

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE (Maharashtra): Some time during this session.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: You will please consider it and inform us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You spoke about it yesterday, and I told you that I could not promise. If there is something to report, I will tell you.

THE APPROPRIATION (No. 2) BILL 1963

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT): Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the services of the financial year 1963-64, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

This Bill provides for the drawal out of the Consolidated Fund of India of moneys required to meet the expenditure charged on that Fund and the Grants voted by the Lok Sabha. The figures in the Bill are based on the provisions shown in the Budget documents, exclusive of recoveries, but include sums voted on account and provided for in the Appropriation (Vote on Account) Act of 1963 for one month's supply. Accordingly the total amount to be withdrawn from the Consolidated Fund of India during the year, 1963-64 is estimated at Rs. 9440 crores, of which Rs. 2078 crores are for expenditure on Revenue Account; Rs. 1004 crores for Capital Expenditure other than that of Railways; Rs. 716 crores for disbursement of loans and advances, and Rs. 5642 crores for the repayment of debt.

The expenditure on Revenue Account includes Rs. 1221 crores for Civil Departments; Rs. 742 crores for Defence Services excluding Capital Outlay, and Rs. 116 crores for the Posts and Telegraphs Department. Of the major items under Civil Expenditure, mention may be made of Rs. 280 crores for payment of interest and other charges; Rs. 178 crores for Social and Developmental Services; Rs. 350 crores for grants-in-aid to States including their share of Union Excise Duties; Rs. 96 crores for the Administrative Services proper; Rs. 47 crores for Public Works and Rs. 40 crores for expenditure on certain special items connected with the National Emergency.

Of the major item of Capital Expenditure mention may be made of Rs. 226 crores for industrial development; Rs. 339 crores for expenditure on Schemes of Government Trading, notably for the purchase of food-grains, and Rs. 159 crores for Defence Capital Outlay. Gross requirements for disbursement of loans to States would be of the order of Rs. 541 crores including Rs. 100 crores to be advanced to them in lieu of their market borrowing this year following the decision to float a combined loan for the Central and State Governments. A provision of Rs. 175 crores has been included for loans to other parties.

Of the amount provided for the repayment of debt, Rs. 180 crores are on account of market loans maturing during the year; Rs. 56 crores for other debt repayments including Sterling and Dollar loans and Rs. 5406 crores for discharge of Treasury Bills. The Treasury Bills have a currency of 91 days. Consequently provision has to be made for their discharge four times during the year. By far the major portion of these Bills relates to *ad hoc* Bills issued in favour of the Reserve Bank from time to time for replenishing the Government balances to meet the overall gap in resources. Accordingly the

[Shri B. R. Bhagat.]

ad hoc Bills are notionally treated as having been repaid and simultaneously reinvested four times a year for which necessary provision has to be made and included in the Appropriation Bill.

Full supporting details have been given, as usual, in the Budget documents circulated to the Members. The House has also had an opportunity of a general discussion on the Budget. I do not therefore propose to take the time of the House in explaining any further the provisions included in the Bill but shall try to meet the points that hon. Members would be raising during the course of the debate.

Sir, with these words I move.

The question was proposed.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Mr. Chairman. Sir, we do not have the advantage of discussing the Demands for Grants, and that is a big gap in the entire discussions and debate that take place over these proposals in this House.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

I should like, Sir, in this connection to mention, since the rules are being modified, to see whether certain substitute procedure could be found whereby we could discuss somewhat concretely and in some details the various Demands for Grants. I note that we suffer from certain constitutional handicaps in this matter, but that is no reason why this House, when we are going to amend the Rules of Procedure, should not consider this matter with a view to evolving a certain good procedure that will enable this House to discuss those matters in a different way.

