Gandhi as a running dog of British imperialism, a party for whom violance, sabotage and subversion is an article of faith. This leader of the C.P.I. ran into raptures by extolling the virtues of non-violence.

We saw Prof. Ranga, the veteran ex-Kisan movement leader in this country, coming out as the champion of free enterprise and vested interests. The other day we heard Shri Masani. He spoke on the economic situation. This man who has reconsidered his socialism seems to have reconsidered all his values. I feel like speaking out, "what a great fall, my countrymen?"

Let us understand and examine what they say. They want a holiday in Planning. They want a reduction in taxes. They want to do away with foreign aid and foreign loans. They want to scrap public sector. They want a free hand for private enterprise. They want labour to be exploited. Let me tell my friends Shri Masani and Prof. Ranga to be a little honest in public dealings. Prof. Ranga's party is making a bid for power in Gujarat and Shri Masani is also elected from Gujarat. I will tell them that the Swatantra party is never tired of shouting, "We want the Narmada project; we want the Ukai project; we want thermal power station." Do these people realise that with a holiday in Plan, there will be a holiday in all these projects? Let Prof. Ranga and Shri Masani declares that they want a holiday in planning and therefore want to put all these projects in cold storage for the next five years. If they will tell this to the electorate of Gujarat, they will give the verdict; they will say that "you are championing the cause day in and day out, for the Narmada project and other projects, but you are telling in Parliament that the Plan should be

put in cold storage for the next five years."

Shri Solanki: The Gujarat Government has failed in it; not the Swatantra party. (*Interruption*).

Shri Jashvant Mehta: Gujarat is a land of oil and gas. It is going to be a prosperous area and I have not yet known of a single private entrepreneur who is interested in research and exploration of oil and natural gas. Before the creation of the Oil and Natural Gas Commission, the field for exploration was wide open for all. But let us face the facts. No private entrepreneur is interested in fundamental research and the basic industries. They want money and quick profits. I would advise my hon. friend Shri Masani to remember that Rome was not built in a day; nations are not built in a day. Shri Masani knows that the Narmada project is the lifeline for the development of Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan. He also knows that this project will require a capital outlay of Rs. 1,000 crores and it will take 15 years to be completed if it is executed diligently and properly.

If the Plan is scrapped and the public sector is to be jettisoned, who is going to construct and build these projects? The Swatantra party is a combination of feudal elements, capitalists and bureaucrats and it is a bunch of reactionaries. It has no policy on basic issues like language or Kashmir. Recently, its party leader Mr. C. C. Desai, who is an ex-service man and who joined this party, spoke in Ahmedabad press conference. What did he say? I quote:

> "India could not insist on the sanctity of the instrument of accession in Kashmir after having trampled on it in Junagadh."

While reading this, I felt that the Swatantra party has gifted another Bhutto to India. One was there as the Foreign Minister of Pakistan. Thank God he has gone away. But now we have another Bhutto in Mr. C. C. Desai. He speaks a language which Mr. Bhutto spoke in the United Nations, abusing India. When Mr. Desai was asked whether he favoured a division of the State along the cease-fire line, Mr. Desai is reported to have said that "the whole country is in favour of it except Mr. Krishna Menon." Can there be a greater travesty of truth?

Our Prime Minister has categorically stated more than once that we desire friendship with Pakistan and seek economic and other co-operation, but we cannot and will not tolerate a second partition of India on religious grounds. Today, it would destroy the very basis of our Indian State. Is this not sufficient to give the lie to Mr. Desai who considers that the whole country is in favour of partition? Let Shri Masani and Ranga and their tribe take note of this: that Brig. Usman and Havildar Abdul Hameed did not die in vain.

The plea of national government was made by Prof. Ranga and a plea for a government of talent was made by Shri Masani. It is a fantastic nonsense. My hon. friend Shri Ravindra Varma has stated that Shri Masani knows it we stand in diametrically opposite camps. We are poles apart. Shri Masani wants the country to be divided. We want the country to be united. Shri Masani wants a holiday in Plan. We want to go ahead with the Plan. He wants freedom for exploitation. We want to put an end to exploitation. He wants to play "American in Delhi" like "American in Paris." We want to be Indians first and last. Therefore, Shri Masani should stop talking of a national government.

Let us come to another thing. In six months, we are going to face the electorate. We see how the opposition groups are trying to have electoral alliances. Jan Sangh is never tired of talking about the sovereignty and integrity of India but love of power makes strange bed fellows. Jan Sangh seeks electoral alliances with the Swatantra Party. But their policies are inimical to each other.

(Shri Jashvant Mehta.)

Jan Sangh wants to fight a war over Kashmir, but Swatantra Party wants to surrender it. Jan Sangh wants Hindi as the national language here and now. Swatantra leader Rajaji wants English as the national language. The Swatantra party has aligned with DMK in the south and the Jan Sangh has aligned with Swatantra Party in Gujarat without any conscience. Unfortunately in this country there is not a single powerful democratic opposition. In democracy, we want a powerful opposition. These splinter groups cannot deliver the goods.

There is another alliance on the left side. Mr. Madhu Limaye, the SSP leader, is forming another united left front. He had written a book *Communist Party—Facts and Fiction* in which he warned our country about the true character of the communists and the conspiracy to subvert the foundations of our freedom. These political alliances will not be able to deliver the goods. They want confusion and chaos in this country. The average Indian citizen has got robust commonsense. They do not want confusion and chaos; they want economic stability and prosperity. We, in the Congress, want to fight this confusion and chaos.

We are faced on our borders with two enemies. Our difficulties are both external and internal. We are facing two hostile neighbours—China and Pakistan. Despite the Panchsheel and Tashkent agreement, we have the misfortune of having to face the hostility of both these neighbours. Last year we had an armed conflict with Pakistan. We did not seek it; it was imposed on us and we passed through it creditably. This has caused a great strain on our economic resources and on our development. In these circumstances, we have to face the double challenge of defence and development. Our victory over Pakistan was doubtless brought about by the brilliant strategy of our Generals and the heroism of our jawans, but it was also a triumph socialistic planning. But for Jawaharlal Nehru's insistence on developing heavy industry, we would not have been in a position to resist Pakistan's on slaught, backed by the vaunted Patton tanks and Sabre jets. Steel is the barometer of a country's industrial strength. Our *per capital* production of steel is 14 kg. against Pakistan's 7. Our oil products come to 765 crore litres against Pakistan's 187; our production of electric power is 2464 crore kws. against Pakistan's 208; our production of cement is 93,60,000 tons against Pakistan's 15,03,000; our production of sulphuric acid is 5,68,000 tons against Pakistan's 19,000. We have 11,652 locomotives against Pakistan's 1,362. All these figures show where Pakistan stands and where we stand. If there was no planning, if the three five year plans were not there, these achievements would not have been possible. All our defence preparations were helpful in fighting against China and Pakistan. Our friends who are crying that plans should be curbed and industrial development should not be done would not have been able to fight Pakistan and China on this defence and development front. Both these things—defence and development—must go together. The Plan must be taken up seriously and carried to the successful end.

Shri Mohammed Koya (Kozhikode): Sir, for the last three days we were hearing sermons on democracy from the ruling party. We also believe in democracy, but we do not believe in the democracy of Shri Satya Narayan Sinha—the democracy of wits and counter-wits, tricks and counter-tricks. We do not believe in the democracy of Shri Azad who wants all opposition to be curtailed. We do not believe in the democracy of Mr. Nanda, who has arrested a great leader of Gujarat, Mr. Indulal Yajnik, who is more popular than the gentleman who has just sat down.

We believe in a democracy where the ruling party is criticised in a con-

structive manner by the opposition. They call the no-confidence motion a periodical exercise. Even if it is so, what is wrong. It is a weapon in the hands of the opposition where we get an opportunity in this House to criticise the policies of the Government. They are afraid that their policies will be exposed. They were telling us about the heterogeneous character of the opposition parties. I know, we have not got an opposition as in Great Britain. But in a way the Congress itself is responsible for it, because they would not allow opposition to show in this country. They have got black money. Thep have got loaves and fishes of office to distribute and take away people from the opposition. They are taking people from the Swatantra, Jan Sangh and many from the Muslim League also. They can bring official pressure and ministerial pressure. They have got licences and permits to distribute. They see to it that the leaders in the opposition are whisked away overnight. Shri Pattom Thanu Pillai, who was the leader of the PSP in Kerala was offered governship and was whisked away. Similarly, Shri Asoka Mehta, who was a PSP leader, was made the Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission.

They were telling the House that the opposition parties are divided into Washington patriots, Moscow patriots and China patriots and there are no Indian patriots. But these are the people who are going with a begging bowl through every Washington street for some flour and loaf and they call the opposition members as Washington patriots. By paying 25 paise, members of the Swatantra Party join the Congress and even without a bath they are taken into the Congress and the next day they become good patriots! It is only 25 paise worth patriotism.

They were saying that Mr. Mukherjee's speech was cancelled by Mr. Ranga's speech and Mr. Ranga's speech was cancelled by Mr. Gopalan's speech. I heard Mr. S. K. Patil's speech. I thought it was originally intended for the Chowpatty Beach. That speech was cancelled by the speech of Mr. Krishna Menon. If you delete the words "I oppose the motion" and the musical lines about Vietnam, what is the difference in their speeches? They say the opposition is heterogeneous, but the Congress is a Parabrahma; everybody is there. Hindu Maha Sabhites are there, Jan Sanghis are there, progressive people like Shri Malaviya and Krishna Menon—so-called progressive people—are there, Swatantra-minded people Patil and others are there —all sorts of people are there (Interruption). Yes, Shri Sheo Narain is their SSP. Therefore, all kinds of people combined together, Congress is heteregeneous.

They were asking, where have you got the votes to defeat us? Even if we have not got the votes, as long as you are there as Congressmen sometimes we can defeat you. Many of them will cross the floor if something that they do not like happens. If we could move a no-confidence motion at that time when the Congress was under the great leadership of a man like Pandit Nehru, now that the Congress has only a Prime Minister who got in the party election a "ho-ball-game ball" majority why can't we do it? I am told the war of succession is still going on. I am told that Shri Kamaraj is angry. Responsible people of the Congress Party like Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha have been saying that the Kamaraj-Prime Minister difference is widening and the war of succession is going on. Therefore, it is possible that the same thing that happened in Kerala might happen here also. In Kerala the Congress had a majority. We moved a no-confidence motion and then many Congress members joined us with the result the Congress majority was broken like a glass. That may happen here also. Simply because we have not got a majority now, do not say it is difficult to defeat the Congress Government.

In 1952, when the Opposition was not very strong, when many Opposition parties like the Swatantra and the DMK had not come in the field, the

[Shri Mohammed Koya]

Congress had no majority in the State of Madras. Then Shri Rajagopalachari was brought from his house where he was resting and he was asked to lead the Congress Ministry with the support of the Communal Party, the Tailers Party and the Muslim League Party. If we could do that when the people were not very much educated if we could do that when the Congress Party was at its peak of glory after fighting for independence, if in 1952 we could defeat the Congress, will it be difficult for us to do that in 1967? It can be done. In the State of Kerala, what was their majority in 1952? What was the majority in 1957? What was the position in the last elections? Let them not think that because they are getting a majority every year this majority will last for ever and the people will always have faith even in their misrule, misdeeds, malpractices and corruption. Our people are not fools.

What happened in the State of Kerala? There are 48 seats from Malabar area. Will the hon. Members belonging to the Congress Party deny, when I tell them that they got only one seat from Ponani, which we lost through inadvertence, and one in Manjeshwar, because of the language trouble, and all the other 46 seats the Congress lost? By God's Grace, this time even those two seats will be taken away from them. This is the position.

Let them not think they cannot be ousted. Let them not think they will always be in power. India was not created for the Congress to rule. Congress is not the only one party. There are other parties also in this country. Let them not say that they will always be there and they cannot be ousted.

About the financial policy of the Government, much has been said. I do not want to add anything to the heap of literature that has been published in this country about the follies of the Government. They say, devaluation was inevitable. I do not say devaluation was wrong. But who was responsible for bringing the country into this mess. The Congress people say, do you not get a project? there? Are we not planning? We were told in the morning that the Cochin Shipyard may come in 1972. They say, but for them the country would not have made any progress. We have seen what is the progress they have made. The British Government used to ask: 'if we leave, what will happen?' Gandhiji used to tell them: 'you leave India and India will look after itself. Therefore, do not worry. If you leave, the country will not go to dogs. The country will go on. You had all the opportunities. You had the legacy of the British Government. You had a very good and efficient bureaucracy. With all that you have brought the country into this mess, and you were responsible for devaluing the currency. It is due to the policy of the Government. We are told that because of the Chinese aggression or the Pakistani attack all these things had to be done. That is not the case. All these things have hapened because of the misdeeds, malpractices and ill planning of the Government.

I was wondering why when we were criticising the Government the Congress Members also stood up and critised the bureaucracy, criticised the officials. They said the officials are responsible for all this. Leave the poor officials alone. Get hold of your own Ministers. I know you are doing a little bit in your own party circles, you are giving them some headache. Do not blame the officials for everything. Even in the Bhoothalingam affair, I differ from the attitude taken by many Members. They ought to have brought to book the Minister concerned.

When I was a student in the fifth class, we had a lesson "The benefits of British Administration". There it was said: "We gave you the Railways, we gave you electricity, we gave you this and we gave you that, and therefore the logic was that the British Gov-

ernment must remain. In the same way, these people are saying, that a Government which could not give drinking water to all the villagers in India even after ruling this country for 19 years must continue. They are claiming that they have done something. A Government which could not provide two meals to the millions of people in the country after ruling this country for 19 years, even after making this country go through three Five Year Plans, is claiming that it has done something for the country. In my State, we were given a promise by the hon. Minister of State—he also comes from our State—that at least during the Onam festival we will be given an ounce more of rice. But we are now told that our rations may be reduced. This is all due to the policy of the Government.

