

सदन में रखे। यही रिक्वेस्ट हम आपके जरिये सरकार से कर रहे हैं।

**श्री उप-सभापति :** रिक्वेस्ट तो सवेरे भी की गई थी।

**श्री मोहन लाल गौतम :** सवेरे की रिक्वेस्ट का ही यह नतीजा हुआ कि दो रिपोर्टें हाउस के सामने आ गई हैं मगर अभी पूरा नतीजा नहीं निकला। चेंबर पर दबाव डालने से दो रिपोर्टें आ गई हैं जब कि हमने सिर्फ 45 मिनट ही इस पर बहस की थी। इसलिये मैं आप से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि आप 22 मिनट और दे दें ताकि तीसरी रिपोर्ट भी आ जाय।

**श्री उप-सभापति :** आपने काफी कह दिया है और अब आप बैठ जाइये।

**श्री मोहन लाल गौतम :** मैं आप से यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि यू० पी० के बारे में जो कल बहस होने वाली है अगर राज्यपाल महोदय की रिपोर्ट नहीं रखी जाती है तो वह बहस बेकार होगी। यू० पी० के बारे में कल बहस करना बेकार होगा अगर वहां के संबंध में राज्यपाल महोदय की रिपोर्ट हमारे सामने नहीं रखी है। इसलिये मैं आप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर आप हाउस का समय बचाना चाहते हैं तो जो डिस्कशन कल होने जा रहा है उसके पहले राज्यपाल महोदय की रिपोर्ट हमारे सामने आ जानी चाहिये ताकि बहस को बाकार किया जाय बेकार न किया जाय।

इसलिये मैं सरकार से दरखास्त करता हूँ कि वह यू० पी० के बारे में राज्यपाल महोदय की रिपोर्ट को सदन के सामने रखे।

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :** We have heard you enough. That will be enough. Mr. S. N. Mishra.

#### MOTION OF THANKS ON THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS—*contd.*

**SHRI S. N. MISHRA :** Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I wish I could associate myself somewhat enthusiastically with  
M 13 RS/70—8

the sentiments of the hon'ble mover of the Motion in this House and, if I may say so, somewhat sweetly and delicately with the seconder of the Motion so far as their sentiments in respect of the gracious Address of our esteemed President is concerned. But if I am not able to do so, Mr. Deputy Chairman, the responsibility is entirely of the Government which the hon'ble mover of the Resolution supports.

Sir, one could have noticed the obvious unease and discomfort with which the honourable mover of the Motion was trying to organise a few words of thanks for the President. The hon'ble Mover, I know, is not a professionally trained person in thanks-giving—and he admitted that in the very beginning—as some of the other hon'ble colleagues are on the other side of the House.

But may I say that no one can derive any kind of inspiration from an Address of this kind? I am very clear on this point in my mind. The Government has, Mr. Deputy Chairman, in my humble opinion, brought about a devaluation of the President's Address as surely as it has done in respect of the Presidential awards...

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** I hope not on the advice of Mr. Asoka Mehta.

**SHRI S. N. MISHRA :** Whoever did it the Government has brought about a devaluation of the President's Address as surely as it has done of the Presidential awards, as was illustrated in the case of the conferment of Padma Shri on Shri Ghatak on the occasion of the last Republic Day.

This Address, is a completely lifeless, dull, dry and desiccated Address the like of which we have had very few in the past. And this was bound to be so because the Government has only tried to cover up its failures on the economic front, its failures on the international front, its failures on the defence front and also, most important of all, its failures on the political front.

One of my hon. colleagues on this side just now referred to the anxiety expressed by the hon. Chief Justice of India about the danger to democracy. And in conjunction with that, Mr. Deputy Chairman, you will also recollect that the Chief of the Army Staff, General Manekshaw, said the other

[Shri S. N. Mishra]

day that he was not in favour of the military personnel being drawn upon for quelling civil disorders. Now I do not see any similarity, I do not, for the life of me like to read any kind of similarity, between what General Manekshaw said and what the Chief of the General Staff of Pakistan said to Gen. Ayub Khan, the then President of Pakistan. The Pakistani General went straight to the President of Pakistan and said, Mr. "President, you just cannot expect us to quell civil disorders with the help of the military personnel." I do not want to draw any parallel because the conditions in India are different. And yet I would not like to fail in drawing attention to the implications of the two important statements made by the two important persons of this country.

But what exactly do you find? The President of India, Mr. Deputy Chairman, has not been enabled by this Government to present the whole Indian scene, and thereby the Government has also brought about a shrinkage in the stature of the office of the President of India. The functions and authority of the President of India do not only relate to the Central Government. I would maintain with all the emphasis at my command that the functions and the authority of the President of India relate to the entire Indian Republic, and the President in his Address should survey the entire Indian scene. Has the Address done that? The Address does not do anything of that kind. The Address only gives some humdrum details in the beginning about the economic situation, details which could have been taken care of, and I am quite sure that they are going to be taken care of, in the Economic Survey. To burden the gracious Address of the most esteemed President with these humdrum details is an idea which could occur only to this Government. There could have been brief references, no doubt, to the economic situation.

What, after all, has the President been made to say? What are the achievements on the economic front of the last few months? Let it be quite clear in the minds of hon. Members that I would not like to criticise the Government for the time till we were together. And I am not going to heap on them all the omissions and commissions—and there are bound to be

omissions and commissions in the career of any democratic party in power—of the past few years for which we were equally responsible. But the past few months have shown that there have been serious failures on the economic front. So far as the common people of India are concerned, they are bound to feel some kind of anxiety about the price situation. And what has been the price situation? The price situation, Mr. Deputy Chairman, has been somewhat disturbing. It has risen over a year to the extent of 7 per cent. The foodgrain prices increased by nearly 10 per cent. The prices of raw materials went up by 11.7 per cent. This has been the achievement of the Government on the price front which concerns the common people and the labour.

Then, we have been talking very often about self-reliance. In fact, that is one of the most important national objectives which the country must hold up before itself. But this very important national objective of self-reliance is now being seriously threatened and imperilled. We have learnt that there has been a precipitous fall in the rate of growth of exports. The stipulation in our Fourth Five-Year Plan is that our exports must chalk up a rate of growth of about 7 per cent and then alone we would be in a position to attain a self-reliant economy in days to come. But what has been the achievement of the Government on the export front? And export is not a simple matter. It relates to our national objective of self-reliance and, therefore, of self-respect as a nation. Has not there been a precipitous fall? The Government has not said anything about it. But certain other things about exports have been doled out to us.

What has happened on the industrial front? The industrial sector, indeed, has been picking up to some extent, but that has been possible mainly because of the fact that there has been a slack in the economy which was undergoing a recession. There was unutilised capacity and on that slack we have been able to draw. And yet the achievement is only about 7 per cent rate of growth in our economy, whereas the stipulation in the Fourth Five-Year Plan is that it must be 8 to 10 per cent. I really do not know what is the Fourth Five-Year Plan we are talking about. I have been a student of planning

perhaps for a longer period than many of them sitting on the Government side and am even now associated with planning in some way. I must tell you that the Fourth Five-Year Plan has become completely out of date and the Government must not dupe the people about it. None of its objectives whether on the investment front or on the production front or on any important front is going to be achieved. That is clear enough. I would come with a certain amount of details and information on this subject when I take part in the discussion either on the Budget or on the Fourth Five-Year Plan, if the Government has the good sense to bring it up in Parliament at a time when Parliament would be able to devote some time and thinking to it. I have my fears that the Government would come up with the Fourth Five-Year Plan towards the fag-end of this session. That would not be fair to Parliament of India which would like to concern itself with planning more than with anything else.

Now on the industrial front I would sound a warning that as soon as this slack is exhausted, there would not be much unutilised capacity to draw upon and then the problem of raw materials also would come in which would come in the way of our achieving the stipulated growth rate in the industrial sector.

Then, the esteemed President was pleased to refer to the seriousness of the unemployment problem. It does seem to me that the Government has only paid a ritualistic attention to this problem of unemployment. Do you get any kind of assurance as a result of the gracious Address of the President? Whatever has been said, does not carry any conviction that the Government is going to set about this task with any amount of seri-

ousness. What has the Government said? In fact it was admitted by the honourable mover of the Resolution that there had been a growth in employment only to the extent of 2 per cent. But what has been the rate of growth in unemployment? Unemployment in the country has been increasing at the rate of 7 per cent per annum and the rate of employment in the industrial sector—that may be comparatively a small sector—has been increasing at the rate of 2 per cent. What is the gravity of the problem of the educated unemployed?—To that the esteem-

ed President has not thought it fit to pay any attention. Now this situation is becoming really explosive—the problem of the educated unemployed. This is my estimate that at this point of time probably the number of the educated unemployed would be 1.6 million. That means that about 16 lakhs of the educated unemployed are there on the live register of this country. With this large number of the educated unemployed you can think that the country is sitting on a powder keg. If this is the situation, where is the assurance that you are going about this task in a really serious way?

Now, I was saying that the President has not told us the full story of the Indian Republic. The President did refer to the fact or probably the Government condescended to pass on only this information to the President—that there were serious riots in the city of Ahmedabad. But no information has been given about the serious political and other disorders in the country. That is serious enough. We all know what happened in the city of Ahmedabad so far as the communal situation was concerned. But was that the only aspect of the national political situation to which the President should have drawn the attention of the country and Parliament? Are not there very serious political disorders which have caused the Chief Justice of India voice anxiety and concern about the future of the Indian democracy itself.

What has been happening in West Bengal? I must say that the situation in West Bengal has not been touched upon. That is a piece of dynamite which the Government does not want to touch at all. What has been happening there? In the State of West Bengal the Chief Minister says that there is "an uncivilised and barbarous Government". The Deputy Chief Minister says that "the Chief Minister has been subverting the Constitution by annihilating the Council of Ministers". These are within quotes, the Chief Minister has been saying something on this line and the Deputy Chief Minister has been saying something on that line. And what does the Home Minister, the wise Home Minister of India, say? Sometimes he gets away with his brevity of words. Whenever he has to speak on any subject, he has only to say that this is the political solution. These two words, the political solution, seem to be the key words for the Home

[Shri S. N. Mishra]

Minister to get away with any thing. He may not have any rationale with him. He may not have any reasoning or argument with him, and he gets away with that. What the Home Minister of India says is, "No comments". Or, if he is a little more communicative, he says that "there is no law and order situation in West Bengal". If that is so, I would ask you one question. It may be that we are having the spectacle of a unique experiment in West Bengal and we will have to watch it with all the care and attention. But I must say that the people cannot be silent spectators, the President of the Indian Republic cannot be a silent spectator to this, nor can this House afford to be a silent spectator to this. But what I would like to say is that if there is no drastic therapy that can be applied to this situation in West Bengal, can there not be any human engineering? Who is doing the human engineering so far as the situation there is concerned? The Home Minister would not go anywhere near the borders of West Bengal. He has been perambulating from Delhi to many of the small towns of Maharashtra. . .