I should like now to make a few observations with regard to the general state of our economy. From all accounts it is clear that in the Third Five Year Plan, in the middle of it,

economy is sagging in many respects. Some of the vital projects are not being carried out according to schedule and there is a serious lag there. Agriculture is not looking up at all, and as against the estimated increase of foodgrains production of the order of 4 million tons per year during the Third Five Year Plan there has been a marginal, if I may say so, and negligible increase of only 2 millions tons or so in the 2½ years of the Third Five Year Plan. It is, therefore, that we are not attaining the target of 100 million tons, and if we do not attain that target, with the population growing, with the prices rising, the situation is going to be extremely serious and the impact on our economy as a whole and the development in particular would be of a negative nature.

We should have thought that the emergency would be exploited in order to step up production, in order to step up economic life or economic activity. But what has happened is exactly by and large the opposite. I am not saying that in no sphere has there been some improvement. There has been a little improvement in certain industries connected with defence production. But if you take all other industries, we are lagging far behind and that too in this third year or second year of the Third Five Year Plan when the tempo of development should be of a much higher order when, even if we had not taken off, as the term used to be used previously we should be in good strides. The Government and the Planning Commission in particular and the others, all of them, are answerable to the people of the country.

Why should this be so when they had been armed with enormous powers under the emergency powers and under the Defence of India Act? Never a Government failed in such a situation to bring about orientation, changes, as this Government has in the course of the last six months of emergency. Yet I

do not see any sign of repentance on their part. Prices are rising and the hon. Minister of Finance has proposed a Budget which will lead to further rise in prices. Unemployment is growing apace in the country and yet there is no proposal whatsoever to arrest the growth of unemployment, let alone coming to grips with it in order to overcome it. The industrial production is lagging, taking industry as a whole and yet the idle capacity of the order of 40 to 50 per cent. in many industries is not being utilised. These are some of the examples I can give. There are many other examples an economist can give. In fact, all the papers have written that the condition of economy is not at all reassuring in the present situation. The Government wants to escape this responsibility under the cover of emergency powers, sometimes by asserting what they think right even if it is not right and often with a red eye threatening people.

The Finance Minister the other day indulged in threats against the Opposition because they dare to oppose some of the budget proposals. Madam Deputy Chairman, we are accustomed to such threats and we are not going to be frightened by such threats. But this is only a minor consideration. What, however, the country should take note of is the fact that the Government is trying to utilise these emergency powers in order even to silence the legitimate democratic criticism that is not only necessary in a constitutional democratic set-up that we are supposed to have but it is absolutely essential and, of course, undoubtedly desirable. Madam Deputy Chairman, therefore, let me deal with some aspects of the emergency.

You will remember that on the 26th of October last year the President, acting under article 352 of the Constitution, proclaimed emergency and he said:

"In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (1) of article 352 of the Constitution, I, Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan, President of India, by this proclamation declare that a grave emergency exists whereby the security of India is threatened by external aggression."

As you know, this came after the Chinese attacks on the 20th October, 1962. Six days after that the emergency was declared. Now, the reason is given as "external aggression" and grave emergency. Straightway I would like to say that the Government did not consider the invocation of the emergency powers on, shall we say, 10th October, 13th October or even on the 15th October. Only when the Chinese forces in large numbers crossed the MacMahon Line and came into our territory did the Government think it necessary to advise the President, on the ground of grave emergency, to make this proclamation. In this House we all supported the proclamation of emergency because we felt—and we still think—that in a situation like that it would be necessary for the Government to arm itself with powers such as emergency powers under our Constitution. I am not going into the details of it. Now, therefore, we have to review these things here. The Government and the Home Ministry do not at all show the slightest concern for discussing the working of the emergency powers. When discussions in an Informal Consultative Committee of the representatives of the various parties were held before the Defence of India Act was brought up for discussion in this House, a suggestion was made by us and others that Parliament should appoint an advisory committee in order to watch the operation of the emergency powers and give such advice to the Government as it thought fit. The Government, and the Home Minister in particular, brushed aside these constructive suggestions of the Members of Parlia-