Sir, they have not replied to any of the points that have been raised by the Opposition as far as devaluation is concerned. Hearing their speeches I was sometimes thinking whether we were sitting in the American Parliament or the Russian Parliament, because the policy of America was debated here, the policy of Russia was debated. But the most wonderful thign or the most humorous think about it is, the Communist Members were quoting Gandhiji and the Congress Members were quoting Lenin. That was really the irony of it. That is peaceful coexistence!

I will just quote what the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce have said. They have got some knowledge about economic matters They have said:

> "Our economy has been ailing for a long time. There has been much unproductive spending on the part of the Government. Industry was not operating to full capacity. Agricultural production actually decines and prices have been rising."

About the prices I may add, our prices rose much more than the rise in other countries. In the last five years prices rose by only 2 per cent in Japan, 7 per cent in Germany, 12.4 per cent in Pakistan, 8.7 per cent in Venezuela as compared to 32 per cent in India. They were telling about the progress that we have made. Compared to other countries, Shri A. K. Sen our ex-Minister of Law when he was speaking during the last session comparing the figures of our national income, our *per capita* income, said, with all the progress that we have made India is second from the bottom, above Indonesia.

A word about the bandh. My hon. friends, the Congress Members, will be surprised to know that even the Kerala Provincial Congress Committee joined the bandh in Kerala. Even the INTUC members in Kerala could not escape joining the bandh.

Then, Sir, about the question of minorities nothing has been done. The question of Urdu has been hanging fire for many years. Millions of signatures were obtained and a petition was taken to Rashtrapathi's house. Urdu is a language of Indian origin....

Shri A. S. Saigal (Janjgir): You do not speak Urdu.

Shri Mohammed Koya: I do not speak Urdu, I speak English and Malayalam only. But, a man who does not speak Urdu, has the magnanimity or the large-heartedness to plead the cause of Urdu whereas Shri Saigal who can speak in Urdu and who gives his speeches in Urdu is so narrow-minded that he would not allow Urdu to be the official language in Madhya Pradesh.

Shri A. S. Saigal: I support you.

Shri Mohammed Koya: I am very happy that you support me. That means something. But that support alone will not do. The Congress Government must do something better.

Double standards are seen in everything. There were riots in Jamshedpur, Rourkela and Calcutta. But nothing was done to enquire into it. When in places like Banda and others there was trouble, judicial enquiries were

(Shri Mohammed Koya)

ordered. Let them not consider the minorities to be second-class citizens. That is all that I have to say.

Shri Muthyal Rao (Mahbubnagar): Could you really speak Urdu?

Shri Mohammed Koya: I am sorry, I cannot speak Urdu.

Shri Liladhar Kotoki (Nowgong): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I rise to oppose the no-confidence Motion before the House, moved by Shri H. N. Mukerjee. Nobody has taken this Motion seriously, not even the Members of the Opposition, because when we have followed the debate during the last three days we have seen that the only purpose of the mover and the supporters of the no-confidence motion was to prepare themselves for the coming general elections. But in a democracy, in a parliamentary system of Government, the purpose of a no-confidence motion is to seriously endeavour; on a matter of high policy, to criticise the Government and to throw it out, if possible. The Opposition here knows that it is not possible, and, therefore, it has, off and on, in season and out of season, come before the House to move no-confidence motions. About the number of no-confidence motions moved in the House so far, the hon. Member, Shri A. C. Guha, has already given the dates and the fates of those motions. The fate of this motion is also going to be decided the same way this very evening.

Even so, let us see the points that the Opposition has brought before the House in order to justify the no-confidence motion against the Government. The two points that they have mentioned are devaluation and Viet Nam. I need not take up the Viet Nam issue, because that has been dealt with sufficiently. So far as devaluation is concerned, the Opposition has an opportunity of discussing the issue on the substantive motion moved on behalf of the Government. Yet, they wanted to take recourse to the no-confidence motion only, as I said, to seize an opportunity to criticise the Government in a wider field.

Coming to devaluation itself, whether Government could have avoided taking recourse to devaluation has been amply discussed in this House. What is more important for us to consider is, besides the follow-up measures already announced by Government, what more steps should be taken so that the purpose of devaluation is served and our economy is strengthened so that we can go ahead with our development programme without any further trouble. Some of the follow-up actions that have been indicated are necessary corollary to devaluation like restriction on imports, import substitution and increasing production so as to augment export and increase agricultural production.

I will take up one issue where I have to advance a few suggestions for the Government to consider. So far as agricultural production is concerned, we have to admit, and the Government has admitted, that during the Three Five Year Plans it has fallen far short ofthe demand, the requirements of the country. Therefore, I would urge on the Government to take positive steps so that by the end of the Fourth Plan we can get rid of the shame of depending on foreign countries for our food. This I have repeated in this House every year whenever I have participated in the discussion on the Demands of the Ministry of Food and Agriculture and on Planning. I am glad that Government have admitted it and they are taking positive steps.

Here I want to emphasize the urgency of giving the top-most priority to the input of irrigation. So many inputs have been suggested and they sought to be provided. But, of all inputs, irrigation is the primary factor for increasing agricultural production. This can be proved by one simple test. Whenever there is favourable monsoon we have bumper

crop and there is less headache for the Government, so far as food is concerned. But, whenever there is unfavourable monsoon, either too much of rains and floods or drought conditions as we had last year, there is shortage of foodgrains, the entire economy is disturbed and we have to incur huge expenditure on import of foodgrains. This is the real disease of our economy which compelled us to take recourse to devaluation a second time. Therefore, this diagnosis of the disease of our national economy has always to be kept in view, particularly at this time when the Fourth Plan is going to be finalised.

Along with irrigation comes the question of floods. Floods and drought are the two great enemies to agricultural production. Even if we provide irrigation, but do not control floods and allow them to come as happened this year in some parts of the country, whatever crop is grown by the farmers is destroyed by the floods. Therefore, control of floods in such areas where devastation is heavy and provision of irrigation facilities all over the country, particularly in the drought-affected areas, should be given top-most priority. Irrigation facilities should be provided in such areas where they can grow crops, particularly paddy, during the winter months. I think these things are not being attended to with that seriousness at present.

Much has been said about foreign aid. It is true that our foreign exchange position became very serious, our balance of trade became very adverse and so we had to take recourse to devaluation. In the matter of taking further foreign aid we have to see that we take that much of credit that is necessary, firstly, to augment our agriculture and, secondly, to increase the production of such things as can be exported to earn foreign exchange. That is the only sure way we can get out of the present difficulty.

Here I want to mention one thing. One of the follow-up measures is import substitution. We have set up a large number of research laboratories in the country. When we go through the working of the national laboratories we find that the consumer departments have not given encouragement to these laboratories and our research scholars to go ahead with their research projects, to develop our indigenous know-how and, therefore, the import substitution has been very much hampered. Therefore, when we have been faced with this predicament of taking recourse to devaluation, we have seriously to examine as to whether we have fully utilized the national laboratories, whether we have fully utilized the services of the research scholars in these laboratories and, if not, what are the reasons for that.

15 hrs.

There are various instances whereby researches made in these laboratories are sabotaged in a way; that is, while progress is being made in developing indigenous know-how, long-term agreements are entered into with foreign collaborators so that that particular item will never be commercially exploited. There are various instances that we come across in the various laboratories. Particularly from the Estimates Committee's reports on the laboratories that have been submitted to the House last year and year before last we will find that several instances have been pointed out. The Estimates Committee have urged the Government that for the sake of the national economy this matter should be taken up very seriously and in no case, when there is a possibility of developing indigenous know-how, long-term agreements with any foreign collaborators should be allowed to be entered into.

So also there are certain foreign aids which are offered to us. We simply accept them because it has come and we want foreign exchange. There we have to be very cautious now. Even if the particular foreign aid may be wanted and easily available, we must not go in for it if that

(Shri Liladhar Kotoki.)

is going to create an additional burden to us and if it is going to affect the development of our indigenous know-how. This way we shall be able to face this problem with strength and courage.

As regards the fear that many Members have expressed in this House, and also outside, that devaluation will bring further devaluation and so on and so forth, I for one as a student of economics do not fear that such a thing will happen in this country because of the follow-up actions that the Government have proposed. They are very vigilant about it and they will see that no evil effect of devaluation takes place in this country.

Lastly, I will take up the question of holding the price line. It is true that the internal prices should not increase as a result of devaluation but prices have risen and, therefore, very stringent measures should be taken. A proper machinery should be set up not only to hold the price line but to bring the prices down because the prices are already very high.

In this connection I would suggest that so far as essential commodities are concerned, as Government has already begun, for the towns there should be consumer stores and for the rural areas there should be multi-purpose service co-operatives. These are the only two ways whereby we can check the rise in prices. Palliative action in this direction will not solve the problem. A network of this machinery must cover the entire country so that no one is left unserved by the fair price shops and the profiteers and blackmarketeers cannot have a free way as they are having now. We have seen that if there is a rise in taxation by .01 per cent, the price in the market will immediately rise. So also now, even though there is no reason that the prices of internal commodities should rise, the prices have risen. That is the experience of everybody and that is the experience of the Government also although the difference may be in degree, as to how much they have increased.

These are the few suggestions I would like the Government to consider. As I said before, I do not find any point being proved by the Opposition in support of the No-confidence Motion and I have no doubt that this will be thrown out by the House.

Dr. M. S. Aney: Sir, I wish to thank you for giving me an opportunity of making some small observations on the motion that is before the House.

The debate on this No-confidence motion has been likened and characterised by some of my hon. friends on the Congress Benches as an unreal one. What they meant was that when a motion of no-confidence debated in a body like this, the expectation is that at the end of the debate, if it succeeds, there is a change of government and transfer of power; but, so far as this House is concerned, everybody knows that there is a party which commands more than three-fourths majority .....

An hon. Member: Brute majority.

Dr. M. S. Aney: I do not give it the adjective. The total strength of the Opposition itself is very small. Therefore there is no reality introduced in the discussion at all. We know, we have to loss and they know, they have to gain and we have to remain what we are in spite of the arguments that we have used against them and they have to remain where they are for whatever they have hurled against us.

An hon. Member: They are incorrigible.

Dr. M. S. Aney: Therefore, the seriousness which a discussion of a no-confidence motion generally creates is not to be seen. That is a sign of unreality. In spite of that, we have seen—it would appear to anybody who was listening to it very patiently and with understanding—that

most of the Members spoke with a good deal of zeal and feeling about it. When I listened to the first speech which my hon. friend, Shri Mukerjee, made—he is always a brilliant speaker —he rose to special heights of eloquence and appealed to the Members of the opposite side. So also, various other speakers spoke with the same kind of earnestness and zeal. With this kind of earnestness and zeal that is there, we know what the result is going to be.

There is some difference between the position in which the previous debates on the no-confidence motion have been held in this House and this one. In fact, my hon. friend, Shri Mathur, in his characteristic way, said that it is an annual feature. Yes, it is an annual feature. That is true, but there is something more in this debate than that it is an annual feature. The arguments addressed here may or may not impress the Members today in this House on the other benches, but the debate is being held in some peculiar circumstances. Those who are speaking here are speaking not to influence the Members who are sitting here but to influence their masters outside. Let me tell them that. The whole story of charges and counter-charges that has been told here is not with a view to convincing each other here but to tell them that this is being heard and is going to be interpreted after the debate is over all over the country when the election campaign is going to come which will be in a short time. It will be heard and it will be explained all over the country. Every sentence, every allegation made by one party against the other will be explained to them and they will be the persons to determine ultimately the fate of this. You have to face a vote of the people as a result of the discussion that has taken place here. That is the position of this debate. This position should be very well known to our friends there.

This being the case, in my opinion it is very important to see what is the real attitude in which those who have been sent here as representatives of the people try to understand each other when this debate is going on. We are not meeting in ordinary times. We are meeting in rather extraordinary times, when the need for the utmost co-operation and the utmost unity among all the parties is being felt by us. That had been stated several times. I only want to bring that point to the notice of the House which assumed that India is a country without any enemies. We had two invasions on our soil from the two hostile neighbours of ours. They are trying to infringe our sovereignty and territorial integrity and they are also trying to infuse a feeling of disloyalty amongst our people in this country in various places. That is however, in reality the situation in which we are placed today.

Soon after this session is over, we shall be called upon to approach our constituencies and ask for votes, so that after the elections we could form a new Government. The people who have returned us to this House for the past five years should keep in mind the incidents and activities of the Government over the past five years and then come to the conclusion as to what shall be the proper Government to rule this country for the next quinquinnium and whether the Government which has been in charge of the administration for the past five years or even ten years has been of such a nature that they can safely entrust the affairs of the country in the hands of those very people for a further period of 5 years. It is a question which they have to think for themselves and which we have also to think for ourselves.

Let us remember that the need for national solidarity is being keenly felt by us and this is the time when we should seriously think as to what should be the Government that we should have at the end of these five years. I think you will admit that this is the occasion for us to think

[Dr. M. S. Aney]

over this question more seriously than ever before.

We talk of our foreign policy, financial policy, etc. We all realise that some serious mistakes have been made. At the same time we should remember that if proper care is not taken of our finances, then the evil of devaluation will have very far-reaching adverse consequences. If our finances are not properly administered by proper persons hereafter, if the price-line is not properly held, if the exports do not increase to our satisfaction, then there will be only chaos and all the evil consequences of mal-administration will follow. Therefore, we have to see what the experience of the last five years or ten years has been and decide whether those who have been in power should continue to be left in charge of the same or it should be given to others. We all feel like that and I believe that some members on the treasury benches must also be feeling in the same way.