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : He went to Patna recently.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Merciful enough that he went to Patna. Although it was an accident—I must be fair to the Home Minister that he went to Patna at the time of the meeting of the Consultative Committee of Members of Parliament—it was a bad conjunction from our point of view. But the Home Minister would not be allowed to do any kind of human engineering. The Home Minister is an unwanted daughter-in-law in the house of the honourable Prime Minister. So he would not be allowed to do anything, any kind of human engineering. . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : On a point of order. He is trying to liken the Home Minister to a daughter-in-law. But we have better ideas.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : No, please understand this. . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I think it would not be a proper analogy.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : But daughters-in-law are sometimes unwanted in the house.

So Sir, the President of the Republic did not tell us the full story about the situation that is developing in India.

The first and the most important fact, the most patent fact that should have been noted by the President was that there is now for the first time after independence a minority Government functioning at the Centre. This should have been noted by him because it has been his pleasure to address a Parliament which was having for the first time in the citadel of power a minority Government. And the Government is in minority no doubt. It is a kind of United Front Government behind a *purdah*. The real nature of it should have been placed before us by the President in some manner so that Parliament could think about the problems that would arise in this kind of a United Front Government behind *purdah*, because we know the problems which are confronting a U.F. Government outside the *purdah*. We know something about that. We should have been told about it so that the House could have bent its energies to thinking about those problems. This is a Government which is going in a kind of palanquin which is carried by one of my most honourable friends, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. . . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : No, no. It would have been better if it were so. But my friend has been carrying Mr. Nijalingappa's palanquin !

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA : The honourable Member is not fair to one of the most eminent Members of this House. He is too manly to operate behind *purdah*. He is too great to carry a palanquin.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : I do not suggest in any way that he is a member of the Star Chamber of the Government. Even so, what I would like to submit is that this point should have been noted and this is the most important point for the consideration of this honourable House.

When I was enumerating some of the failures of this Government I was conscious of the fact that nothing better could have been expected of this Government. The Government has always been in a kind of oxygen tent for all these months. . . .

(Interruptions)

Now the Government, Mr. Deputy Chairman, which has been living constantly in close proximity of the exist door cannot be expected to do better than what it has been doing. Therefore I have all the sympathy and compassion for this Government. It is all the time obsessed with the problems of its survival. This is an ordinary physical and psychological law that if you are always pre-occupied with the problems of your survival, you cannot make any forward motion. And as the Sanskrit saying goes :

भोजने यत्तसन्देहो धनाशा किम करिष्यति ।

So what can we expect of this Government when it is concerned all the time with its existence, to save itself from extinction and death ? But what is disturbing is that it has not hesitated to do anything which would imperil the future of this country. This is my grievance against this Government; it has absolutely no qualms to do anything which would imperil the future of this country. Now, Sir, a Prime Minister has necessarily got to stick to certain norms for the stability of democracy in this country. What is most amazing and unprecedented has been happening in this country. The Head of the Government of India has been undertaking tours in order to crusade against the Heads of Governments in some of the States in this country. (*Interruption*) I am not saying anything in a spirit of undue criticism but I am saying all this on the basis of what has been appearing in the newspapers. I must say that I would like to go by certain objective standards. I am not trying to say something which would unnecessarily malign the Prime Minister or for that matter the Government. But these things have been happening and appearing in the newspapers from day to day, and this struck me as most amazing that the Prime Minister should have undertaken tours only to topple the Governments. We have heard of the topless in the social field but topplers in the political field is something which is no less interesting and perhaps no less charming also in some way. But here I must say that if this goes on, then you cannot have stability of democracy in this quasifederal set-up. A quasifederal set-up, Mr. Deputy Chairman, does demand certain norms of conduct and behaviour on the part of the highest person in the Government. Otherwise this quasi-

federal set-up cannot ensure stability. And what has happened is that these tours have been organised by the Government, financed by the Government and conducted in Government transport. A fleet of helicopters has been mobilised and for these helicopters helipads too have been constructed. (*Interruptions*). You can contradict me with facts and figures later. So, Sir, these tours were conducted only to topple certain Governments. With all the seriousness at my command, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I put it to you : Under these conditions can you expect any stability or any future for our country ?

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I am saying you have taken 27 minutes already.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : There is enough time, the rest of time from my party.

Now, Sir, we will have to frame some rules for the tours of the Prime Minister as also for the tours of Central Ministers. Some of the Central Ministers take aeroplanes of the Central Government to attend political meetings of a highly partisan character and mostly for that purpose they are going there. I am not only referring to the Prime Minister for this purpose but there are some other examples. (*Interruption*). Therefore, I say, that should have been mentioned by the President in his Address. I do not know why some persons on the other side are interrupting. You can take your time and we would all be here to listen to you with as much attention as we can muster. So these are the doubts which arise in our minds as representatives of the people who have got as much national responsibility as the Prime Minister has. We do not consider that our responsibility is any the less because we are not in office. Therefore I want to place before this hon. House all the facts that have been made available to me.

Then, Mr. Deputy Chairman, we have also heard that there have been serious allegations that the Prime Minister and her Government have recently pressurised Governors in the States and those allegations are going to be taken up tomorrow. But it is only as an aspect of the present-day national situation that I would like to place it before the House today. There have

[Shri S. N. Mishra]

been serious allegations, and perhaps for good reasons the reasons are going to be made known to the House tomorrow, that there have been heavy pressures from this side and the situation has come to this stage that the august office of the Governor has been used for highly partisan purposes. The House will have to think very seriously how to checkmate politics and manoeuvrings of the Central Government operating through the august office of the Governor. Unless there are some effective checks against political manoeuvrings of the Central Government operating through the Governors, I think there would be no peace in this country.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Abolish the post of Governor.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Then come forward with that amendment but you are completely opting out of the field.

Now, Mr. Deputy Chairman, the Central Government, according to the spirit of our Constitution, is not only *central* in physical or geographical sense but the Central Government is *central* in the political sense too. It cannot be only a partisan Government all the time. The office of the Prime Minister of India is also one which has to be looked upon as the trusted tribune of the people. But how does the Prime Minister of India really function? It seems to me that the Prime Minister of India functions only as a *part-time* Prime Minister of India, because three-fourths of her time is occupied with partisan politics or petty politics. This is not a phenomenon in respect of the Prime Minister herself; we have got also a *part-time* Food and Agriculture Minister, because he must devote some time, a major part of his time, to the Presidentship of the so-called requisitionists' Congress. This infection is bound to spread. The Home Minister too does appear to me to be functioning more for keeping his own State in order because he fears that some serious troubles are brewing there and they are bound to take serious dimensions in days to come. So what is happening now is that the office of the Prime Minister of India which was looked upon as a cementing force so far as political unity was concerned, has become a highly controversial and

disintegrating force. That is a tragedy for this country. What I am saying is not at all from the point of view of the Opposition. I am saying this with great agony in my mind about the future. If the office of the Prime Minister of India functions for such a disintegrating role and, if I may say so, so far as the values are concerned, not very uplifting role—I cannot say degrading—then the future of the country is indeed very bleak and the House must think about these, things in a rather serious way.

Then I come to defections. Now defectionism is being preached, practised and propagated by the leaders of the Central Government. Wherever they go, they go with the gospel and the mission of defectionism. Defectionism is now the creed which has been elevated to the status of almost a religion by the leaders of the Central Government. What do you find?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : You are yourself a defector.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Whether I am or not history will judge. I am at the bar of history and you also cannot keep out of it. What I say is that the good work done by this House and the other House in the report of the Committee on Defection has been completely nullified. One who would now talk about implementing the report of the Committee on Defections would make himself utterly ridiculous. You can rest assured that from our side of the House this stupidity would not be indulged in that I should ever come before you for the implementation of this report when the Government, when the leaders of the Government themselves are indulging in this so blatantly.

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI K. K. SHAH) : That is not fair.

(Interruptions)

That is what you are doing....

SHRI S. D. MISHRA (Uttar Pradesh) : Tonnes of money are flowing.

SHRI K. K. SHAH : Where money is flowing I know. It will be proved.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, order. You may continue, Mr. Mishra.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : I thought that in addition to many of his other qualities, the

Leader of the House had also the asset of great wealth or at least of mobilising great resources. And if he does not accept it, I think it is the misfortune of his Party. But one did not think that he is one of the persons who cannot mobilise a great deal of resources.

SHRI K. K. SHAH : I thought you will observe the Code of Conduct between us.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : He is very right because you have lost so much in these Benches that you have to cover up or make up.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Another part of the disturbing political situation in the country which also must be noted by the hon. House is that for the first time not one Governor but many Governors have spoken against the Central Government in their Addresses and therefore identified themselves with the politics of the States. That is also a matter which you cannot fail to notice.

Then I would come to some other lighter side and yet, in its import, somewhat grave aspect regarding the President's Address

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : I thought the Leader of the Opposition was saying something very seriously.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : This is for the consumption of my hon'ble friend Shri Akbar Ali Khan. We are told that there was something astrological about the beginning of this Session.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Nandaji has come back and so also Haveli Ram...

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Our esteemed President is said to have opened the Joint Session on an auspicious day discovered after a good deal of laborious search by astrologers. But while the services of those astrologers were pressed, were they for the fortunes of the President? No, not at all. I have checked up on that; it was for sustaining the fortunes of the Government. And I have no doubt that this astrological aspect of the functioning of the Government would be further strengthened by the advent of my hon. friend Shri Gulzarilal Nanda as the Railway Minister.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Do I understand that astrology has defected? You find Mr. Morarji Desai has gone to that side.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : If Mr. Desai had that faith, then that faith is not helping him at all. But may I submit that this Government which is surviving with the heart transplant from our friends like Shri Bhupesh Gupta or some others, I do not know which Dhanwantari is going to help. (*Interruptions*). I know you do not want to be clubbed with the hon'ble Member Shri Bhupesh Gupta, in which group I place you sometimes but I cannot help. Would you please help me out of this situation sometimes? What I say is that this Government which is surviving with the heart transplant from the Communists, Communalists and also secessionists, cannot be expected to last long.