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

ment. It was a most unfortunate action on his part because in the course of the six months we have not had the opportunity of discussing how the emergency is being worked and yet the emergency powers cut across our Fundamental Rights. They have taken away certain provisions in Chapter III of our Constitution which give us the Fundamental Rights and at the same time make it impossible for the citizens of the country to enforce certain other rights given under articles 21, 22 and other articles of the Constitution. I have never known of a Government so cynical about the use of emergency powers. If it were in England, that Government would have been hauled over the coals the next day. I cannot think of the British Government flourishing on this abuse of emergency powers with so much of impunity for a period of six months. Yet this great Government of ours which speaks of democracy and acts cruelly in certain spheres of fundamental rights, would not even give a chance to Parliament to discuss this matter. Therefore I would like straightway to point out this. In this connection I would recall to the House what was said in the report of the Nehru Committee in 1928 or so when it dealt with the question of Fundamental Rights and I think we should remember some such thing.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): We have the Constitution now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The sentiment was expressed in 1928 but the report came later. It said:

"Our first care should be to have our fundamental rights guaranteed in a manner which will not permit their withdrawal under any circumstances."

One of the members of this Nehru Committee was the living Nehru, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, and I do

not know whether Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri remembers this noble sentiment expressed and the pledges made. What has happened to our fundamental rights now, I would like to know. Here I should point out to you a very interesting thing. The Defence of the Realm Act of England had certain provisions and also the Defence of the Realm Act in India had certain provisions at the time of the first Great War and the safeguards that were given there under the Defence of the Realm Act in England or under the Regulations of the Defence of India Act or Realm Act in our country in those days under the British—these safeguards—do not exist to-day in the present Defence of India Act and under the existing emergency powers. Many people in the country perhaps do not know this thing now because we are trying to forget what happened under the British. I should only like to mention in this connection one or two things. Under the Defence of the Realm Act, Regulation 14-B of 1914 and Regulation 18-B of the Emergency Powers Regulations of 1939 they gave certain safeguards which do not exist under the present Defence of India Act and it is stated clearly by all authors and also in the provisions themselves. Yet they were dealing with the situations of a Great World War.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR (Madras): What is the provision?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have told you the provisions—they are 18-B and 14-B. I will again give you. They are 14-B of the Defence of the Realm (Consolidation) Regulations, 1914 and Regulation 18-B of the Emergency Powers (Defence) Regulation, 1939.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: What do they refer to?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He wants you to read it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have not got the provisions. He can read it. Why should I do his reading? Let him do some work. He can find it out. The point I am making is, the safeguards that obtained then do not exist here. The British Government in the Defence of India Rules during the last war, negated them and I think under Rule 26 the British did it and now you are carrying forward the latest British tradition of 1940 or 1939. Here I would point out one or two things. Before I proceed, I would invite the attention of the House to a Resolution of the Central Executive Committee of our Party. The Resolution was passed only on April 11, 1963 and said:

"It is nearly six months since the President of India declared the National Emergency on October 26. All parties and groups in the country, including the Communist Party, supported it and voted for it when it came before the Parliament for endorsement.

Since then, following the cease-fire the Colombo Powers helpful intervention and internal mobilisation for defence, etc. the conditions which necessitated the extraordinary law and the Emergency have materially ceased to exist. Its continuation and operation obstruct normal life, more to the detriment of the common man than the big obstructionist vested interests. This change in the situation was, in a sense, recognised by the Government when it decided to conduct the bye-elections."

More bye-elections are being held.

"The continuation of the Emergency does not seem to be necessary now to fulfil the tasks of development and defence. And if the same extraordinary situation arises again, it can be revived.

The Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party of India, therefore, is of the opinion that the

Government should hold a consultation with the Opposition Parties in the Parliament with a view to assessing the situation and lifting the Emergency."