Whenever there was a national emergency or a national crisis, the whole nation stood as one man; though there were differences, in a national emergency they were forgotten and the whole nation stood as one man. That feeling of unity and solidarity has to be restored. We are seeing today that there are several hostile influences around us. This is a time when we have again to think of national unity and national solidarity. We have to think in terms of having a Government, truly representative of the whole nation and not only of a particular party. You may perhaps succeed in getting a larger number of representatives in this House but not the support of the majority of the number of voters of this country. When a national emergency arises, with what face can you approach the Opposition Parties and tell them that they must now come together? Therefore, you must carry these discussions here in such a way not as to widen the gulf between the parties but to understand one another more carefully and more intelligently with a view to coming together and bridge up the gulf. This is an opportunity afforded to us to revise our old ideas, doctrines and dogmas in light of new forces and not from the point of view of party politics saying that this is my party and that is my party, but from truly national point of view.

The Congress is the Party which had got the best of traditions; it is a Party which had been led in the past by man like Mahatma Gandhi; it is a Party which had been led by great and eminent men like Lokamanya Tilak; it is a Party which got freedom for this country; it is a Party which was led by our late Prime Minister; this Party has had leaders who did not have any narrow outlook, but who had an outlook which was universal in spirit. It is in that spirit that we have to look at this problem today. Even after this debate is over in this House, the debate will continue as I have stated before outside the House and throughout the country and the people will be discussing the same problems. So our stand should be such as would enable us to form a Government, truly representative of the people, a national Government. It is not proper to think in terms of Congress Party or this party or that party, but we should think in terms of being Indians, Indians first, Indians second and Indians last. It is in that spirit we must look at this debate. We should approach the electorate so as to bring them together to evolve a cohesive interpretation of our ideas, and unanimously acceptable policies so that it will be possible for the nation to form a truly representative national government, so that this great Indian Republic shall stand united and shall successfully face any emergency that might arise in future.

I thank you for having given me the opportunity to speak.

Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara): As I heard the magnificent and eloquent speech of my hon. friend Shri H. N. Mukerjee in his true Oxford style, my mind went back to our Father and Founder of our great nation, Mahatma Gandhi.

When I was coming back after the end of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference in London, last month, with the little money I had, I had purchased this book at London airport, "Lord Moran on Churchill", which is in my hands, at a cost of 63 shillings.

Shri Manoharan (Madras South): Place it on the Table of the House.

Shrimati Vimla Devi (Eluru) After devaluation, what is the price?

Shri Joachim Alva: There is a very interesting passage in this book, which has been written by Lord Moran who was the personal physician of Churchill. At page 53 of this book he talks of two men who had the greatest influence on Churchill. Churchill looked to Gen. Smuts for the approval of any one of his actions, and Smuts was a kind of dictionary whenever he did anything big or small. And here is the passage where Lord Moran refers to this and says:

> "I can think of only two—who have Winston's ear because he respects their mental processes. The other, of course, is the Prof . . .

The Professor referred to is Professor Lindemann (afterwards Lord Cherwell). Churchill always used to listen to these two people. Then, the passage goes on to say:

> Winston is encouraged when he hears from Smuts that he is proceeding along the right lines.".

Then follows the conversation with which we are concerned now.

> "P.M.: As I got older, I begin to see a pattern in things.
>
> Smuts: There is a pattern in history though it is not easy to see or follow.
>
> Smuts (spoke of Gandhi): He is a man of God. You and I are mundane people. Gandhi has appealed to religious motives. You never have. That is where you have failed.
>
> P.M. (with a great grin): I have made more bishops than anyone since St. Augustine.

But Smuts did not smile. His face was very grave. Here is the tribute paid by one of the greatest men in history to Mahatma Gandhi, and Churchill who was such a great statesman sat in silence when Smuts reminded him of the true greatness of Mahatma Gandhi. The reason why I am referring to this is not because of the Devil quoting the Scriptures, but because I want to point out that these friends opposite us are prodigal sons who have strayed away from the great house of our Indian National Congress. We are bitterly sorry that they had left us. Shri H. N. Mukerjee has served nearly ten years of his life in jail; so has Shri A. K. Gopalan. They have grown weary in the service of the Motherland. There are a number of patriots on the other side, and we would have very much liked to have them on this side ,because they have also made sacrifices for the country. But, unfortunately, their methods are different.

The hon. lady Member Shrimati Renu Chakravartty was also underground for some time and has suffered. She is the daughter of a great man, Dr. Roy. When I condoled with her, she sent me a card where Dr. Roy had said:

> "I shall keep the Bharat, and you keep the Ratna.'.

Shri Indrajit Gupta (Calcutta South West): Shrimati Renu Chakravartty is not the daughter of Dr. B. C. Roy. Let not my hon. friend put the wrong relationship into the record.

Shri Joachim Alva: I am sorry She is his niece. If my hon. friend had not interrupted me, I would not have made that mistake.

We are sorry that they have left our fold. We are sorry that they have taken to paths and courses of action which are destructive of the best in Indian society and Indian culture.

If we glance right from Africa to South-East Asia, ours is the only country which has kept our liberty going. Look at the continent of Africa, where there are nearly or over 30 countries, most of whom have fallen one by one under a military government. If you go to even a place like Cairo, you will find armed police at every corner. You may also go to Burma; there, the great patriot U. Nu is still in jail. If you go to Bangkok, you will find that the Parliament is locked up there. I asked them 'Where is the Parliament?', and I was told 'There is the Parliament; it is locked up!". If you go to a country like Indonesia, the Parliament there is now in commotion every day. This is the state of affairs in all those countries. And yet our friends opposite are not prepared to give credit to India which has remained stable, and which has been built by Mahatma Gandhi for whose freedom up he had shed the last drop of his blood. Had he remained alive for some more time, he might have gone out to Pakistan, and as a result of his efforts, both our countries could have remained united. This is the background of our country.

Today, Jawaharlal Nehru's daughter happens to take over the crown. The question is whether she has been elected unanimously by the party. If she has not been unanimously elected by the party, it is no fault of hers. If hon. Members find fault with the Congress Party, then I would say that the Congress Party is like any other democratic party in the country.

If my hon. friends find fault with our country and say that our country is going with a begging bowl before other countries, I would say that even the USA today is finding it difficult to maintain the value of her dollar. The United Kingdom is also finding great difficulties about her pound. I was present in the galleries of the House of Commons when the Tories were asking Mr. Wilson to get out of office. So, this is not something new when our hon. friends opposite want our Prime Minister and the Cabinet to get out. Other countries are facing greater difficulties. But our trouble has been due to the fact that we have been too much attached either to the dollar or to the pound. The dollar and the pound have held their supremacy far more than it can be justified. The two countries have made an unholy alliance or have an unholy collusion wherein economic supremacy is concerned. President De Gaulle is today demanding that the payments to which his country is entitled should be made in gold. If President De Gaulle succeeds, then we shall perhaps be released from the tentacles of the dollar and the pound. My hon. friend Shri Krishna Menon has made a most valued suggestion that the dollar should be devalued, and surely there is something in it, because so far as the countries in Asia are concerned, our rupee has been a great factor. Our rupee was a great factor in South-East Asia. It used to command respect. Now, there is going to be set up the Asian Development Bank which is going to be bossed by America because they have put most of the capital, to the tune of nearly 1000 billion dollars, and we are again going to be fleeced on the other side through all these processes. But what happened was that there was devaluation, and this devaluation came as a surprise. It was not that devaluation was accepted, but it was forced on us. It was not as if we accepted it of our own accord. We should not accept anything from any country at the point of a sword or at the point of force whereby our money will lose its intrinsic value. My hon. friend Shri S. K. Patil did not know that even President Nasser was having difficulty in getting food from

America. The Americans tightened the screw there and they said 'We shall not give any food'. There is a party in the US Congress which says that 'We shall not give any food to other countries unless they toe our policies'. So, the tall story that food is given without conditions, and that aid is given without strings is a story that we cannot easily swallow. But we have our own difficulties. What the Finance Minister should have done is that he should have taken a series of ruthless measures along with devaluation. Devaluation is something which we do not like, because the rupee today is a small creature when you go abroad; the rupee today does not command that respect which it ought to. If along with devaluation, a number of other ruthless measures had been taken, then that would have been a different story.

In England, there has been a great cry that the five big banks there are making enormous profits, and the British Parliament is demanding that restrictions should be put on the British banks. If that be the position in England, then what about our banks here? Why should we not nationalise our banks? There are hardly a hundred families, and probably 500 account-holders who are taking away nearly two-third of the advances by the banks and the small entrepreneurs are getting nothing. Unless the banks in India are nationalised we cannot have any security for the masses of India.

Then, there is the question of the nationalisation of the general insurance companies. *The Economic Times* which is Asia's best economic paper in its issue of 1st August has listed 32 general insurance companies; out of them, the New Indias alone have a total assets and premiums amounting to nearly one-third of the total assets of the rest. The total assets are about Rs. 7921 lakhs, and the profits for these 32 general insurance companies have been of the order of Rs. 524 lakhs. So, why should we not take over these general insurance companies? One fine morning, Shri C. D. Deshmukh as our Finance Minister brought all the life insurance companies within the public sector. Why should we allow these milch cows to be milked by the capitalist community who have these general insurance companies under their control? The Finance Minister is a man who has been in the heart of capitalism in Calcutta, and he knows how the British and the Scottish jute and tea lords have been lording over the market there, and he knows how the jute and tea lords have cornered everything, and they have cornered all the finances and also the best men, both the brown and the white. It is time that he took some drastic measures to set these things right.

Then, we should have a complete Monopolies Commission sitting in inquiry. In England there is the Monopolies Commission sitting in inquiry. It will be a shock to my hon. friends if they were to read the London *Times* of June 18, 1966 where they will find a report to the effect that the leading tyer companies have been fired and have been fined heavily for restrictive practices. You will be shocked to know that the Firestones, the India Rubbers, Dunlops and what not, all the leading tyre companies of England and of the world have been subjected to a heavy fine because they adopted restrictive practices in regard to the sale of tyres. Here we do nothing of that sort, and we just allow the tyre companies and other companies to become as rich as they can and the result is that the ordinary consumer suffers. So, I submit that a Monopolies Commission is very essential because unless we have such a commission, the strangle hold of the newspaper barons cannot be lessened. We do not learn from England, whatever we can learn with safety and efficiency and quickness. England is still the home of democracy. The British Parliament is still the mother of Parliaments, and England has many lessons to teach us. If on the floor of the House of Commons, as early as this

[Shri Joachim Alva]

month and as early as last month, the Monopolies Commission could hold an inquiry, wherein also the five big banks of England could be hauled up in regard to the huge profits that they had made, what about our country? Why should we be afraid of taking action against the few people who control our money market?

Then, I would submit that we should have extensive and intensive manufacture of indigenous defence implements, but we have not done that. Fortunately, we have had the semi-automatic Ishaopre rifle, the new mountain gun (75 m.m.) light-self-loading pistol, recoilless gun, anti-tank grenade or rockets, man-dropping parachutes, winter garments, ice axes, high-altitude tents and so on.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): On a point of order. The hon. Member is giving out information in regard to defence matters.

Shri Joachim Alva: These are the implements which we have manufactured and we have saved thereby a lot of foreign exchange. So, why should we not go on making these defence equipment and defence implements on an extensive scale? The former hon. Defence Minister, Shri Menon was laughed at when he produced some implements in the ordnance factories which were not entirely meant for defence. But go down to the French aircraft manufacturing companies; go to some other public sector companies therein you will find that they produce consumer goods along with big machines. Perhaps we do not know. We do not read about what is happening in other parts of the world.

There should be no import of food at least after 1970. If we do not fix a target, we shall be laughed at. Little children in foreign countries tell us: 'I have given a little food for your country'. Our self-respect and dignity demands that we should not accept any food from abroad. We do not want it. We are grateful to the United States for the food they have given us; we are grateful to the other countries for the food they have sent us; children of other countries have helped us. But after 1970, not a bag of rice or wheat should be imported into this country. Our country is big enough and large enough to produce all the food we require. And if at all we have to import food, let us pay hard cash and get it. But let us not go with a begging bowl for food. Let us not depend on PL 480. Nothing seems to have been done even now in regard to the achievement of self-reliance on the food front.

We should also have self-reliance in the matter of our aircraft manufacture. Let us go even in aerial bullock-carts discarding most modern planes but let us save that money and let us have aeroplanes manufactured ourselves, the Avro machines and so on. We can fly them rather than pay foreign exchange for foreign planes. Once upon a time, that is 30 years ago, Russia had not enough planes. But see the Soviet Union today. See the number of aircraft they have. At a civil airport in Moscow, last year I counted, over 200 of them. You cannot even count them while getting down. If Russia could do that, if her citizens could travel freely in their planes, we should also be able to do the same. May be we may have smaller planes or planes of an inferior variety. But it is time our country did something in this respect. We have got a big network in the Indian Airlines, the largest civil airlines of any country . But we must chalk out a programme of self-sufficiency and achieve it in ten years.

There should be penalisation of exporters who bring us a bad name. When Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri sent us on a delegation to East European countries in 1965 headed by Shri Malaviya, in Budapest, we had a meeting with the Chamber of Commerce. They said 'We bought 5,00,000 metres of cloth from one of your

mills: but it was all sticking like gum'. This huge quantity of cloth means a lot of money. On inquiry, we found that this was manufactured by one of the biggest units in the private sector in this country. I am prepared to hand over the name of the firm to Government. When I asked the boss of that concern, perhaps the biggest industrialist in India, he said 'This mill is not under my control'. However it is under the control of his son'. Whatever be the position concerning the legal responsibility, the moral responsibility is evaded. We draw a curtain between our private and public life. That has been the bane of Indian public life—you draw a curtain between private and public life. If that particular textile concern has sent 500,000 metres of cloth to one of our great friends like Hungary and when they have told us in most dignified language that the cloth sticks like gum, that company should be debarred from the grant of any export licence in future. But we shall not do it because the Ministers will be pressurised, the Secretaries will be pressurised, MPs will be pressurised and the thing will go on for ever. This is the kind of thing that damages our reputation, that makes us lose our friends as well as valuable exchange and bring ruination into our country.