SHRI K. K. SHAH : Now you can find out who has consulted the astrologers.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Mr. Nijalینگappa is bound by his horoscope...

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : A kind of Nasakom seems to be functioning in this country, the same kind of Nasakom which functioned in Indonesia. And I am quite sure in my mind that the Communist-courting Prime Minister of India is not going to meet a better fate than the Communist-courting President of Indonesia because the policy is the same which brought the other country, that is Indonesia, into great difficulties.

But this astrological aspect of the functioning of the Government is not only confined to the political situation. There is something else astrological too and I am coming to that. The House would be very much interested, particularly my friends from the Communist Party—of both shades—that there is something astrological about the sudden spurt in the thinking of the Prime Minister on socialism. There is something astrological about it; otherwise, did we hear so much about it earlier?

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) IN THE CHAIR].

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I hope, Sir, no constellation of stars has brought you there.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Otherwise, Mr. Vice-Chairman, how are we to explain the incessant radical outpourings only after the Bangalore Session of A.I.C.C.? You saw how the artesian level of socialism was struck at the All India Congress Committee Session in Bangalore in the month of July last. And after that this socialism has been gushing forth in such a ceaseless stream that it seems to have no let or hindrance. (*Interruptions*). Let me correct myself.

SHRI K. K. SHAH : You are also affected.

AN HON. MEMBER : The Leader of the Opposition should not be disturbed in his speech.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : There seems to be something astrological about the month of July in the year 1969.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA : Mr. Mishra was a convener of some sort of socialist forum till some time back. Now he has passed on his socialism to Mrs. Sharda Mukherjee.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : All right, if that is your pleasure, then I think the socialism of Mrs. Indira Gandhi stands inferior to the socialism of Mrs. Sharda Mukherjee by any test.

SHRI C. D. PANDE (Uttar Pradesh) : Ivory tower of socialism.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Anyway let us not bring in all that.

Now it went on gushing forth, but I must correct myself and say that it again came to a stop in the month of December when the Prime Minister met a Japanese Business Delegation, when the Prime Minister happened to encounter, as it were, the Japanese Business Delegation. And what did the Prime Minister say at that time? "Now there is going to be no more nationalisation of anything. We don't contemplate any further nationalisation, and this bank nationalisation is an old and hoary thing, which had been accepted by my party much earlier. There is nothing new about this but we don't contemplate for goodness' sake any further nationalisation." And not only that. Recently, in the month of January, at Budaun in Uttar Pradesh,

the Prime Minister even came down to saying this that there was no intention to nationalise even the key industries. These are facts which have been reported and which have gone uncontradicted. So it is not even the key industries on the agenda, and yet my hon. friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta has developed so much solicitude for the socialism of the Prime Minister. And that makes me completely dazed. It dazes me that a person like Shri Bhupesh Gupta, who has been fighting for socialism in such an aggressive manner, reads, in spite of these pronouncements, other meanings in all these things. And probably he also consults some astrologer to find out other meaning in all this—I really do not know. But these patent facts are before me that the Prime Minister did say all this. And would anybody come forward and say that the Prime Minister did not say all this?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : My astrologer is out of Bengal—Shri Atulya Ghosh; I cannot consult him. Therefore I am absolutely helpless.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Mr. Vice-Chairman, so the Prime Minister has gone on record; these have been reported and these reports have not yet been contradicted. I see some kind of a seesaw movement in all this, a kind of planned rhythm suiting the political expediency of the Prime Minister. Otherwise, how do you explain these sometimes pro-Birla postures and sometimes anti-Birla postures? Sometimes anti-Birla postures are taken and an inquiry is ordered. But the inquiry is delayed. The terms of reference are delayed. And for what purpose? May be, there was the Bombay session coming and a lot of things were required to be done for it. We, naturally, are all practical people and the Prime Minister is no less. Then again, after that, we heard of the Goa fertilizer factory to be set up by the Birlas. I do not go into the merits of it just now; there would be opportunity for doing that. But what I am saying is that these things can be explained only in terms of a deliberate rhythm that the Prime Minister has been adopting, and all this is being done with the last word in the finesse of a female artist. Otherwise, what are these anti-postures sometimes, and pro-postures at other times, I really do not know.



THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Mr. Mishra, it does not behove you, the Leader of the Opposition, to say so.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : I am not saying anything objectionable. Sir, I am saying some of the most pleasant things. I am saying that all this is being done with the perfection of an artist. I say there is artistry in what the Prime Minister has been doing.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Is he qualified to speak on art? With Mrs. Tarakeshwari in his camp he perhaps is more qualified to speak on art than anybody else.

SHRI S. N. MISRA : I really do not know, Mr. Vice-Chairman, why you do not restrain these hon. Members from bringing in the names of Members of the other House. I have a grievance against you on that score, Sir.

*(Interruptions)*

This Address, Mr. Vice-Chairman, makes again a resounding declaration of faith in socialism after the Prime Minister took a number of regressive steps and made a number of regressive statements. I come to them now. I am not a person who would speak in the air; the other side must bear it in mind since they have been sometimes interrupting. They are bound to reel under my attack because they are going to be well presented and they are not going to be based on certain fictional or imaginary things. Now whom are they going to convince by this resounding declaration of faith in democratic socialism the edifice of which they want to build brick by brick from below—as they say? Whom are they going to convince except those who are attached to them only for patronage or for material advantages? They are not going to convince any other person in the world except perhaps a too obliging hon'ble Shri Bhupesh Gupta. Even as regards my hon. friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, I have great faith in him so far. Sometimes when he is talking, we find him very objective, and I think he would examine these things also in a very dispassionate and objective manner, these things of this Government, which thinks of bank nationalisation as the terminal station of socialism. *(Interruptions)* Many do say that bank nationalisation is

the terminal station of socialism. Can that Government convince anybody that what they say is socialism?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : The planes were in their terminal station and you are hijacking whatever plane was available there.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : No, no, I am not hijacking; she is herself hijacking.

Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, since I told you about this rhythm, I am coming to certain examples also immediately lest I forget them later. We have always been stressing this fact, but if you want to examine the socialism of this Government, examine their spleen. There is something personal about it. There is something not very genuine about this socialism. So there is something splenetic about their socialism. Let me make myself clear, I repeat, if you want to examine their socialism, you examine their spleen. And all this came only after the rift that took place in the Presidential election. And what has this Government been doing? Again you would be astounded to learn of certain developments that have taken place in the course of the last few months. Now we are having a kind of polyester or a kind of nylon socialism functioning under the leadership of Shrimati Indira Gandhi.

SHRI KRISHNA KANT (Haryana) : Ginger socialism.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : It is polyester socialism, very scientific. You please see the taste of ginger socialism. Now a kind of polyester socialism, a kind of nylon socialism seems to be functioning under the leadership of Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi.

While the poor masses require only rough cloth at cheap prices, the socialist empress of India—I am using that word with a purpose—says, why not have nylon, why not have polyester, as the French empress said to the starving millions, if they do not have bread, why do not they eat cakes. This is what the socialist empress of India is saying that you can have polyester if you are unable to pay for rough, cheap and standard cloth. And what has been done in this regard? The great achievement of this socialist Government is that three or four polyester factories totalling up to

[Shri S. N. Mishra]

30 to 40 crores, when our resources are very scarce, are being established in the country. Licences for these have been given by this Government and one of the factories is going to be located in the august constituency of the great socialist Prime Minister, in Rae Bareilly.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA : That is not correct. It is proposed at Ghaziabad.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : If that is not correct, I would stand corrected. But this is an unassailable, incontrovertible fact that three polyester factories are going to be established.

SHRI OM MEHTA (Jammu and Kashmir) : What is wrong in that ?

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Because they are said to be for the masses. The hon. Deputy Chief Whip of the Government must understand the economics of it also. These polyester factories are going to be based on the DMT produced by the Koyali public sector factory. The public sector factory would produce the raw material and the consumer goods based on that would be produced by the private sector. The raw material stage is not a very profitable stage, so the Government seems to stand only for the socialisation of losses and not for the socialisation of gains. This is something which I am not able to understand. At this rate, Mr. Vice-Chairman, the public sector to which many of our friends on that side also seem to be devoted and rightly too, is bound to end as a subsidiary of the private sector and nothing more. I am not a person who would go by mere slogans. This is public sectorism that is being preached in this country; this is not a socialism. Every public sector unit is not a socialist enterprise. The public sector will have to qualify to be a socialist enterprise; it is not *ipso facto* a socialist enterprise. Therefore what is being preached in the country is a kind of public sectorism and we will have to raise our voice against it.

Now let us come to more recent development. On the eve of the joint session another very great socialist example was set and that was the delicensing of industries. Now what has this delicensing done ? Hon. Members must understand the implications of this delicensing. This delicensing apart from freeing industries from licensing up to Rs. 1 crore also permits the key sector

of the industries to the big industrial houses. The key sector of the industries is going to be thrown open to the big industrial houses and for that necessary resources will have to be made available to them. That is what has been said in the Dutt Committee Report; if you give licences, all financial and other resources required must be made available to them. That is what is going to be done under the new policy of delicensing. The only possible result of this policy that I can foresee is—not that I want to run down all the aspects of this delicensing policy—that there would be a spurt in the production of luxury and semi-luxury goods and our production system would get distorted. The production system would get oriented to the needs of the higher income groups; it would not be oriented to the needs of the poor and the lower income groups. Let the House bear this in mind when they consider this policy of this Government.

To crown it all, what this Government has done is—and that cannot be forgiven by the people easily—that they have postponed indefinitely the national target of fulfilling the basic needs of the people in terms of food, clothing, housing, health, education. In the Fourth Five Year Plan document which has been approved by the Central Cabinet, they have postponed it indefinitely and yet this Government considers itself to be a Congress Government. It was the Congress session at Bhubaneswar which passed a Resolution the important feature of which was that we made a commitment to the people that we would be fulfilling their basic necessities of life by the year 1975-76. This target was repeated in the election manifesto of 1967 and it was further emphasized in the Ten Point Programme. Now, there are friends on that side who want the Ten Point Programme to be implemented sincerely. Why don't they pull up this Government which has postponed this important national target of fulfilling the basic necessities of the life of the people by 1975-76 ? That is why I have given notice of an amendment.

