

allowed it. So yours is no point of order; there is no point of order in what you have said.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am not asking you to disallow it. You have not understood it. (*Interruptions*). I am not at all questioning whether you should allow Mr. Abid Ali to say the thing he wanted to say, or not. It is for you to decide.

(*Interruptions*).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order, I have already given my ruling. So there is no other point.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why do you come to the question of ruling. I must point out, Madam, that what you said rather startled me, that you will not allow anything to be said about the Presidential election. I want to know under which rule, Madam, you say that because I think common sense also demands it. You may say certain things and you may advise us. We may listen to your advice. But it is strange that you should give a ruling here about a discussion on a matter of very vital State importance, of public importance. If there are divergent views, let them be expressed. What is the harm? If you think certain things should not be said, you may advise us accordingly and leave it to us whether we listen to your advice or not, rather than say this thing. If this kind of a ruling is to take place then I do not know where we will be. It will be far from being a ruling.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What is it that you want to say, Mr. Chagla?

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI M. C. CHAGLA): Madam, I was only saying that you have given your ruling and so let us get on with the business for the day.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes. This is an extraneous matter and, therefore, this should not be taken up on the floor of the House.

SHRI ABID ALI: Then may I raise it this afternoon? If you will please allow it I shall be very thankful to you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We pass on to the next item on the Order Paper—the Finance Bill.

#### THE FINANCE BILL, 1967—contd.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS (Orissa): Madam Deputy Chairman, when we are considering and discussing this Finance Bill I am constrained to say that during these twenty years of Congress rule the economic and fiscal affairs of the country have been so managed that the country has been pushed to the brink of economic disaster. Madam, without going into various aspects of the fiscal policy of the Government I want to point out to you and to the hon. Members of this House that up till now, though we have been living in what is called an era of planned economic growth, no income and price policy has been evolved by the Government. You know that they were all wedded to planning. But planning does not mean how to collect the taxes and how to expend them. Planning also means giving directions to expenditure, to the effect of that expenditure on the economic and social fabric of the country and also the distribution of the national product that is generated in the course of planning. For all these things a definite income and price policy has to be evolved by the Government of the day.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) in the Chair.]

I am sorry to say that for the past twenty years and, although fifteen years of planning have elapsed in the meantime, the Government has not been able to make up its mind as to what should be the income and price policy for this country.

[Shri Banka Behary Das.]

Sir, first coming to the question of prices I want to say that the way planning has been conducted in this country has itself given rise to inflation and there is no stability of price levels of essential goods in the country. The prices of these articles have gone up and this has created bad economic situation in the country. I am here asking the hon. Minister in charge to tell me whether he can say that in his Department the cost structure of various essential goods has been analysed and whether a relation between the cost of production of essential goods in the country and the retail prices of those goods has been fairly established. I am sure and I know that up till now the Government of the day has not given any attention to the study of this matter as a result of which the prices have gone up and we have been the victims of anti-social trading activities of the monopolists of the land. Therefore, I want to submit here that before we evolve an income and price policy, the Government must be determined to see that stability in price levels is achieved in his country.

In this connection, without going into details I will just point out one aspect of the matter that vitally affects certain sections of society and that will show the behaviour of a public sector industry. I will give one example. The price paid by the public at Barauni and round about that area for petroleum produced at Barauni Refinery is Rs. 836.52 p. per kilo litre. But the Calcutta consumer of the same petroleum pays only Rs. 768.68p. per kilo litre. So the consumer at Calcutta pays much less price for the petroleum than the local consumer pays for it though the actual production is taking place in that refinery only. This is the result of incoherent, incongruous and whimsical policy of treating the ports as pricing points. The three inland refineries will produce more than 7 million tonnes of products every year

and not to treat them as pricing points does show the muddle-headedness of those who run the Government and squeeze the consumer and the taxpayers. This sort of wrong and idiotic policies have resulted in such a situation that while there is idle capacity in the country for the production of kerosene, we have to pay from our precious foreign exchange for imported kerosene. Even the price of foreign kerosene varies greatly at ports. Although I have given the example of petrol which is being produced in the public sector industry, if you go and analyse the cost of production and the retail prices of all the essential goods in the country, beginning from sugar, textiles and other things, you will come to the conclusion that there is absolutely no relation between the cost of production and the retail prices of these goods. I submit that not only has a happy relation to be established but we have to see that the price line is also stabilised in the case of most essential goods and even reduced if required by slashing down the excise duties on those commodities.

Without going any further into this question because I have spoken about this on other occasions, I want to refer now to the income aspect of the matter. Only on the basis of a stable price level, the income policy of a government can be directed in a planned way. Otherwise the demand of the Government servants for higher dearness allowances and of the working classes and other fixed income groups for higher incomes will go on cutting at the very root of the State exchequer and will create a condition for overdrafts on the Reserve Bank. However much the Finance Minister may caution and warn the Chief Ministers or the Finance Ministers of the States, the way the federal structure is being run and the way allocations of taxes are made in this country, the State exchequers have to work under strained circum-

stances and they have always to suffer under the impact of the expenditure of the Government of India. In this process because of these expenditures, the richer sections of society and the anti-social traders will take advantage of the situation of economic flux in the country and will grow richer.

1 P.M.

The depressed sections of the society will be poorer and poorer day by day. Only a sound incomes policy will create conditions of economic growth and ever rising national product which will be diverted in a planned manner to augment the capital resources of the country of ours and to raise the real income of the depressed sections of the society.

In this connection I may refer to the question of wages of the working class of India. As one of the official documents show, because of the rise in price level and lack of an incomes policy during the First Five Year Plan the real income of the working class of India did rise to a certain extent but during the Second Five Year Plan despite the fact that there was a growth in the economy the real income was to a greater extent stabilised—it did not go up—but during the Third Five Year Plan in spite of rise in wages in certain sectors of society the real income of the working class has gone down. I am not speaking from my own memory; I am quoting the Government reports to show that not only because of rise in prices but because of a lack of policy on incomes we have come to such a situation that the richer sections of the society who are in a privileged position are taking full advantage of the economic growth of the country whatever might be the quantum of that growth. That is why I want to impress upon the Finance Minister that if a judicious and sound economic policy is not followed in the future very soon even despite our planning we are not going to help in the growth of the country.

In this connection I also want to refer to the question of taxes and debts. On other occasions I have referred to these things but again I want to emphasise that when the Minister comes up with the regular Budget he should see that in certain sections, at least on essential commodities, the excise duties are lowered so that at least the consumers of the country are not allowed to suffer as they are suffering now. I know there is a great pressure on the Finance Minister from the side of the industrialists of the country to lower the income-tax and corporate tax. I can point out to the Minister how in spite of all this we have seen that in this country 75 big business families have grown rich and are controlling about half the paid-up capital of the non-banking industries of this country. (*Time bell rings*). Sir, without referring further to this matter I want to say that the tax structure should be overhauled in such a way that the big business houses like the Birlas—about which we have referred in this House and we are going to have a discussion next time—and others disintegrate and the economy is run on a socialist pattern. Sir, the fiscal and the economic policy should also take note of the question of debts.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Das, it is time to wind up.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS: We know recently that the authorities of the International Monetary Fund have clearly said that they are also greatly concerned about the indebtedness of the developing countries like India and unless we take care to manage our affairs in such a way and live within our means, and spend whatever loans we contract in such a way that the production of the country goes up, we will be heading for an economic collapse. The fiscal and economic policy has resulted, on

[Shri Banka Behary Das.]

the one hand, in the creation of industrial empires tending to cast their shadows over political and social values and, on the other hand of crores of people leading a sub-human standard of life, dying inch by inch, during these twenty years of Congress rule.

With these words I would request the hon. Minister to overhaul the fiscal structure of this country in such a way that our aspirations for an egalitarian society is achieved and in that process ensure that a sound prices and incomes policy is evolved in the country.

Thank you.

**श्री शीलभद्र याजी (बिहार) :** माननीय वाइस चेयरमैन महोदय, मैं इस विन्न विधेयक का समर्थन करता हूँ और समर्थन करते हुए मुझे अफसोस है कि जिस पार्टी का मैं चित्रण करने जा रहा हूँ उसके सदस्य श्री राजनारायण जी यहाँ मौजूद नहीं हैं।

वाइस चेयरमैन महोदय, इस सदन में कतिपय जो हमारी पार्टी के सदस्य हैं उन्होंने रुबी जेनरल इन्श्योरेंस के मामले को और और मामलों को बराबर इस सदन में उठा उठा कर बिड़ला की मजबूत की है वह सारा हाउस जानता है। अभी कई रोज पहले आठ सदस्यों ने जा कांग्रेस पार्टी के हैं, जो शासक पार्टी के हैं, उन्होंने जा 3, 5 लाख में दे कर के बिड़ला फर्म में जो मवाद आया है उसका भंडाफोड़ किया। जो यह भंडाफोड़ हम लोगों ने किया लेकिन उस पार्टी के वह सदस्य महोदय हमारा बिड़ला में सम्बन्ध दे कर कहते हैं उस पार्टी के लिये जो पार्टी कि समाजवाद की स्थापना करना चाहती है, उन्होंने बिड़ला में सम्बन्ध दे कर एक नया चित्रण दिया लेकिन महा मानों में मैं उसका अभी चित्रण देना हूँ। एस० एस० पी० क्या है, एम० एस० पी० का क्या मतलब। एस० एस० पी० है साहू सर्वेंट पार्टी या साहू सर्विस पार्टी; जो माह-जैन है

और उसमें डालमिया भी हैं। यह पार्टी उनकी नीकर है।

**श्री बांक बिहारी दास :** राजनारायण जी तो नहीं ह।

**श्री शीलभद्र याजी :** आप सुनिये उनके साथ बैठते हैं।

**श्री बांक बिहारी दास :** हमारे मुनने में क्या फायदा ?

**श्री शीलभद्र याजी :** हमारी पार्टी ने गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया ने, वीवियन बोम कमिशन बना कर छः वर्ष में 36 लाख रुपाया खर्च कर के साहू जैन डालमिया की फर्म का मामला सामने रखा और उस डालमिया फर्म से रुपया ले कर वह एलेक्शन लड़े और उसमें रुपया ले कर एस०एस०पी० चले और फिर यह जूट हो। वाइस चेयरमैन महोदय, जो हमारे पुराने वित्त मंत्री श्री कृष्णमाचारी थे वह वीवियन कमिशन की रिपोर्ट में सम्बन्ध ले कर साहू जैन के ऊपर मुकदमा करना चाहते थे, उनको सजा देना चाहते थे तो यहाँ से इन लोगों ने मैनेजरेंडम किया, कितना कितना लिखा। लाटो रुपया उस पार्टी ने लिया। यह साहू सर्वेंट पार्टी, साहू सर्विस पार्टी, जिसको एस०एस०पी० कहते हैं वह आज हिन्दुस्तान की शासक पार्टी जो कि समाजवाद की स्थापना करना चाहती है, उसकी मजबूत करती है। उसके जो सदस्य हैं उनके लिये मैं कहता हूँ, पहले तो मैं उसे डालर मोनोनिस्ट पार्टी कहता था, वह डालर पर भी चलती है और साहू सर्विस पार्टी भी है, जो एस०एस०पी० के लोग हम पर यह कहने की जूट करते हैं कि वीवियन कमिशन को बिटा कर, 36 लाख रुपया खर्च करके माह-जैन का जो मवाद था उसको खोला लेकिन उस मवाद की रक्षा करने के लिये यहाँ उनकी दिन रात बैठक होती है, रुपये लिये जाते हैं वहाँ में कास्प्रेमी होती है कि कितनी लीटर्स के कंटेनर पर चढ़ाई हो।

क्या क्या चीजें चलती रहती है। तो आज हमारे जो साथी हैं पी०एस०पी० के हैं और समाजवादी है, उनको भी मैं कहता हूँ कि जरा होशियार हो जाय, जो आपकी बगल में बैठते हैं उन लोगों की वजह से आज समाजवाद कमजोर हो गया है। आपकी कुशलता बहा से हटने में है, डाह्या भाई साहब की बगल में बैठने से नहीं, जन सघ की बगल में बैठने से नहीं, पर्वटेंट मोशलमिस्ट एस० एस० पी० यानी साहू सर्वेन्ट्स पार्टी में मेरने से नहीं बल्कि शासक पार्टी को मदद दे दे कर है। शामक पार्टी जो समाजवादी प्रोग्राम लेना चाहती है उसके साथ आप मदद देंगे तब खैरियत है, नहीं तो याद कीजिए इटली में क्या हुआ, जर्मनी में क्या हुआ। आप जैसे लोगो ने, कामरेड नीरेन घोष की तरह के लोगो ने, भूपेश गुप्त की तरह के लोगो ने, हिटलर को लाया, मुसोलिनी को लाया, गलती की, अभी फिर लाने जा रहे हैं। इसलिये मैं फिर उन लोगो को चेतावनी देता हूँ कि यह जो साहू सर्वेन्ट्स पार्टी है, एस०एस०पी० है इसके फेर में न पड़ो और सही मानी में समाजवाद की स्थापना करना है तो हमारी पार्टी के रास्ते पर चलो जिसने बिडलाशाही का सड़ा माल निकालने के लिये आवाज उठाई है। वाइस चेयरमैन साहब, आपके नेतृत्व में हम लोगो ने पहले भी इस सदन में आपको निकाला है और साहू जैन और डालमिया के वास्ते हमने बीवियन बोस कमीशन बनाया था। इसलिये गलत गलत बीज कह कर कैसे यह आज हमारे हाउस का समय बर्बाद करने है और कैसे उसकी जुर्रत होती है। जो जैन से रुपया लेकर पार्टी को चलाये और इलेक्शन लड़े उसकी यह हिम्मत हो और टी० टी० कृष्णमाचारी को यहाँ से बिदा करने के लिये मेमोरेडम पर दस्तखत करे, उस पार्टी को यह जुर्रत है कि हमारा पार्टी जो हिन्दुस्तान के पजीपतियो के खिलाफ आवाज उठाती है उसका मजाक करना, यह बुद्धिमत्ता का

दीवालापन है, अक्ल का दीवालापन है। मैं जो चित्रण कर रहा हूँ सही है, हमारे पास इन्फारमेशन है कि ये बैठते हैं, रुपया लेते हैं, पार्टी चलाते हैं, उनके वहाँ से दीक्षा मिलती है, मत मोखते हैं कि आज इस नेता को, मंत्री को, निन्दा करके निकालना है। उनके चरित्र का हनन करते हैं। ये लोग आज हिन्दुस्तान में क्या समाजवाद की फिजा बना रहे हैं जिनका असली नाम मैंने आपको बताया है। जो अपने को बाँम पक्षी कहते हैं, व अपने को बाँम मार्गी; न बनाए, बाँम पक्षी सही मानो मे हो। अगर वे बाँम मार्गी बन जायेंगे तो मुल्क का कल्याण नहीं होगा। हिटलर और मुसोलिनी को नहीं लाइये। यह शामन जो समाजवाद को लाना चाहता है, यद्यपि इसकी गति धीमी है, आप लोग इसको मदद देकर इसमें तीव्रता लाइये। यही शामक पार्टी समाजवाद की स्थापना कर सकती है, देश की यूनिटी रख सकती है। शासक पार्टी को यदि आप कमजोर करते हैं तो आप देश को कमजोर करते हैं। देश की आजादी और उसके साथ देश का इन्टोग्रेशन, यूनिटी, यह पार्टी रख सकती है, और समाजवाद की भी यही पार्टी स्थापना कर सकती है। वह साहू जैन पार्टी से नहीं होगी, बिडला-पार्टी से नहीं होगी। उनको हम कानून बना बना कर खत्म करना चाहते हैं। इसलिए जरा मैं अपनी सरकार से भी कहना चाहता हूँ ठीक है, आप प्लानिंग करते हैं, योजना बनाते हैं, समाजवाद आपका लक्ष्य है, लेकिन जो रफ्तार है वह उतनी तेज नहीं है। उन लोगो को कुछ कहने का मौका नहीं दें। जल्दी जल्दी आल इंडिया व. प्रो. व. मेटो में इस पर फैसला करें और 1971 के दिमम्बर, 31 तक इस देश को सोशलिस्ट रिपब्लिक डिक्लेयर करके जितने कल कारखाने हैं, बैंक है, सब का राष्ट्रीयकरण करके जल्दी से समाजवाद की स्थापना करनी चाहिये। हमने रूनिंग पार्टी, शासक पार्टी की तरफ से माग की है। आपकी कभी जुर्रत नहीं हुई, हममें नहीं हुई। नीरेन घोष समझते हैं कि मनाज

[श्री शीलभद्र याजी]

वाद हमसे होगा कि नहीं होगा। ये चीजें छोड़ें। जर्मनी से लेसन लें, इटली में लेसन लें, नहीं तो आपके देश की खैरियत नहीं होगी।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं विधेयक का समर्थन करते हुए राजनारायण जी को चैलज करता हूँ जो नामकरण मैंने किये हैं साहू जैन सर्वेंट पार्टी सचमुच में वही पार्टी एस० एस० पी० की है और वे हमारी पार्टी के ऊपर इल्जाम लगाने की कोशिश न करें।

**SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal):** Mr. Vice-Chairman, I tender no apology for returning to a topical subject because in today's press we see that the Prime Minister has given a statement that in order to arrive at an agreement over the Presidential and Vice-Presidential election, the Opposition should not have announced their candidature first. I say that the way the thing has been put by the Prime Minister . . .

**श्री शील भद्र याजी :** वाइस चैयरमैन साहब अभी आविद यली साहब को रोकने की चेष्टा की गई। उनको बोलने नहीं दिया इसलिए आपसे दरखास्त करता हूँ . . .