In regard to the production of cotton, we have set a target. But we find that the production is not according to the target set. Every year the production has gone down—I have got the figures but I cannot quote them for lack of time.

Lastly, how is it that jute is going into China from here through Nepal? I would like to know how the jute lords are selling it this way, selling the pass away! . How is our jute going to Nepal and *via* Nepal to China?

These are important matters. Unless we close the gap, we have no safety line. Our agricultural production will lag behind, our industrial production will suffer, our foreign exchange difficulty will continue and we will always be beggars at other countries' doors begging for food, when we know that there can be plenty amongst us.

Coming to Vietnam, Shri H. N. Mukerjee made much of our weakness. I think our Prime Minister did a very good thing by going to Cairo, to Belgrade and finally to Moscow on the Vietnam peace mission. I was the first Member in this House to condemn the napalm bombing in 1953 by the French in Indo-China. Shri Krishna Menon read out yesterday from the *New York Times* of 1950 to show that the Americans did not intervene in Vietnam out of any altruistic motives, but they went there to tap the enormous natural resources of Vietnam to improve their own economy. They jumped into Vietnam in 1954 with that objective.

We are under a delusion that our safety line is in Vietnam. These bombs which are being dropped on people there may be dropped on our own bodies; children are being destroyed by Napalm bombs. If we do not protest in time, those bombs will come upon us one day.

The late Mr. Arthur Henderson, one of the pioneers of the Labour Party was one of the pioneers of disarmament long ago—some of you may not have been born at that time. In 1932 he was the Chairman of the Disarmament Conference which met at Geneva. I was reading about it while I was in jail. I was shocked when his son, Lord Rawley, told us, in London last month 'Bombing is a part of war and you will have to stand it, whether you like it or not!' These are serious matters. Are we going to see napalm bombs dropped on our children, bombs that will flay them alive?

Now, the efforts of our Prime Minister to bring about peace are commendable. I was present in the Gallery of the House of Commons on the 7th of July when Mr. Wilson was replying to a point raised by Sir Alec

[Shri Joachim Alva]

Douglas-Home, the Tory Leader. I would just quote the last sentence of Mr. Wilson's speech winding up the Viet Nam debate:

> "I would rather try and fail and finally win than not try at all".

So far as peace is concerned, it is better to try again and again. The objective is very great. We have got to achieve it. Our Prime Minister has done a good job and the allegation that Shri Mukerjee has made cannot be levelled at those efforts of the Prime Minister. We are the people who are going to suffer, if the bombing continues in Vietnam. Our country will be in danger then. So whatever is done in the direction of putting a stop to that and restoring peace that is worthwhile.

Lastly, let me say this. Shri Mukerjee was always an admirer of the rose that Jawaharlal Nehru put on. That rose has now been transferred to another personality whom our Party has elected leader with an overwhelming majority. May he not, great orator that he is, trample that rose under his foot!

Shri Umanath (Pudukkotai): While speaking on this no-confidence Motion, first of all, I wish to draw the attention of this House to the most improper and highly atrocious performance of our Prime Minister while in Moscow. At a banquet given by the Soviet Government, our Prime Minister spoke thus, as reported in the *Hindustan times* of 16-7-66:

> "Even the so-called progressive parties together with others have sometimes abused this freedom and have resorted to strikes and violence which are against national interests".

This statement follows closely on the heels of the heroic struggle of the toiling millions in Kerala, Bengal, Bihar and other States against rising prices, food shortage and for higher D.A. and restoration of ration cuts. Not satisfied with attacking the unarmed workers, peasants and middle class employees with the military and police at home, she has carried this attack to the citadels of foreign countries in the presence of a large number of foreign government dignitaries.

Does she not know that to do that was highly improper and anti-national? Perhaps at the banquet, she lost her bearings and did not know what she spoke. Or perhaps having realised that millions of our own countrymen have lost confidence in her, she was trying to earn the sympathies of the foreign governments against her own countrymen. Patriotism indeed!

One of the main points made out in defence of the Government is that the present economic debacle on the industrial, agricultural and foreign exchange fronts which led to the much-hated devaluation, was not the result of past policies of the Government but due to unforeseen developments such as the India-China conflict, the Indo-Pakistan conflict and the recent drought. The two-pillar policy of defence and development arising out of the India-China war was brought into effect from late 1963 onwards, whereas the plan crisis in industry, agriculture and foreign exchange set in in 1961 and 1962 itself. During the mid-term appraisal, they admitted that during 1961 and 1962, the average annual rate of growth of national income dropped from 3.7 per cent in the First Plan and 4·1 per cent in the Second Plan at constant prices to 2·5 per cent in the first two years of the Third Plan. They admitted a fall in the food production index from 137·5 in 1961-62 to 131·3 in 1962-63. They also admitted shortfalls in industrial production in many sectors. Where was the India-China war then? What more proof is required to support our contention that the stagnation in the economy leading to the present climax had its roots in the past policies of the Government.

Shri S. G. Barve, Member, Planning Commission, rendered a yeoman service to the country when he pinpointed the Government's responsibility in this matter. He said:

"Our present troubles have arisen out of the fact.....he does not say Chinese and Pakistani aggression and drought, he says—

> "....that the new industries set up with imported equipment and knowhow and dependent upon imports of components and raw materials, have not been able collectively to build an export potential, adequate to take care of the import requirements and service obligations of foreign loans and royalties."

I am quoting from *Problems of Industrial Growth in India*, 1966.

It is this policy of building industries dependent on foreign monopolies and similar policies of the Government that have come to roost today. This Government which called us pro-Peking, are themselves taking refuge under China and Pakistan to cover up their bankruptcies.

If post-1962 developments had anything to do with the present plight of our people, it is again this Government's so-called policy of Defence and Development that pushed the country's economy to the pre-devaluation precipice.

Even at this stage, our Government, instead of coming down to the plains of political realism of taking initiative for a negotiated settlement of our border dispute with China, made the plunge for the devaluation sell-out to the Americans. "Sell Independence to save Independence" is the latest slogan of this Government. This is the political superstructure of their latest economic slogan: "Take more loans to pay back loans".

When Mr. Nanda, the other day, introduced the Unlawful Activities Prevention Bill, he suddenly developed a love for the National Integration Council decisions of 1963. The same Council had decided that Government should formulate and execute special plans for the accelerated development of markedly backward areas in each State, the continuation of the backwardness of which posed a threat to national unity.

The Planning Commission team appointed to go into this question recommended that backward areas must be identified by the end of the financial year 1963-64, but not a single area has been identified, even 2½ years after the targeted date.

This power-mad Government which hastens to arm itself with Fascist powers to suppress the people in the name of the decision of the National Integration Council, has chosen to ignore the decision of the very Council having crucial relevance on integration.

The greatest threat to our national integration is posed by the Government's policy towards the tribals in our country. The latest case in point is provided by the Government's conduct towards the tribals in Tripura. The Dhebar Commission report on page 484 says:

> "The influx of displaced person from Pakistan to Tripura has been enormous and has upset the local economy. This has greatly affected the tribals and has made the land problem acute. The rights of the tribals in land should be safeguarded."

And the Commission recommends:

> "At present there is no scheduled areas in this Territory. The Chief Commissioner has suggested that the areas of Kanchanpur, Chamanu, Amarpur, Teliamuru Block and some other areas under Sadar, Belonia and Subroom Subdivisions which are contiguous to Amarpur and Teliamuru blocks, and have a preponderance of tri-

[Shri Umanath]

bal population, may be declared scheduled areas."

The Maharaja of Tripura had already in the past declared certain areas as "Tribal Reserves". The implementation of the Dhebar Commission's recommendation meant that the Fifth Schedule of the Constitution be extended to Tripura, and along with the five Scheduled Tribes mentioned in the Maharaja's order, other tribes recognised by the President's Order as Scheduled Tribes may all be given the benefit of the proposed Tribal Scheduled Areas. But strangely enough, the Tripura Government is now actively considering a proposal to de-reserve all areas that remain reserved for Tribals from the Maharaja's time. This is just the way to disintegrate the country. And when the tribals resort to mass resistance against their extinction, this Government will come here and scream that the tribals are in revolt, the country's integrity is in danger etc.

On Viet Nam they say that their membership of the International Control Commission prevents them from taking a forthright stand on the side of the liberation forces. Poland also is on the same Commission and yet it did not prevent the Polish Prime Minister from taking a forthright stand. If they still believe so, let them get out of the Commission which has been bombed out of existence according to Mr. Krishna Menon.

The real reason is not far to seek. A Government which has embarked on the path of selling its own independence is incapable of taking a forthright stand in favour of the independence of others.

In conclusion, if my friends on the other side insist on saying that this Government commands confidence, I would concede; but then, whose confidence? In the *Times of India* dated 14th July, 1966 a gentleman has said:

> "We may consider ourselves fortunate that the leadership of the country has passed into the hands of Indira Gandhi. Quite apart from the experience and wisdom she acquired... our new Prime Minister in the short period in which she held office, had shown a degree of courage and decisiveness, and a fresh approach which a augur well for the future."

Yes, she commands the confidence of citizens of this type. And who spoke this? Mr. Tata, at the annual General Body Meeting of TISCO. That being so, I wish to submit that if this House passes a vote of confidence by rejecting this motion, it shall be reflecting the sentiments of the big business tycoons, and not that of the teeming millions of our country.

Shri Kappen (Muvattupuzha): No-confidence motions have become a regular feature of this House so much so that they do not raise that kind of expectation which would otherwise be raised inside and outside the House. The constant moving of such resolutions, the numerous bandhs and demonstrations that led to the destruction of public property, the ugly scenes exhibited in this House, all these are symptoms of a malady which is eating into the very vitals of this nacent democracy. All these show that the opposition in this country are desperate and hopeless.

They have moved these no-confidence motions. What is it they want? They want that this Government should go out of power. What will happen if this Government goes out of power. There will be confusion and chaos in the country, and probably a section of the opposition wants chaos and confusion so that China may walk into this country.

Mr. Gopalan was speaking like a Delphic oracle. He prophesied that the Congress would be written off in the next election in Kerala. I humbly ask him: if the Congress is so weak in Kerala, why should Mr. Gopalan and Mr. E. M. S., run about and form unholy alliances with the Muslim League and other parties?

I heard Mr. Gopalan speaking about corruption. I was reminded of the shameless prostitute who spoke about morality. Mr. Gopalan's party was in power in Kerala, and corruption was the policy of the Government then. Who has not heard of the notorious Andhra rice deal where Rs. 2 lakhs have been knocked off by Mr. Gopalan's party from the public coffers? I have got hundreds of such instances.

Birlas wanted to start a factory in Kerala, and for that they required bamboos to be purchased from the Government. They offered to give Rs. 2 per ton. (*Interruptions*). I know that you will be very much affected by what I am saying. They offered Rs. 2 per ton at a time when bamboos were being sold to the agriculturists in Kerala at Rs. 7 to Rs. 9, and all the Government officers and forest officers said this was a very low price which was being offered. And yet Mr. Gopalan's party's Government gave this at Re. 1 per ton to Birlas for 20 years. What is behind this? If this is not corruption, what else is this?

The target of attack in this no-confidence motion is the devaluation of the rupee. The devaluation of the rupee is only an admission of a fact. I carefully read through Mr. Masani's speech. If I understood it correctly, he was supporting devaluation. He said on the midnight of June 5th there was a moment of truth in this country, this country came with a thud on to firm earth. If that is the truth if that is the right thing to be done, why should you blame the Government for it?

Then, some people imagine that devaluation was effected because America asked us to devalue the rupee. If it is really correct and right to devalue the rupee, what if America asked us to do it? If praying is good, should I refuse to pray because the Devil asked me to pray.

Another cause of complaint is that this devaluation was not proclaimed earlier. I ask: will a Commander wanting to abandon a fort proclaim to the enemy that he is going to abandon the fort tomorrow? That is never done. This is not the first time in the history of the world that devaluation has taken place. In 1949, Britain devaluaed the pound. Did Mr. Cripps proclaim earlier that he was going to devalue? He denied it to the last day..... (*An Hon. Member*: He did not mislead Parliament). He did. In 1931 when England went off the gold standard, they stoutly denied it until 20th September when it was proclaimed. When Roosevelt sprung a surprise on the world by going off the gold standard, even the previous day he denied that America was going off the gold standard. There is nothing strange with these things and there is no cause for complaint. The devaluation of the rupee is described as some disaster. The recognition of a fact which is in existence—how can it be a disaster? On the other hand it is a blessing in disguise, if it is properly used. How did it come? If we really analyse what has happened over the last eighteen years, we see that it was brought about because of various circumstances beyond the control of Government. Take, for instance, 1965-66. There was Pakistani aggression; there was an unusual draught in the country. Foodgrains production went down in that year from 88.6 million tons to 76.7 million tons and the loss in exports was about 89-90 crores. So, in that year there was a great strain on the economy. We have invested large sums in the public sector projects which have not yet begun to yield dinvidends. In a few years, we will just turn the corner and let us be patient; in a few years we will get the dividend and a self-generating economy will be produced. We are going to benefit and our country is going to advance. Whatever be our faults or shortcomings, we have done one thing. We have given this country a stable government. Secondly, in the last 18 years, we have fed the teaming millions of India. In spite of adverse cir-

[Shri Kappen]

cumstances and unusual draught and floods and other things, we were able to feed the millions of India in the last 18 years, maybe, with PL. 480 wheat. On the other hand, let us look back into the history of India. Every five years there was a famine and the last one was in Calcutta and lakhs of people died. All these 18 years no such thing happened. We have done another great thing. We have laid solid foundation for industrial development in this country. We have built up the basic industries which are going to generate further industrial development in this country. I have had the good fortune to visit some of the industrial institutions run by the Government. I was not alone; several Members of Parliament from the Opposition also were with me and Mr. U. M. Trivedi was there; unfortunately, he is not here now; he is an honest man. We all witnessed when we went to the rifle factory at Ishapur what is being done there. We went to the Chittaranjan locomotive factory and various other institutions in the country and we were thrilled at what is being done. In fact without consideration of party or group affiliations all of them praised what is being done. We have been able to win the Pakistani war and our jawans were able to prove that the invulnerability of the American tank is a myth. How was it done? It was done because arms were produced in our ordnance factories we have laid the foundations for industrial development in this country. So, it is not correct to say that we have been wasting money. On the other hand we have built solid foundations for industrial development. Therefore, we have nothing to be ashamed of. We can face the country in the coming general elections. Our people may be poor or illiterate but they have abundant commonsense. They know that this opposition cannot deliver the goods and that the Congress should be there at least for good administration. In the last eighteen years, we have given them good administration where their life and property were safe. Therefore, we know as a matter of fact that we are going to be returned with a thumping majority. Now, Mr. Gopalan and his people know very well that fact. After the last general elections, the Congress in Kerala has come out stronger. In the next general elections they are going to face a stiff fight. The wonderful thing is that they are having alliances with the Swatantra party! That is for defeating the Congress. Mr. Gopalan maintains that Congress is weak in Kerala. I challenge Mr. Gopalan: we shall meet at the polls.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: What about the Palai Bank?