According to me, what is being preached by the Government side is pseudo-radicalism which is worse than reaction and which would stunt the growth of socialism and justice. You cannot expect anything from policies of this kind. The real socialist

challenge is in the fulfilment of this national target of fulfilling the basic necessities of the life of the people by 1975-76 because that would require a major production drive and major shift in the distribution of national income. Then alone you can achieve this target by 1975-76. Socialism does not consist in odd disjointed moves, socialism consists in a planned strategy which would bring about the redistribution of the national income according to the needs of the people. This is an important target for which, if for nothing else, the Government must be attacked by the entire Opposition—and the Opposition now is real Opposition—and unless the Government is made to accept this target I think the Opposition would be failing in its cardinal duty by the nation. Therefore I have placed this for the consideration of this House.

Only one or two words more. One thing which I would like to mention is with regard to the privy purses. The Government does not give us any idea of the progress made. Something has been indicated but not much of a progress has been reported on what the Government has been saying on this subject. You know, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that we, as Congress, stand committed to the abolition of privy purses and privileges. We passed a Resolution on this in a session of the AICC in which I had a role to play and the Ten Point Programme contains this as one of the items.

**SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY :** The entire House has passed a Resolution here.

**SHRI S. N. MISHRA :** Yes; the Rajya Sabha also has passed a Resolution but what has happened? It is bankruptcy of statesmanship of the Government that they could not bring it about through negotiations. If the Government had the requisite tact and firmness—sweetness and at the same time firmness—then probably this could have been brought about.

Now, our mind goes today to the revered memory of our great Home Minister and Deputy Prime Minister, Sardar Patel, who brought about the accomplishment of a greater task, namely, the integration of the States, a much greater task, by the snap of his finger, without batting his eyelids. But here is a Government which could not

bring it about through negotiations. This is a bankruptcy of the statesmanship of this Government. This Government cannot be expected to accomplish any task. This is a much smaller task compared to the integration of the States. Even this small task could not be accomplished by these leaders. There is a great merit in that approach. Otherwise you come up against all kinds of legal complications and difficulties before the Supreme Court. Now it may be that the Supreme Court takes a view and there would be again a confrontation, but we do not shy away from that kind of approach. We can certainly make the legislative approach, but this should have been, in my humble opinion, accomplished by the leadership if it has got really the resources which go to make leadership. This leadership lacks the requisite resources and, therefore, it has not been brought about through negotiations.

Now, only a few words about international affairs and defence. I do not know how much time I have taken.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) :** Mr. Mishra, you started at 3.48 p.m. and it is now seven minutes to five. You have taken one hour and five minutes.

**SHRI S. N. MISHRA :** Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, the fact that the international situation has merited such a scanty attention in the Address is also significant. It causes us concern. This is symptomatic of the diminishing role of India in international affairs. This again shows the poverty of leadership. What are we to do? Are we to sit quietly watching the scene, watching the military escalation in West Asia? The four powers are meeting and discussing from day to day the situation in West Asia, but India has no role to play in West Asia. Why has it been so? My hon. friend reminds me of Rabat and Rabat is now unfolding itself. Now, there is going to be an Islamic secretariat. The full Rabat story is now unfolding itself. There is going to be an Islamic Secretariat and there are going to be protests from our side and that is what we are expected to do. Now, we have absolutely no role to play and why did it happen like that? Of course, we have to exert our weight on the side of justice and right cause, but there is a style which must be adopted in diplomacy. By

[Shri S. N. Mishra]

committing too aggressively to one side, we have forfeited the role of a mediator or even the desire to mediate. That is what has happened in the Arab world. I am a great friend of the Arab people in many ways. These people do deserve our sympathy and support but do not we expect anything in return? What happened? These people took us for granted. At Rabat, about the treatment that was meted out to us, the less said the better. That is what has happened in South East Asia also. We have in a manner committed ourselves to a stand on Vietnam, but what happened in Vietnam again? These friends do not accept any obligations so far as we are concerned. The most shabby treatment was meted out to our Foreign Minister in North Vietnam...

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Foreign Secretary.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Foreign Secretary. I am sorry. What we find, therefore, is that our non-alignment is being reduced to a theological doctrine and it is losing its creativeness because of the ossified and bankrupt statesmanship of the Foreign Affairs Ministry, or shall I say, of the Government as a whole. This is becoming completely uncreative. A Tito can think of bringing in a whiff of fresh air. We may disagree with his new ideas on non-alignment, but we seem to stay put where we began. We have to stick to non-alignment by the skin of our teeth. Let there be no doubt about it. But non-alignment in a changing world will have to acquire fresh attributes. Then alone it can cope with the developing world situation.

Now, one thing which has appeared in the press some time back and which was not probably duly noted by many of us is the statement of our Foreign Minister supporting the Russian position in the latest Sino-Soviet clashes on the Damansky Island. It is another example of our wrong style of foreign policy. Moscow has not found it prudent to support us in our border dispute with China. Soviet maps still continue to show the Chinese claimed territory as a part of China. Why should we be so over-zealous in aligning ourselves with the Russian stand on anything? We may have our views, but there must be some style of expressing them. Therefore, I find that our foreign policy, the real content of

the non-alignment in our foreign policy, is being imperilled. Our non-alignment is made synonymous with the absence of thinking in terms of national interest and that is a most dangerous thing. Therefore, I think that the House will have to think about our foreign policy in a much more serious and detailed way. It should not be taken in by the kind of ritualistic and perfunctory reference that has been made to it by our esteemed President.

Lastly, may I say that the Government is not thinking seriously about the security aspects of our foreign policy as also about the defence problem? We have been talking about a vacuum arising in the Indian Ocean, but there is no vacuum now in the Indian Ocean. The vacuum has already been filled in...

SHRI A. D. MANI : The vacuum is in Delhi.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : The vacuum is in the minds of men in Delhi, but there is no vacuum in the Indian Ocean. That has already been filled in, in spite of what they have been saying to our Parliament here.

So, with these words, I would like to say that it pains me not to associate myself with the motion. Although I happen to be the Leader of the Opposition, I would have considered it to be my sacred duty to pay my homage to the President, to pay my tributes to our most esteemed President, for having delivered his Address most graciously to both Houses. But if I am not able to do so, as I was saying in the beginning, the fault lies squarely on the Government which has not advised the President correctly in this matter. Thank you very much.

5 P. M.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, श्री नेता विरोधी दल ने एक बहुत ही भावात्मक तथा-त्मक व्याख्यान दिया, अच्छे ढंग से दिया, और इनके बाद हमको बोलना पड़ रहा है और बहुत थोड़ा समय हमारे लिये है, तो मैं आपसे यही निवेदन करूंगा...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री अकबर अली खान) : राजनारायण जी, आपकी पार्टी के पूरे 28 मिनट हैं, यह मैं आपसे अर्ज कर दे रहा हूँ।

**श्री राजनारायण :** यह तो आपको सब पार्टियों को पहले बताना चाहिये, खाली हमारी पार्टी को बताने की आवश्यकता नहीं है ।

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री अकबर अली खान) :** वह बता दिया है ।

**श्री राजनारायण :** अच्छा सुनिये, अनावश्यक ढंग से हमको छेड़िये नहीं ।

श्रीमान्, मैं तो कहूंगा कि मैं तो इसको प्रेसिडेंट का संभाषण मानता ही नहीं, अच्छा हो यदि इसे सरकार के सूचना विभाग के डाइरेक्टर का भाषण माना जाय या यह श्री आई० के० गुजराल का भाषण हो सकता है मगर राष्ट्रपति का संभाषण तो यह है ही नहीं और इस ढंग का संभाषण दे कर के राष्ट्रपति ने निश्चित ही अपने पद, अपनी महिमा, अपनी गरिमा को तौहीन किया है । मैं इस के एक एक पन्ने पर चलूँ और अपने को सीमित रखूँ तो हमको बहुत ज्यादा समय लग जायगा, इसलिये जो आज चर्चा में है, विवाद में है उतने तक ही अपने को सीमित रखूँगा ।

एक तो यह राष्ट्रपति कितना अज्ञानी है कि सुप्रीम कोर्ट के फैसले के बाद भी इस कानून की पौथी के पढ़ने की कृपा नहीं की, इन्होंने बैंको के राष्ट्रीयकरण शब्द का प्रयोग किया है कि राष्ट्रीयकरण के बाद राज्यों के बिजली बोर्डों को बैंकों से बड़ी मात्रा में ऋण लेने की सुविधा दी गई है । क्या मैं कहूँ कि किसी भी राष्ट्र का राष्ट्रपति जो इतना तथ्य और सत्य विहिन हो वह इस देश को कैसे संभाल सकता है ! वह कहते हैं 'राष्ट्रीयकरण' जब कि कानून का नाम है 'अधिग्रहण'—एक्वीजिशन । ये 14 बैंक अधिग्रहीत हुये, सरकार ने अपने हाथ में लिया, यह राष्ट्रीयकरण नहीं है, मगर राष्ट्रपति अपने संभाषण में कहते हैं राष्ट्रीयकरण । यह राष्ट्रीयकरण शब्द के साथ राष्ट्रपति महोदय इस सरकार के चक्कर में फंस कर स्वतः बलात्कार कर रहे हैं ।