**SHRI NIREN GHOSH:** . . . to some extent is a distortion of truth. Please sit down.

**SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE:** You are not the Chair. On a point of information, I am asking the Chair. You cannot order me. (*Interruption*). We are not Fascists. You claim to be socialists. At least become pseudo-socialists.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA):** He is speaking on the Finance Bill.

**SHRI NIREN GHOSH:** Sir, it is a known fact that the Opposition from the very first expressed a desire to arrive at some sort of . . .

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA):** I may tell you that your time is fifteen minutes. So,

you can adjust whatever you want to speak.

**SHRI NIREN GHOSH:** That means till 1.30. We tried to arrive at some sort of agreed settlement, but the Congress was not prepared to arrive at any sort of consensus on this proposition. Without going into the history of it, it is this. They thought first that the Opposition could never agree on a name. When they found that the Opposition had agreed on a name, then they thought perhaps the candidates suggested by them would never agree to contest the election. Ultimately when it was found that the candidate himself, Mr. K. Subba Rao, announced that he was ready to contest, they got furious. Without any sort of trying to have a discussion on the subject, they deliberately avoided any discussion and announced their candidature. It is known, and it was quite on the cards, let me tell you, that the Opposition was agreeable to a compromise formula and it was known to the Prime Minister and the leader of the Congress Party, Mr. Kamaraj, yesterday, i.e., Dr. Zakir Husain be accepted as President and Shri K. Subba Rao be accepted as Vice-President. This was conveyed to the Congress in ways it could be in the course of the negotiations. It was known to them. But they deliberately avoided coming to any compromise and announced their candidature and have gone in for a contest. I am sorry that the Congress Party has taken this attitude, without quite realising the chain reaction, the serious political complications they are going to introduce into the Indian body-politic, by adopting this arrogant, adamant attitude. They are trying to have everything their way without any regard for the Opposition. If there is a contest for the posts of President and Vice-President, the responsibility squarely lies on the shoulders of the Congress Party and the fact must be known to the people and the country at large. That is the position in which we are. I can only say that the more the Congress Party persists in this course, the more they

are damaging the image of the Congress Party in the country and I wish godspeed to the Congress in their ill-chosen course.

I touch on another point. It is this. Recently a book has come into our possession, with a foreword written by Pandit Sunderlal, a close associate of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. He had talks with Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. He had talks with Sheikh Abdullah. We have it on his authority that a compromise solution was worked out over the question of Kashmir and the details were worked out. Sheikh Abdullah and Pandit Nehru agreed. Then, Sheikh Abdullah was sent to Rawalpindi in order to get Pakistan's consent to their part in the scheme of things. He says that President Ayub Khan agreed to the solution. He was prepared to come to Delhi to discuss the matter with Pandit Nehru. So it seems a solution was hammered out over the Kashmir question, and Pandit Sunderlal says that just at that time Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru died under suspicious circumstances. He has used the words "suspicious circumstances". He has made a dangerous allegation that the entire thing has fallen through; the Government of India reversed their policy with the death of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and all those things have gone. I just mentioned this in passing. We will be seized of this problem on and off in the future. I get this opportunity to put on record that such a thing has come to our notice.

Then I come to the Bill. We cannot agree with this sort of Finance Bill which is against the interests of the country. The Finance Minister, Shri Morarji Desai, draws a circumference of his own and asks everyone of us including the different States to fall in line and move within that circumference. But the question arises whether it is not a fact that because of the black money the price line is not held. It is Rs. 300 crores of evasion of taxes each year; for 15 years it is Rs. 4,500 crores. How to get at that? Why not demonetise

and force them to disgorge the entire hoard so that the price level may immediately come down? You are not doing that. That is one thing.

Secondly, as regards the Centre-State relations, practically there is no avenue open to a State from which they can draw, which they can utilise in order to make more resources except to enhance the rate of sales tax and tax the vast mass of the poor people. That is the only thing that has been left to them. That is a position that has become quite untenable, and we say to the Government, whether Government likes it or not, that the peoples of the different States will fight and will go on fighting for more powers and the widest possible autonomy in the financial sphere as well, or the Government must find resources so that they can undertake and fulfil their obligations without denying every opportunity to them and just blackmailing and asking them not to overdraw or make overdrafts on the Reserve Bank. But what are you doing? You have a printing machinery and you are printing money and resorting to deficit financing. Is it not overdraft? You are doing that. You are trying to blackmail the States in order to fall into a pattern. This is not going to take place. Nobody is going to be taken in by your words, and the peoples of the States will go on fighting for more financial powers so that they can fulfil and meet their obligations to the people.

Then, is it not a fact that you are not in a position to restore the exchange value, the previous exchange value of the rupee without the consent of the International Monetary Fund? If that is so, then your sovereignty over your fiscal measures, over your financial policies, over your rupee, that is gone. You are just in the hands of the I.M.F. which is an organisation of the U.S.A. So a country which has not the freedom or the sovereignty to fix the exchange value of its own monetary standard is no

[Shri Niren Ghosh]

free country at all, and it is a fact and I lay the accusation and charge against the Government that without their prior approval or consent you can do nothing and under their thumb you have devalued and you cannot revalue even if you want to because you have surrendered your sovereignty on this question. I also say that as regards the foreign debts and repayment, however much you may regale us with fairy tales that import liberalisation will take place, that some non-project aid will come, this and that, nothing is going to help you because just now you are borrowing in order to pay a part of your previous borrowings, the previous debts you have incurred, for the servicing of the debt payments. That is, a man who has got into the mire, in trying to get out of it, goes more into the mire and sinks deep into it. So, what is the way out? Cannot you have a moratorium on foreign debt payments for ten years at least so that we can have, India can have, breathing space? Is it possible or not? Every country worth the salt will resort to this.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI K. C. PANT): We are negotiating for the rephasing of the loans.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: You have given the red signal of bankruptcy and ask for time. At least put a moratorium on foreign debt payments for a decade, ten years. If not, have the courage or guts to write it off altogether. Some countries even do that.

SHRI K. C. PANT: It needs a certain element of dishonesty, not guts.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: I see. Another thing I would like to bring out. In a recent survey of the Reserve Bank it has been brought to light that almost 60 to 70 per cent of the working capital of the private sector companies comes from external sources, 60 to 70 per cent working capital, I do not say equity capital. If equity

capital is Rs. 5 lakhs, for working capital the company requires at least Rs. 20 lakhs. But 60 to 70 per cent comes from external sources, that means from foreign sources. That means the private sector is completely tagged on to the foreign interests; let alone the public sector, the debt burdens and all that, our so-called private sector on which our friend, Shri Babubhai Chinai, waxes eloquent and the Federation and the Chambers of Commerce and Industry wax eloquent, they talk of tax reduction and all that, let them disgorge these Rs. 4,500 crores. But what about taxation? The entire rise in taxation, almost 60 to 70 per cent has fallen on the vast majority of the people; only a minor fraction of 20 or 30 per cent has fallen on the rich people. On that score they have avoided taxes to the tune of Rs. 4,500 crores; that is the black money in circulation to boost the spiralling rise in prices. So I say that even the so-called private sector is now passing into the hands of the foreigners, behind our back, and we are not even kept informed of those things, and this Government is trotting on and off the so-called childish theory that it is trying to build an independent economy, a self-generating economy that will go on to the take-off stage. But it has got down to a take down stage; we will never go to the take-off stage. It has stepped down and got stuck up in the mud and it will never take off under your regime unless a thorough break is made with your policies.

As regards licensing, we will discuss that thing. Only I want to seize this occasion to say that only the big strata have been favoured. Lakhs of entrepreneurs, middle, lower and medium, have been denied any privilege in the matter of licensing, in the matter of raw materials, in the matter of foreign exchange, everything. Do you think that all those small capitalists are for ever going to toe your line? I do not think so because their very existence is at stake. For twenty years they have been dancing to your



tune. They are not going to do so for ever. So take heed; at least rethink and make a thorough break with the reactionary anti-national financial policies that you are pursuing so long. Thank you.

**श्री जगत नारायण (हरियाना) :** वाइस चैयरमैन महोदय, मैं आपकी वसातत से श्री पन्त जी से दो सवाल पूछना चाहता हूँ। आजकल अखबारात में यह खबर छप रही है कि चंडीगढ़ के मुताल्लिक हमारी प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहिबा बहुत जल्दी आरबी-ट्रेडन का फैसला करने वाली है। चंडीगढ़ के लिए खतरा यह है कि चंडीगढ़ यूनियन टेरीटरी है, पार्लियामेंट की प्रापटी है, पिछले वजट में आपने उसके लिए रुपया मंजूर करवाया है। पंजाब और हरियाना की सरकारों तो वहां पर किरायेदार सरकारें हैं। इन दोनों सरकारों के चीफ मिनिस्टर जो खुद किरायेदार है, कैसे यह फैसला कर सकते थे कि जो पार्लियामेंट की प्रापटी हो, इस हाउस की प्रापटी हो, उसके लिए प्राइम मिनिस्टर को आरबीट्रेटर बना दे। मैं उनसे जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने वाकई आरबीट्रेटर बनना मंजूर किया है। जबकि चंडीगढ़ यूनियन टेरीटरी है, इन दोनों हाउसेज की प्रापटी है, प्राइम मिनिस्टर कैसे आरबीट्रेटर बन सकती है, यह मैं उनसे जानना चाहता हूँ। इसकी जरा वजाहत करें, क्योंकि बहुत से लोगो के दिलों में शक है कि क्या वाकई प्राइम मिनिस्टर आरबीट्रेटर बन सकती हैं और क्या उन्होंने आरबीट्रेटर बनना मंजूर किया है। आप जब अपना जवाब दें तो इस सवाल के मुताल्लिक वाजेह बयान दें।

दूसरी बात जो मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि आपके बजट का एक बटा तीन हिस्सा डिफेंस पर खर्च किया जाता है। 1950-51 में 164 करोड़, 1954-55 में 172 करोड़, 1960-61 में 245 करोड़, उसके बाद चीन का हमला हुआ तो 1962-63 में 769 करोड़ खर्च हुआ और 1966-67 में 779

करोड़ खर्च हो रहा है। तो मैं उनसे यह पूछना चाहूंगा : "We accept China's Challenge"—Jawaharlal Nehru—Publication Division. यह पडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू का लेक्चर है, जो हमें तक्सीम किया गया है, यह वह किताब है, इसमें जो पार्लियामेंट ने 14 नवम्बर, 1962 को हलफ लिया था कि क्या करना है हमन—

"This House notes with deep regret that, in spite of the uniform gestures of goodwill and friendship by India towards the People's Government of China on the basis of recognition of each other's independence, non-aggression and non-interference, and peaceful co-existence, China has betrayed this goodwill and friendship and the principles of Panchsheel which had been agreed to between the two countries and has committed aggression and initiated a massive invasion of India by her armed forces."

यह उस रिजोल्यूशन का एक हिस्सा है। और आगे कहता है—

"With hope and faith, this House affirms the firm resolve of the Indian people to drive out the aggressor from the sacred soil of India, however long and hard the struggle may be."

यह रिजोल्यूशन 14 नवम्बर, 1962 को पार्लियामेंट में पेश हुआ। यह 1962 में हुआ था, अ 1967 आ गया है। इसके मुताल्लिक हमारी सरकार क्या कर रही है जबकि वजट का एक तिहाई हिस्सा डिफेंस पर खर्च कर रही है? वे यह बतायें कि चीन ने जो कब्जा कर रखा है हमारे इलाके पर 20 हजार या 22 हजार मुरब्बा मील पर, उसके सम्बन्ध में हमारी गवर्नमेंट की पालिसी क्या है—चीन को निकालना है या नहीं? यह पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बरों ने पास किया था, मैं तो उस समय पार्लियामेंट का मेम्बर नहीं था, मगर बतौर एक हिन्दुस्तानी के मैंने इस रिजोल्यूशन का स्वागत किया था। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी गवर्नमेंट क्या

[श्री जगत नारायण]

कर रही है, जब वे डिफेंस पर एक बटा तीन हिस्सा बजट का खर्च करते हैं, क्या इरादा है, क्या चुप रहना है, निकालना है या नहीं निकालना है। इसके मुताल्लिक मैं चाहता हूँ वे जरूर बयान दें।

तीसरी बात उनकी खिदमत में मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि मुझे भी 10-12 मुल्को में बाहर जाने का मौका मिला है। जितने टैक्सेज इस देश में हैं, बाहर के मुल्को में जाये तो वहाँ इतने टैक्स नहीं हैं। मुझे अपने पजाब का पता है, पजाब और सेन्टर के सारे टैक्स मिला कर एक आदमी को 25 टैक्स देने पड़ते हैं। अगर कहे तो मैं 25 टैक्सेज की लिस्ट बना कर वजीर साहब को भेज दूंगा। 25 टैक्सेज एक आदमी को देने पड़ते हैं। क्या वजह है कि दूसरे मुल्को में 4-5 टैक्सेज से काम हो जाता है और क्या वजह है कि हिन्दुस्तान में इतने टैक्सेज लगाये जाते हैं? मैं नहीं कहता कि टैक्स मत लगाइए। टैक्स लगाए बगैर काम नहीं चल सकता, लेकिन कोई रास्ता निकालिए, जिससे इतने टैक्स एक आदमी को न देने पड़े। किस ढंग से निकालें यह हमारी गवर्नमेंट को सोचना चाहिए।

इसके साथ साथ आज क्या हालत हो गई है इनकम टैक्स के मुताल्लिक। जितनी फर्म्स हैं अच्छी या दरम्यानी सबने डबल एकाउन्ट्स बना रखे हैं। इनकम टैक्स लाइथर रखे हुए हैं, जो इनकम टैक्स डिपार्टमेंट में जाकर डबल एकाउन्ट्स की किताबें पेश कर देते हैं और उसी ढंग से इनकम टैक्स डिपार्टमेंट में वे डील हो जाती है। आप अपने इनकम टैक्स डिपार्टमेंट को कहिए कि ठीक ढंग पर इन्क्वायरी करें और ठीक ढंग से टैक्स वसूल करें। ऐसा करेंगे तो इतने टैक्स लगाने की जरूरत नहीं पड़गी जो इस देश में लग रहे हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि वजीर साहब कोई रास्ता निकालें कि जितने टैक्सेज हैं 25 उनका जो बाझा है वह लोगो पर न पड़े।

चौथी बात उनकी खिदमत में मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि हमारा जो एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन है वह बड़ा टाप-हैवी है। अग्नेज के जमाने में इतने सेक्रेटरी नहीं होते थे, इतने अन्डर सेक्रेटरी नहीं होते थे, इतने वजीर नहीं होते थे जितने आज इस एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन में हैं। इसके सम्बन्ध में भी कुछ हम सरकार को सोचना चाहिए। किस तरह करना चाहिए, उसके लिए एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव कमीशन बना है, वह स्कीम रखेगा, लेकिन फिर भी गवर्नमेंट को सोचना चाहिए। जैसे सेन्टर में 52 वजीर हैं, पार्लियामेन्टरी सेक्रेटरी है, तीन आदमी के पीछे काग्रेस पार्टी के एक वजीर है। इसके बारे में भी सोचना चाहिए कि किस तरीके से हम काम कर सकते हैं।

मैं वजीर साहब की खिदमत में यह अर्ज करूंगा कि मैंने जो तीन-चार बातें कही हैं, उनकी तरफ तवज्जह दें। खासतौर पर मैं चाहूंगा कि चडीगढ के मुताल्लिक डिफेंस के मामले पर चीन ने जो रकबा दबा रखा है, वहाँ से उसको निकालने के बारे में—इन बातों के मुताल्लिक जरूर जिक्र करें, जहाँ वे जवाब दें। बहुत-बहुत शुक्रिया।

SHRI G P SOMASUNDARAM  
(Madras) Mr Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am very proud to tell the House that throughout India, Madras State where the DMK Party rules is a State which cleared the overdraft within twenty days of assuming office. I think that this will attract the attention of the Finance Minister because several States have not paid their overdraft. My leader, Thiru Annadurai, the Chief Minister of Madras very clearly stated that the Centre should not stand in the way of the State Government's efforts to improve the lot of the people. He said that if Delhi did make any such attempt, he would not hesitate to expose it.

We have got so many States in the Union. The States should be given more powers. The residuary powers

that are to go to the States are not given to the States. Unfortunately, these powers are enjoyed by the Central Government itself.

I think that relations between the States and the Central Government are cordially maintained and established without any grouse from any quarter of this country, irrespective of the fact whether it is a non-Congress Government or a Congress Government. Sir, we have seen in the papers that the Chief Ministers are demanding that the increase in the dearness allowance of their employees should be borne by the Centre. I think that it is a justifiable demand. After all, it is due to the economic and fiscal policies of the Indian Government that prices have shot up. The responsibility for the economic health of the country is constitutionally and otherwise squarely on the shoulders of the Centre. So when price-spiralling goes up unchecked, it is but fair that they should bear the rise in the dearness allowance which is a concomitant evil of the price rise.

SHRI K. C. PANT: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I have listened with great attention to the debate that has just taken place and I have tried to benefit from it. But before I go on to discuss the points that have been made in the debate, may I, with your permission, associate myself with the sentiments expressed in this House earlier today when the Prime Minister and friends opposite paid their well-deserved tributes to our distinguished Chairman.

Sir, I would like to thank all the hon'ble Members who have participated in this debate. But I would particularly like to thank those who have spoken on financial matters. I know that this is a Finance Bill which merely seeks to continue the present tax rates, and there is nothing new in it. Therefore, it is perhaps natural that the attention of the hon'ble Members, some of them at least, who spoke should have strayed to other subjects of greater current interest.