Now we are saying that the situation is such today that there should be consultations between the Government and all Opposition Parties to compare notes, to assess the situation, with a view to seeing whether the emergency could be lifted. We are of the view that it is no longer necessary. It does not seem necessary but maybe we are not in possession of certain information which the Government may have, maybe we are not right in our assessment but what I say is, in the interests of democracy in the country and of the people and their fundamental rights, there should be mutual consultations over this matter after 6 months of the emergency regime in our country. I am prepared to be convinced if the Government thinks that it should continue and I should also be given a chance to convince if I think there are factors which may not justify its continuance; but let these things be discussed as we have suggested in our resolution.

Since the Colombo proposals, even the prisoners of war—the Indian prisoners of war—are being released by China. You will remember, speaking on the President's Address, I believe I was the first in this Parliament to raise this demand very openly that the Chinese Government should release the prisoners of war and that it should not be treated in the routine way and that they should not wait for an armistice or any such talks. I am glad that these prisoners of war are being released and they are welcome home and I hope others will also be quickly released, those who are still in Chinese hands. No matter what happens to the future of the Colombo Proposals, talks or no talks, the prisoners should be released in the interests of creating a better atmosphere and for the cause of Afro-Asian solidarity which should be promoted.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

Now I would deal with certain aspects. The emergency was proclaimed not because of a threat only, but of an act of aggression on our territory which has given rise to a great emergency in the country. In any situation you do not suspend the Constitution.

The question today is to judge whether that great factor, grave emergency, exist. Nobody will say that we are living in the days of October and November. It is five months since the cease-fire took place. It is six months since the emergency was proclaimed in the country and certainly today we are not living in the situation that prevailed at that time. I am not suggesting that the crisis is completely gone and over. If the assessment of the Government is this that they are likely to be immediately attacked and so on, then one can understand the continuance of the emergency. If however the assessment of the Government is, as is indicated in the Prime Minister's statement, that there is no such likelihood of hostilities or attacks again, then you must consider whether the emergency should continue. This is the question and we can discuss it with open minds because whatever our Party differences, we are all interested in defending the Constitution, in seeing that the fundamental rights under the Constitution are not negated and suspended more than they are necessary. We are all interested in seeing that Part III of the Constitution is not make a nullity for a long period of time. You know, even in the Constituent Assembly the matter was discussed

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Subject to the security of India.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This question of the security of India is a constant problem. Merely, consideration for the security of India does not provide for the proclamation of emergency. It is a constant thing, this security of India. Have we become

such a country and is our Constitution such a creation that it cannot give us security of India in any circumstance unless we have emergency powers? That is talking like President Ayub Khan, when with a little disturbance here or a border clash there, he would declare emergency and continue it. Fortunately enough we are not given to that doctrine or ideology or that line which perpetuates an emergency and the emergency rule to the annulment of democracy and the suppression of the Fundamental Rights and the ruination of the country's future. It is in that spirit that I speak today. Let us discuss this matter with the opposition parties.

Madam Deputy Chairman, I wrote to the British Information Service here in order to find out what happened in the course of the Second World War as far as detention without trial was concerned, and the British authorities here in New Delhi were good enough to make enquiries from their Government in England and to write to me like this.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: I am glad you are following the British precedent.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You will never understand when I follow whom.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE (Uttar Pradesh): That is exactly the position.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You will never understand. If I am quoting Shakespeare, you may be saying the same thing. Anyway, I am afraid you are out-doing even the British in this matter and even the British imperialists were a little more generous than some of you gentlemen opposite, smiling as you are at the moment. Now here it says:

"While Regulation 18B was in force, the Home Secretary was required to report monthly to Parliament the number detained and released".

And these reports were printed and were available to the public and the published figures show that 1887 people, including a handful of non-British, were detained for periods varying from a few days to several years, but the maximum number detained at any time was very much less than this. That is to say, for the period of 6 or 7 years of the World War, the total number of detenus, the total number of those who entered the jails, was only 1847 and at any given time the number was much less. This information I got from the Head of the Reference Section of the British Information Service here. The letter in the original is with me.