मैं आज फिर कहना चाहता हूँ ये जो समाजवादी अपने को कहते हैं, तथाकथित समाजवादी अपने को कहते हैं उनसे, कि सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने जो बैंकों के बारे में कहा कि सभी बैंको को क्यों नहीं लिया गया उसके लिये सुप्रीम कोर्ट की तारीफ नहीं हो रही है । सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने कहा कि सरकार को सभी बैंकों को लेना चाहिये था, तमाम विदेशी और देशी सभी को, मगर एक नया अध्यादेश आया और उसमें भी वही 14 बैंक आये । वही जैसा कि हमने पहले कहा अब भी बताऊँ कि निजी-हाथ रूपी ताड़ के पेड़ से 14 बैंक गिरे और सरकार रूपी खजूर के पेड़ पर अटक गये, यह राष्ट्रीयकरण नहीं है, यह शुद्ध सरकारीकरण है, अगर समाजवाद लाना है तो सरकारी-ताड़ के, खजूर के पेड़ को काटना होगा और इन बैंको को समाज के हाथ में, राष्ट्र के हाथ में लाना होगा, कुछ निजी हाथों में इनको नहीं रखना चाहिये । निजी उद्योग-धंधों की समाप्ति चाहता हूँ लेकिन निजी उद्योगधंधे की समाप्ति के माने सरकार के हाथ में सारे उत्पादन, वितरण के साधन आ जाय मैं इसको समाजवाद मानता ही नहीं । हमारे बहुत से मित्र यहां बैठे हुये हैं, हमारे श्री एम० एन० मिश्रा जी भी सोशलिस्ट फोरम के कोई पदाधिकारी थे, पता नहीं इतने दिनों में इन्होंने समाजवाद क्या सीखा, क्या फर्क है समाजवादी दर्शन में और साम्यवादी दर्शन में ? कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी पहले से थी 1924 ई० से, फिर 1934 ई० में सोशलिस्ट पार्टी बनाने की आवश्यकता क्यों हुई, अगर कम्युनिस्ट फिलासफी और सोशलिस्ट फिलासफी में कोई फर्क नहीं है तो सोशलिस्ट पार्टी बनी क्यों ? और आज हम अपने को समाजवादी कहते ही क्यों हैं ? अगर कम्युनिस्ट ढांचा ही हमारा ढांचा हो तो सीधे सीधे इस पार्टी को खत्म कर देना चाहिये और कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के रूप में जा कर काम करना चाहिये । मगर, श्रीमान्, आप अच्छी तरह से इस बात को समझ लें और आपके द्वारा सदन के सम्मानित सदस्य इस बात को समझ लें

## [ उपसभाध्यक्ष ]

कि आज समाजवाद की हत्या हो रही है और समाजवाद के साथ, समाजवाद शब्द के साथ बहुत ही अनुचित व्यवहार हो रहा है प्रधानमंत्री श्रीमती इंदिरा नेहरू गांधी की तरफ से ।

इसके बाद फिर इन्होंने कहा है : “एक समाजवादी लोकतांत्रिक समाज के निर्माण के गंतव्य की ओर अविचल ले जाये ।” यह राष्ट्रपति की मंशा है । तो समाजवाद क्या है ? श्री के० के० शाह साहब समाजवाद क्या है ? समाजवाद आर्थिक विषमता की बढ़ोतरी है या समाजवाद आर्थिक विषमता की घटोतरी है ? श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी के प्रधानमंत्रित्व में आर्थिक विषमता बढ़ी है और जिस ढांचे में आर्थिक विषमता की बढ़ोतरी हो उस ढांचे को वही समाजवाद कह सकता है जो कि शूतुरमुर्ग की तरह अपने सिर को बालू में गड़ा कर देखता है, सभ्य समाज और जानकार समाज उसको समाजवाद कह ही नहीं सकता । मुझे आंकड़े देने की इस समय आवश्यकता भी नहीं है, समय भी नहीं है, वरना मैं आपको एक एक आंकड़े दे कर बताता कि इस समय आर्थिक विषमता कितनी बढ़ी है । हमारे मित्र श्री एस० एन० मिश्रा जी ने एक हवाला दे दिया, मैं भी इनको कह दूँ कि एक तरफ बिड़ला की इक्वायरी है, एक तरफ एकाधिपत्य है और एक तरफ 56 करोड़ रुपये का लाइसेंस गोवा में फर्टिलाइजर का, खाद का, क्यों है ? एक ही आदमी एक मुंह से गर्म और सर्द दोनों सांस ले, यह क्या मामला है ? अरे भाई यह समाजवाद है, अगर नहीं तो क्या है ? जनतंत्र के माने क्या है के० के० शाह साहब ?

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : चेयर को एड्रेस कीजिये ।

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, जनतंत्र का अर्थ ट्रेजरी बेंच से पूछा जाय । एक ही जनतंत्र की खर्ब है कि वह अल्पमत को बहुमत में परिणत होने की तमाम सुविधाएं

उपलब्ध करता है और जो ढांचा अल्पमत को बहुमत में परिणत होने के लिये तमाम अवसर उपलब्ध न करे उसे जनतंत्रीय प्रणाली कहना मूर्खता है । आज कांग्रेस, इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी की कांग्रेस, मूर्खों का राजा बनी हुई इस देश की अशिक्षित जनता के साथ खिलवाड़ कर रही है । मैं जानना चाहता हूँ, कौन से जनतंत्रीय प्रणाली में ऐसा है, श्री के० के० शाह पुराने हैं, वह शायद जानते होंगे, 1952 ई० में प्राइम मिनिस्टर जवाहरलाल नेहरू साहब थे, वह हेलीकाप्टर से चुनावों की मीटिंग में गये । तो हम लोगों को एतराज था कि कांग्रेस की तरफ से हेलीकाप्टर का इस्तेमाल नहीं होगा क्योंकि एक तरफ तो प्राइमिनिस्टर एक दिन में कई मीटिंग कर सकते हो और विरोधी पक्ष के लिये वह सुविधा नहीं हो, मगर यहां तो उत्तर प्रदेश में उत्तर प्रदेश की गवर्नमेंट को गिराने के लिये तीन तीन हेलीकाप्टर एक एक साथ गये हैं, एक बार रिहसल करने गये हैं और फिर एक में इनको ले कर गये हैं, एक में प्रधानमंत्री साहिबा विराजमान हैं और एक में श्री कमलापति त्रिपाठी हैं और एक में हमारे सारे पत्रकारों को भी साथ में जाने का मौका दिया गया ।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : आप भी तो पटना उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार के प्लेन से गये हैं, आप क्यों बोलते हैं ऐसा ?

श्री राजनारायण : देखो झूठ मत कहना, मेरे विषय में मत कहो, हम गये हैं तो हमने चार्ज दिया है, जो कहते हैं कि यू० पी० गवर्नमेंट का हुआ, वह गुलाम थे, वह झूठे हैं, बेईमान हैं, गद्दार हैं । वह हमने अपना चार्ज दिया है, मीटिंग में जाना था सो गये ।

तो मेरा कहना है कि यह जनतंत्र नहीं है, यह जनतंत्र का निषेध है, यह जनतंत्र का नेगेशन है और मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि कौन सी उत्तर प्रदेश की विषम समस्या आ गई थी जिसमें कि प्रधानमंत्री साहिबा तीन-तीन

हेलीकाप्टर से गई, एक जगह नहीं गई, अनेक जिलों में गई।

**श्री शीलभद्र याजी :** आप भी यू० पी० सरकार के हवाई जहाज से अपनी पटना की पार्टी मॉटिंग में गये। आप क्या बोलते हैं ?

**श्री राजनारायण :** आप देखें कि लखनऊ दिल्ली हो गई थी, लखनऊ दिल्ली की तरह थी, दिल्ली की तमाम डी० एल० वाई० टैक्सियां लखनऊ में विराजमान, राजस्थान की मुखाड़िया की टैक्सियां लखनऊ में विद्यमान, महाराष्ट्र की टैक्सियां लखनऊ में विद्यमान, और बिड़ला के कारखाने की नई नई अम्बैसेडर कारें थीं जिनमें वही प्लेट लगी थी, वही ओरिजिनल प्लेट थी जिसको कि ले कर आते हैं, वह कारें विराजमान थीं। हर जिले में चार चार, छः छः कारें, जहां जहां श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी गईं वहां वहां विराजमान। तो यह किस जनतंत्र की सुरक्षा के लिये हैं ? किस के लिये हैं ?

श्रीमन्, मैं आज फिर कहता हूं, डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया नहीं हैं, उनके निधन की जांच के लिये बार बार इस सदन में हमने कोशिश की और यहां पर एक स्वास्थ्य मंत्री ने कहा भी कि सरकार जांच कराने के लिये तैयार है।

दो चिट्ठियां हमने प्राइम मिनिस्टर को लिखी, दो स्वास्थ्य मंत्री को लिखी, मगर हमारे खत का जवाब अभी तक नहीं आया जब कि इस सदन में उत्तर दिया गया है कि सरकार को कोई ऐतराज नहीं है। तो सरकार ने आज तक डाक्टर लोहिया का किस ढंग से निधन हुआ है विनिगडन अस्पताल में, उसके बारे में जांच आयोग क्यों नहीं बैठाया ? लालबहादुर शास्त्री के लिये जांच आयोग क्यों नहीं बैठाया।

गणकर्षण हमने परसों दे दिया

श्री टी० एन० सिंह और

र दस्तखत किये हुए हैं।

हमारा कहना है कि जुलाई 1962 में डा० लोहिया ने एक लेख लिखा जिसमें उन्होंने लिखा था कि :

"The last Viceroy of British Imperialism may be the first Viceroy of Chinese Imperialism."