Shri Kappen: Palai side also, we are going to win with a large majority. I have spoken about devaluation and the next thing that is to be done. What are its benefits if we properly use it? The benefits are, firstly, that imported things become costly. Then, we will have a tendency to resort to import substitution. Of course the price line has to be maintained strict measures have to be adopted for maintaining the price line. Therefore, with regard to this no confidence motion, I appeal to the Mover of the motion my friend Mr. Mukerjee to gracefully withdraw the motion.

15.58 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

If he is not prepared to do that, I request the House to vote it down.

The Prime Minister and Minister of Atomic Energy (Shrimati Indira Gandhi): Mr. Speaker, Sir, we are all aware that we have had so many no-confidence motions that they have lost much of their impact. Even so, I welcome this one because it gives us an opportunity of hearing the views of the Opposition; it gives the Opposition an opportunity to contradict one another and within themselves to answer their own argu-

ments. Fortunately, some of the speakers on our own side have also met these arguments very ably and there is really not very much more for me to say.

I have a sense of unreality, sitting here these two days, listening to the speeches here in this House and also in my room. About three years ago, I was sitting in the gallery upstairs when there was a similar no-confidence motion against my father and he said on that occasion: "What has brought together in this curious array, these various Members? It is obvious that what has brought them together is a negative, and not a positive fact." This negativeness was very much there in the speeches made here. The Opposition during this debate was very much the same, not only in the diverse and even contradictory views which were expressed but in the absence of any logic or any sense of purpose.

16 hrs.

When the motion was tabled, I had the impression that devaluation was going to be the main point which the Opposition Members had against the Government. However, in this remarks, the Mover of the motion did not even mention one argument against devaluation. The thread of devaluation which ran through most of the speeches; however, the fear was not whether devaluation was good or bad but whether we were pressurised—and it was very emphatically stated on the other side that we were pressurised,—I want to state equally emphatically that we were not pressurised. That is not to say that we were not advised by the International Monetary Fund to take certain measures; we were also advised by our own economists, as well as economists outside the Government, not only now but for a very long time. In fact, one renowned economist who is supposed not to support devaluation now had supported it in an article just six months before we took the action.

I think it was the hon. Member, Shri Manoharan, who asked us whether we had in fact consulted other people. I want to tell him, as our Finance Minister had stated, I think, in this House, that we had consulted not only our own economists but technical experts and economists outside the Government also, and we remain in touch with different economists.

At no time have we said that devaluation was something which we would rush to do. On the contrary, we took this decision as our Finance Minister said, after very long thought, painful thought, and it was an unhappy decision. But it was a decision which we felt we had to take. Some hon. Members have tried to point out that we had to take this decision because of wrong policies followed over the years. This is absolute'y incorrect. We took this decision: there was, of course, a certain amount of pressure of circumstances, the circumstances you are well aware of: the circumstances were the aggression on our borders, the tremendous strain on our economy put by this repeated aggression, by the drought and economic conditions which arose from these events. Thi' compulsion was there. Nevertheless, I would like to repeat that when we took this measure, it was not a measure taken back to the wall; it was a measure taken with eyes open. It was a deliberate measure which we took in order to stop a worsening of the economic situation. It was a part of a confident, forward-looking approach, designed to place the Government in a better command over the economic situation, and we felt that the permanent and long-term effects of it would lead to a healthy and self-reliant growth of our economy.

We did not think then, nor do we think today, that it is a magic cure, that just by the act of devaluation all the ills will be cured or that the prices will be checked. The prices,

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

mind you, have not been going up just this last month; the prices have been spiralling upwards in the last two or three years, and in spite of numerous measures and attempts to try and curb the rise, we have not been able to do so. So, devaluation was not going to achieve all this suddenly, but it was something which if followed by the right action could give the opportunity of again coming back to the onward progress which had been held up due to circumstances beyond our control.

Here I would like to remind hon. Members that there is no significant step which can be taken without difficu ty. There is nothing that is worth doing which can be done easily. We have undertaken upon ourselves the tremendous task of building, taking forward this great country of ours and it cannot be done without difficulties which are of equal, if not of greater magnitude. So we were fully aware of the difficulties. We were also aware that this would give an opportunity to the hon. Members of the Opposition to take advantage of these difficulties and to take advantage of an unpopular decision. Nevertheless, because we felt this decision was right, we took the decision, knowing that it might weaken us, and it might make things more difficult for us, not in the economic field, but in the political field.

Prof. Mukerjee argued that if only we had nationalised our foreign trade we need not have devalued the rupee. Surely he is aware that even in countries which have nationalised the trade, they have had to devalue their currency. For instance, in January 61, the heavy rouble equivalent to 10 o'd roubles was inroduced in the USSR and in fact, the rouble was devalued by 55 per cent, after taking into account the change in gold content. You are also aware, Sir, that another socia'ist-communist country, Yugoslavia, has a'so devalued her currency not so long ago. I was there a few months ago and after talks with their Government—some of my officials had talks with their officials —we found that it had helped them to stabilise their economy. They felt that there again it was not pressure from outside, but it was pressure from their own internal circumstances.

Devaluation, we feel, if tackled the right way, if the follow-up is done in the right way, will immediately enhance the export prospects of all infant industries and indeed pave the way for exporting new commodities, to which Government's attention has been drawn in the past. It is in this larger context that we should appraise the devaluation decision. It is a pity that a subject of such obvious importance to the economy has evoked only rather superficial and sentimental comments from the opposition, mainly political in tone and ignoring almost comp'etely the economic argument, which is the one which is relevant to the situation.

Prof. Mukherjee made an appeal for the revival of the Swadishi spirit. If the hon. Member has been following some of my tours in this country, he will have noticed perhaps that this is what I have been doing too, and this is what I consider the most important subject for us to take up now. But I feel that devaluation itself is no more than a device to penalise all those who patronise anything which is not Swadeshi. What does devaluation mean? It means that foreign currencies become more expensive. I do not want to go into the details of this economic argument. Perhaps the Finance Minister, when he speaks in the next debate, will go into these matters. Was there an alternative to deva'uation? The alternative was to estab'ish a closed society, to peg the rupee artificially and to take over total powers to direct the economy and the nation's man-power. Is this possible for us with our existing system, without the

whole-hearted single-minded cooperation of all the different people living in this country? Would we at this time have been able to get this cooperation, for instance, from hon. Members opposite? I do not think we would have been able to get it. As a matter of fact, I did talk with the various members of the opposition parties with regard to cooperation merely on the food front. I said that I knew that being an election year, they cannot fully support us on other matters, but food, being a matter of life and death to our people, was a matter in which perhaps we could get together. But I did not get any response. Therefore when this is the position, in view of our democratic freedom, complete freedom of expression which we offer—and I am glad to say that we offer it to all our people—we could not possibly have done this.

One matter which has, naturally, aroused the concern of the House, and of the Government too, is the increase in prices of essential commodities. As I said, this is not something that has suddenly come into being after devaluation; it was a process that was there and it was getting out of hand even before.

Devaluation by itself is not solely responsible for any increase in prices which may have taken place even after devaluation except of course in those goods which are imported goods. We have to deal with this matter. We have started various shops. I fully realise that they are not adequate, that far greater measures will have to be taken and that such stores will have to be opened not only in all the urban areas but in our rural areas as well. We cannot, in this matter, neglect the rural areas which need more help from us.

Hoarders and anti-social elements have been prosecuted not only in Delhi or Punjab, which have received a certain amount of publicity, but in other States also although it has not been publicised. But I agree that perhaps as much as could be done has not been done. I want to say here, and all those hon. Members who have perhaps read my speeches or heard them earlier will support me, that this is something which I have been very conscious of all the time. We are not perfect. We make an attempt to do some thing. We do not always succeed, nor can we always succeed. We have taken up tremendous programmes. Whenever we have taken up these programmes, the cry has been that it is too big a thing, we cannot do it. Yet we have braved it and we have tried to do it. You cannot expect cent per cent success, but in a large number of things we have succeeded.

Now, what, sometimes weakens us in a way, but which is also helpful is the criticism. When I say weaken, I do not mean Government, I am not referring to the Government but I am referring to any particular programmes. If I may draw the attention of hon. Members, some years ago the Asoka Hotel was built. It had hardly been completed when questions began to be asked in this House as to why it was running at a loss. Whenever a programme has been started, even before it gets on to its feet, there is an avalanche of criticism and questions are put as to why it is not working, what are the mistakes and so on, so that people who are working there naturally get discouraged and they do not know whether they should go on with it or should not go on with it in spite of orders and so on. These are some of the difficulties which are faced when we take up new programmes. Everything we have done in India is new. Even democracy is new. Democracy has existed for very many long years in many countries, and yet in the manner in which we have brought it in India, in this vast country to have adult franchise, it was something very new to the world. I remember the debates in

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

foreign newspapers at that time. All prophesied that it would not work, it was too big, there would be riots at election time which we simply would not be able to control. But one by one those things have been achieved, in spite of the tremendous difficulties which we had to face.

I sopke about follow-up action. The Opposition has not come up with very many positive suggestions. whatever constructive suggestions have been made will certainly be fully considered and given due weight. I am glad to say that some of my own party members, the hon. Member, Shrimati Subhadra Joshi and others, have also made various suggestions, and they are worth going into and fully considered.

I have a long list with me here but I do not want to go through the entire list. The most important point, of course, is holding the price line of articles of mass consumption. The second is stimulating exports or liberalisation of those imports which will help as in our exports or which are essential for some of our purposes. But we do not intend at all to liberalise the imports of articles which could even remotely be considered as luxuries.

I was not fortunate enough to be in the House when the hon. Member, Shri Masani was speaking. I was told that he quoted from something which I said; but it was out of context. I was then speaking at a small meeting of people who were engaged in some of our public sector undertakings. The meeting was specifically called to see how we could build up effciency and how we could increase our production. So, naturally, I picked up points of criticism, points which I thought should be discussed there in order to help them and to help the discussion. At no time was it my intention to run down our public sector. I think we have made mistakes, we have been slow in certain things, we have some times had the wrong person in a particular job but, on the whole, they have done very well. This is not the time, again, to go into the list as to which ones have produced good results. I am sure, hon. Members are well aware of this. The hon. Member, Shri Frank Anthony said yesterday that anywhere you go in India you can see the results, the changes which have been brought about. It is not a question of having one big prestige project, because every big project gives rise to thousands of small ones; thousands of jobs come up and give opportunities to all kinds of people to start their own small concerns.

Now, the Fourth Plan is based on the follow-up action, what is to be done to gear up the economy. There has been much talk about whether we should have a big Plan or a small Plan. I personally think that this big or small has no relevance. Big related to what or small related to what? I believe, as someone mentioned, perhaps Shri Krishna Menon, not in this House but somewhere else, that no matter how small our plan is, it will still be a very big plan because of the size of the country.

Perhaps you have seen that the size of the Plan is something like Rs. 16,000 crores for the public sector. But, as I said, I do not look at the Plan in terms of money. What I feel is that the Plan must be big enough to utilize more fully, not only our existing industries and agricultural potential, but it should be able to correct the imbalance in our economy, and fill in gaps in our production which make us dependent on aid. The Plan must also lay some base for future growth; otherwise, at the time of the next Plan we will find ourselves exactly where we are at the beginning of this Plan. So that the maximum we can do is the minimum which we must attempt. It is with this spirit that we must look at planning and the next Plan.

Some hon. Members, for instance, Professor Ranga and his party, would like to have a small Plan which would result in freezing poverty at the lower rungs. I feel that such a Plan would be in favour of the more affluent sections of the society and, therefore, it would make self-reliance a receding goal.

The policy we have followed, or the path we have followed, has been such that we are bound to come in conflict with people on either side of us. On some matters we are in conflict with one side and on some others with the otherside. So, whether anybody likes it or not, this Government is determined to go ahead with the expansion of the public sector. We are determined to go ahead with measures to correct the inequalities of the economic system.

That is why we have taken a decision the other day with regard to managing agencies. If wealth remains in a few hands, apart from the injustice of it, it will disturb the stability of the country. The whole idea of planning or of building up the economy is to build the muscle of our nation.