While I shall accept the various suggestions that have been made for consideration I shall, in the course of my reply, try to touch upon some of the other points that were raised which do not have a direct bearing on the Finance Bill.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, first of all, let me say that the Government does share the concern of the House in regard to the various aspects of the present economic situation which are causing a measure of anxiety. For instance, several Members in the House expressed concern over the rising prices. Some Members referred to the possible waste of public funds. Some referred to the inadequacy of return in public sector enterprises. Some referred to the food difficulties and the need for this country to continue to rely on imports to feed itself, and even those who did not refer to this aspect of the situation, I am sure, had it in their mind.

Then, the question of under-utilisation of the installed capacity in industry was raised. Sir, all these matters are receiving the attention of the Government and the Government will have to devise a multi-pronged attack on all these problems. I hope when the regular Budget comes up next month in this House and the other House, a fuller picture will be available on the Government's approach to all these problems.

At this stage may I only say that the present economic difficulties are, if not the direct result, at least have been greatly influenced and are very largely the product of two important factors. One is the fact that this country has had an unprecedented succession of droughts which have seriously affected food production. And the other is the fact that in the course of the last five years this country has been through two wars which has necessitated a much larger outlay on Defence. When the outlay on Defence was increased, and a reference was made to this a moment ago by my revered friend, Shri Jagat

[Shri K. C. Pant.]

Narainji, at that stage there was a discussion in the country and in Parliament as to whether this country could bear the burden of Defence and development simultaneously. Well, Sir, this country decided to go ahead with the developmental activity while bearing the extra burden of Defence, and the people of this country responded magnificently to this challenge, and we have been able, in spite of the enormous stresses and strains that were created in the economy, to carry on with our basic developmental projects as well as to find the necessary resources for Defence.

Sir, in the present situation I agree with Shri Banka Behary Das that we have reached a point where we have to aim at a reasonable stability of prices. One cannot speak in terms of absolute stability. But unless we have reasonable stability of prices, it will be difficult to create conditions in which we can ensure the smooth progress of our economy without inflation.

Sir, while we discussed the difficulties with which we were faced, and rightly so, I think we should not forget that the last twenty years have seen a transformation of the economic situation in this country in its widest sense. Forgetting the immediate difficulties, if we look back over the years we find considerable progress in various directions. Whether it is power, whether it is transport, whether it is irrigation, whether it is education, whether it is the control of disease, whether it is the increase in the longevity of our countrymen and so on, there has been progress. We cannot be satisfied with it; we feel that in many directions, it should have been more; but we cannot also ignore the fact that there has been progress. The infra-structure that is necessary for further industrial growth has been built up to a very large extent, and I do not agree with the hon. Member who said that we are receding from the stage of take-off. We have created an infra-structure which will

enable us to take off in a relatively short time, provided we can get over some of the bottlenecks. In machine-building industry, for instance, this country has made remarkable progress in the course of the last few years. I do not want to go into the details, but whether it is in the manufacture of power-plants or machine tools or railway equipment, this country has forged ahead and is now in a position, in fact, to export many of these sophisticated items to foreign countries and is, in fact, doing so—and in some cases, to advanced countries, to developed countries also.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, my hon. friend Mr. Dahyabhai Patel—I am sorry he is not here now—objected to the extra expenditure on import of food. Well, I wish he would tell us how one can escape the necessity at this stage. So far as agriculture goes—and he made a passing reference to it—I can assure him that the Government is propagating the use of varieties of improved seeds all over the country. He referred to Taichung rice. I can assure him that Taichung rice is being propagated all over the country wherever irrigation facilities are available. In fact, the whole thrust of the present agriculture policy is to concentrate on providing all the necessary facilities in those areas where agricultural production can be stepped up most rapidly. In the past, the resources were somewhat dispersed. In some places where there was irrigation, fertilisers were in short supply and in some places where fertilisers were available, seeds were in short supply. Now there is a concerted attempt to make available all the elements that go into agricultural production, at the same place, so that in combination they can help to increase agricultural production rapidly. This is the so-called "Package Programme" approach and it is certainly producing results. In the matter of agriculture, we have to concentrate on intensive agriculture and on getting more production out of the same area because we do not have much surplus area to bring under the

plough. And in this respect, Government has laid considerable emphasis on minor irrigation. Sir, the House knows the Government's policy in these matters which have come up in other debates. I do not want to repeat what has been said here by my colleagues. But broadly speaking, Government wants to reduce the dependence on food imports progressively and to attain self-sufficiency in the matter of food as early as possible. And may I say that whereas the present economic situation and the food situation look difficult—and they are difficult—on account of these two droughts and bad harvests, it is equally true that if we have a few good harvests, the picture would suddenly assume a bright look because we are dependent in these matters on the harvests?

Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, broadly speaking, there are three points on which we have to concentrate. One is to increase our food supplies, that is, agricultural production. The other is to increase our industrial production for which more liberal imports are being made available to priority industries. I do not agree with my hon. friend Mr. Ghosh when he says that imports cannot be liberalised because of the repayments of debts. As a matter of fact, this recent credit that has been announced in respect of non-project aid does not include the re-scheduling of debts and, therefore, liberalisation of imports can take place within the ambit of the aid that has been announced. The third thing is that we have to bring about a measure of fiscal and monetary discipline. This is absolutely essential and in this matter the co-operation of the States is of vital importance.

Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I should like to come to some of the points that were raised by hon. Members in the course of the debate. Shri Mitra referred to the fact that there was some discrepancy between the figures of landed cost for foodgrains and the sale price and the subsidy given by the Government. I have checked

those figures and I find that the landed cost is approximately Rs. 59 to Rs. 60 per quintal, the issue price is Rs. 55 per quintal and the Government has to give a subsidy of Rs. 12 per quintal. I am sure there is some confusion in the figures that have got into Mr. Mitra's hands.

Then, Sir, Mr. Mitra raised the point of under-utilisation of capacity and he referred to a figure of 50 per cent under-utilisation. I do not think that the figure of 50 per cent applies to each and every industry. But the fact remains that there is under-utilisation and one of the factors was, until recently, the shortage of imported raw materials and components. I have already referred to the liberal import policy to get over this difficulty. Another factor was the lack of adequate demand for the products of some of the industries. This shortage of demand arose in part because of the Government's conscious efforts to curtail investments with a view to checking the rise in prices and in part to the rise in the prices of food and the resulting rise in the prices of other commodities. Now this is one aspect. On the other hand, there is a considerable demand for basic consumer goods and the demand has outstripped supply in certain cases. So we have this peculiar situation where, on the one hand, we have a low demand which is affecting industrial production, and on the other hand, we have a high demand for the basic consumer goods which is leading to high prices and which is creating so many difficulties. And when I referred to the need for financial discipline, I did so keeping all these factors in mind.

Now, Sir, the Chief Ministers are meeting in Delhi and they are discussing various matters concerning food and finances with the Central Government, and I hope that many of these aspects will be tackled to the satisfaction of all concerned at these meetings. Shri Bhandari suggested that Sales Tax should be replaced by Excise Duties.

2 P.M. gested that Sales Tax should be replaced by Excise Duties.

[Shri K. C. Pant.]

This matter has come up in this House only a short while ago and it has been dealt with and I would only briefly like to put before him the pertinent facts. Firstly, the Sales Tax, as he very well knows, is a State subject. So that part of the Sales Tax we need not discuss at all. The other is the Central Sales Tax. Even that, while it falls within the Central sphere of taxation, is related to the levy of local Sales Tax by the States on the commodities. There is link between the two. Anyway the basic idea behind the suggestion was explored in 1957 and the Sales Tax was in fact replaced by Excise Duty in the case of certain commodities.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS: Four commodities.

SHRI K. C. PANT: Yes. You do not want me to go into this list?

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS: Why do you not extend it to other commodities?

SHRI K. C. PANT: I am coming to that. In 1959 at a meeting of the Chief Ministers of States a Committee of certain Chief Ministers was appointed under the chairmanship of Dr. B. C. Roy with the idea of examining the possibility of extending the scheme of replacement of Sales Tax by Excise Duty. I am sorry to say that ultimately in view of the opposition from the States the scheme was dropped. In fact the Central Government had suggested a list of 9 items where this could be done but the States objected and it was dropped. Again the matter was examined in 1963. The State Finance Ministers Conference met in 1963 and again the States objected. So it had to be dropped. So really speaking it is the Central Government which is helpless in the matter. So long as the States strenuously object to the idea, it is very difficult to do anything in the matter unless all the States agree to it.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI (Rajasthan): What about the Central Sales Tax?

SHRI K. C. PANT: I have told you that the Central Sales Tax is linked. If a commodity is not taxed in the State, it cannot be taxed by the Centre. There is relationship there. Therefore, the willing cooperation of all the States is absolutely essential before we can do anything.

श्री डाह्याभाई व० पटेल (गुजरात) :  
'मेरी गो राउन्ड' जो कहा है वही है। उसमें कोई फर्क नहीं है।

SHRI K. C. PANT: May I say that my respect for Shri Dahyabhai Patel comes in the way of my taking note of these frivolous remarks.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: It is not frivolous. I said in all seriousness and supported by what I said.

SHRI K. C. PANT: He is frivolous even when he is serious. Shri Bhandari referred to the overdrafts of the States and the fact that the Centre was trying to withdraw the overdraft facilities suddenly. I agree with him that it would be advisable and it should be the object of the Centre and the States to work unitedly in this matter. It is something which concerns both and both should try to accept certain financial discipline in the interests of the larger good of the country but I would also request him to view this matter in its entirety and not in the context of States versus Centre. When overdrafts are given to the States, ultimately those overdrafts are paid for by the Centre. Otherwise the States' ways and means position is affected and, therefore, ultimately it adds to the deficit of the Centre. Shri Bhandari rightly laid great stress on fiscal discipline, on the need to strengthen the rupee, on the need to bring down the prices, etc. If he really feels that these matters must be dealt with immediately and cannot be put off to some future date, then certain consequential steps are necessary and

[Shri K. C. Pant.]

one such step is that the Centre should not go on having larger and larger deficits, that the Budget must be balanced and that the States should not pass on their deficits to the Centre. If he accepts the need for this and if he accepts that it should be done quickly, then surely this process cannot be very gradual. That is the only difficulty.

**श्री सुन्दर सिंह भण्डारी :** एक बात ओवरड्राफ्ट के विषय में एकदम यह निर्णय लिया गया है कि जहाँ कहीं ओवरड्राफ्ट हो स्टेट्स का चेक आनर नहीं होगा । इस चीज के बारे में सारी पद्धतियों को स्वीकार करते हुये इसके लिये भी कोई प्रैज्युअल और फ्रेज्ड कार्यक्रम बनाना आवश्यक है ।

**SHRI K. C. PANT:** It is easy to face something that is pleasant because one gradually gets used to it but if it is something unpleasant, then sometimes there is need to show that you mean business. Otherwise the other party tends to go on in the old ways. This matter of overdraft is not a new one. For years and years the Centre and the States have discussed it, they have sat round the table and promises have been made to the Centre that this will not recur and yet it has kept on. Here I would agree with Mr. Patel that it is a merry-go-round and it has been going on in the same old way. Now something has got to be done and the need for discipline is so overriding at the moment that this step had to be taken but my appeal to friends opposite would be to take an overall view of the problem and to advise their States also to exercise greater discipline in fiscal and financial matters.

Then comes the performance of the public sector undertakings. This is a point which is raised in almost every Budget Debate. This was raised here by Shri Patel and Shri Bhuwarka and I was a Member of the Public Undertakings Committee and am conscious of the fact that many of the public undertakings have not given the

results expected of them. On the other hand I have also come across various undertakings which have done rather well. I can cite the Hindustan Machine Tools which is a well-known example and there is the Indian Telephone Industries. I can name other examples. Even the steel plant at Bhilai has done rather well and even the others have come up to their rated capacity in production. This year because of fall in demand, there has been a certain setback in production but by and large they have come up to the rated capacity and so the picture is not uniformly . . .

**SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL:**  
What about the rated profits?

**SHRI K. C. PANT:** In regard to profits, some of them are rather good and some others are not so good, but there is scope for improvement. There is no getting round that basic fact that there is room for improvement. There is scope for improvement and there is need to tackle this problem in a way so that we get from these public sector undertakings the returns that the exchequer deserves. Having sunk so much money into these undertakings we shall certainly do our best to see that this happens as quickly as possible. But I do feel, and I would appeal to all sections of the House not to take a partisan view of this matter, of the public sector undertakings. They are national undertakings and crores and crores of rupees have gone into these from the nation's fund, and our approach, I feel, should always be to see that these undertakings produce the results that are expected of them, and not to go on criticising them as something which is inherently incapable of producing results. I do not agree that there is anything inherently wrong with these undertakings. Some of them have very long gestation periods, and some others have had various other difficulties in the initial stages, but gradually they are coming into their own, and with proper encouragement from Parliament which, I think,

[Shri K. C. Pant.]

they deserve, they shall come into their own much quicker.

Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Shri Jagat Narain referred to the fact and he asked me two pointed questions, and the first was whether the Prime Minister had agreed to become the arbitrator in the matter of Chandigarh. Now as far as I know, there has been no new development in this regard since the Sant broke his fast. At that time both the then Chief Ministers had approached the Prime Minister and requested her to agree to become the arbitrator and as far as I know, that is where the position stands. Nothing new has happened there. I don't see his point when he says that she cannot become the arbitrator because Chandigarh is the property of this House. If both the Chief Ministers agree to make her the arbitrator, I think she is within her rights to become the arbitrator, if she wants to.

श्री जगत नारायण : वे तो किरायदार हैं। वे कैसे कह सकते हैं ? कोई किरायदार भी किसी के मकान के लिये किसी को आरखीदेटर बना सकता है ?

How can the Prime Minister become the arbitrator?

SHRI K. C. PANT: Shri Dahyabhai Patel has infected Shri Jagat Narain.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: That is why he sits behind me.

SHRI K. C. PANT: Then the second question he asked was about the increase in the Defence Budget, and the failure of the Government to fulfil the pledge which was taken in Parliament, and he read out that pledge the last part of which said, "however long and hard the struggle may be". He will realise that no time limit has been set to that pledge. And so that pledge holds, and "however long and hard the struggle may be", that pledge will hold, and we shall fulfil that pledge when the time comes.

SHRI JAGAT NARAIN: When will that time come?

SHRI K. C. PANT: Then the hon. Member from Madras—I am sorry I do not know his name . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Somasundaram.

SHRI K. C. PANT: Now, Sir, he referred to one fact, which I have to take notice of. He said that constitutionally it is the Centre's responsibility to meet the D.A. liabilities of the States. I would respectfully differ from him. It is up to the States to pay their employees any remuneration they like, any dearness allowance they like. They are completely free in the matter, but they have to find their own resources for it, and within those resources they have absolutely untrammelled freedom.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: He means that you are responsible because your policy has caused the prevailing high prices. If your policy had not caused the high prices, they would not have held you responsible. That is what he means.

SHRI K. C. PANT: "Constitutional responsibility" he said. I have only checked him on that.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS: Moral responsibility.

SHRI JAGAT NARAIN: It is good morality also.

SHRI K. C. PANT: Let us not talk of morality here. It is a dangerous subject.

Then Shri Jagat Narain referred to the fact that the Cabinet here should have been smaller as it is a very large Cabinet. Well, I took the trouble of checking up on the figures for Orissa, and I find that while the erstwhile Congress Government had seven Cabinet Members, the present non-Congress Gov-



ernment, which takes its inspiration from Shri Dahyabhai Patel, has ten Cabinet Members. I need hardly comment on that, Sir.

Now coming to the reference by Shri Banka Behary Das to the need for an income-price policy, I agree with him that this is a vital subject, a subject of great importance and that we have to devote our attention to it, and he will be glad to know—I think he probably knows it—that a steering group of experts was set up to go into this question of a price, wage and income policy, and it has submitted a report to the Government.

**SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS:** Why the Government sits tight over it then?

**SHRI K. C. PANT:** The report is being considered by the Government. It is not so easy, you will please appreciate. You have yourself given some aspects of this problem. And it is a problem with immense ramifications and with immense implications, and to have a practical incomes and price policy is not an easy matter. Even in England, where this was attempted and where this has been carried through with a large measure of success, there have been great difficulties, which you probably know about. So the report is being considered by the Government, and more than that I cannot say at this stage except that, whatever view the Government might take of this problem, or of this suggestion, ultimately it is a question of agreement among the various sections of the community to accept certain disciplines. It is ultimately the realisation that the present spiral of costs and wages chasing each other and then the prices and wages chasing each other up the spiral has got to be broken, and price stability has got to be restored, and this, I am afraid, requires a certain measure of discipline from all sections of the community, and it requires agree-

ment among them. So this, at any rate, is a vital element, and sooner rather than later we must decide **about this policy.**

Now I would like to assure Shri Dahyabhai Patel, who raised the question of demolition of the Western Court, that it is not being demolished, and my colleague, the Minister for Works, Housing and Supply, had said here in reply to a question that it was not being demolished and he assured this House that as many Members as used to live in the Western Court rooms would continue to live there seven now.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA):** To be precise, 53 rooms.

**SHRI K. C. PANT:** I thank you Sir, for giving me this information which I did not have. I hope it will satisfy Shri Dahyabhai Patel.