उन्होंने कहा था कि अंग्रेजी साम्राज्यवाद का अंतिम वाइसराय चीनी साम्राज्यवाद का प्रथम वाइसराय हो सकता है। मैं आज उसको दूसरे शब्दों में कहना चाहता हूं। इंदिरा नेहरू गांधी कांग्रेस का अंतिम प्रधान मंत्री रूसी साम्राज्यवाद का प्रथम प्रधान मंत्री हो सकता है।

**श्री एस० डी० मिश्र :** हो गया, हो गया।

**श्री शीलभद्र याजी :** एक सिन्डीकेट समाजवादी है, एक बिड़ला पंथी समाजवादी है। क्या कह रहे हैं।

**श्री राजनारायण :** आज मैं मुक्त कंठ से कहना चाहता हूँ और मैं चाहता हूँ कि हमारे देश के कुछ लोग निकले जो तमाम जोखिम और खतरे को उठा कर जो सत्य है उसको कहें और उसकी वाणी को कोई भी आसुरी वाणी रोकने में असमर्थ हो। इसलिये मैं पूरी जिम्मेदारी के साथ कहने को तैयार हूँ और इस वाक्य को कह रहा हूँ कि इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी की कांग्रेस का अंतिम प्रधान मंत्री रूसी साम्राज्यवादी का प्रथम प्रधान मंत्री भी हो सकती है।

**श्री शीलभद्र याजी :** रूस क्या साम्राज्यवादी है ?

**श्री राजनारायण :** तुम क्या जानोगे। तुम खाओ बैठो। यह बेचारा पैसा ले के इन्दिरा का काम करे। हमारा कहना है कि जाकर के जरा देखा जाय। मैं यहां पर पूरा करिष्मा नहीं सुना रहा हूँ। मेरे पास समय नहीं है।

**श्री सी० डी० पांडे :** कह दो।

**श्री राजनारायण :** अपना समय हमें दे दो तब । यह है कि श्री चन्द्र भानु गुप्त का पत्र । चन्द्र भानु जी गुप्त ने 10 तारीख की रात को महामहिम राज्यपाल को जो चिट्ठी लिखी है उसमें उन्होंने कहा है : विदा लेने से पूर्व मैं अपना कर्तव्य समझता हूँ कि मैं भारतीय जनसंघ, संसोपा, स्वतंत्र पार्टी, प्रजा समाजवादी पार्टी, निर्दलीय तथा अन्य दूसरे मित्रों के प्रति अपनी कृतज्ञता प्रकट करूँ तथा उनकी सराहना करूँ जिन्होंने कार्यक्रम के आधार पर मुझे सहयोग दिया था । मुझे विश्वास है कि उन्हीं कार्यक्रमों के आधार पर उपर्युक्त दलों का सहयोग और समर्थन चरण सिंह जी की सरकार को भी प्राप्त होगा । यह चन्द्रभानु गुप्त की चिट्ठी है 10 तारीख की जो 10 तारीख को ही राज्यपाल के पास गई । इस चिट्ठी को श्रीमन् चरण सिंह जी पढ़ते हैं । पढ़ने के बाद गुप्त जी से मिलने आते हैं और मिल कर के सारी चर्चा करते हैं और हमारे यहां के लोग जाकर के—हर दलों के—राज्यपाल महोदय को यह खत देते हैं करीब साढ़े दस या ग्यारह बजे रात को । चरण सिंह का बयान आता है और यहां दिल्ली घबड़ा गई, इन्दिरा रानी की नींद टूट गई और इन्होंने चारों तरफ एकदम से बिल्कुल हल्ला मचा दिया कि चाहे जैसे हो, अब तो मैं मर गई, उत्तर प्रदेश में हमको चौहान खा जायेगा, वह कहता है उत्तर प्रदेश के लोग उनके साथ नहीं हैं तो प्रधान मंत्री क्यों रहें । अब क्या हुआ । अब राज्यपाल यहां बुलाये जाते हैं । मैं आपके सामने आप को साक्षात् बनाना चाहता हूँ अगर चरण सिंह को शपथ देना था तो राज्यपाल ने 11 तारीख को क्यों नहीं दिया, 12 तारीख को क्यों नहीं दिया । राज्यपाल के सेक्रेटरी के पास हमारा कम से कम बारह, पन्द्रह मिनट का नोट है । उन्होंने कहा है कि इस नोट को हम राष्ट्रपति को देंगे और गोपाल रेड्डी ने हमसे कबूल किया कि हाँ राष्ट्रपति ने तुम्हारे नोट के बारे में मुझसे चर्चा की थी । हमने उनको कहा था कि चरण सिंह को शपथ दिलाकर ही जाना चाहिये था । मगर 11 तारीख को, 12 तारीख

को, 13 तारीख को शपथ नहीं हुई । शपथ कब होती है, जब 14 तारीख को उत्तर प्रदेश के किसी कांग्रेसी नेता पर प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहिब का विश्वास नहीं रह गया । तब वहां से भेजे जाते हैं द्वारिका प्रसाद मिश्र । यह बेचारा बहुगुणा भी कट गया, कमलापति त्रिपाठी भी कट गये । तब द्वारिका प्रसाद मिश्र और कोई कपूर है...

**एक माननीय सदस्य :** जसपाल कपूर ।

**श्री राजनारायण :** वह कपूर वहां भेजे गये श्रीमन् । वह जसपाल कपूर ने खूब अपना जस वहां कमा लिया । चरणसिंह को कहते हैं, और अखबारों में झूठी खबर छपवाई जाती है, 11 तारीख को हमारा प्रदर्शन था, रोकने के बावजूद भी लोग चले आए थे, हम वहां पर बोल रहे थे, कोई आक्रोजन नहीं है कि हम चरणसिंह के बारे में कोई ऐसे शब्द का प्रयोग करें जो शान के विरुद्ध है । एक खत हमको एक कांग्रेसी मेम्बर ने दिया कि आपने तो चरणसिंह को फिर नेता मान लिया क्या—यह बड़ा झूठा है । हमने कहा यह हमारा भाषण है, मैंने चरण सिंह को पहले भी नेता माना था, चरण सिंह की सरकार को न तो इन्दिरा रानी गिरा पाई, न तो चन्द्रभानु गुप्त चरण सिंह की सरकार को गिरा पाए । चरण सिंह की सरकार तब गिरी जब अपने वचन को चरणसिंह जी ने स्वतः भंग किया, हम फिर भी चरणसिंह को नेता बना सकते हैं और बना रहे हैं, उन्हीं कार्यक्रमों की पूर्ति के लिये जिसका जिक्र श्री चन्द्रभानु गुप्त ने अपने रेजिनेशन लेटर में दिया है अगर वह पूरा नहीं होगा तो चरण सिंह हमारे बड़े भाई है, उम्र में बड़े हैं, बड़े भाई का आदर उनको है । मगर हमारा पथ है, अगर हमारे पथ से विचलित होने को कहेंगे तो हमारा स्वभाव विद्रोही है, हम विद्रोह करेंगे । यही हमारा कुल भाषण है । एक दिन अखबारों में लिखवाया गया—साहब की तरफ से, कि— है कि चरणसिंह नहीं मा-



निकलवायेंगे। दूसरे दिन अखबारों में यह निकलवाया गया कि उन्होंने कहा कि आज तो फूल की माला दे रहे हैं और जब नहीं कार्यक्रम पूरा करेंगे तो जूते की माला पहिनायेंगे। और तीसरे दिन नेशनल हेराल्ड में आ गई तीसरी स्टोरी। श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी की चिट्ठी है "जन्मनिधि प्रेस" के शेयर कहां से आये, रूपया कहां से आया। इसकी जांच करे कि जिससे मालूम हो पैसा कहां से आता है। मालूम हो तो बता दो भैया। एक स्टोरी नेशनल हेराल्ड में आ गई कि राजनारायण ने जूता उठाया और कहा कि इन्हीं जूतों से पीट कर चौधरी को कुर्सी से अगल कर दूंगा। कितना झूठा कितना अनर्गल, कितना गलत लिखा? नेशनल हेराल्ड को हमने चिट्ठी, रजिस्टर्ड नोटिस लिखा। तो उसमें लिख कर आ गया दीक्षित जी दिल्ली हैं। तो हमने दिल्ली भेजा लेकिन हमारा कान्फ्रेंडिक्शन उसने अभी तक छापा नहीं है। यह क्या है, यह डिमोक्रेंसी है, यह जनतंत्र है? जो पार्टी और जो सरकार इन तरीकों को अख्तियार करती है क्या वह जनतंत्र ला सकती है, क्या वह समाजवाद लायेगी। इसीलिये तो गांधी जी ने कहा था कि बिना पवित्र साधनों के पवित्र उद्देश्यों की पूर्ति नहीं हो सकती है। कभी भी भारतीय स्वातंत्र्य संग्राम ने इस बात को कबूल नहीं किया गया कि "जस्टिफाइड एन्ड दि मीन्स"। हमने यह कभी नहीं मानी, हमने कहा, अच्छे मीन्स होंगे तभी अच्छे एन्ड होंगे, अच्छे साधन होंगे तभी उपलब्धि होगी।

(Interruptions)

श्री एस० डी० मिश्र : यह क्या रनिंग कमेन्ट्री चल रही है श्रीमन् ।

श्री राजनारायण : यह हमारे समय में नहीं लगेगा। देखिये यह कौन सा तरीका है इनका।

उपसभध्यक्ष (श्री अब्दुल अली खान) : देखिये आपके 20 मिनट हो गये। आपकी पार्टी के 8 मिनट बाकी रह गये हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन् अगर आप यह कहते हैं तो इस सरकार को हम न तो लोकतंत्री मानते हैं, न तो समाजवादी मानते हैं। अगर विदेशी विषयों में जाऊं तो बड़ा समय लग जायेगा। आज एक बड़ा षडयंत्र हो रहा है फन्डामेंटल राइट को चेन्ज करने के बारे में! बहुत प्रचार कराया जा रहा है एकतरफा कि इस कांस्टीट्यूशन के रहते हम कुछ कर नहीं सकते मगर मैं यह कहना चाहता हूं कि यही पार्टी है जिसका एक सदस्य था दामोदर स्वरूप सेठ, जिसने फन्डामेंटल राइट में प्रापर्टी राइट को इन्क्लूड न करने की बात कही थी। उन्होंने उस समय कहा भी कि अगर इस बहाने हम फन्डामेंटल राइट को परिवर्तित करने का अधिकार पार्लियामेंट को देते हैं तो हंगिज नहीं होगा, एक कांस्टीट्यूएन्ट असेम्बली बनाओ, उसमें बैठ कर किन किन क्लार्जों को हमको परिवर्तित करना है उसको लावो, वरना एक बात के बहाने अगर हम सब को कह दें तो मामला बिगड़ जाता है। सुप्रीम कोर्ट के जजमेंट को क्यों नहीं पढ़ते। सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने कहा है कि संसद् को अधिकार था इन बैंकों को लेने का—संसद् के अधिकार को उसने नहीं कहा—मगर सभी बैंकों को लेना चाहिये, सब को नहीं लिया, कंपन्सेशन को उन्होंने मान लिया।

कम्पनसेशन देने के क्लार्ज को तो मान लिया मगर उसमें जो तर्कपूर्ण तथ्य थे, उनको सुनने की कृपा सरकार ने नहीं की। कम्पुनिस्टों की तरफ से बड़ी कोशिश हो रही है और वे श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी को बोल रहे हैं। यह जो कांग्रेस में लगे लोग हैं, वे भी श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी के साथ बोल रहे हैं। सब बोले तो बोले छननियां जिस के 72 छेद हैं। वे कहते हैं कि सुप्रीम कोर्ट के जज ऐसा करने लगे तो इस समाज में परिवर्तन होना नामुमकिन है। अगर समाज में परिवर्तन करना चाहते हो तो श्री चन्द्र भानु गुप्ता की सरकार ने जो सवा छः एकड़ की जोत में लगान की माफी का ऐलान किया है उसको पूरा करो। किसानों