I have stressed in the Planning Commission and elsewhere that we must give very special consideration to landless agricultural labour. Although I feel that there has been tremendous progress in India since independence, this is one section which has really had a very hard time and which is deserving of very special consideration. Similarly, although many programmes have been initiated, the Tribals, the Harijans and the backward classes are the sections of the people who deserve and should get far greater attention than they have been getting. We want to make every effort to do so in our next Plan. We want to try to benefit all the underprivileged . . . (*Interruption*).

Shri Ram Sewak Yadav (Barabanki): What is the concrete, precise programme for Harijans and the backward classes?

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members should now hear patiently.

श्री किशन पटनायक (सम्भलपुर) : जब भाषण दे रही हैं तो कोई ठोस कार्यक्रम भी बतला दें ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह तो नहीं हो सकता कि जो आप चाहें वही वह कहें । उनको मौका है कि जो वह चाहती हैं वह कहें । आपको सुनना चाहिये ।

श्री किशन पटनायक : बेकार भाषण तो नहीं देना है ।

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Ambalapuzha): You will agree that we have a right to expect of the Prime Minister to explain in concrete terms what she wants to do for these people.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: The Plan is still in the process of being formulated. I have just said that these are the guidelines which we have put for the Plan. We are surely not going to hide the Plan from the hon. Members of the House. It is going to be placed before them and they will have full chance to discuss it and give their criticism at that time.

Shri Umanath: After Johnson saw it!

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: I must resent very strongly this type of a remark from the Opposition Members... (*Interruption*).

Shri Surendraath Dwivedy (Kendrapara): There are small interruption here on this side, but what is happening on the other side.

Mr. Speaker: I am asking both sides. Members on both sides must be patient and hear the Prime Minister's reply.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): We are patient but they are not... (*Interruption*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: There has been much talk of honour or loss of honour. If anything is going to bring India down, it is the view we form of ourselves. I can assure the hon. Members that I have had the opportunity not only of going abroad now, not only of meeting Government people but meeting very large sections of the public, in whichever country I have been and, I think, hon. Members are aware that even in India I have some opportunity of meeting people—villagers and other people—and since devaluation I have also been to two States of India and the hon. Member, Shri Gopalan, will know that in spite of his efforts in Kerala, the people in Kerala, in spite of a fervent appeal made to them that they should boycott my visit and that they should greet me with black flags from airport to all the functions—there is nothing shameful in that; they have a right to show black flags if they think like that....

Shri Umanath: They were arrested in Madras.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: I am sorry, they were arrested in Madras and I expressed my sorrow and regret both to the Government and to the people who approached me.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: How many people were arrested?

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: But where they were not arrested was in Kerala and there the people came in very large numbers...(*Interruption*).

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair (Quilon): We have always been good to you.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: Thank you.

What I was saying was that I wish hon. Members would consider what effect their remarks have when they make them on the floor of this House. I was very sorry to hear a phrase fall from Shri Frank Anthony's lips, something about licking boots.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: Even he has to say that.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: If he says it and if people outside take him seriously, then indeed our position is a bad one.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: Cancel his nomination.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: But without that if you go out and meet people outside, you will find a very genuine appreciation of the tremendous effort which we are making in this country. Let me say that this effort is not the effort of the Government. The Government puts down the Plan; it shows the way. But the effort is the effort of the Indian people. What we have done here has been done by the Indian people, whether it is in industry or whether it is in agriculture. With all the shortfalls in agriculture, we have achieved 75 per cent increase in production. Who has done this? It is the Indian people who have done this. When we are talking of shame, when we are talking of failures, let us remember whom we are talking about. Let us remember that the only thing that counts in the world, no matter how down you are, how poor you are, how broken you are, is hope and confidence and I must say with great sorrow that members of the Opposition are today breaking the hope and self-confidence of the Indian people. It is not a question as to with what feeling it is done; it is a question of what results it produces and this is the result which it is bound to produce: if you keep on telling a person that nothing is being done, he will naturally wonder whether what he sees himself is right or not.

Prof. Mukerjee spoke with great emotion about Vietnam. On the other side, the hon. Member, Mr. U. M. Trivedi, said that we should keep entirely aloof from Vietnam. The Viet-Nam conflict has to be viewed in the general context of various ten-

sions in Asia and Africa. We believe that the continuation of the war in Viet-Nam is a threat to world peace, is a threat to India too. We are vitally concerned in the peaceful settlement of Viet-Nam.

Prof. Mukerjee was a little sarcastic—may I use that word—about my own feeble attempts in this matter. But I can assure him that in none of the countries which I visited after making that statement did any of the leaders share this hon. member's opinion either of the attempts or of what I had said. So far as the other countries are concerned, there are many in Asia, Africa and Europe who have welcomed it warmly. Why did I make the attempt? He made a caustic comment; that in Calicut I said I did not have anything to say and soon after I said something. What I said in Calicut was that there was nothing new that one could do. What I said in my broadcast was, in fact, nothing new. I did feel so strongly about the whole problem that I said it; the time was such that something had to be said even if it was a repetition of what we had said before. We have not changed our attitude regarding Vietnam either when I was in the United States or when I was in the U.S.S.R. or when. I was just here in Delhi, our attitude has been the same But our concern has been a growing concern because the conflict is growing and we fear escalation.

The other question which somebody put was why did we say "Geneva-type Conference" instead of Geneva Conference. This is because that this Conference should have the participation of all the parties concerned in the hostilities and that will mean inclusion of the National Liberation Front of Viet-Nam as well as the United States of America and other vitally interested parties who were not originally in the Geneva Conference. This is the reason why that word had to come in there.

It is interesting that the criticism of my suggestion as it was made by the hon. Member, Shri A. K. Gopalan, is practically the same as that put out by the Peking Radio. It is significant also that China is the only country which has rejected my suggestion straightaway.

Prof. Mukerjee quoted extensively from Bertrand Russell. I respect Lord Russell very greatly.

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Kasergod): What harm is there in saying that it is Johnson's voice that she is repeating?

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: I think it is very harmful because it is not true nor did anybody whom I met say so. As I said, they did not share the opinion which some of the Opposition members have vouchsafed.

Shri A. K. Gopalan or rather Professor Mukerjee fully knows that this is what Peking Radio also says about the Soviet Government. They are also supposed to be lackeys of American imperialism or I do not know what, because I am not very well up in this phraseology.

I was talking about Bertrand Russell. I admire him and respect him as a philosopher, as a scholar and as a mathematician. But we cannot agree with everything that he says. For instance, we know what he said about the Chinese aggression on our territory. He thought that India had committed aggression and he had said so very strongly. Therefore, we cannot be guided in our policy or in the determination of our national interest by any outsider's remarks, no matter how eminent he may be.

The problems of Viet Nam is complex, and one thing which we keep on saying and which we feel deeply about is that there cannot be a military solution our sympathy is fully with the people of Viet Nams. It may be remembered that the end of world War II is the beginning of their war of independence and their struggle is not yet over.

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

There was another remark about our conflict with China, because I said somewhere that it was not merely a military conflict. I wonder what the Chinese leaders themselves would say. Do they consider it an ideological conflict or do they consider it merely as a military conflict? My father wrote in 1963: "The challenge from China as it has revealed itself is not only to our foreign policy but to our domestic policy as well."

Even at Nathu La which is so far from Peking, the Chinese are highlighting their ideological conflict with us and urging our brave and patriotic officers and jawans to desert their troops. Our conflict with China is not a conflict with communism. As hon. Members know, we are friendly with other communist countries, with the Soviet Union and with other countries. What their tensions are with China is none of our affairs.

The other important question is that of the Tashkent Declaration. A great deal has been said about it, and I do not think that more has to be said here except that I would like to reiterate that friendship would bring benefits to both nations, and also that we do not believe that Kashmir is the basic cause of our differences but that it is only a symptom of the basic disease.

Now, we have noticed ominous signs or rather contrary tendencies which have caused concern to the Government and to the hon. Members of this House. Government is fully alive to its responsibilities for defending the country, and let there be no illusion that mischief can be created in Jammu and Kashmir with impunity. I must make it clear as did my father in 1957 and Shastriji in 1965 that any attempts from outside to create such mischief in Jammu and Kashmir will be dealt with in the same way as if they were directed at any other part of the country.

At the same time, I would like to assure Pakistan that we shall also react most favourably to any friendly approach which they may make. Pakistan is constantly saying that there must be a change of heart on our part. Well, I think that our hearts are in the right place but they just do not want to see it.

The world is in a very critical situation, and many factors have contributed to this. International relations are undergoing profound changes. The non-aligned nations must forge new sanctions to save their own independence and world peace. New power centres are developing; new dangers are crystallising. And the immediate danger is the tendency to treat Asia and Africa as the testing ground for war games.

There are no simple answers to find the path of peace, but India will always continue to play a major or as big a role as she can in reducing tensions, in preventing wars and in safeguarding peace. This is our approach and this is different from noisy and hollow demonstrations; and I do believe, far more effective too. In order to play any of these roles, in order to strengthen our borders we must strengthen our economy, we must build up our unity and march steadily towards our goals of socialisms, of democracy and secularism in our internal affairs, and peaceful co-existence, non-alignment and devotion to peace in our external affairs

I have reserved to the last what worries me most, even more than the economic crisis or foreign relations, and that is the growth of violence and the threat it poses to democracy in India, Our democratic system, our parliamentary structure and the decencies of public life which have been patiently built up on the principles of non-violence and tolerence are being threatened.

Shri Kishen Pattnayak: Police democracy.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: I feel we must exert ourselves...

Shri Vasudevan Nair: See Gujarat.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: I repudiate the theory that violent incidents which we agree are harmful are the result of people's dissatisfaction; rather it is a case of a handful holding the rest of the community to ransom. Several hon. Members have mentioned that it is the knowledge that people will not call some of these Opposition parties to responsibility which makes these parties resort to violence. Many of the demonstrations which are called are, I know, meant to be peaceful demonstrations, but we all know that large-scale agitation once launched goes out of control and goes into the hands of anti-social elements..... (*Interruptions*). In these very difficult times, it is in the interest of the country and of all of us to see that this kind of violence does not take place. It is my earnest prayer to the people of the country not to be taken in by these things. I do not at any time say that they should not ventilate their grievances or that they should not be helped to ventilate their grievances, but not if it is going to lead to violence or if it is going to aggravate the conditions it is sought to relieve....(*Interruptions*).

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय (देवास) : साधुओं को क्यों पकड़ा है ? वे तो शान्तिपूर्ण प्रदर्शन कर रहे थे । उनको क्यों नहीं छोड़ते हो । उनको क्यों जेल भेजा है ?

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: I should like to take this opportunity to appeal to hon. Members and, through these chosen representatives of the people, to the country at large to pause and consider where we are going to. What is the future we want to build for our children and for our children's children?

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द (करनाल) : यह जो लाखों लोग मारे जा रहे हैं, इसमें आपको हिंसा नहीं दिखाई देती है ?

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: Are we going to establish a co-operative society based on equality and dignity of the human being in which the fundamental freedoms and the wishes of the community are respected? Or are we going to rule by violence and by force? This is the question before us.

An hon. Member: Before you.

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: The seeds of conflict and disruption which are now being sown must not be allowed to take root. Even in this House, I was very sad to see that the attitude of indiscipline is being attempted and we have witnessed accusations and strong language against the Chair. I have admired the patience with which you, Sir, have laughed off some of these remarks made against you....(*Interruptions*). We must remember what democracy means. Democracy is based on the rule of the majority. But we fully realise that the minority has an important function to perform and must be helped to perform it. We do not at any time want to come in the way of their performing it.

Lastly, I want to say that we have faced this no-confidence Motion with confidence . . . not only because of our numerical strength with which we are being constantly taunted by the Opposition Members...

श्री ओंकार लाल बेरवा (कोटा) : इस लिए क्या सरकार जब चाहे मनचाहा अत्याचार कर ले ?

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: In so questioning our strength, they do not realise that it is not us they are taunting or questioning, but rather the electorate which has sent all these Members. But we face this motion with confidence because.....

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : अगर सरकार त्यागपत्र देकर चुनाव लड़े, तो पता लग जाये कि जनता कहां तक उसके साथ है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मेरी प्रार्थना है कि जब साधुओं के लिए इतना कुछ कहा जा रहा है, तो कम से कम साधु जी तो आराम से बैठे रहें ।

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय : साधुओं को बेकसूर पकड़ा गया है । उन को छोड़ दिया जाना चाहिए ।

श्री रामेश्वरानन्द : साधुओं को पकड़ा जाये और हम चुप रहें ।

श्री रामसेवक यादव : प्रधान मंत्री इलैक्ट्रैट की बात कहती हैं, लेकिन वह खुद कहां से चुन कर आई हैं ?

Shrimati Indira Gandhi: ....because of our confidence in ourselves, because of our confidence in our policies, because of our confidence in our programmes, and lastly because of our confidence in the wonderful people of this very great country.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): I am sorry to have to say that even though I was prepared to be disappointed, I was not quite ready to hear from the Prime Minister a speech compounded of innocence and of confusion which might have sat very well upon a young lady entering public life, but they are not good enough for the Prime Minister of this country.

A very conspicuous feature of this debate has been that there has been expressed an almost national consensus against devaluation which is the biggest single economic fact symbolising all the misdeeds of the Government. Those who spoke against my motion like Mr. Mathur, Mr. Azad and most pre-eminently Mr. Krishna Menon, pointed out arguments in their side which amounted to an admission that devaluation was wrong and that we have now somehow to manage a very difficult situation which has thereby been created. They were rather shamefaced about it, even Mr. Patil, and now the Prime Minister also joins Mr. Patil's appeal to us to help Government to solve the problems which they have created by their own default. I say that it is no part of our job at least in this debate, there would be other debates, other occasions, but it is no part of our job in this debate to elucidate what we ought to do now that Government has committed a criminal act by way of devaluation. It is not for us now to pick the chestnuts out of the fire which the Government itself has brought about. But I know they have a guilty conscience about it.