Then Shri Dahyabhai Patel talked about bulges and bursts and so on, at the Centre. I think that what he was trying to say was that he hoped that the Government at the Centre would fall in the manner it has fallen in U.P. Now, Sir, the Opposition has come to very hard days if it looked to Congressmen crossing the floor in order that the Government might fall. I had thought that a healthy practice in democracy was for the Opposition to build itself up so that it could replace the other party. But it has fallen on very sad days when it looks forward to this kind of activity on the part of Congressmen, and tries to silently encourage it and, well, even if that happens, we would have the satisfaction of seeing Mr. Dahyabhai Patel sitting next to Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. And that is no small satisfaction. It has been seen in some of the States. But to see them sitting together in the Treasury Benches here would be a new experience for all of us. Now, as I was listening to the debate, I

[Shri K. C. Pant.]

felt that the danger of this happening is receding, because I found that revolutionaries like Shri Bhupesh Gupta, Shri Niren Ghosh, and others are now talking in terms of consensus. But consensus is the very anti-thesis of a revolutionary, and even Mr. Rajnarain, I think, referred to the consensus that had emerged from among the Opposition parties. Since when do revolutionaries subscribe to consensus? And if they have been tamed to this extent, then I am tempted to feel that the Congress Government will remain with greater stability.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: They are counter-revolutionaries.

SHRI K. C. PANT: Sir, Shri Bhupesh Gupta and Shri Rajnarain referred at some length to the selection of candidates by the Congress for the Presidentship and Vice-Presidentship.

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) : वह छोड़ो कामराज के लिये उसमें मत जाओ ।

SHRI K. C. PANT: They said that this is a national question and should not be made a party question and that they were in favour of a unanimous decision. Sir, I quite agree. It is very much preferable that these questions should be dealt with not as party questions but as national questions and unanimous decisions are attempted to be arrived at. I should like to assure them that the Congress and the Government were very keen that a national consensus should emerge in the matter. Even before the last elections, when the Congress held sway over most of the states—all the States practically—and at the Centre, and had an overwhelming position in the political life of the country, the Congress, I think it can be said with fairness, took a national view of these national questions and tried to find national solutions to

them. Yesterday Shri Bhupesh Gupta referred to the fact that the late Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, sounded the Opposition leaders in 1962 on the names he had in mind for the Presidentship and the Vice-Presidentship. That was certainly in response to this desire to find national solutions to these national questions. And if one looks at the ultimate selection of the current President and Vice-President, it will be seen that both are national figures in every sense of the term. No one can accuse them of having loyalties that are confined to any one party or group. Therefore, national solutions have been found in the past and we would have welcome any national solution being found in the choice of candidates for these high offices.

श्री राजनारायण : इसमें पंत जी तुम्हारा क्या मतलब, इसे कामराज को बोलने दो ।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : तुम क्या बोलते हो ?

श्री राजनारायण : इसका स्पष्टीकरण हम आज कर दें क्योंकि हम आज कामराज से मिले थे ।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : हम लोग भी बैठे हैं ।

SHRI RAJNARAIN: I may tell you what Shri Kamaraj told me today.

SHRI K. C. PANT: Yesterday reference was made to this matter. So far I have only expressed my own personal views, that consensus should be found. I think there is nothing objectionable in what I have said.

श्री राजनारायण : मैं आज श्री कामराज के पास जार्ज फर्ननडीज के साथ 9 बजे गया उनसे मिला ।

SHRI K. C. PANT: I would re-question . . .

श्री राजनारायण उग आप बैठ जाइये  
मै बता दू ।

श्री. १० स० पंत बाद मे कह दीजियेगा ।

श्री राजनारायण मै आपको जानकारी  
दे दूँ आप जरा बैठ जाए ।

SHRI K. C. PANT: Let me have my  
say. I would request my hon friend  
who is a senior Member to let me  
have my say बाद मे उनका सुन ले ।

श्री राजनारायण पहले जानकारी कर  
लो पूरी बात की तो बोलो । मैने जानकारी  
की है ।

SHRI K. C. PANT: Sir, I would like  
to make it clear that one particular  
matter has been referred to, namely,  
that the Prime Minister made a com-  
mitment to the Opposition leaders to  
accept their choice. That is not cor-  
rect. She did not commit herself.  
She certainly met them and requested  
them to let her know their choice.  
But there was no commitment that  
automatically that choice would be  
accepted. The main point here is  
this. While it is a matter for gratifi-  
cation that the Opposition parties  
could agree on two names, in this re-  
gard, the point is that these names  
were given publicity in the Press be-  
fore the Congress Party was given  
any time to consider this matter or  
their consensus obtained. So this is  
the central point, really. My hon.  
friend Shri Bhupesh Gupta said  
yesterday that the Congress party had  
not been reasonable in this matter.  
But even he conceded that the Prime  
Minister's approach was both reason-  
able and flexible. These are his very  
words that the Prime Minister's ap-  
proach was both reasonable and  
flexible. If the Prime Minister's ap-  
proach was reasonable according to  
Mr Gupta, then I cannot understand  
why he should not have gone to the  
Prime Minister with those two names  
and given her time to consider them,  
to consult her colleagues and to con-

sider those two names before an-  
nouncing them in the Press. That I  
do not understand. If there was so  
much desire for a common consensus—  
and we all share that desire—surely  
the methodology for obtaining that  
common consensus was to have full  
and frank consultations before the  
matter went to the Press. After the  
matter went to the Press which  
naturally created difficulties, you  
created conditions in which it became  
much more difficult to view this whole  
question from the angle of consensus.  
This is so obvious.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY (Mad-  
ras): The trouble with the Prime  
Minister is that she is depending on  
the Congress President who is not  
for any agreed solution.

SHRI K. C. PANT: We in the Con-  
gress are not accustomed to a single-  
man rule and we have no dictatorship  
in our party. We do arrive at deci-  
sions after consultations. After con-  
sultations we arrive at certain deci-  
sions and we are not ashamed of that.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY: Is it so?  
It is news to me.

SHRI K. C. PANT: Sir, this is the  
main point. If consensus was desired,  
the obvious thing would have been  
for the Opposition parties to really  
give the Congress a serious chance to  
consider their candidate before an-  
nouncing it to the Press to get  
even a "No" from the Congress before  
announcing it to the Press. It is not  
fair to announce it to the Press and  
then to come forward and say "We  
have made a unanimous choice and  
now it is up to you to accept it." That  
is not the way to go about for getting  
consensus.

I believe the Prime Minister has  
written to Mr Masani in this regard  
and she has expressed her unhappi-  
ness and her surprise that the Opposi-  
tion should have decided to publicise  
it in the Press without giving the  
Congress a chance to consider such an  
important proposal. That is the crux

[Shri K. C. Pant.]

of the matter, this publication. One-sided unanimity can hardly be expected to promote consensus.

Leaving aside this aspect of the matter, I would go right to the heart of the matter. I would like even now to appeal to my friends of the Opposition to weigh very carefully the consequences of their decision to force a contest. I would certainly do it because they will have to answer certain questions before our people and before the country. The first of those questions is this. Why did they feel it necessary to contest the candidates set up by the Congress? This is a question which they have to answer. Once Dr. Radhakrishnan had removed himself from the contest, the obvious and logical choice was Dr. Zakir Husain. It is so obvious that they will have to answer this question as to why they preferred not to do the obvious thing and to go right out of their way and bring into the field somebody who was not in the field. I have nothing against him. I have the greatest respect for him.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY: On a point of order, Sir. Is it absolutely necessary for the hon. Minister to dwell personalities in high offices and who are aspiring to high offices?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Mariswamy, you were not here yesterday. You should have raised the point yesterday. So there is no point of order now. At this stage there is no point of order.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY: Is it at all useful?

SHRI K. C. PANT: Sir, the point is Dr. Zakir Husain is the Vice-President and his claims for the Presidentship should not be brushed aside unless there are compelling grounds for brushing aside those claims. That is a question that they will have to answer. They may not if they feel

uncomfortable. They may not like to refer to it. But they have to answer that question put by the country. It is not a matter between me and my hon. friends sitting opposite. Why should they feel uncomfortable?

Sir, Dr. Zakir Husain has been paid rich tributes by this House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Pant, may I tell you that you have taken 50 minutes? How much longer are you going to take?

SHRI K. C. PANT: I shall hurry up now.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Please be brief.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, यह जितना समय चाहें उतना दीजिये ।

श्री के० सी० पंत : बड़ा शुक्रिया करता हूँ आपका ।

श्री राजनारायण : वही हमारा अपने लिये भी कहना है ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महाब र प्रसाद भार्गव) : यह तो उनकी भूमिका है ।

श्री राजनारायण : हम सब के लिये अपने लिये सब के लिये यह चाहते हैं ।

श्री आबिद अली (महाराष्ट्र) : इसी झटके में शायद आपको भी कुछ मिल जाय इसलिये ऐसा कह रह हैं ।

SHRI K. C. PANT: I need not refer to the personal qualities of Dr. Zakir Husain. That is not necessary and it would be embarrassing to do so in this discussion. I need only say that everybody acknowledges that he has lent grace, distinction and dignity to the office he occupies just now and nobody really questions his credentials to the Presidentship, no one that I

know of. If there is anybody I at any rate do not know about it. The only thing that I can perhaps suspect is that there are some political parties opposite who may object to his being a Muslim (*Interruptions*). It is possible I do not know. But it is possible and I have been very careful in formulating it. But, Sir, others, I hope, are not motivated by this at all. One is constrained to say this because yesterday my hon friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, made a remark. He said that he was not sure if all Congressmen would vote for Dr. Zakir Husain. I am sorry he is not here today. I would have liked to ask him what exactly he meant by this. Is it that the Opposition or Mr Bhupesh Gupta himself has some scheme to lure away Congressmen?

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE. He was inciting Congressmen not to vote.

SHRI K. C. PANT. Or is it that he suspects that among Congressmen some will not vote for him because he is a Muslim? I want to understand what is at the back of his mind when he said that some Congressmen would not vote for Dr. Zakir Husain. If the latter was the case, then it was nothing but insidious communal propaganda and I am very sorry I feel that this would be the very negation of our concept of secularism in which the Congress believes and which is a part of our Constitution and I would tell Shri Bhupesh Gupta that it would be very dangerous to make political capital by playing upon suspected communal susceptibilities and sentiments. It would be a very dangerous thing. So I can assure my hon friends opposite that every Congress Member will vote for Dr. Zakir Husain and will be proud to vote for him and for Shri Giri and I would still appeal to hon friends opposite, in view of all that I have said, ultimately to reconsider and to veer round to Dr. Zakir Husain in the name of justice and fairplay in public life if not anything else.

Now, may I say a word without referring to the Opposition parties?

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया  
(मध्य प्रदेश) कन्वेमिंग खत्म ?

SHRI K. C. PANT. May I say that it would be very difficult to justify opposition to Dr. Zakir Husain under the circumstances which are prevailing in the country today? It would only create an impression in the country that a member of the minority community who is now

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया :  
श्रीमान् मैं प्रार्थना करूंगा कि .

SHRI K. C. PANT. I have heard a lot yesterday.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया :  
इस टाइप की चर्चा बंद की जाय तो अच्छा। जैसा आप ठीक समझे। हमको पर्सनली कोई दुख नहीं है।

SHRI K. C. PANT. Why are you feeling uncomfortable about this? I cannot understand.

श्री राजनारायण ऐसे ही पेशेन्स के साथ उनको सुनना चाहिये।

SHRI K. C. PANT. I cannot understand the feeling of discomfort, why are you feeling uncomfortable?

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरडिया :  
कम्फर्ट यही है कि जब इधर से कुछ भी शब्द नहीं कहे गये और आप इस तरह कन्वेस करोगे तो हम मरीखे आदमी जो इस मामले में शांत रहना चाहते थे वे भी अब कुछ कहने की जरूरत महसूस करते हैं।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): You have said a lot on this subject.

SHRI K. C. PANT. I shall conclude by saying that this would also create a bad impression abroad and I would

[Shri K. C. Pant]

leave it at that. In the end may I merely say that I hope that even at this late stage it would be possible to avoid a contest and for all of us to agree? And I am encouraged in this by the remarks of Shri Niren Ghosh who said that the Opposition was prepared to accept Dr. Zakir Husain provided something else was there. If we leave out the provided part, it means that there is no intrinsic objection on the part of the Opposition to Dr. Zakir Husain. In that case why are they forcing a contest? Is it a matter of bargain? If Dr. Zakir Husain is acceptable according to Shri Niren Ghosh as President I cannot see the idea of their forcing a contest against a candidate who is acceptable to them. Do they want to bargain for the Vice-Presidency I cannot understand this point of view. I would appeal to hon. Members opposite that even now it is not too late. We should try to get together and I hope they can ultimately veer round to our point of view and be motivated more by justice and fairplay in public life than anything else.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI: But you have chosen a very wrong platform for this purpose.

SHRI K. C. PANT: I have not chosen it; it was chosen for me yesterday.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): You try to finish; you have taken nearly an hour.

SHRI K. C. PANT: You will appreciate this is a Finance Bill. A large area was covered and it would be disrespectful to this House if I did not cover all the points.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: You have not said anything about nationalisation of the banks.

SHRI K. C. PANT: I do not want to take much more time. I understand

you want to get on with the business. May I just refer very briefly . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, he has said, hotch-potch. Why does he refer to this thing as hotch-potch?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): He has not said that; don't put words into his mouth.

SHRI K. C. PANT: I want to refer very briefly to certain allegations made yesterday by my hon. friend, Shri Rajnarain, regarding the Prime Minister. I would like to say two things. The first is that it is not . . .

श्री राजनारायण : मेरा प्वाइन्ट आफ आर्डर है कि प्रधानमंत्री इस सदन में जब चाहे तब आ सकता है। हमारा एन्रीगेशन प्राइम मिनिस्टर पर है पंत जी पर नहीं है, पंत जी चाहेंगे यह तरीका जो वे अख्तियार कर रहे हैं तो दूसरे दिन उन पर आ जायेगा। हम तो अभी तक उनको छोड़ रहे थे।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) : आपने यह प्वाइन्ट उठाया है तो डीसेन्सी यह कहती है कि आप तब मामले को उठायें जब प्राइम मिनिस्टर यहां हों। आपका कोई प्वाइन्ट आफ आर्डर नहीं है। अब डिबेट नहीं कर सकते हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : तो मैं रिवेस्ट करूंगा कि आप प्राइम मिनिस्टर को यहां आने के लिये मजबूर करें और उनके ऊपर जितने चार्जेज हैं उनका जवाब दिलवाएं। पंत जी के जवाब से प्राइम मिनिस्टर की सफाई नहीं होती है। अगर पंत जी कहते हैं तो थर्ड रीडिंग चार बजे तक चलेगी हम उस पर कहेंगे क्योंकि प्राइम मिनिस्टर के बारे में वह जवाब नहीं दे पायेगे।

श्री आबिद अली : उसकी सफाई तो कभी भी नहीं हो सकती है।

SHRI RAJNARAIN: All right, I will allow it.

SHRI K. C. PANT: The difficulty is if I said nothing about the charges levelled by Mr. Rajnarain . . .

SHRI RAJNARAIN: Don't be a loudspeaker of the Prime Minister.

SHRI K. C. PANT: . . . it would be disrespectful to him. He has made certain charges. He occupies a certain place in the public life of this country and if in the reply I were to ignore these charges, I think it would be a matter of disrespect to him.

श्री राजनारायण : पंत जी से ज्यादा दिनेश सिंह जी बोल सकते हैं। उनको ज्यादा जानकारी हो सकती है। यह नये हैं दिनेश सिंह पुराने हैं।

SHRI K. C. PANT: As a member of the Government once a man . . .

SHRI RAJNARAIN: All right; go on.

SHRI K. C. PANT: Shri Rajnarain is an eminent man in the public life of this country. He makes some charges and if I do not take notice of those charges I would be offending him. Therefore, I do not want to be disrespectful to him. So when I take notice of the charges that he makes I thought he would be happy.

श्री राजनारायण : हां हां, कहिये।

SHRI K. C. PANT: First of all I would like to ask him whether allegations can be made in the House without prior notice to the person concerned. That is the rule here.

440 RSD—4.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Don't digress.

SHRI K. C. PANT: That is the rule. Now that he talks of digression I would say . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On a point of order. There is no such rule in the House.

SHRI K. C. PANT: That is not a point of order.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why do you say that? I will take it from the Chair.

SHRI K. C. PANT: I have no doubt about it that you will take it from the Chair.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: There is no rule whatsoever. If I see a Minister is committing a theft can I not come here and say that he is committing a theft?

श्री राजनारायण : क्या यह सदन की व्यवस्था है कि अगर किसी बात की हमको तत्काल जानकारी हो और पब्लिक में की हो तो हम उसको सदन में रेफर न कर पायेंगे ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Did Shri Gulzarilal Nanda issue a prior notice to you when he made that statement?

(Interruptions)

SHRI K. C. PANT: I merely refer to this in order to put certain facts before the House and to convey those facts to Shri Rajnarain because he had raised those points. The first is about land. The land purchased by the . . .

SHRI RAJNARAIN: The first is the sable coat presented by the Russian Government. मेरा फर्स्ट चार्ज से ल कोट के बारे में था सेक्रेट लैंड का और थर्ड ग्राही का।

SHRI K. C. PANT: I shall give certain facts.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: What about the sable coat?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The order can be changed, but do not say first.

SHRI K. C. PANT: The order can be changed. The purpose why I have brought this matter forward is to show that at least on some of the facts the gentleman might have informed him incorrectly and, therefore, from all the information that we have received he had been guided by the inaccuracy of facts. The fact that I have obtained, after enquiry, is that the land purchased by the Prime Minister was paid for partly by her and partly by her late and distinguished husband, Shri Feroze Gandhi. It is entirely false to suggest or insinuate that anyone else paid for this land. That is so far as the land goes.

श्री राजनारायण : कहां की लैंड ?

श्री के० सी० पन्त : आपने जो लैंड के बारे में कल जिक्र किया था ।

श्री राजनारायण : हमने तो कई बार जिक्र किया है ।

SHRI K. C. PANT: The second thing is the station wagon was purchased and paid for by Shrimati Gandhi's father, our late and revered leader, Jawaharlal Nehru . . .