[श्री राजनारायण]

के खते वही जारी करने का जो अध्यादेश जारी किया है, हरिजनों को 45 फीसदी तक सरकारी सेवाओं में तब तक जगह मिले जब तक कि उनकी 18 फीसदी की पूर्ति न हो जाये, बड़े-बड़े फार्मों और फैक्ट्रियों की जमीन लेकर हरिजनों में बाँटने का ऐलान श्री चन्द्रभानु गुप्त की सरकार ने किया और उसके संबंध में आदेश जारी किये। अध्यापकों की तनखाह नियम के अनुसार सरकार समय पर दे, इसकी भी जिम्मेदारी श्री चन्द्रभानु गुप्त की सरकार ने अपने ऊपर ली। राज्य कर्मचारियों और तमाम दूसरी बातों के बारे में एक प्रगतिशील कदम गुप्ता की सरकार ने उठाया था। लेकिन श्री चरण सिंह को बहका कर जो सरकार यह कहती है कि तुम सवा छः एकड़ तक लगान माफ मत करो जोत मत बटवाओ और न इसके जिम्मेदारी लेना और फैक्ट्रियों की जमीन को भूमिहीन किसानों को मत बटवाना क्या इस तरह के प्रगतिशील कदम हैं और क्या यह समाजवाद है। आज इस देश में वही समाजवाद है जो कि विशेष अवसर पर सिद्धान्त मानते हो। आज अपरच्युनिस्ट सिद्धान्त एक पूर्जवादी नारा हो गया है और विशेष अवसर पर सिद्धान्त समाजवादी हो गया है। जो समाज में पिछड़ा है, जितना दुखी और दरिद्र है, उसकी ज्यादा से ज्यादा मदद सरकार की ओर से होना चाहिये। यही आपके समाज का दर्शन है और यही नियम है।

पहले मर्तवा और पहली बार आज इस देश में, उत्तर प्रदेश में जो सवा छः एकड़ के छोटे-छोटे किसान हैं उनके लगान के माफ करने के बारे में ऐलान हुआ। इस प्रकार का विशेष अवसर दिया गया गरीबों को मगर आप यह कहते हो कि सब को दो। सब को कैसे दिया जा सकता है। आज पहली बार छोटे किसानों को इस तरह का मौका दिया गया है और उस मौके को आप खत्म करना चाहते हो, मैं कांग्रेसियों से कहना चाहता हूँ

और अपने मित्र ठाकुर साहब जो टोपी लगाये बैठे हैं उनसे भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि मुजफ्फरनगर के सम्मेलन में श्री कमलापति त्रिपाठी का इजलाम हुआ था और उसमें कहा गया था कि सवा छः एकड़ तक के किसानों का लगान माफ होना चाहिये। अलाभकर जोत जितनी है उन्हें खत्म किया जाना चाहिये। अब हम देखेंगे क्योंकि अभी तो इन्तदाये इशक है, आगे देखें होता है क्या क्या। 26 तारीख को समाजवाद की कसौटी होगी। आज हमारे मित्र श्री भूपेश गुप्त उनके साथ हैं जो अपने को सजनी मैं हूँ राजकुमारी कहती है। कम्युनिस्टों को और उनको भी पता चल जायेगा कि 26 तारीख को उत्तर प्रदेश की विधान सभा में क्या होता है। कम्युनिस्ट सवा छः एकड़ तक लगान माफ करने के हक में हैं या नहीं खाता वही जारी करने के पक्ष में है या नहीं, अध्यापकों को नियम के अनुसार तनखाह देने के पक्ष में है या नहीं। भूमि विनरण के साथ है या नहीं। जो लोग कायदे कानून में रोड़े हैं उन रोड़ों को उत्तर प्रदेश की जनता पीस देगी, यह ऐलान मैं कर देना चाहता हूँ। वह दिन दूर नहीं है जब लखनऊ की सड़क में जो सवा छः एकड़ किसानों के लगान की माफी में बाधा पहुँचायेगे वे खड़े किये जायेंगे और उन्हें जनता जनार्दन पकड़ेगी और फिर प्रधान मंत्री श्रीमर्त। इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी से कहेगी कि तुम्हारा समाजवाद कहां है, तुम्हारा चल चित्त कहां है। आज श्री चरणसिंह श्रीमर्त। इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी के चंगुल में आ गया है। जो पहले उनको बलकटी कहते थे और कहते थे कि इस तरह की बलकटी जैसी झूठी हमने किसी को पाया नहीं। यह उनके बर्ड्स थे बलकटी। आज वही श्री चरण सिंह ने श्रीमर्त। इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी और श्री द्वारिका प्रसाद मिश्र के साथ अपवित्र गठबंधन कर लिया है और इस तरह से उत्तर प्रदेश में यह मामला आया है।

शायद मैं कल न रहूँ और मैंने इतना समय आपका ले लिया है, इसलिये आप मुझे

क्षमा करेंगे। अभी हमारा समय तो बाकी है क्योंकि हर पार्टी को 45 मिनट का समय दिया गया है। चूंकि अब 5 दिन का विवाद हो गया है इसलिये आप हमें 28 मिनट और देंगे। जब 3 दिन का विवाद था तो आपने हमें 45 मिनट का समय दिया है। अब मैं अपना भाषण समाप्त कर रहा हूँ चूंकि अभी हमारे 3 आदमी और बोलेंगे।

**SHRI PHOOL SINGH (Uttar Pradesh) :** Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the Motion of Thanks. Some of my valued friends have spoken before. Some of them have supported the Address for some of the acts that the Government has done. Others have criticised it. Such speeches are customary. They have their own good as well as bad points. The President's Address mentions things done by the Government as well as mentions the lines on which the future activities of the Government are to be carried on. Sir, I propose to devote myself to the other half of the Address.

The President Address speaks of a new order of society that this Government intends to introduce. He also speaks of recasting the Fourth Five Year Plan. I hope when this Plan is recast most of the difficulties of the people will be removed; most of the aspirations of the people will be realised.

Sir, towards the end of the British raj people began to talk of the kisan. The name of the kisan became very popular. He was on the lips of everybody. The kisan's name is like Ram Nam. Now whosoever wants to do anything does it in the name of the kisan and whosoever wants to do anything bad, he also does it in the name of the kisan. Those who are going to occupy the Government Benches invoke the blessings of the kisan. Those who are in the danger of being thrown out also invoke the blessings of the kisan.

Our friend has been mentioning the U.P. Government's case. It is not my habit to criticise people. But in Uttar Pradesh whenever a party came to power they said that they would act for the benefit of the kisan. The last S.V.D. Government did the same. But when they were in power they increased the irrigation rates and did all sorts of

things to trouble the kisans. When they were in power we criticised them. But when we came to power and Guptaji became the Chief Minister, again, he instead of removing those difficulties further raised the taxes. He increased the irrigation rates to 25 per cent. He imposed a sales tax on fertilisers. And while he was talking of socialism he did not forget to mention that he was wanting to further reduce the ceiling of the kisan. So that is the custom nowadays. The kisan is getting only lip service. I hope in the new order of things the kisan will get his proper place.

Sir, it is well known that 50 per cent. of the national wealth is produced in the fields and the other half is produced by the industry. From that standard agriculture should receive at least that much of attention. But actually that is not happening.

I am thankful to this Government for nationalising the banks. They might redress that grievance. If you look into the figures of the Schedules Banks, in 1951 about Rs. 200 crores were lent to the industry and Rs. 12 crores went to the kisans.

In 1961, the advances to industry went up from Rs. 200 to Rs. 700 crores. And the advances to kisans went down from Rs. 12 crores to Rs. 5 crores. In 1969, the advances to industry went up to Rs. 1,740 crores and the advances to kisans to Rs. 9 crores. Is this the way that we are going to help the kisans? Sir, that is not the way to improve things. I admit that the kisan gets a lot of money from the co-operatives. But all told, the co-operative advances come to Rs. 550 crores. So the share of the kisan in the advances is very meagre. There was a survey some 10 years back. It found out that the kisans were in debt to the extent of about Rs. 1,300 crores. Unfortunately up till now, no survey has been made about the requirements of the kisans. Sir, this is one point which I want to make. If you want to help the kisans, it is not a favour to anybody. It is well known that the development of the country depends upon agriculture. Agriculture and industry are inter-dependent, but increasing agricultural production is necessary for further employment and for development of industries. Therefore, the lever lies with agriculture. That point has totally been ignored up till now. All our Plans have been city-based. All our plans have been for the

[Shri Phool Singh]

middle men and the higher class People. Sir, I was a Member of the Constituent Assembly also. Since then every year we hear talk about small cars. I do not know what is all this about. The country is starving, the people are hungry, you are spending crores of rupees on imports and we are talking of small cars. Why don't you talk of things which will produce something? What is a car? It is a luxury good. At best, it is a consumer good. But what about tractors? A tractor is a producer good. Producer goods should have been given preference over consumer goods. But this did not strike the people up till now. If things have to be improved, agriculture should get the credit that it deserves.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair].

In 1963, India produced 15,000 cars. In 1964, it produced 23,000 cars, that is in one year it went up by 48 per cent. In 1968, the production rose to 33,000. It means that as compared to 1963, the increase was two-and-a-half times. What about tractors? We are producing 15,000 tractors a year now. And what is the requirement? The Planning Commission itself said that there is a backlog, a pending demand, of 70,000 tractors. The annual requirement, they say, is 40,000 tractors and it will be 90,000 in 1973-74. I doubt these figures. They are an under-estimate. The country cannot achieve self-sufficiency if you do not give proper attention to the requirement of the producers. We are trying to be as ingenious as possible in producing consumer goods. A few years back, the then Finance Minister, Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari said "We want diversification of the consumer goods." So that is where we are becoming experts. That is where our attention goes. The real point is, unless you give top priority to agricultural and other producers, the country cannot go the way that it has to go. Otherwise, it is all huge waste.