An hon. Member: No.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: That is why they only....

An hon. Member: They have no conscience.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Possibly they do not have a conscience, but I do not go into that.

They tell us we should all unite in follow-up action to prevent the situation going too disastrously downhill. What was the essence of the only defence of devaluation which was sought to be made by Mr. Patil. He said, in complete disregard of what Jawaharlal Nehru had written himself in the second chapter of the volume on the Second Plan which I hope Mr. Asoka Mehta knows almost by heart, in complete defiance of the principles adambrated there, he said that our three Plans were based on massive foreign aid, "we cannot get aid even for servicing our debts; so we had to devalue". From this it follows that without devaluation we are not going to get dollar aid and the entire planning was faulty, something to warm the heart of Mr. Dandekar or Mr. Masani on this side. This was the kind of thing which he said. My friend the Railway Minister is much too intelligent to hug the illusion which he tried to spread that organisations like the World Bank and the IMF give us purely "advice" from the economist's point of view

and have nothing to do with ideology. Our Prime Minister also said that she had "advice" from economists in this country as well as abroad. In regard to the role of the IMF I have got here an extract from a book by Mr. Schlesinger, *A Thousand Days, John F. Kennedy in the White House*. He writes and I quote him:

> "The insistence on monetary stability before all else received the ardent support of the International Monetary Fund which imposed deflation on a number of Latin American States as the condition for IMF loans. Undeterrred by past error, the International Monetary Fund in 1964-65 persuaded a complacent government in the Dominican Republic to accept a fiscal programme which reduced per capita income, increased unemployment and led in the spring of 1965 to political convulsion and united States invention.....If the criteria of the IMF had governed the United States in the nineteenth century, our own economic development would have taken a good deal longer. In preaching fiscal orthodoxy to developing nations, we were somewhat in the position of the prostitute who, having retired on her earnings. believes that public virtue requires the closing down of the red-light district."

I would like very much to know—there are eminent economists like Prof. Gadgil in the other House and so many other economists in this country—the kind of economist's advice which was taken by the Government before this very decisive step was taken. We have read about Prof. Sir Roy Harrod; he is no Marxist, no fellow-traveller and no progressive. He has said: "My own feeling is that the IMF advice must have been based on false promises". That is about the economic advice which my friend Mr. Patil pointed out was the most paramount element in their consideration.

When devaluation or something like that has to take place and a crisis arises, what is done in countries which have a more lively sense of their independent functioning? Let us take the UK; we have a great deal against her but she has a certain personality. The UK is trying to stave off devaluation, taking advance measures, not follow-up measures. Government, particularly Mr. Patil whose was the only serious speech on the Government side, makes a big play of the other idea that we had to be very confidentially moving in the matter; the whole thing had to be kept as a top secret decision. Of course it had to be. But do not talk in this way; you cannot hoodwink the people. If it was the result of your own volition, if you were not hustled into it by the World Bank and the IMF, you should have armed the Government in advance with proper controls to check the after effects of devaluation. Even now, the Government has no clear idea. It is not my job to tell Mrs. Gandhi, it is not my duty in this particular debate, it does not devolve upon me in this debate to tell the Government what they should do. But even now, I know Government has no clear idea of how and where a sizeable export boost is expected. in which industries, tea or jute, and how and in which period of time in the future are you going to have a sizeable export boost and where a sizeable export boost is expected; what will be the nature of import substitution which you are talking about; what is the extent of installed capacity which is idle and which will now be working; how far they are useful to the pattern of economy which we wish to see set up in this country. So many other problems are there Government has not said a syllable so far about these things. Of course, Government thought only of placating western Big Money and not of be friending the fellow sufferers in the underdeveloped world. In the underdeveloped world for the last 15 years or so,—Shri Manubhai Shah is there, he goes and attends the international

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

trade conferences and that sort of thing—billions of dollars worth of advantage are gained by the developed countries because they beat down the price of our exports and raise the prices of our imports, and as a result of that, they are getting an advantage in comparison with which the aid which they give is nothing at all. They give us by way of aid very much less than what they get because of this particular advantage which they get by beating down our export price and raising our import liability.

Now, they are talking about secrecy. They were talking of it as if it was a war-time measure and therefore one has to be very careful about it. I agree; you had to be very careful, but when you declare a war, naturally, the news is kept top secret, but before the actual outbreak of hostilities, all necessary preparations are made. soldiers are moved up to the front, the supply lines are kept open and the entire logistics are worked out. In this case, my hon. friend, Shri Patil,—whatever he told us, I remember all that—gave us very little evidence. The only logistics of which the Government has given evidence are the super market and the All-India Radio's price bulletins. That is the only logistics of which they have given any kind of evidence.

I am sick of hearing this talk of follow-up action which we are supposed to suggest to the Government so that they can possibly throw out something by way of exercising their own grey matter. The only follow-up action which is needed—people say in terms which are understandable to them—is, sack the Ministry; kick the whole lot out of the picture. At least let three or four Ministers most closely concerned, let them get out; let them seek re-election when the Election Commission can be persuaded to allow this kind of thing happening. Let them go to the country; let the three or four people particularly responsible for this go and fight the re-election.

Shri Kamalnayan Bajaj (Wardha): We are all going to the elections. (*Interruption*).

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Shri Patil told us that there was nothing wrong in importing food. Whoever said that there is anything wrong in importing food? Of course, there is nothing wrong; but what have we done all these years? Our food imports from abroad, overwhelmingly from the United States, have amounted from 1948 to 1965, both years inclusive, to nearly 65 million tons Their costs have amounted to the staggering figure of Rs 2,667 crores. Of this amount, payment for PL-480 supplies alone amounts to over Rs. 1,500 crores, up to 1965. If you wanted to have it, of course, we have it. But what about the promises made by Government? What was the complacent smugness with which Shri Patil, as Food Minister, used to regale the House. He used to say in those days—1960 or so when this business became consolidated into our economy—that he would build buffer-stocks. That was the only justification for importing such enormous amounts of foodgrains from abroad. Nobody likes it; of course we have to pay through our nose, and now we are going to pay by saying good-bye to our self-respect. With this money so many things are taking place. The US embassy has so many hundreds of crores of repees at its disposal, doing all kinds of damage to our honour and our interests. The peace corps-wallas are going round, and there is a paper which reprints from a Congress newspaper, edited by Shri Chaplakanta Bhatacharyya who is sitting over there—*Jansevak*—(*Interruption*) —and it shows how the peace crops chaps in Calcutta—they were having as we learn a wonderful "beans"—were tearing up copies of the *Discovery of India* by Jawaharlal Nehru.

Shri C. K. Bhattacharyya (Raiganj): I may inform the hon. Member that I do not edit any paper at present.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I am sorry; he seems to be specialising in being sacked from paper after paper. Copies of the *Discovery of India* by Jawaharlal Nehru were torn up by these people and thrown at passers-by and they were molested and a Calcutta case is proceeding. It is a very small matter, but all this money in the hands of foreign people like the US Embassy and its agencies and the CIA operating in ways which they do not divulge to Shri Chagla who is also here—Naturally they did not tell him about it; they are operating, keeping this money in their hands. Where is the buffer? Only day before yesterday, in reply to Starred Question No. 106, Shri P. Govinda Menon said "There is a proposal to buil dup a buffer stock of 6 million tons of foodgrains". Still we have this proposal which, in the early sixties, was made in this House by Mr. Patil! We hear about these food imports. We know what Jawaharlal Nehru or any decent person had thought in regard to food imports. This idea of buffer stock which Mr. Patil has popularised is the biggest bluff. There are other ways of taking PL 480 assistance. Mrs. Gandhi only the other day saw Mr. Nasser and some Indian pressmen said nasty things about Mr. Nasser keeping mum about Vietnam, because he had taken food from America. Mr. Nasser made a speech on the UAR National Day, only three weeks ago. He is not cowed by fear. He says, "I would rather go without food than give in on policies and principles." There are ways and ways of accepting PL 480 food also, but this country's Government does not know how to do it.

Some people, including Mr. Patil and also, of course, the Prime Minister in a different way—she does not happen to know the kind of vocabulary we specilise in; I plead guilty to the charge of being in the know of all kinds of vocabulary—they have made fun of our reference to Vietnam. She has not, but some other people have. From out of their own ranks, Mr. Krishna Menon has answered that charge. I say in all sincerity and seriousness that India has not only moral, but a definite international, political commitment. Till this day, the Government of India has not protested against the violation of the neutral zone, which is under our direct charge. Why can't we muster courage and warn the USA to keep out?

The Prime Minister has talked first about a Geneva conference, then about something in the framework of the Geneva conference and then about a Geneva-type conference. Wherever she has gone—Cairo, Belgrade or Moscow—she could not sell this idea because they knew that she ought to have known as head of the Indian Government that this could not possibly be accepted by Hanoi. At a time when the Americans were practising the most egregious imaginable brutalities, to ask Hanoi to sit down without any conditions and to have a Geneva or any type of conference with America is something which only the Americans like, which the British seconded and nobody else did. That is what the Prime Minister has done.

I have no time to analyse this matter, but the Prime Minister ought to know. She goes on explaining—even the other day in Parliament she said—that she used the word "imperialists" in Moscow because like a good student in the old days, she learnt the maxim "In Rome, do as Romans do", but she did not mean the United States—Who the devil was meant by it? In regard to Vietnam, who else could have possibly and conceivably been meant? I am sorry to have to say that according to the cynics of this world, Eve has a new face for every situation, but at least

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

two are absolutely essential for the Prime Minister of India! I do not like this kind of thing taking place.

17.00 hrs.

There is a distinct link-up between the concessions on fertilisers, Mr. Asoka Mehta's "back-seat driving" talk, devaluation and our supine and dishonourable Vietnam stand. It was good to hear Mr. Anthony—I never knew he was so ancient; he said he was the second senior-most member of this House—it was good to hear him about the American arm-twisting. It was good to hear him say, we have been made to "lick the American boot" which no self-respecting Indian must stand That is the kind of feeling which everybody has got. Why do I have this preoccupation with Vietnam? I have it because if the Vietnam peasant can give a hell of a fight to the Americans, why can't we even stand up to them? We are rightly proud of what our people did during the days of the Indo-Pakistan confrontation. Let us have a sense of proportion. Let us remember how Vietnamese people are fighting for decade after decade in conditions where the mightiest country in the world is spending in one year more than the total gross national product of this country in war against the Vietnamese. They are fighting against them. I take my hat off to them. I sometimes think what Shri Masani says about the Mekong river being the boundary of India, it has some kind of relevance. It is along the Mekong river that the fight for Asian freedom, Asian self-respect, is being fought. And, here we are not being forthright, we are not being straight, we do not stand up before the world and say we are not going to tolerate this kind of enormity. And, we are Chairman of the International Control Commission. I know some people ridicule us. The "Three Musketeers of Devaluation", of course, they never spoke, possibly because they do not have muskets but crutches which the Prime Minister finds it so difficult to rely upon, but even those who spoke had the gumption to ridicule our pre-occupation with Vietnam. I ask Jawaharlal Nehru's daughter to remember that after Jawahar lal had returned from Europe in the days of the Fascist advance in that continent, he want to Khali, somewhere in the Himalayas, and wrote: "I cannot rest because I hear the echoes of barbarian feet stamping the streets of Vienna". Here is something happening in Asia and you do not respond, this Government does not respond. Here is something happening in a part of Asia which is part of our country. If you know a little of Indian history, it is part of *Suvarnabhoomi*, in other words, it is a part of greater India. It is here that the people of Asia are fighting, it is here that they are fighting a war. I want the Prime Minister to remember that here in India we have a kind of tradition which makes us take the world as our province: *yatra vishwam bhavatyek needam*—all the world becomes a single nest. That is the only justification for whatever foreign policy we try to put forward.

In September 1965, our people rose as one man to defend our country and there was a demand for self-reliance. But we have forgotten all that. We have forgotten the Patton tanks and we go abegging for dollars. The Cabinet is responsible for all that. All of them are responsible. They are talking about their joint responsibility having been performed very properly. They are parading their unity. But there is no unity worth the name. I have no pity for them. Acharya Kripalani wanted us to show pity to them. It is not pity; people feel angry because the people are suffering and they are trying to repress the people in blood. They shoot wherever they have an opportunity, even before an opportunity conceivably presents itself. I do not pity the pretty plumage. I pity the dying bird about which Gandhi had told Kripa-

lani and others that he could not soothe with a song a dying bird. Our people are like a dying bird. I do not pity the plumage, I pity the dying bird, and I curse those who are responsible for having roused the anger of our people. I have no pity, I have anger, our people have anger. If they believe that by administrative methods, by repressive apparatus becoming stronger they are going to suppress this anger and indignation of our people, they are living in a particular paradise about which they would soon find out.

I, therefore, say that I press my no-confidence motion. I know I shall be defeated by the vote, but I make an appal to the moral conscience, if they have any, the moral conscience of this Parliament.

Mr. Speaker: I will now put the motion to the vote of the House.