श्री राजनारायण: नेहरू जी के अकाउंट में उसका जिक्र कहीं नहीं है ।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : आप उनके प्राइवट सेक्रेटरी थे ?

श्री राजनारायण : मैं उनका बहुत कुछ हो गया हूँ ।

SHRI K. C. PANT: I am giving these facts in order to show that Shri Rajnarain with the best of intentions may have brought these matters for-

ward in the House, but his informant may not have informed him correctly. On the basis of facts, if I can controvert him, I hope he will then regard the information that he has received, in the light of the facts that I have controverted, as incorrect. The third is, it is entirely incorrect that any Ambassador car was purchased for official use by the present Prime Minister. These are the three facts. And now, with regard to . . .

श्री राजनारायण : उनके पास एम्बेसेडर कार नहीं है ?

SHRI K. C. PANT: जहां तक मुझे मालूम है खरीदी नहीं गई है उनके लिये ।

That is the point you made yesterday. Now, regarding the diamond necklace, Shri Rajnarain said that there was discrepancy between her statements in the two separate Houses. She had made a statement in the other House which he has probably seen. In effect, what she said is this that the diamond necklace was presented to her by the King of Saudi Arabia, that it was never in her custody, that she saw it and after that it was kept by somebody, she did not even know who had it and ultimately it was sent to the Finance Ministry.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन् मैंने इसके बारे में नहीं कहा था । मैंने यह कहा था कि जो श्री पदमपद सिंहानिया के जरिये डाइमंड दिया गया था वह कहां गया जो कि इन्दिरा जी ने कहा था कि हमने सारे डाइमंड और जवाहरात का अकाउंट कर दिया है । जब उन्होंने कहा था कि नेशनल डिफेंस फंड में हमने सारे जवाहरात दे दिये हैं, यह चर्चा वहां से चली हुई है । हिन्दुस्तान गाड़ी के बारे में भी मैंने कहा था ।

What about sable coat?

SHRI K. C. PANT: I thought yesterday he said that contempt of this



House was committed by the Prime Minister because she made different versions about this particular thing.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: Yes, Sir.

SHRI K. C. PANT: So, it is with regard to that that I have made this statement and I hope that I have clarified it. I am very careful where he is concerned.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: You Are giving information about this.

SHRI K. C. PANT: I try to be very, very careful. If, as I have said, these facts are incorrect, I would only hope . . .

SHRI RAJNARAIN: What about the sable coat?

SHRI K. C. PANT: . . . that a gentleman like Shri Rajnarain, for whom I have great respect . . .

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, हमारा चार्ज जो था उसका पूरा जवाब पन्त जी दें। हमारा चार्ज यह था कि सेबिल कोर्ट उन्होंने अपने पास रख लिया और एकाडिंग टू रूल उन्होंने उसकी मार्केट वैल्यू जमा नहीं की।

SHRI K. C. PANT: Again, Sir, I would not offend Shri Rajnarain by replying to all the points. He wants the Prime Minister to reply some points and I must leave some points for her also.

The only thing I would say in the end is that Shri Rajnarain whom I have known since childhood and for whom I have a great deal of affection and respect, has enormous vitality and energy and if this energy and vitality could be utilised . . .

SHRI RAJNARAIN: In a constructive way.

SHRI K. C. PANT: . . . for purposes which he himself has recog-

nised, it would do this country an enormous lot of good. Now, he participated in the Finance Bill and I am glad that he had so much to contribute to it, but it is a pity that his mind was diverted and he entirely concentrated on matters which were extraneous to the Finance Bill. I hope that so long as I am in this Ministry he will be good enough to give me a more helpful exposure to his mind. May, I, in the end, say . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What about Bird and Company?

SHRI K. C. PANT: Regarding Bird and Company, we are looking into the matter. The Government *suo motu* can look into certain matters.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: May I explain?

SHRI K. C. PANT: We have referred this matter to the Law Ministry and we are seeking their opinion on this. The matter has not been closed. We are looking into it.

Sir, I realise that this was not the occasion for a long speech. I realise that I have transgressed the limits of your patience and perhaps the patience of the House, but in view of the wide range of matters that were raised, I had no choice and seek your indulgence.

Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): The question is:

"That the Bill to continue for the financial year 1967-68 the existing rates of income-tax with certain modifications and the existing rates of annuity deposits and to provide for the continuance of certain commitments under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the discontinuance of the duty on salt for the said year, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): We shall now take up the clause by clause consideration of the Bill.

*Clauses 2 to 5 were added to the Bill.*

*Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.*

SHRI K. C. PANT: Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill be returned."

*The question was proposed.*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Mr. Dahyabhai and others, please be brief.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Sir, I will not take much time of the House. I tried very much to confine myself to the Finance Bill during the First Reading and spoke mainly on financial matters. It was thereafter perhaps the discussion went on to several other matters. I am glad the hon. Minister has made an effort to reply and, in doing so, he has practically admitted that the same merry-go-round run is going on. Well, if he admits this, he should have no reason to object to the Opposition coming together or for some Members crossing the floor. Crossing the floor is a recognised procedure that happens in a democracy. It is a pity that more of it has not happened in this country and that is why we have had predominance or dominance of one-Party-rule for twenty years. If facts are taken into account, you will find that many of us who have literally crossed the floor belonged to the Congress Party before, when the Congress Party was fighting for freedom. Therefore, it is possible that some of us saw wisdom early and some of them may see it late after the elections. They may change their mind and cross the floor. The hon. Minister should not very much object to that. I understand how he feels when it happened in his own home-province.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY) in the Chair.]

That I can understand.

SHRI N. PATRA (Orissa): That is two-way traffic.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: There is no objection to a two-way traffic. I am not objecting to it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You are not objecting to his crossing the floor.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: At this stage I felt that the hon. Minister's speech, the way in which he tried to twist what happened a little earlier to support his party's candidate for the Presidentship, was not exactly very right. This reminds me of what happened soon after we gained independence. It is a known fact, it is a fact of history that the first Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, wanted my present leader, Shri Rajagopalachari, to become the first President, and it is also a well known fact that many others felt otherwise.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: You were in the Congress then . . .

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I hope those who do not understand very much will not interrupt. It is a historical fact that there were consultations and during the consultations Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru was advised not to canvass openly for any one because, in case the candidate sponsored by the Prime Minister was not elected, even though the Congress Party remained in power because of its large majority, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru being a true democrat would have to give up his place as Prime Minister. History is repeating itself. A candidate has been sponsored by the Prime Minister, of course, supported by her supporters, but what happens if that candidate loses? The Prime Minister will remember that the Prime Minister will also have to resign even though the Congress Party has a majority. That is the true democratic tradition. May I, Sir, draw the attention of this House to this fact? Sir, elections are a normal part of democracy and should not be avoided. It is true that in certain cases if it is possible to arrive at unanimity, it is welcome,

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel.]

but not arriving at unanimity is no offence. On the contrary election is the essential part of democracy. How else does one test the will of the people? In this country fortunately—thanks to Gandhiji and the way in which he laid the foundations of freedom and democracy—we have a democracy. We do not have a single paper on which all the offices are voted for as happens in some places. That is a different type of democracy. To that we are not used, and we hope that we will never have to go to that situation. Therefore, I do not think this election is anything wrong. On the contrary an election brings education to the people. Every election particularly in this country, where literacy and education are so low, brings enlightenment, education. If we cannot give them education in the sense of educating them in the three R's, public consciousness is aroused—their right to vote, what this country is, why they have to vote, and so on. If only these things are put before them, this country would make greater progress. I would repeat that if the party in power had heeded the right advice that was given to them to vacate office at least three months before the election, they would not have been sitting there even with this precarious majority because the verdict of the people is very clear; the people have voted them out of office, not to office, much more so with half of the States now outside. I was waiting patiently to hear what the hon. Minister had to say about how they are going to treat the States, particularly their demands for tackling the main problem of food. I am afraid I did not see much light in the answer.

SHRI K. C. PANT: You were not here

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I am sorry if I was a little late.

May I also say that we would have liked to have seen the Finance Minister at least for a short while in this House during the discussion of the

Finance Bill? I know he has many added responsibilities since he is now the Deputy Prime Minister. But the Prime Minister is in this country now and hence the Deputy Prime Minister could have honoured this House also with his presence for a little while, perhaps by a few words also, as to what his policy in some of these important matters is going to be. Not that I mean to say that the Minister who is piloting the Finance Bill has not done it ably. I am sure he has done it equally well and we have no reason to take any offence at the manner in which he has done it. I hope he will always continue to treat the House in the manner in which he has done. We may disagree on many matters; that always happens, but one would have liked to see that in the new order the Finance Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister was going to give as much attention to this House as he does to the other House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I would not have spoken but for the reference that was made to me. Now that I am on my feet I shall say a few words. First of all I never made this kind of suggestion prophetically that a Congressman will vote against the Congress candidate. All I said was: How do you know that they are going to vote according to your will? Because you know very well from the elections that your men had worked against your candidates. That has been helpful to us. I know, for example, in Andhra your Congress people were saying after the motor car accident to Mr. Sanjivayya that Mr. Sanjivayya had become blind and it was no use voting for him. That kind of thing has been said. Your Mr. Yajee you put up as a Rajya Sabha candidate from the Bihar Assembly and it is well known that many Congressmen did not vote for him.

SHRI P. C. MITRA (Bihar): Many members of other parties also did not follow their party mandate.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** If you are so happy and confident, all to the good. I only struck a note of warning. Who am I to keep track of your elastic conscience? I am not the man for it.

I am glad that the Minister has said that the case of Bird and Company is not closed. But he should have been a little more expansive on the subject. Why was this order passed at all on the last day of the Minister in office? We naturally ask for his explanation. The whole thing is suspicious. I demand, therefore, an enquiry into this matter.

With regard to the Presidential election, I wish the young Minister had not spoken in the vein in which he spoke. He can give expression to his views but it sounded much more like canvassing, and it is not good either for me or for him to canvass for our respective candidates on the floor of the House. He never meant it perhaps but it sounded like that. That should be avoided here. But it is now a political contest I must say. It is a political contest between the nominee of the Congress Party, a one-party nominee . . .

**SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL:**  
Kitchen Cabinet.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** That is your speciality. I did not have the afternoon food also, so kitchen is not in my mind very much. Whether it is a kitchen Cabinet or garden Cabinet or whatever it is, the fact remains that he is a party candidate, and rightly or wrongly some other parties have come together and put up another candidate for political considerations, just as for political considerations they too have put up a particular candidate.  
**3 P.M.** Now the whole thing has been shifted to a pure and simple political level and if it has been accentuated as a political conflict and content, I said yesterday—I say it again—the responsibility rests with the Congress Party for it.

Now, Sir, our party is being accused of joining with the Swatantra Party in this Presidential contest, on this specific thing. Well, if we had all joined the Congress, then that would have been perfectly logical—that is their charge. If Mr. Dahyabhai Patel and I joined to resist some of their evil methods, some of their arrogance, then you speak of sin. You tell my friend that he has committed a sin, that I also have committed a sin. (*Interruptions*) Here I say that it is not a sin. But Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am very much interested; I am rather amused by the sudden love of the Congress Party for principles and other things. Here is Mr. Debabrata Mookerjee sitting in this House, an hon. Member, whom we defeated in the first election. Immediately after the election, he was appointed a Judge of the Calcutta High Court. What principle is this—may I know from the hon. Minister or any Member of this House? No principle is involved. Traffic was there from politics, after the defeat, to the Bench. Now, we [*THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.*] have opened another way of traffic, from the Bench to politics. What is wrong there? Both are there. Therefore do not try to look as if you are Caesar's wife; and that as far as the principles are concerned, we are sinners. It is not so. Double-way traffic has started. We propose to pay you some of the coins back; we have been given so many coins in all this period. Some of them we want to give you back. Accept them gracefully. Therefore, I do maintain again and again that if it was still possible for the Government, for the ruling Congress Party, to come to an understanding over this matter, we would have been in a mood for understanding. We were flexible; we were prepared to consider any reasonable proposal also; we were ready to make some proposal. It was not acceptable to them. Jantar Mantar Road must realise that the country is not ruled by Jantar Mantar Road any more. Realisation must dawn upon them first, upon whoever is sitting there, that at least nine

States today have passed out of the domination of Jantar Mantar Road, that the federal concept has come into operation and that they shall make way, come what may, the caravan will pass, no matter how many animals may be barking at certain other places.

**SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL:** What is that animal barking?

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Whatever animal barks, let it bark.

Therefore, they must realise it. Well, politically let us do it. It does not mean an individual, the issue is not about any individual today. The issue is about principle. The issue is between the Opposition, a big chunk of them, over a single matter, and one party, the ruling party, which has got less than 40 per cent of the total votes and which has lost eight States by one single stroke in the election. The issue is between the two . . .

**SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY** (Andhra Pradesh): Madam . . .

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** The lady Member wants to get up. I very much appreciate it, it is a privilege and a pleasure to be followed by you. After all, the prodigal daughter has come back home. (Interruptions) Therefore, let us not go into that. But I do again stress here. Now the issue has shifted from a moral plane to a political plane, from what looked like an issue about consensus to the arena of struggle between the ruling party rejected by eight States by an overwhelming majority of the voters and by other parties who are in control in some of the States, also representing the overwhelming majority of voters. Let the country decide.

Now, here I should like to say one thing because so many questions have been asked. We do not want the President to be anything more than a constitutional head. That was our position at the time of Dr. Rajendra Prasad, this remains our position and this will continue to remain our posi-

tion. But the President has a moral authority. It must be invoked when the interests of the nation and the masses demand it. Therefore, I would like to see a President at the Rashtrapathi Bhavan who, if the Government advises him to do something anti-national like the devaluation or the imposition of the Proclamation or similar other things curtailing the democratic rights of liberty or striking at democracy or undermining the federal aspect of the Constitution or to go against the non-Congress Government, in an unjust manner and if the Prime Minister sends such an advice to him, would have the courage to tell him, "Well, look here, Mr. Prime Minister, you are asking me to undermine the democracy in the name of the Constitution. You are asking me to prostitute my legal authority for your constitutional authority for the sake of your party. Choose one of these two courses. Either accept my advice and modify your decision or I will quit office." I never like a President who would say, "I do not care for Parliament." That would be the beginning of dictatorship. Therefore, I lay down the principle. After all, now the time has come; it is for you it is for us. In our Constitution there is a provision for the impeachment of the President. And let us declare that whoever the President may be, if he goes against democracy, if he goes against the fundamental interests of the nation and takes the side of the worst exploiting classes, then it will be open to all the democrats, no matter which party they belong to, no matter who that President is, to invoke that particular provision of the Constitution and table a motion of impeachment. That is our line. Therefore, it is quite clear as far as that thing is concerned.

Madam Deputy Chairman, I should not be misunderstood because some people are telling as if we are preparing the ground for dictatorship or some such thing. We have been living under what Mr. Setalvad called a constitutional dictatorship. And these

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

gentlemen coming from the opposite side tell us that by the political choice that we have made we are preparing for the evil day as if they have all been angels sitting there. Please do not take sides.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: Madam Deputy Chairman, I am trying to catch your eye.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You have caught all our eyes.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: After you, if the Chair allows me, I want to speak, not with your permission, but with the Chair's permission.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why are you concerned with a pair of eyes? So many eyes are on you.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: I am only concerned with the Chair's eyes, not with anybody else's.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I know that you never like my eyes. What can I do to my eyes?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, firstly look at the Chair and then you must be aware of the time and be brief now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am surprised at the lady trying to catch another lady's eyes. Everything that the Congress does is abnormal; nothing is normal nowadays. Women are catching women's eyes; men will catch men's eyes. That is the situation to which we have come. I can understand the intellectual doldrums and other things. Wonderful things, I say. But being a normal being, I look at you and catch your eye.

Now, the position is this. As far as the other aspect is concerned, he has replied to some of the charges made by my hon. friend, Mr. Rajnarain. Well, I think it should be done—when charges are made, no matter how or by quoting a letter—the Government

should always reply. We shall give them this advice and we are giving this advice to our Ministers and friends that whenever a charge is made by anybody, reply to that charge immediately. Do not skip it. This is in public interest. I hope that will be observed by all. I think that is proper. These things should be cleared up. But one thing I should like to say whether Mr. Rajnarain likes it or not. This Mathai business I do not like. Mr. M. O. Mathai's name comes up again and again. Cannot this Government enquire from Mr. Mathai why and how he wrote that letter when Miss Padmaja Naidu has said that she has not received that letter? Either he sent a letter or he did not send. If he sent that letter, then the Postal authorities are responsible for not delivering it to the Governor.

SHRI K. C. PANT: Mr. Rajnarain should find out.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If the Postal authorities are not responsible, then the Minister in charge should explain why the letter was not delivered. Now if the letter has been delivered, obviously somebody has delivered the letter. But we take it that what the Governor says is true. Anyhow, Madam Deputy Chairman, I hope my friend, Mr. Rajnarain, will not misunderstand me.

As for the charges, I am not interested in the necklace or the mink coat or the overcoat or whatever it is. I do not know any such thing. But I do not like a former officer of the Government of India, who has been mentioned on the floor of the House, going and meeting Members of Parliament. I do not say that he has met me. He has, perhaps, not met me. I do not like his going and meeting Members of Parliament, producing letters which he is supposed to have written to some Governor or things like that. I do not like such things. Therefore, I think the Government should examine in a proper way Mr. Mathai. They should know on

what legal grounds they can examine him because by the writing of the letter, I do maintain, one gets the impression that it has been written with a certain political motivation; it has been written with a malice; it has been written in the style of a pure and simple blackmailer. The language is one of a blackmailer. If that is so, are we going to permit blackmailing tactics by former officials of the Government of India, I should like to know. I am told that he was at one time an Assistant Secretary or some such thing. Is he getting his pension still, I should like to know. If so, do I understand that the Government of India pays pension to a blackmailer? Well, the letter is patently in the language of a blackmailer. It can be sent to Chicago as a sort of good lessons for blackmailers.