I will give another example. There was talk of electricity also here. Sir, electricity can be used for many purposes. It can be used for agriculture, and you can use it for illuminations as you do on the Independence Day. It is unfortunate that when such occasions of merry-making come, we are not found lacking, but when occasions for production come, when occasions for hard work come, we are absent and sleep-

ing. We spend so much energy on these illuminations. It is all waste of time and energy. What about agriculture? My friend was very loud about the position of U.P. In U.P. we have got only 9,500 State tubewells. But they are not enough for the State. When Government could not do anything, cultivators started having their own tubewells. The number of private tubewells is 2,70,000. And what about energy? Only 68,000 tubewells could be energised so far. What about the rest? The rest are being done either by the tractor or by the diesel engine. Sir, those who know about costing know that hydel power is the cheapest and thermal power is at least 50% more costly than hydel power and diesel power is double that cost. If you force the kisans to spend that much of energy on energisation of tubewells, how do you expect them to be self-sufficient? In 1961, U.P. spent 20 per cent of its energy on agriculture. Out of a total of 97 crore Kw-hours, 20 crore Kw-hours went to agriculture. And what has been the progress so far? In 1966, the total energy was 197 crore Kw-hours and the kisan got 23 crore Kw-hours. From the percentage point of view, the energy given to agriculture fell from 20 per cent to 9 per cent. Comparative figures for other States are not available. But in the All India basis, industry gets 70 per cent of energy and agriculture gets 7 per cent. Is that the way to make the country self-sufficient? I am sorry, Sir, we are wasting our breath in accusing each other. We are wasting our breath in talking all sorts of things, but nobody thinks of anything which can increase productivity. It is high time that we all stopped all this nonsense and thought of helping the people in our own humble way. We have our own duty to discharge, and we should think of that before we start throwing stones at others. Sir, when Jesus Christ was alive, there was a custom to kill a thief by throwing stones at him. He would be half buried and people would throw stones at him. One such thief was caught one day. A hole was dug for half burying him and urchins like me were standing with stones in their hands and each was eager to throw the first stone. Christ said "Yes, he should be beaten like this. But the first stone should come from the man who is not guilty." Sir, can we say here that we are not all guilty? Can we lay all the blame on any one individual?

In my own humble way I feel the whole nation is guilty. We are all deficient. That is my humble submission. We must all think of doing something constructive.

Sir, I have taken a lot of time. I am very thankful to you for giving me this opportunity.

**SHRI BALACHANDRA MENON** (Kerala) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, I have heard with interest the speech of the Leader of the Opposition. Not that I am very happy with the President's Address. It does not give us any clear picture of what we expect from the Government. But the speech made by the Leader of the Opposition clearly tells us where he wants the country to go, and if that is allowed, there is going to be a great danger. The Leader of the Opposition, of the Congress (O) as he puts it, has chosen to attack the Government on five questions. What are they? He has done it from a right position. He has created some doubt about the State sector. He wants to attack our non-alignment policy and make fun of it. He speaks about the agrarian sector and says that nothing has been solved. He speaks about our foreign policy and tries to show that nothing has been done. He speaks of defections while he himself is the leader of it. Why are all these things done? The next speech made that very clear. From that to Mr. Rajnarain is another step. There is an attack on the Soviet Union. They attack the socialist countries, they attack all countries wanting to bring about some general transformation and work for progress. Further step will be taken up by the Jan Sangh and finally the Swatantra will have its way. The first step has been made by him to be followed up by his friends. That is the danger. Till now, for the last 22 years, the Government of India has been following a very vacillating policy. It has always been doing it. Our attack has been that. You were hesitating, you were not prepared to take any bold step; neither are you prepared even now. There are vacillations. We know that. But then, something has been done. That ought to be seen, from social control to the nationalisation of banks is a step in the right direction. And when this is being attacked by the Supreme Court, again you are bringing about an Ordinance and then are coming forward here pressing for that.

That really is something. That ought not to be attacked. But that is being sought to be attacked by our friends here. They are doing it. And I am sure, with all the speeches the leader of the erstwhile socialist forum is making, he has now gone into a company which is trying to put the entire clock back. He was speaking about the defections. He should remember what happened in 1960 in Kerala. He should remember how State after State was brought down when the Congress was one. He had been a party to all that. Today he finds that his wishes do not succeed in Bihar or in U.P. and that is why he has turned round and said, "Oh, you have turned out to be so bad as that." Why does he not remember his history? Now he is sorry that what he hoped for, did not take place. I am glad that he is not succeeding. To that extent at least he has been shown his right place. This company which he takes, this company which he has now, will surely lead him to a point where he will be all alone himself with all the reactionary forces, and the day will not be far off when he would even try to see that whatever little steps we have taken are wiped out in the interests of the monopolists and others whom he wants to serve. He is sorry that the stand that we take along with our Arab brothers in the freedom struggle is not a correct one. He asks, "Why should you take such a stand?" What does he want? I am glad that at least we have made our position clear regarding the Arab question. We stand by them. We will stand by those who are anti-imperialists and who are putting out a big fight. And we know what Israel is attempting for. Its dagger is always used against the Arab National Movement and that has to be knocked down to the extent that we can. We will be with them. Our attack is only when you are not taking sufficient positive steps.

**SHRI B. T. KEMPARAJ** (Mysore) : Sir, is he opposing or supporting this motion?

**SHRI BALACHANDRA MENON** : You will know what it is. The State sector which we have has to be strengthened and much more positive steps should be taken. I will be happy if the Government will be able to come forward extending the State sector even to some consumer industries like sugar, plantations, etc. In that way we

[Shri Balachandra Menon]

must be in a position to have a bigger State sector. Attacking the State sector, saying that the State sector is only a hand-maid of the private sector, is all that he wanted to make out. We must try to make a bigger State sector. We should have a larger State sector not only in key industries but also in certain consumer industries which are of absolute importance. If you can do that, it will certainly take us a little forward.

The next question is that of the agrarian sector. In this we have rightly claimed that our production has increased. But the pressure is still there. The question of the rich-peasant economy is there. And every attempt by this rich-peasant economy will create greater imbalances in the countryside.

We should be in a position to see that effective land ceilings are brought there, that all the semi-feudal conditions in the countryside are wiped out; and if you have an agrarian sector which will not allow capitalist development, that alone is going to save us. While we should take credit for whatever little steps we have taken for improving our agriculture and for a greater yield in foodgrains, I would say that the present set-up—and I am afraid this will continue to operate—will create terrible unrest in the countryside, and unless effective land reforms and positive land ceilings by every State are taken up, nothing much will be done and there is going to be danger to our democracy itself.

Then again he spoke on the question of privy purses. What does the Leader of the Opposition want, I would like to know? Does he not want to stop the privy purses? Why does he not say that so? Or, does he want to say that even the compensation—I am told they are going to make some compensation—should not be paid? Or what? What does he want to say? He does not openly come out and say where he stands. I would say we will be happy if it is done immediately. We will be happy if no compensation is allowed. We must be bold in our stand on the question of the privy purses. The Government has taken a stand but it is not very clear as to what they are going to do. How much compensation are they going to give or what compromise are they going to make? Is it going to be a huge amount which will finally

mean that even the five crores which they get now is less than the interest on the compensation now contemplated

SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA (Mysore) : But you have agreed to giving Rs. 92 crores or so to the banks...

SHRI BALACHANDRA MENON : The ninetytwo crores to the banks as a sort of compensation is too heavy a price... (*Interruptions*). It means the attack is on the common man. This should not be allowed. We cannot allow the Supreme Court to be the final arbitrator. No. It is the Parliament's right for which we have to put up a bold stand. And for that I wish the Government to come forward definitely and boldly and, if necessary, change the Constitution. And it should be done. The valid interests should not be allowed to make use of the Supreme Court to block our progress. What is happening here? We have seen a split in the Congress. Its reactionary wing has gone off. It is now finding it difficult that Parliament can be used for stemming the right steps that you are taking. So, the courts are being used. This cannot be allowed, and I believe we will take a positive stand on such questions, bring about the necessary changes in the Constitution, so that we are able to take our country forward. The capitalist path of development has its own dangers. Whatever words you may use, it still is only that much and nothing more. Why are we hesitating for a complete take-over of all monopoly concerns? Why should we not do it? This country demands it and all monopoly concerns will have to be taken over. When that is done and when you do not allow monopoly concerns to come up, when you allow the small industries and the medium industries to continue and a huge State sector, a cooperative sector to develop, if you are going to take such a non-capitalist path as your aim, only then you will be able to satisfy the people, and not otherwise. This hesitating and vacillating policy will finally end only in creating more and more bitterness among the people. The people cannot wait for long. The *status quo* Governments cannot continue and therefore I hope you will have the courage to take some bold steps and come forward with bold plans. See what is happening outside; the people are discontented; you are sitting on a volcano. Therefore you will have

to take certain bold steps under these circumstances; you cannot vacillate any longer. Those who have gone away have only shown the path for others; many more will have to follow them and then only there might be some future for the country. As it is, this vacillation and this fright about taking bold steps will only end in creating more and more discontent among the people; the situation is already highly explosive and unless bold policies are adopted, you will not be able to make any headway. Whatever be the programme, 10-point or 11-point, you will have to take some bold steps on each issue. Look at the countryside. There is a huge demand for housing. Why don't you have some housing programmes for the agricultural workers, not only for the industrial workers? The Centre itself must take the initiative in this matter. The downtrodden people who have been all along exploited by caste and class should have a decent living. If such bold steps are taken, I think our State sector will become dominant and we will be able to expand even up to the consumer industries. On Vietnam the Leader of the Opposition has taken the stand that we have committed too far. On the Arab question also he has taken that stand. He said that we have committed a blunder. That means we should not take any positive stand on Vietnam or

in respect of the Arab countries. I think this is a very dangerous stand taken by the Leader of the Opposition. You can think about it. This means that you will never be able to mobilise the progressive sections of the people for anti-imperialist steps. Have faith in the workers and peasants and adopt such policies so that you can mobilise them. That way the country can march forward. You have not done much so far. Even the national minimum wage has not been given to the workers. Unless you take bold steps, there is no possibility of progress. Therefore I hope you will take some firmer steps so that you can mobilise the workers and peasants. If that is not done, we cannot be with you. It is not a question of any attachment to the Prime Minister or any such thing; it is a question of policy. To the extent she takes some bold steps as suggested by me we are bound to support her and we will be happy to support her and we will be with the Government ready with out support. Thank you, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at fifty-five minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 24th February, 1970.