The question is:

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

Division No. 6] **AYES** **[17.07 hrs.**

Alvares, Shri
Bade, Shri
Badrudduja, Shri
Banerjee, Shri S. M.
Berwa, Shri Onkar Lal
Bhattacharya, Shri Dinen
Bheel, Shri P. H.
Biren Dutta, Shri
Chakravartty, Shrimati Renu
Chatterjee, Shri H. P.
Chaudhuri, Shri Tridib Kumar
Dasaratha Deb, Shri
Deo, Shri P.K.
Dwivedy, Shri Surendranath
Gopalan, Shri A. K.
Gulshan, Shri
Gupta, Shri Indrajit
Gupta, Shri Kashi Ram
Kabir, Shri Humayun
Kachhavaiya, Shri Hukam Chand
Kakkar, Shri Gauri Shanker
Kamath, Shri Hari Vishnu
Kandappan, Shri S.
Kappen, Shri
Kapur Singh, Shri
Koya, Shri
Krishnapal Singh, Shri
Kunhan, Shri P.
Laxmi Dass, Shri
Limaye, Shri Madhu
Lohia, Dr. Ram Manohar
Manoharan, Shri
Misra, Dr. U.
Mukerjee, Shri H. N.
Murmu, Shri Sarkar,
Nair Shri N. Sreekantan
Nair, Shri Vasudevan
Omkar Singh, Shri
Pandey, Shri Sarjoo
Pattnayak, Shri Kishen
Pottekkatt, Shri
Rajaram, Shri
Ramabadran, Shri
Rameshwaranand, Shri
Reddi, Shri R. N.
Reddy, Shri Eswara
Raddy, Shri H. C. Linga
Roy, Dr Saradish
Saraf, Shri Sham Lal
Sen, Dr. Ranen
Sezhiyan, Shri
hastri, Shri Prakash Vir
Shinkre, Shri
Singh, Shri Y. D.
Sivasankaran, Shri
Solanki, Shri
Swamy, Shri M.N.
Umanath, Shri
Venkaiah, Shri Kolla
Vimla Devi, Shrimati
Yadav, Shri Ram Sewak
Yashpal Singh, Shri

NOES

Abdul Wahid, Shri T.
Achal Singh, Shri
Achuthan, Shri
Akkamma Devi, Shrimati
Alagesan, Shri
Alva, Shri A. S.
Alva, Shri Joachim
Aney, Dr M. S.
Anjanappa, Shri
Ankineedu, Shri
Anthony, Shri Frank
Arunachalam, Shri
Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha
Babunath Singh,
Bajaj, Shri Kamalnayan
Balakrishnan, Shri
Balmiki, Shri
Barman, Shri P. C.
Barrow, Shri
Barupal, Shri P. L.
Basappa, Shri
Basumatari, Shri
Baswant, Shri
Bhagat, Shri B. R.
Bhagavati, Shri
Bhakt Darshan, Shri
Bhanja Deo, Shri L. N.
Bhanu Prakash Singh, Shri
Bhatkar, Shri
Bhattacharyya, Shri C. K.
Birendra, Bahadur Singh, Shri
Bist, Shri J. B. S.
Brij Basi Lal, Shri
Brij Raj Singh, Shri
Chanda, Shrimati Jyotsna,
Chandak, Shri
Chandrabhan Singh, Shri
Chandrika, Shri
Chaturvedi, Shri S. N.
Chaudhury, Shri Chandramani Lal
Chaudhuri, Shrimati Kamala
Chaudhuti, Shri Sachindra
Chavan, Shri D. R.
Chavan, Shri Y. B.
Daljit Singh, Shri
Das, Dr. M. M.
Das, Shri B. K.
Das, Shri N. T.
Desai, Shri Morarji
Deshmukh, Shri Shivaji Rao S.
Deshmukh, Shrimati Vimalabai P.
Dey, Shri S. K.
Dhuleshwar Meena, Shri
Dighe, Shri
Dinesh Singh, Shri
Dorai, Shri Kasinatha
Dubey, Shri R. G.
Dwivedy, Shri M. L.

Ering, Shri D.
Gahmari, Shri
Gajraj Singh Roa, Shri
Ganapati Ram, Shri
Gandhi, Shri V. B.
Ganga Devi, Shrimati
Ghosh, Shri Atulya
Govind Das, Dr.
Guha, Shri A. C.
Gupta, Shri Badshah
Hajarnavis, Shri
Hansda, Shri Subodh
Hanumanthaiya, Shri
Harvani, Shri Ansar
Hazarika, Shri J. N.
Heda, Shri
Himatsingka, Shri
Jadhav, Shri Tulsidas
Jamir, Shri S. C.
Jamunadevi, Shrimati
Jedhe, Shri
Jena, Shri
Jha, Shri Yogendra
Joshi, Shri A. C.
Joshi Shrimati Subhadra
Jyotishi, Shri J. P.
Kajrolkar, Shri
Kamble, Shri
Kannamwar, Shrimati Tai
Kedaria, Shri C. M.
Khadilkar, Shri
Khan, Shri Osman Ali
Khan, Shri Shahnawaz
Khanna, Shri Mehr Chand
Kindar Lal, Shri
Kisan Veer, Shri
Kotoki, Shri Liladhar
Koujalgi, Shri H. V.
Krishna shri M. R.
Kureel, Shri B. N.
Lakshmikanthmma, Shrimati
Laskar, Shri N. R.
Laxmi Bai, Shrimati
Lonikar, Shri
Mahadeo, Prasad, Shri
Mahadeva Prasad, Dr.
Mahato, Shri Bhajahari
Mahida, Shri Narendra Singh
Mahishi, Dr. Sarojini
Maimoona Sultan, Shrimati
Majithia, Shri
Malaichami, Shri
Malaviya, Shri K. D.
Mandel, Dr. P.
Mandal Shri J
Mandal, Shri Yamuna Prasad
Maniyangadan, Shri
Mantri, Shri D. D.
Marandi, Shri
Maruthiah, Shri
Masuriya Din, Shri
Mathur, Shri Harish Chandra
Mathur, Shri Shiv Charan
Mehdi, Shri S. A.
Mehrotra, Shri Braj Bihari
Mehta, Shri J. R.
Mehta, Shri Jashvant
Mengi, Shri Gopal Datt
Menon, Shri Krishna
Menon, Shri P. Govinda
Minimata, Shrimati
Mirza, Shri Bakar Ali
Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
Mishra, Shri M. P.
Misra, Shri Bibudhendra
Misra, Shri Mahesh Dutta
Misra, Shri Shyam Dhar
Mohanty, Shri Gokulananda
More, Shri K. L.
Mukerjee, Shrimati Sharda
Munzni, Shri David
Murthy, Shri B. S.
Murti, Shri M. S.
Muthiah, Shri
Nanda, Shri
Naskar, Shri P. S.
Nayak, Shri Mohan
Nayar, Dr. Sushila
Niranjan Lal, Shri
Oza, Shri
Paliwal, Shri
Pande, Shri K. N.
Pandey, Shri R. S.
Pandey, Shri Vishwa Nath
Pandit, Shrimati Vijay Lakshmi
Pant, Shri K. C.
Paramasivan, Shri
Patel, Shri Rajeshwar
Patil Shri D. S.
Patil, Shri M. B.
Patil Shri S. B.
Patil, shri s. K.
Patil, Shri V. T.
Patnaik, Shri B. C.
Pattabhi Raman, Shri C. R.
Prabhakar, Shri Naval
Pratap Singh, Shri
Raghunath Singh, Shri
Raghuramaiah, Shri
Rai, Shrimati Sahodra Bai
Rajdeo Singh, Shri
Raju, Shri D. B.
Raju, Dr. D. S.
Ram, shri T.
Ram Sewak, Shri
Ram Singh, Shri
Ram Subhag Singh, Dr.
Ram Swarup, Shri
Ramakrishnan, Shri P. R.
Ramanathan Chettiar, Shri R.
Ramaswamy, Shri V. K.
Ramdhani Das, Shri
Rampure, Shri M.
Ramshekhar Prasad Singh, Shri
Rane, Shri
Ranga Rao, Shri
Rao, Shri Jaganatha
Rao, Dr. K. L.
Rao, Shri Krishnamoorthy
Rao, Shri Muthyal
Rao, Shri Raiagopala
Rao, Shri Ramapathi
Rao, Shri Thirumala
Rattan Lal, Shri
Ray, Shrimati Renuka
Reddi, Dr. B. Gopala
Reddiar, Shri
Reddy, Shri Narayan
Reddy, Shri Surendra
Reddy, Shrimati Yashoda
Roy, Shr Bishwanath
Sadhu Ram, Shri
Saha, Dr. S. K.
Sahu, Shri Rameshwar
Saigal, Shri A. S.
Samanta, Shri S. C.
Satyabhama Devi, Shrimati
Scindia, Shrimati Vijaya Raje
Sen, Shri A. K.
Sen, Shri P. G.
Shah, Shri Manubhai
Shakuntala Devi, Shrimati
Shankaraiya, Shri
Sharma, Shri A. P.
Sharma. Shri D. C.
Sharma, Shri K. C.
Shastri, Shri Ramanand
Sheo Narain, Shri
Shinde, Shri
Shree Narayan Das, Shri
Shukla, Shri Vidya Charan
Siddananjappa, Shri
Siddhanti, Shri Jagdev Singh
Siddiah, Shri
Sidheshwar Prasad, Shri
Singh, Dr. B, N.
Singh, Shri D. N.
Singh, Shri K. K.
Sinha, Shrimati Ramdulari
Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan
Sinhasan Singh, Shri
Sivappraghassan, Shri Ku.
Snatak, Shri Nardeo
Sonavane, Shri
Soy, Shri H. C.
Srinivasan, Dr. P.
Subbraman, Shri
Subbramaniam Shri C.
Subramanyam, Shri T.
Sumat Prasad, Shri
Sunder, Lal, Shri
Surendra Pal Singh, Shri
Surya Prasad, Shri
Swamy, Shri M. P.
Swaran Singh, Shri
Tahir, Shri Mohammad
Tantia, Shri Rameshwar
Thengal, Shri Nallakoya
Thomas, Shri A. M.
Tiwary, Shri D. N.
Tiwary, Shri K. N.
Tiwary Shri R. S
Tripathi, Shri Krishna Deo
Tularam, Shri
Tyagi, Shri
Ukey, Shri
Upadhayaya, Shri Shiva Dutt
Valvi, Shri
Varma, Shri Ravindra
Veerabasappa, Shri
Veerappa, Shri
Verma, Shri Balgovind
Verma, Shri K. K.
Virbhadra Singh, Shri
Wadiwa, Shri
Wasnik, Shri Balkrishna
Yadab, Shri N. P.
Yadav, Shri Ram Harkh
Yadava, Shri B. P.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf (Jammu and Kashmir): Sir, my vote, which is for 'Noes', has not been correctly recorded.

Shri H. C. Linga Reddy (Chikballapur): Similarly, my vote, which is also for 'Noes' has not been correctly recorded.

Shri M. L. Jadhav (Malegoan): *rose—*

Mr. Speaker: All these might be noted down. The result of the Division, as recorded by the machine, is: Ayes 61; Noes* 267. The 'Noes' have it.

The motion was negatived.

17.05 hrs.

RE. CLOSURE OF BANARAS HINDU UNIVERSITY—*contd.*

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया (फर्रुखाबाद): अध्यक्ष महोदय, सब से पहले तो आप मुझे आपत्ति करने दें कि इस विश्वविद्यालय का नाम हिन्दुस्तानी में काशी विश्वविद्यालय है, अंग्रेजी में बनारस हिन्दू यूनिवर्सिटी है । इस लिये जब भी हिन्दी में कोई चीज छापी जाये, तो उसको काशी विश्वविद्यालय के सम्बन्ध में छापा जाना चाहिये ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब आप सवाल कीजिये ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : यह बहुत गलत चीज चल रही है जिस का सुधार हो जाना चाहिये ।

अब इस विश्वविद्यालय के सम्बन्ध में मैं आप को थोड़ी पृष्ठभूमि बतला दूं क्योंकि एक तो तात्कालिक झगड़ा हुआ करता है और एक सालों पीछे से चला आया हुआ करता है । बुनियादी तौर पर तो यह विश्वविद्यालय सन् 1942 में स्वराज्य की लड़ाई में बन्द हुआ था । उस के बाद से यह तीन बार बन्द हो चुका है । तीनों बार यह क्यों बन्द हुआ । बुनियादी बात यह है कि एक तरफ यह विश्वविद्यालय पूर्वी उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार की गरीबी का केन्द्र बन गया था और लड़के ज्यादा भरती हो रहे थे, दूसरी तरफ यह हिन्दुस्तानी भाषा के माध्यम का केन्द्र बनता जा रहा था, और यह चीज कुछ लोगों को सुहाई नहीं । केन्द्र ने इन दोनों बातों को बन्द करने के लिये, अर्थात् एक तो गरीबों का जो प्रभाव काशी विश्वविद्यालय में बढ़ रहा था और भरती बढ़ रही थी उस को रोकने के लिये और दूसरे भाषा को तबाह करने के लिये, इस विश्वविद्यालय को झगड़े में चपेटने के लिये प्रयत्न किया । इस पर भी....

अध्यक्ष महोदय : अब आप सवाल कीजिये ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : जब तक यह पृष्ठ भूमि नहीं रहती तब तक यह सवाल बार-बार उठता रहेगा और विश्वविद्यालय का बन्द करना....

अध्यक्ष महोदय : डाक्टर साहब मेरी तकलीफ़ तो देखिये । इतने मेम्बर हैं । सब को मुझे सवाल करने की इजाजत देनी है । अगर हर एक मेम्बर स्पीच करने लग जाये तो कम से कम छः घंटे लग जायेंगे ।

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अगर इसी तरह से सवाल किया जायेगा तो उस से कोई मतलब नहीं निकलेगा । विश्वविद्यालय बार-बार बन्द होता रहेगा । लेकिन चलिये, मुझे सवाल ही करने दीजिये ।

क्या इस बात का मंत्री महोदय को पता नहीं लगा है कि इंजीनियरिंग कालेज और कला कालेज को आपस में लड़ाने से ज्यादा फायदा नहीं हुआ करता क्योंकि इस बार दोनों कालेज के छात्र एक साथ

---

*Sarvashri Sham Lal Saraf, H. C. Linga Reddy and M. L. Jadhav all wanted to vote for 'Noes".