Madam, here I am not concerned with the charges. I know blackmailers also sometimes utilise certain things for their purpose. I am not concerned with this matter. But how is it that the letter, which was sent to the Governor, this man has been circulating? The presumption, therefore, follows that he may not have written this letter at all. But the letter was written to Miss Padmaja Naidu and he thought that the name should be given in this manner and circulated in order to add weight to it. The whole matter calls for an investigation. Madam, I would like to submit to the Government of India that Mathai is their creation. I know how in the Tin Murti Marg this Mathai was reared up year after year, built up from a Personal Assistant into an overlord in the Central Secretariat here. And you will be surprised, Madam Deputy Chairman, that some officer has even written criticising me for criticising Mr. Mathai here. He says that when Mathai was in office, the I.C.S. people were put in their good place. Now the I.C.S. people are ruling this country, he writes, because Mr. Mathai is no more. Am I to believe such a gangster who writes like that? I have seen it with my own eyes. He also

says that because he is out of the Central Secretariat, now the I.C.S. people have become all overlords and have got a free run. When he was in the Central Secretariat the I.C.S. people were all controlled. There should be a limit to this sort of conceit and check. Therefore, I would ask Mr. Rajnarain to examine the charge properly himself. I will be with him in castigating this Government. (*Time Bell rings*). Of course, I am never interested in character assassination, but I am with him when he makes certain charges against the Government. But as far as this question is concerned, I demand that the Mathai question should be reopened. The entire record of Mr. Mathai should be reopened. I pointed out in this House, when I spoke of Mathai affairs many years ago, how he was in liaison with the Americans. I named certain Americans also whom he was visiting there. I also make it clear that he was in liaison with the Birla family at that time. (*Time Bell rings*). I gave certain other facts which should not be repeated. I also pointed out in this House that when Mr. Mathai was getting Rs. 1,800 as his salary through the South Avenue post office, he was sending out Rs. 5,000 or Rs. 6,000 per month. When such a man is in the picture, I will have to pursue it. This Government I would like to fall any day. That is not the question. But I would not like the Government to be treated in a particular way that this man, Mathai, wants to treat it.

Madam, everybody knows that this man wanted nomination for the Lok Sabha from Kerala. Everybody knows how he is familiar with some high-ups. But when the Congress High Command did not give him nomination . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are two other speakers. Please wind up.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam Deputy Chairman, the charges should be answered no matter who made

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

them. Forget that, and the fact of Mathai's letter, since he has admitted having written it to Miss Padmaja Naidu, that must be considered. The style and language of the letter, his presentation of the whole thing and the arrogant style in which the letter is written is peculiar. Everybody to him is "Padmaja", "Indira" or some such thing. He does not say "Mr." or "Mrs." or "Shri" or "Shrimati". Well, I say this Congress Party sitting there, they built up this man, and when he is trying to strike at you, at least now admit that you committed a crime in having appointed him in a high place.

I return to the subject again. This question should be examined. The Central Government should order the Central Intelligence Bureau to examine or through some other agency to examine and find out from Mr. Mathai the circumstances in which the letter was written and the intention with which this letter was written, the name of the post office at which the letter was posted in the name of Miss Padmaja Naidu. All these things should be gone into. It is a very, very serious thing. I think Mr. Mathai should be at least taken care of in this matter. Charges about Ambassador car or some such thing are absolutely apart from this thing. Mr. Rajnarain wants to serve the public cause. I agree with him. The charges should be answered. Whether they are true or false, it will be seen after hearing the Government answer.

As far as this man is concerned he is in Delhi behaving in this manner. I know some people in the Congress Party who are entertaining him

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Some people in the Congress Party are entertaining Mr. Mathai. He is in liaison with men in important places. Do I have to divulge all these things?

(Time bell rings)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do, Mr. Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I hope the Minister will make a statement and clear up this whole thing. We want to fight an honest, forthright battle with the Congress. But we do not want this political battle with the Congress Party in the Government to be tarnished by such interlopers. That is all that I have to say.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shrimati Yashoda Reddy.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: Madam Deputy Chairman . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I hope you will all be very brief.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: ... I thank very much Mr. Bhupesh Gupta for having welcomed me back. Even though he called me the "prodigal daughter" of this House, let me tell him. They say 'East, West, Home is best.' Rajya Sabha is my home and I have come back to the home I belonged to.

Madam, today, first of all I did not want to take part in this Finance Bill. But so many things, which have nothing to do with the subject, especially the Presidential election and the way in which the nominees have been discussed, have been referred to here. But I would like just to say one or two points to Mr. Dahyabhai Patel. He said that he welcomed the elections. Certainly we also like to welcome elections as much as he welcomes, rather more than he wants. When he talked about elections, he evidently meant that we did not know about elections. He was so eloquent about traditions. He said that we in the Congress Party did not know how to keep up traditions. I have to submit one thing to him through you, Madam. He referred to the elections of Mr. Rajagopalachari and the great traditions of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru this morning. But let me point out that the whole House bears with me



and the press and the public would have noted how when our beloved Chairman was going away, when the whole House was giving him felicitations, the Leader of the Swatantra Party, did not have a word to say. Irrespective of the person who held the Chair and the party to which the Chairman belonged, the leader of an Opposition party, in all graciousness, ought to have said, irrespective of his own convictions, even for convenience, some good words. And is he the man to talk about traditions, I would like to ask. I think we know traditions better than he knows . . . (Interruption.) I do not get as much time as Mr. Bhupesh Gupta gets and so let him not interrupt. Then, Madam, he said "Are you not bothered about Congress reverses and about the fact that Congressmen defeated Congressmen?" Coming from Andhra Pradesh, I can say that it was the fight between the two Communist parties trying to beat each other that helped Congress to win, more than anything else. He also said that my good friend Mr. Pant in his speech was canvassing for Dr. Zakir Husain. I am sorry that such an impression was given. But knowing as I know Mr. Pant, I am sure he will never do such a thing. Madam, I would like to say that a person of the personality and stature of Dr. Zakir Husain does not need any canvassing. (Interruption.) Do not interrupt. I did not interrupt when you were speaking. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta said "We have been talking about principles; we told the Congress Party to have principles." I would like to say here that we would always like to hear, understand and appreciate the good points put forward by the Opposition. If it was they who fought for some good principles why should they now go off from those principles? If they taught us something, why not they themselves retain the thing they taught us? They say that we have brought politics into the Presidential election. I challenge their contention. They say: "To-day the Presidential election is not a mat-

ter of personality or a matter of Constitutional propriety; it is a matter of politics; it is a question of fight between Shrimati Indira Gandhi and other political parties." But I would say that it is the Opposition parties who are bringing in politics into the Presidential election . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You have got your own party candidate . . .

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: That is different. But I would say that certainly we did not bring politics into it. I am not bringing anybody's name. But what I would like to tell my hon. friends is that we did not bring in politics, but it is they who introduced politics into it and turned it into a question of politics rather than a question of Constitutional rights and so on. Madam, I really wanted to talk about these two points only—about tradition, to Mr. Patel and about principles to Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

Thank you.

SHRI ABID ALI: Madam Deputy Chairman, I do not know who is influenced by Americans and who is obliging them. That is a matter which only remains as an allegation by interested parties like the Communists. But it has been proved and established beyond doubt that amongst the Communists, there are people who are obliged by the Chinese and there are people who are obliging the Chinese, and there are people who are fighting to make the Chinese win and take possession of as much land that this great country possesses as they can. And that is why these people are working as fifth columnists for the Chinese. They should be ashamed of their actions. They just try to create a situation by which they make people believe that Congressmen are under the influence of the Americans. But the Americans have never invaded India. The Americans are nowhere near India. But it is these people who are friends of the Chinese, who are always praying "Let the Chinese attack India again" so that they may

[Shri Abid Ali]:

help them and tell the villagers on the border "Here are the people who are coming to give you real liberty" . . .

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Madam Deputy Chairman, I request you to adjourn the House. A Member is suffering from mental dementia and on humanitarian grounds, let us adjourn for a few minutes . . .

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** You please take your seat.

**SHRI ABID ALI:** The hon. Member should understand that abuse does not argue a case. He has been telling how we are being influenced by Americans and how we are obliging the Americans. But I am only making a statement of fact, and up to this time no Communist denies that he is a friend of China. This is the factual position . . .

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Mr. Nanda also said that . . .

**SHRI ABID ALI:** By saying this, day does not become night and night does not become day. It is known to everybody. Everybody knows that he is a friend of China which is an enemy of this country . . . (*Interruption*) I am referring to Communists.

Now, Madam, politics should not be brought in so far the Presidential election is concerned. What happened in 1952? What happened in 1957? How elections were held in 1962? Our great leader, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, invited Dr. Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan, who was never a Congressman, who was never a friend of the Congress, and who was never kind to the Congress also, to become the Vice-President and Chairman of this august House. At the time of the last election, he consulted other political parties and Dr. Radhakrishnan was elected. Now, not only are the Opposition parties bringing politics in the matter of the election of the President, but it was a very unfortunate day for India when they projected

politics into the judiciary which has such a big name and is so much respected. And my good friend Mr. Pant pointed out in his reply how these people manoeuvred it and without consulting the Congress Party, without even getting the consent of the persons whom they were proposing for the posts of the President and the Vice-President, they announced their names in the papers and wanted the Congress just to follow them. This is dictatorship to which we are so much opposed. Certainly we will not follow these people who want to establish dictatorship. Before Mr. Chagla was appointed Ambassador, he was the Chief Justice of Bombay. He resigned the post. Then he was offered the post of Ambassador after many months. How much shouting was there at that time—that this Congress Party is influencing judges by giving them these posts and so on? Everywhere the Opposition parties tried to agitate on this issue. Now they unite themselves and attempt to pollute the judiciary by offering the Chief Justice of India the post of the President of India. It is very unfortunate. The posts of the Chairman of the Public Service Commission, the Auditor-General and the Chief Justice of India and the like should remain above politics. Everybody accepts it. Let them remain above politics. These friends, when some posts were offered to retired judges, were vehemently denouncing the decision and saying that no post should be offered to any retired judge. Now the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, although he had decided to resign, was in office when the offer was made by these people. They were once saying that a judge should not be offered any post after retirement. Now while he is working as Chief Justice, they offer him the Presidentship of India and then tell the Congress about it. Of course, unanimity in some other situation would have had some respect, but the situation in which all this has happened is very unfortunate for this country. And now what happens is that he agrees to contest and in spite of that\*\*\* Where are we going?

\*\*\*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On a point of order. Now he is discussing the conduct of a judge. The judgment was delivered yesterday.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh): \* \* \*

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The conduct of a judge he is discussing.

SHRI ABID ALI: . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I very much appreciate your speech because it reminds me of so many other things. The judgment was delivered yesterday when he was till a judge. The case had been heard.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: \* \* \*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All this will be expunged. I am listening to him. I do not see why you should go on levelling those charges. I think this will have to be expunged.

SHRI ABID ALI: Of course, Mr. Subba Rao has lost nothing because after a few days he is retiring and so he has made no sacrifice. I would request the Opposition parties kindly, in the name of the requirements of the judiciary, its status, its independence and the need for a democratic set-up, to reconsider their decision. In the light of what my friend has said some time back, so far as our retiring Chairman is concerned, you should accept him and at the same time do justice to the gentleman who deserves it in the words which you all uttered this morning. Be honest to your words and (a) pledge your support and ensure his unanimous election and (b) in the name of the requirements of an independent judiciary in this country, kindly reverse your decision and tell Mr. Rao that the Chief Justice of India should remain always independent and no party, at any time, should give him bribe or attempt to influence him by any method and tell him that there should be no more of this and he should not allow anyone to exploit the situation as is being done. We

\*\*\*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

will not do. Of course, there was some possibility of adjustment but the friends in the Opposition are responsible for what is happening and it will be known in the course of time to the public also and the bad part they have played will ever remain a black mark for them.

श्री राजनारायण : माननीया . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I will give everybody a chance but this is the Third Reading and I am leaving it to the good sense of the Members.

श्री राजनारायण : ठीक है सबके गुड सेंस पर छोड़िये अपनी तरफ से प्रतिबन्ध न लगाइये।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This is the Third Reading. You should say relevant things.

श्री राजनारायण: मुझ अफसोस है मुझे ज्यादा समय लेना पड़ेगा क्योंकि पन्त जी ने ज्यादातर अपने जवाब में मेरी बातों को कोट किया है। एक-दो सेंटेंस मैं पढ़ देना चाहता हूँ 'हिन्दुस्तान एम्बेसेडर कार'। हमने पढ़ा था :—

"When the Finance Minister, Sachindra Chaudhuri, advised Indira to use a small Government car in the interests of economy, she promptly had a new Hindustan car bought at Government expense exclusively for her trips to Parliament House (to impress MPs) and retain the newly imported provocative air-conditioned American luxury car for her other travels."

इन दोनों कारों के बारे में पन्त जी ने कोई चर्चा नहीं की। पन्त का जो कहने का तरीका है उसकी मैं तारीफ करता हूँ यानी एक गलत बात को भी किस सरलता से और सुगमता से कहने में ये पन्त मंत्री माहिर हो रहे हैं— इसके लिये उनकी मैं तारीफ करूँगा। मगर मैं चाहता था कि जब उन्होंने जवाब देना ही

[श्री राजनारायण]

पसन्द किया तो उनको पहले जवाब देना चाहिये था कि जो हमने इस सरकार का नाम रखा है 'आर्डरली ऑफ दि बिड़ला एम्पायर'—ओ० बी० ई०। क्या यह सरकार बिड़ला एम्पायर की आर्डरली नहीं है। बिड़ला को जितने लाइसेंस दिये गये, पांच तारीख को एक्साइज ड्यूटी को खत्म करने का एग्रीमेंट हुआ, जयपुर में जाकर श्री के० एल० राव ने बिड़ला की सीमेंट फैक्टरी के लिये बिजली देने का एग्रीमेंट करवाया इसका जवाब होना चाहिये था। (Interruption) इसका जवाब न देकर पन्त जी दूसरी तरफ चले गये।

ज्यादा समय तो माननीया आप मुझे दे नहीं पायेंगी, इसलिये खास-खास बातों की ओर आना चाहता हूँ। एक बात हमारे मित्र भूपेश जी ने कही—पता नहीं वे कहाँ चले गये। मैं चाहता हूँ कि सदन में हर आदमी जुरिसप्रूडेंस को कुछ पढ़े। जुरिसप्रूडेंस का सार क्या है? अगर कोई चोर है, हो सकता है चोर, मगर वह चोर 'ए' को न कहे कि तुम चोर हो बल्कि वह अपनी सफाई दे। ब्लैक-मेलर कहीं पर किसी की निन्दा भी करा सकता है और ब्लैकमेलर किसी की तारीफ भी करा सकता है। दोनों ही हो सकती हैं। जिस ढंग से जस खूबी और बारीकी से श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी के पक्ष में एक विरोधी दल का नेता बोल सकता है, वही श्री भूपेश गुप्त का भाषण था। मैं इसके लिये उनकी तारीफ करना चाहता हूँ। हाँ, मैं इसके लिये तयार हूँ। मैं माननीया, आपने अभी भी कह देना चाहता हूँ कि एम० ओ० मथाई की शक्ति हमने नहीं देखी है। एम० ओ० मथाई ने अपने पत्र में लिखा है—जिसके सम्बन्ध में हमारे पन्तजी ने विवरण दिया—कि पद्मजा जी आप यहां आईं तो आपने मुझको फोन किया। मैं उस समय यहां नहीं था, आया तो घर पर मालूम हुआ कि आपने फोन किया, इसलिए मैं यह खत आपको लिख रहा हूँ। उसने खत में पूरा-पूरा

लिखा है कि मैं हैरत में हूँ, मैं चाहता हूँ कि मैं इन्दिरा की मदद करूँ, मगर इन्दिरा की मदद मैं कैसे कर सकता हूँ क्योंकि इन्दिरा ने हम लोगों की पोजीशन को गड़बड़ कर दिया कि उसने पब्लिक स्टेटमेंट दे दिया कि जो कुछ हमारे पास वल्यूएबिल गिफ्ट्स हैं वे हमारे दाप और दादा से मिली हैं। फिर उसने लिखा है कि जब तक मैं पंडित जी के पास था, इन्दिरा गांधी के पास मिन्क कोट नहीं था। पंडित जी का एकाउन्ट वे डील करते थे, पंडित के एकाउन्ट में कोट की कोई चर्चा नहीं थी।

SHRIMATI LALITHA (RAJAGOPALAN) (Madras): This matter was raised by Shri Rajnarain previously and the Chair has given a ruling in regard to this and the Chair has also taken his letter and the very fact that Dr. Padmaja Naidu did not receive any such letter has been confirmed any such letter has been confirmed and he informed the House about this.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You know about it and you make a note of it.

श्री राजनारायण : इसी पर भूपेश जी को आपने 20 मिनट सुना। मुझे इससे कोई मतलब नहीं कि पद्मजा नायडू को लेटर मिला या नहीं। हमारा काम पूरा हो गया जब हमारे चेयरमैन साहब के पास जा कर एम० ओ० मथाई ने कह दिया कि यह हमारा लेटर है। अब एम० ओ० मथाई ब्लैकमेलर हैं . . .

(Interruption)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Rajnarain, you have nothing else on the Third Reading.

श्री राजनारायण : मेरी मजबूरी है। मैं अंग्रेजी में बोल तो बोल सकता हूँ। अंग्रेजी में भूपेश गुप्त आध घंटे बोल गये। क्या हिन्दुस्तानी में बोलने का मतलब यह है कि हम बोल न पायें।

**उपसभापति :** बोलने के लिये मैं नहीं कह रही हूँ, इस विषय पर न बोलें।

**श्री राजनारायण :** माननीया, इसी पर भूषेण गुप्त ने 20 मिनट लिये, इसी पर के० सी० पन्त ने 10 मिनट चर्चा की।

**SHRI M. M. DHARIA (Maharashtra):** On a point of order. My point of order is, I would like to draw your attention to Rule 240 which says:

"The Chairman, after having called the attention of the Council to the conduct of a member who persists in irrelevance or in tedious repetition either of his own arguments or of the arguments used by other members in debate, may direct him to discontinue his speech."

I believe in this House we have been listening to this repeated argument of Mr. Rajnarain over the letter of Mr. Mathai on several occasions. It is not only repetition but it is a tedious repetition and under these circumstances I request you to stop Mr. Rajnarain from repeating his arguments. It is against the Rules and the Code of Conduct and Procedure.

**उपसभापति :** ठीक है, रिपीट नहीं करना चाहिये।

**श्री राजनारायण :** मैं आपके जरिये माननीय मित्र मोहन धारिया को बधाई देता हूँ कि कम से कम उन्होंने इस रूल को तो पढ़ लिया। मैं अब इन समय रिपीट नहीं कर रहा हूँ, मैं श्री के० सी० पन्त का जवाब दे रहा हूँ, मैं श्री भूषेण गुप्त का जवाब दे रहा हूँ। श्री भूषेण गुप्त ने जब इसकी चर्चा की थी उस समय थोड़े समय के लिये इस सदन से धारिया साहब का अस्तित्व विलुप्त था। I have got every right to say this at this time.

**SHRI M. M. DHARIA:** But not to repeat the same thing.

**SHRI RAJNARAIN:** I am not repeating.

**SHRI M. M. DHARIA:** You have been repeating and, Madam, we shall not allow it.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Be reasonable, Mr. Rajnarain. You have raised this subject in and out during the session. It does not add to its weight by your repeating it. I have also known the ruling given by the Chairman on this. You must know as a good parliamentarian how far to go and when to stop. You can speak otherwise than on this.

**श्री राजनारायण :** बिल्कुल सही आप कह रही हैं, आपका कहना मैं बिल्कुल सही मानता हूँ मगर मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि मैं भी जो सही कहूँ उसको दूसरे लोग भी सही मानें। मैं अपनी ओर से कुछ नहीं कह रहा हूँ, हमारे सम्मानित सदस्यों ने जो आरोप लगाये हैं और जिस ढंग से उसकी चर्चा की उसके बारे में मैं अब सफाई दे रहा हूँ।

अब दूसरी बात मैं इसके बारे में अभी साफ कहे देता हूँ कि यह सही है कि यह ठीक है कि आज से दो दिन पहले हमने श्री एम० ओ० मथाई से बात की कि क्या प्रिविलेज कमेटी में जो पत्र में तुमने चार्ज लगाये हैं उनको साबित करने के लिये तुम तैयार हो . . .

**सरदार रघुबीर सिंह पंजहजारी (पंजाब):** यह वही बात है।

**श्री राजनारायण :** यह वही बात नहीं है। माननीय This is a new thing.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** I appeal to the hon. Member; when the Chairman has given a ruling on this, about the letter that he has read, his consultation with the person concerned, and he has said that this is a closed matter. I do not know how you can go on with it.

**SHRI RAJNARAIN:** Others have said it already in the House.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Others may have said it, but why should you repeat it?

**श्री राजनारायण :** मीठा मीठा गुप कहुआ कहुआ थू, जिसके भाषण का अंश प्राइम मिनिस्टर की मलाई में जाय उसको कहने दिया जाय और जिसका न जाय उसको न कहने दिया जाय।

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN.** I was not here for the whole of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's speech. I do not think he went to this length—I am not quite sure. But what is the use of your repeating and repeating and repeating it? Have you nothing new to say?

**श्री राजनारायण :** I am not repeating Madam. इसलिये मैं आपसे अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ, मैं सिर्फ इस बात को पत से कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो यहां पर उन्होंने श्रीमती इन्दरा नेहरू गांधी के कहने के अनुसार सफाई की वह सफाई काफी नहीं है, मैं पत जी से निवेदन करूंगा कि अगर उनको श्रीमती इन्दरा नेहरू गांधी ने कहा हो इस तरह से सफाई देने के लिये तो फिर जा कर पूछे और आ कर सदन को बतायें, सारी बातें बताये कि उनको कितना रुपया मिला और कितना नहीं मिला।

**श्री एम० एम० धारिया :** आन ए प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर।

**श्री राजनारायण:** मैं मंत्री जी की बात को इस वक्त रफर कर रहा हूँ, आगे वह कभी नहीं रफर किया गया है। क्या तमाशा है। प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर, प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर।

**श्री एम० एम० धारिया :** मंडम्, आन ए प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर। यहा तमाशा कुछ नहीं है। राजनारायण जी है तो तमाशा होगा, हम यह तमाशा नहीं चाहते। I have a point of order and that point of order is that these arguments

against Shrimati Indira Gandhi, our Prime Minister, have been stated by Mr. Rajnarain not on one occasion but on several occasions. He should be stopped and, Madam, you should not allow him to speak that way.

**SHRI RAJNARAIN:** Who are you? You have no right. I will say whatever I like, you will see. You don't stop me, but if you stop me in this way, you will be treated in that way.

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Please say something new.

**श्री राजनारायण :** क्या इसका मतलब यह है कि कांग्रेस पक्ष के लोग अगर किसी बात पर एतराज करें तो माननीया आप कहें कि हम न बोलें। माननीय मंत्री जी ने कुछ नई बातें बताईं माननीय मंत्री जी ने प्रधान मंत्री की ओर से सफाई दी इसलिये मैं माननीय मंत्री जी की दी हुई सफाई के बारे में बोल रहा हूँ। एक नई बात कह रहा हूँ, मैं उन्हीं बातों को नहीं कह रहा हूँ। धारिया साहब ने एक रूल को कोट कर दिया, कह दिया नहीं बोल सकते, इससे कुछ नहीं होता। मैं भी पार्लियामेन्टरी पद्धति जानता हूँ, इनके से न मालूम कितने लोगो को हम सिखा सकते हैं। क्या समझा है।

**SHRI M. M. DHARIA:** Madam, Mr. Rajnarain is not following the rules in spite of . . .

**SHRI RAJNARAIN:** I am following every decent parliamentary procedure.

**श्री आबिद अली :** अंग्रेजी न बोलो।

**श्री राजनारायण :** ठीक है मैं आपसे अर्ज कर रहा था . . .

**उपसभापति:** नया कुछ बताइये।

**श्री राजनारायण:** अब मामला पूरा का पूरा आ गया। श्री के० सी० पन्त ने करीब 15 मिनट तक यहा पर प्रेजिडेंट के बारे में

कहा है। मैं बहुत ही अदब के साथ कहता हूँ कि अगर श्री के० सी० पन्त या इस सदन के कोई सम्मानित सदस्य डा० जाकिर हुसैन के लिये कनवेंसिंग करें सही मानों में तो उसमें हमें कोई गुरेज नहीं है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि अगर कांग्रेस पार्टी ने कैंडीडेट बनाया है डा० जाकिर हुसैन को तो कांग्रेस पार्टी के लोग उनके लिये कनवेंसिंग करें, कनवेंसिंग करना कोई बुरी बात नहीं है। श्री के० सी० पन्त जी को मैं कहता हूँ बावजूद उनकी तमाम कमियों और खामियों के कि वह कांग्रेस पार्टी में हैं उनको मैं मुहम्मबत करता हूँ, हम उनको दिल से मुहम्मबत करते हैं और इसलिए मुहम्मबत करना चाहते हैं कि वह दिन बहुत नजदीक आने वाला है जब कि वह कांग्रेस पार्टी को छोड़ कर हमारे साथ आये, लेकिन एक सत्य को कि पार्लियामेंटरी डेमोक्रेसी क्या है उसको देखना चाहिये। इसका आये घंटे तक विवाद हुआ। भूपेश गुप्त ने कल इसके बारे में क्या कहा था। जो कुछ राजनारायण ने कहा था करीब करीब उसी को भूपेश गुप्त ने कहा था इसलिये मैं जो जवाब दे रहा हूँ अपनी ओर से हम समझते हैं कि भूपेश गुप्त का भी जवाब हो जायगा।

माननीया विरोधी पक्ष पूरी पूर कोशिश की अदब के साथ कोशिश की कि राष्ट्रपति का चुनाव सर्वसम्मति से हो जाय। जो लोग कहते हैं कि विरोध पक्ष ने नहीं की वह पालिटिस्क खेल रहे हैं। मैंने आज भी किया। हमारे बहुत से दोस्तों ने कहा कि तुमको कामराज के पास नहीं जाना चाहिये क्यों कि वह एक पार्टी के नेता हैं। हमने कहा कि नहीं इसमें एक पार्टी का प्रश्न नहीं है यह एक राष्ट्रीय प्रश्न बन गया है इस लिये मैं कामराज के पास जाऊंगा। सुबह अपने मित्र जार्ज फर्नेंडीज को लिया और सीधे कामराज के पास चला गया 9 बज हमने उससे बातचीत की और हमने उनसे कहा कि आप इस समय एलिंग पार्टी जो केन्द्र में है उनके नेता

है आपकी सिंगल पार्टी सब से बड़ी है इसलिये हम आप से रिक्वेस्ट करते आये हैं कि अब भी आप वह कदम उठावे जिससे कि आनरेबिल ढंग पर राष्ट्रपति का चुनाव सर्वसम्मति से हो जाय। उन्होंने सीधा जवाब दे दिया : Impossible it cannot be done at this stage. उन्होंने कहा : यह असम्भव है, अब लड़ाई होगी, यह इस समय नहीं हो सकता। फिर हमने रिक्वेस्ट किया कि आप नेपोलियन बोनोपार्ट बने और इम्पासिबिल शब्द अपनी डिक्शनरी से निकल दें। हमने कहा कि इम्पासिबिल शब्द को निकालें। नथिंग इज इम्पासिबिल, हर चीज मुमकिन है 13 तारीख तक नामिनेशन होगा लेकिन फिर भी उन्होंने कहा कि पार्लियामेंटरी बोर्ड की बैठक हो गई पार्लियामेंटरी कमेटी की बैठक में फैसला हो गया, अब मैं कुछ कर नहीं सकता। यह 9 बज को जवाब आ गया तो हमने तमाम दोस्तों को बता दिया कि कामराज का रिएक्शन यह है। हम सारे के सारे भूपेश जी और सारा का सारा विरोधी पक्ष चाहते थे कि प्रसिडेंट का चुनाव सर्वसम्मति से हो जाय . . .

सरदार रघुबीर सिंह पंजहजारी :  
आपका सुझाव क्या है।

श्री राजनारायण: मैं दे रहा हूँ, सुन लीजिये, घबराइये नहीं। मैं सब की बातें धीरे से सुनता हूँ किसी के बीच में बोलता नहीं हूँ। हमें डेमोक्रेसी बताई जा रही है। श्री के० सी० पन्त जिस राज्य से आते हैं जिस राज्य में उनके जीवन का ज्यादा हिस्सा व्यतीत हुआ है जिसमें पले पोसे हैं उस राज्य में कांग्रेस पार्टी की दुर्दशा क्या हुई उसको भूल गये। आज के 20 दिन पहले कौन कह सकता था कि चौधरी चरण सिंह जी इस तरह से कांग्रेस से अलग हो कर के आर्येण मैं आज चेतावनी देना चाहता हूँ कि अगर कांग्रेस पार्टी डा० जाकिर हुसैन को कांग्रेस पार्टी का कैंडीडेट बना कर चलना चाहती

[श्री राजनारायण]

है तो और डा० जाकिर हुसैन उसे एक्सेप्ट कर के चलना चाहते हैं तो मुझे डर है कि डा० जाकिर हुसैन हमारे प्रसिडेंट बन पायेंगे। मैं आज सफाई के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ कि कांग्रेस के अन्दर जो इंटरनल कांटेडिक्शंस है वह सेल्फ इंटेरेस्ट को लेकर एक दूसरे से क्लेश करते हैं, आज एक तीर में दो शिकार किया जा रहा है आज जो लोग प्राइम मिनिस्टर इन्दिरा गांधी को प्राइम मिनिस्टर नहीं देखना चाहते हैं वह चाहते हैं कि डा० जाकिर हुसैन जिस दिन हारेगे उसी दिन आवाज बुलन्द होगी कि इन्दिरा गांधी हटें। वह दिन आकर रहेगा और इसलिये जो लोग चाहते हैं कि डा० जाकिर हुसैन प्रसिडेंट हों और श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी प्राइम मिनिस्टर रह जाये उनसे करबद्ध प्रार्थना है कि अब भी समय है चेत जाओ नहीं तो धोखा खाओगे। हम दोष नहीं देंगे। हम चेतवनी के रूप में कह देना चाहते हैं . . .

श्री शीलभद्र याजी: यह सब ख्याली पुलाव है।

श्री राजनारायण : हम हैं, हम आत्मा राम को देख लेंगे। यह वह दल है जिसने 1948 में गांधी जी की हत्या के बाद कांग्रेस से निकल कर फिर कांग्रेस से अलग होना स्वीकार किया जब कांग्रेस कांग्रेस नहीं रह गई, कांग्रेस एक पार्टी की शकल में आ गई। अप्रैल 1948 में आपको याद होगा आचार्य नरेन्द्र देव आदि ने विधान सभा से इस्तीफा दिया था और कांग्रेस पार्टी छोड़ी। उन लोगों ने चुनाव लड़ा था आचार्य नरेन्द्र देव जी का इस बारे में एक बयान है। लेकिन एक दर्शन में यहां पर रखना चाहता हूँ : सत्य। हीगल के और मार्क्स के दर्शन में चले जायें अगर अद्वैतवाद का सिद्धान्त अध्ययन किये हो तो उसे भी स्मरण करें। हीगल क्या कहता है: अस्तित्व में क्या है? जो सत्य है। इसी को लेकर हीगल में दो दल हो गये। अब हम इस बात पर

आना चाहते हैं कि आज कांग्रेस का टटना सत्य है, आज कांग्रेस का बरबाद होना सत्य है। हम भूपेश गुप्ता से हाथ मिलाएं, हम जन संघ से हाथ मिलाएं, हम सोशलिस्ट पार्टी से हाथ मिलाएं हम स्वतंत्र पार्टी से हाथ मिलाएं, इसका मतलब यह नहीं कि संयुक्त सोशलिस्ट पार्टी तथा और पार्टियों के साथ सैद्धांतिक मतभेद दूर हो गये। मगर हमने एक मिनिमम कार्यक्रम बनाया, उत्तर प्रदेश में एक मिनिमम कार्यक्रम बनाया है जिसमें सभी पार्टियां, कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी, सोशलिस्ट पार्टी, जन संघ पार्टी हैं, उन्होंने तैतीस चौतीस पौईन्ट का प्रोग्राम तय किया है—उससे समाजवाद आयेगा, उससे समता आयेगी उससे जनतंत्र आयेगा, उससे गरीबी मिटेगी, उससे बेकारी नहीं रहेगी तो इसमें से दर्शन क्या निकला ?

मैं आपको दावे के साथ कहना हुआ कि कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी, या जनसंघ की पार्टी या संयुक्त सोशलिस्ट पार्टी, इनमें से किसी का विधायक पार्टी छोड़कर जरा अपने क्षेत्र में चला जाय और कांग्रेस में मिलकर रहे ? आज संयुक्त विधायक दल में कांग्रेस के अतिरिक्त जिन दलों के टिकट से चुने हुए लोग आये हैं, उनके निर्वाचन क्षेत्र के लोगों को कही भी मालूम हो जाय कि वे कांग्रेस को मदद दे रहे हैं तो वहां की जनता उनके घरों में घरना दे दे वहां की जनता उनके घरों पर बैठ रही है और कहती है तुम कांग्रेस के विरोध में वोट लिये थे, तुम कैसे जाकर कांग्रेस की सरकार की खिदमत करते हो। (Time bell rings) पांच मिनट और हमारे चौधरी चरण सिंह जी कांग्रेस से अलग होकर आते हैं तो चौधरी चरण सिंह का स्वागत होता है क्योंकि कांग्रेस से अलग होना सत्य है। उस सत्य की पूजा जनता करती है। अगर आज श्री के० सी० पंत कांग्रेस से अलग होकर विरोधी पक्ष में आ जाये उनका स्वागत है, लोग उनकी इज्जत करेंगे क्योंकि उनका यह कदम सही



है। हर जनतांत्रिक उस कदम का स्वागत करेगा। अगर कांग्रेस सरकार मरे हुए बन्दर के बच्चे को जिस तरह बन्दरिया अपनी गोद में चिपटाये रहती है उसी तरह सरकार को बन्दर के बच्चे की सड़ी लाश की तरह छाती पर चिपकायेगी तो वह बन्दर का बच्चा गिरेगा। इसलिये सीधी बात है कि आज हमारी लड़ाई डा० जाकिर हुसैन के लिये नहीं है, डा० जाकिर हुसैन के लिये हमारी इज्जत है। डा० जाकिर हुसैन के प्रति मैंने अपना आदर व्यक्त किया था, भूपेश गुप्ता ने भी आदर प्रदर्शित किया और उनको बिदाई देते वक्त जितने भी लोग आज यहाँ से बोले उन सबने आदर प्रदर्शित किया। हमारी लड़ाई कांग्रेस की डिक्टेटरशिप से है, हमारी लड़ाई कांग्रेस की सरकार से है। हमने सबेरे डा० जाकिर हुसैन के संबंध में बोलते हुए कह दिया था कि सिद्धान्त के लिये प्रिय से प्रिय जनों का बिछोह बर्दाश्त करना हमने सीखा है। डा० जाकिर हुसैन के लिये आदर का और सम्मान का भाव रखते हुए कांग्रेस को गिराने के लिये सभी संयुक्त विरोधी दल आज एक हुए हैं। इस लिये कांग्रेस का पतन करने के लिये कांग्रेस को गिराने के लिये जो कोई भी काम होगा उसमें हम एक रहेंगे। यह हमारा एक धर्म है। आज इस युग का धर्म चिल्ला चिल्ला कर कह रहा है कि कांग्रेस का पतन हो, कांग्रेस को गिराओ। इस युग के धर्म पूर्ति हेतु हम लोग...

**श्री शीलभद्र याजी :** साहू जैन की गोद में जाइये। (Interruptions) क्यों कि आपकी पार्टी साहूवर्बेन्ट पार्टी है।

**श्री राजनारायण :** आचरण करेंगे। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं पुनः आपके जरिये निवेदन करूंगा के० सी० पंत से कि सब बातों को सुनकर अच्छी तरह से हृदयंगम करें।

(Interruptions)

केवल विरोधी पक्ष को दोष न दें।

**उपसभापति :** अब आप बैठ जाइये।

**श्री राजनारायण :** खैर अगर आप कहती हैं मैं बैठ जाऊं तो आपकी आज्ञा शिरोधार्य करता हूँ। सारी पाबंदी हम पर है। अंग्रेजी में बोलूँ तो नहीं।

**SHRI NIREN GHOSH:** Madam Deputy Chairman, I will take just a few minutes only. You know I am always brief and I do not repeat the same point many times. I am however, compelled to speak now, though I had no desire to speak at the third-reading stage of this Bill. First of all I find that Shri Abid Ali is fond of making slanderous accusations, fabrications and figments of his imagination. Nobody takes him seriously. They have been repudiated hundreds of times and so I do not want to do it again now. I do not reply him.

Secondly, I say that the Congress has been stating and the hon. Minister has been saying now that by announcing our candidates we tried to dictate to the Congress in the matter of the Presidential and Vice-Presidential elections.

**SHRI K.C. PANT:** I did not say that.

**SHRI NIREN GHOSH:** It was said that we should not have announced the names but should have gone to them for consultations.

**SHRI K. C. PANT:** I did not say it.

**SHRI NIREN GHOSH:** It was not any dictation.

**SHRI ABID ALI:** Yes, for consultation. I said it.

**SHRI NIREN GHOSH:** It was not any dictation. It was suggestion to the ruling party. They could have fixed.

**SHRI ABID ALI:** Through the newspaper columns?

**SHRI NIREN GHOSH:** They could have fixed upon two names and you could have fixed upon two names and by consultations some sort of decision

[Shri Niren Ghosh.]

could have been arrived at. I repeat and I accuse the Congress that they did not want any solution. They are hedged in and there are divisions and dissensions in the Congress. The Prime Minister was for a solution, but Shri Kamaraj and Shri S. K. Patil and others turned it down. I say they did have information. Was it not known to them that the Opposition was for having Dr. Zakir Husain as President and Shri Subba Rao as Vice-President and there could be a compromise? It has been referred to categorically and it was known to them. I ask: Is it not a fact that they had known? Let them give a straight reply to that. Are they prepared to say that? No, they are heading to a straight contest and they want to put the blame on us. I say that the responsibility lies squarely on their shoulders. They talk of principles. Let not the Congress party refer to principles after having made Judges Governors and the executives trying to influence the judiciary in a variety of ways.

SHRI ABID ALI: After retirement.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: I put it on record that I am all praise for the Chief Justice for having the boldness and the courage to flout the fiat of the Executive, the Central Cabinet. Knowing full well that they are against him he has had the courage to stand up and to decide ultimately that he will contest. That is an instance of courage of the judiciary and that should be recorded. I still say that if they are for compromise it is there. If the Prime Minister asked for it it can be done even at the eleventh hour. Otherwise the whole responsibility for this Presidential and Vice-Presidential contests lies on the Government and by their arrogance they are leading the country to a situation they know not what. Let them beware of that.

The last point that I want to touch upon is this. Madam, I take this occasion to say that some official of the Education Ministry wrote a book called "Indira Priya Darshani". He is

still an officer there. This matter was referred to in this House. The Minister of Education assured us that they had taken note of it. I am informed that some proceedings were brought against this officer because he wrote political articles in that book and it is not right for an officer of the Government to do that. An assurance was given on the floor of the House, as I said, that it would be taken note of. I understand that proceedings were instituted, but somehow, by some hidden way—I do not know how—those proceedings have been hushed up. He is entertaining sixty Members of Parliament at dinner. So I take this opportunity to raise this matter. In the case of such an officer though they had instituted proceedings, those proceedings were quashed and they have allowed him to continue in service. This is corruption incarnate. I tell them, "Please do not do it". This fellow, by praising Shrimati Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister, is trying to worm himself into favour and to improve his position. That sort of a thing should not be allowed. Political writings by such persons should not be allowed. It should be prevented. If you do not do anything about it then we will be compelled to refer to this matter again and again in this House, let me tell you that. With these words, Madam, I conclude.

SHRI K. C. PANT: Madam Deputy Chairman, this debate has moved further and further away from financial matters and in the third reading there was no reference at all to financial matters.

SHRI P. K. KUMARAN (Andhra Pradesh): Current affairs.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: There was reference to the Birla empire, that is a financial subject.

SHRI K. C. PANT: I shall nevertheless try to briefly touch on some of the points that have raised.

Firstly, Madam, I should like to inform Shri Dahyabhai Patel—I am sorry he is not here—that the Deputy

Prime Minister was very keen to be present here during this debate. In fact, he was to have replied to this debate but the Chief Ministers' Conference is meeting since yesterday, particularly to discuss financial matters, economic matters, and therefore it became impossible for him to come away. In fact I went to him at the Conference but he was unable to come away as the Conference was in progress. He wanted me to convey to the House his regret for his inability to come here.

Then Shri Bhupesh Gupta referred to the Bird & Co. case. I have already told him earlier that the Government is looking into this matter; the Law Ministry is looking into it. So I can not touch on any particular aspect of the case at this stage and give him any answer relating to any particular aspect of the case.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta and some other friends referred to the fact that I appeared to be canvassing for Dr. Zakir Husain. I only stated some plain simple facts. I would not have touched on this subject and it was farthest from my mind to touch upon it but yesterday Shri Bhupesh Gupta devoted a good part of his speech to this and Rajnarainji also referred to it. So in fairness to them, in fairness to the record, it was my duty to put forward the facts as I saw them and that it all I attempted to do. I am sorry if it made some friends uncomfortable but that was not my intention at all.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta referred to the fact that this whole contest was a political contest. Now that really is the heart of the matter and that has been our point. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta said, 'You have shifted it to the political plane by a one-party decision in this manner.'

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I did not say that.

SHRI K. C. PANT: I think you said it is a political contest.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I said you have made it a political contest

and I said, let us take it, because we have nothing against Dr. Zakir Husain as such.

SHRI K. C. PANT: I have not said that you said anything against Dr. Zakir Husain. You said it was a political contest. You said it had gone on to the political plane and you were gracious enough to suggest that that would be taken in a sportsmanlike manner. I only refer specially to your remark when you said that it had gone to the political plane. Our whole point is to question whether it is proper to drag in an active Chief Justice as a group candidate in a political election and make him an object of public controversy. It is because it is a political election that the dragging of the Chief Justice whom we all respect and for whom we have the highest regard becomes objectionable. This has been the gravamen of our objection in this particular matter and it is because of our regard, in spite of the jibes that we have heard here, for the separation of the judiciary from the Executive that we are particularly concerned about this development and I hope that Shri Bhupesh Gupta and other friends will have the fairness to see that this objection is not very lighthearted and I could see that Shri Bhupesh Gupta, the honest man that he is, when he spoke reflected a troubled conscience. He said, 'it is now a double traffic in sin. In the past you alone had been sinning but now we are also sinning; so what is the harm?'

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I said that you should not say such things because you made Mr. Debabrata Mookerjee a Judge after he was defeated in the election. There it was from politics to the Bench and now it is from the Bench to politics.

SHRI K. C. PANT: Yes; you said it is double traffic in sin. I respect you for this that you were honest enough to admit that the induction of a high judicial personage into the political election is not something that is going to do good to this country. The fact

[Shri K. C. Pant.]

that you have felt it in your heart, even though you may not have expressed it, is something which I respect and that is what I wanted to express here.

**श्री राजनारायण :** कांस्टीट्यूशनल हैड प्रेसिडेंट होता है, इसलिये कांस्टीट्यूशन जानने वाले को वहां रखिये।

SHRI K. C. PANT: Now, Madam, I do not want to go into the quarrel between Shri Bhupesh Gupta and Shri Rajnarain on that letter . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No quarrel; the quarrel is with you.

SHRI K. C. PANT: . . . of Mr. Mathai about Mr. Mathai's character. I am sure that the two most formidable Opposition members of this House can certainly agree among themselves. But when one senior Opposition member himself has doubts about the person who is writing a letter to another Opposition member the least that . . .

**श्री राजनारायण :** आन ए प्वाइंट आन आर्डर। मेरा प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर यह है कि सदन की एक सभ्य व्यवस्था है कि जो सदन में न हो उसके बारे में ज्यादा चर्चा न हो। मगर यह मैं चाहता हूं कि मथाई अपने को सफाई देने के लिये इस सदन में नहीं आ सकता। इसलिये मथाई कैता है, क्या चाहता है, इस पर यहां चर्चा न हो, मथाई ने जो लेटर लिखा है और उसके लेटर में जो चार्ज हैं, उसकी सत्यता और असत्यता की जांच के लिये मैं चाहता हूं कि उसको प्रिविलेज कमेटी में भेजा जाय।

SHRI K. C. PANT: I wish from the bottom of my heart that Shri Rajnarain had not exposed Mr. Mathai to this kind of speech that Shri Bhupesh Gupta felt compelled to deliver on him. I do realise it is very unfair to Shri Mathai and I hope that at least from this point of view in future Shri Rajnarain will not refer either to Mr. Mathai or his letter.

**श्री राजनारायण :** अभी कोई लेटर आयेंगे

SHRI K. C. PANT: Madam Deputy Chairman I was merely saying that when two distinguished hon. Members of the opposition differed on their assessment of the accuracy of a piece of information . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, no. Don't distort. I confined myself to Mr. Mathai. I advocated the Government should enquire into Mr. Mathai's conduct in this matter, in the black-mailing tactics which he is using . . . (Interruptions.)

SHRI K. C. PANT: I was trying in defence to the wishes of Shri Rajnarain not to repeat the nouns which Shri Bhupesh Gupta used. He said black-mailer, he said gangster. I did not want to repeat them. That is why I was politely trying to say that he was questioning the veracity of the information, he was questioning the accuracy of the information.

(Interruptions.)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI K. C. PANT: I was merely making the point whether it would not be proper in case two distinguished leaders of the Opposition differed in a matter like this that the information be verified before it is placed before the House? And that is the point I am driving at. How far is it fair to this House, how far is it fair to the person against whom these charges are made, how far is it fair to the public life of this country that charges which have not been verified are made on the floor of the House? They then go out in the public, Madam, even if with the best of intentions they have made these charges in order to purify public life, they only succeed . . .

**श्री राजनारायण :** माननीया, दो बार हमने शार्ट नोटिस क्वेश्चन किया कि उन चार्जों के बारे में प्रधान मंत्री जवाब दें, दोनों बार उत्तर मिला कि इस पर जवाब देने के लिये प्रधान मंत्री तैयार नहीं हैं। I tried my best.

**SHRI K. C. PANT:** Yes. I am merely saying when one Opposition leader so seriously questions the source of that information, in all sincerity, with vehemence, with eloquence, is it not proper for the other Opposition leader at least to take cognisance of that and verify the information before he brings it forward on the floor of the House?

(Interruptions)

I think I am trying to make a very serious point here because for the last so many months this has been going on and this has to some extent sullied the public atmosphere in the country. Now, my only request is that according to the rules of the House, according to the dictates of propriety any charge that is made here should first be verified. It should not be aired on the basis of unverified information. That is the limited point that I want to make.

**श्री राजनारायण :** चयरमैन : के पास जा कर दो बार वह कह चुका है कि लेटर हमारा है। क्या कोई उदाहरण दे सकता है कि इस सदन में इससे ज्यादा वेरीफाई कोई लेटर किया गया है ?

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Order, order. The Minister is speaking.

**SHRI K. C. PANT:** He need not get agitated. It is not whether Mr. Mathai did or did not write the letter, but whether the facts which he has said in the letter are accurate or not. Otherwise, it is not fair. That is my submission.

**श्री राजनारायण :** अगर सही नहीं है तो मरुमा चलाओ।

**SHRI K. C. PANT:** I feel that these changes should be examined very thoroughly before they are aired in the public. That is my limited submission. It was asked whether Mr. Mathai received any pension. I just checked it up. He does not receive any pension.

Then, I do not want to go into the other facts. Rajnarainji spoke about the Ambassador car. My information is that the Prime Minister did not purchase an Ambassador car for herself. That is my information. I gave it to him. I also gave some other information which shows that at least some of the information on the land and so on is incorrect. It is utterly baseless. I have already said that. Now, Madam, I would like . . .

**श्री राजनारायण :** तो उसको करेक्ट कर दो के० सी० पन्त।

**SHRI K. C. PANT:** I would like to end on a happy note. So far as Rajnarainji is concerned, he was kind enough again to make a personal reference to me. He has affection for me and he based it on the hope that I would cross the floor. He has often said one should acquire the capacity to dream. My only hope is that I can retain his affection and he can retain his dream.

Shri Niren Ghosh referred to the fact that there was division between the Congress President and the PM on this issue. As far as I am aware the Communist Party has never felt shy of taking advantage of any divisions in the Congress ranks. They have always played upon these divisions and they have done their best to accentuate those divisions. Now, we suddenly find their deep concern for the divisions in the Congress Party. I would like to ask Mr. Niren Ghosh whether, if he really felt so—he has said it and Shri Bhupesh Gupta has said it—that the Prime Minister was very reasonable, was very sympathetic, was very flexible, why is it that these names were given to the press before our friends took them to the Prime Minister? They concede that she was reasonable and flexible. Can they explain this? Why is it that they chose to go to the press rather than to the Prime Minister? They said that she was in a reasonable frame of mind. Then why was it done?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Assuming that we had done something, even after that we had said that we were ready for a consensus and discussion, but look at what they had done yesterday. Yesterday you announced the two names. After that you are still saying these things.

SHRI K. C. PANT: This is not a game of chess, nor is it a question of bargaining. It is a serious matter concerning the highest office in the country. If the approach of Shri Bhupesh Gupta is still to find a solution, he should agree to it. His friend, Shri Niren Ghosh gave a solution. He told us this morning that they have no objection to Zakir Sahib being the President. He has still no objection. That is what he said. They were prepared to accept Dr. Zakir Husain.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Shri Subba Rao as Vice-President. I say as a compromise formula have Dr. Zakir Husain as President and Mr. Subba Rao as Vice-President. Are you prepared to accept that?

SHRI K. C. PANT: Now, the cat is out of the bag. They have no objection whatever to Zakir Sahib according to this.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is distortion. This is not fair. First of all, we have no proposal. There was something floating in the air.

SHRI K. C. PANT: I am not yielding now. They want to bargain for the Vice-Presidency. Can anything be worse than this?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Who is bargaining?

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam Deputy Chairman, we should not be misunderstood at least. None of us made such proposals. Something was floating in the air. Being reasonable men we were responding to it, for finding an inkling of a solution. Hence we are responding to it in a particular manner, quite apart from the

question whether our people have decided to come in or not.

श्री राजनारायण : माननीया, सुबबाराव का नाम तब आया जब कांग्रेस पार्टी कोई फैसला नहीं कर पाई। कांग्रेस का एक गुट कहता था कि राधाकृष्णन हों, दूसरा गुट कहता था फत्ता आए, फत्ता आए। जब इन्दिरा जी ने एक नाम देने के लिय कहा तब अराजकता ने मिल कर फिर नाम दिया।

SHRI K. C. PANT: Apart from the other factors, is it dignified to suggest that the Chief Justice, who has been persuaded by them to become a candidate for Presidentship, should now, under a bargain, become the Vice-President?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is the reason you object. The Chief Justice should not become anything but the President.

SHRI K. C. PANT: We are holding him in high respect and it is amazing that he should be made the subject of this kind of horse trading. (Interruption). I can understand the discomfort of the friends opposite. If I were in their place I would have felt very uncomfortable. But if they still take a large view of this question, even now it is not too late and I would appeal to them to take a larger view of this question. Even at this late stage he should do the right thing and support Dr. Zakir Husain, who is the natural candidate for the post of President.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill be returned."  
The motion was adopted.

STATEMENT RE. CONCLUSIONS REACHED AT THE CONFERENCE OF CHIEF MINISTERS OF STATES HELD IN NEW DELHI ON THE 8TH AND 9TH APRIL, 1967.

THE MINISTER OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE (SHRI JAGJIVAN RAM): Madam, the Chief Ministers of all the States met in a conference