SHRI RAMGOPAL GUPTA (Uttar Pradesh): What about the figures of the mass arrests in India?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am coming to that. I knew you would ask for it. This is the British position, and you remember at that time there was Oswald Mosley of the Fascist Party who was openly supporting Hitler. At that time there were also the pacifists who were opposed to the war. And at that time the Communist Party was also there and unlike the Communist Party of India, they were openly opposed to the war, up to 22nd June, 1941. Even so the arrests were so few under the detention law.

Now, my hon. friend here raised the other point and I think this should be straightway answered. He asked, here in our country, during the War, how many people were in detention.

SHRI RAMGOPAL GUPTA: Does the figure include all those who were arrested in 1942?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am coming to that. In such matters I always try to serve my hon. friends; it is my privilege to serve them. I have got this from the Government of India as to what happened at that time. Here at that time the total number of detenus, detained under the

Defence of India Act, in January, 1945 was 7,574, including foreigners, Germans, Japanese, politicals and non-politicals. And that, as you may know, is for undivided India. The political detenus were much less than what this figure of 7,574, and if you cut out East Pakistan and part of Punjab and certain other places, the number for the rest of India would be even less. The number of such detenus would be still lower. But even within these few months, you have arrested nearly 1,000 people under the detention laws, whereas in those days the number arrested by the British over the entire period would not have been perhaps more than 3,000 or so, and that period embraced the six or seven years of the War. This I have taken from official reports. You know in January 1945 people had not been released. The War had not come to a complete end at all and the leaders were released only in August-September, 1945. Therefore, at that time, everybody was in jail. This is perhaps the biggest figure as far as detention without trial is concerned.

SHRI MOHAN LAL SAKSENA (nominated): Except the Communists, all were in jail.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes, and now the Communists are in jail, I suppose one exception cuts out the other exception. But I may say that many of the Communists were also in jail, you ought to know that. I had to spend a part of that period underground on my return from England for about a year and a half, since a warrant was pending against me, and if I succeeded in avoiding arrest and remaining outside jail, you should congratulate me, Mr. Saxena.

This then is the position. I do not want to say anything more. Today I think the whole thing should be reconsidered, because it has become an engine of suppression, it has become a method for suppressing the Communist Party and in West Bengal Congress circles, it has been stated that there is no Jan Sangh or Swafantra

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

Party or Praja Socialist Party, really, in West Bengal, but only the Congress and the Communist Parties, and they say, "Let us take this god-sent opportunity to suppress the Communist Party," and that is why they have put nearly 140 people in detention without trial, including some 20 members of the Legislature and another 550 under different charges which can never be proved. They will not be proved. That is the position all over the country and now perhaps some 600 people are in detention without trial. I ask, is this right? I would ask the hon. Minister to consider whether such an attitude is correct. Today you may feel happy that you are persecuting the Communist Party, but tomorrow you will not feel so happy, because others might like to persecute you. Therefore, once you start this game, there is no knowing where it ends. Hitler did it. I am not comparing you to Hitler. Far from it. But is historical experience to be set aside? The Weimar Republic gave way to emergency power and the emergency power brought in Hitler and Hitler struck the Communist Party first and then he struck the German democracy and German civilisation and German culture. Are we not aware of such dangers in the process of history? Are we to think that just because a particular party is suppressed, the others have no concern in it? Therefore, Madam Deputy Chairman, I submit and I demand here. After all these months of the cessation of hostilities, after five months, this is the position and I do not know of any democratic country anywhere in the world where preventive arrests continue even after five or six months after the cease-fire. I do not know and I would like you to quote any. You can quote Franco's Spain. You can perhaps quote certain other South American countries which do not have a democratic set-up. But can you quote one single democratic country in the world where you have this kind of extraordinary powers leading to the denial of individual liberty of so many people all over the country for so long a period? I chal-

lenge the Government. Let them prove it.

Now, Madam Deputy Chairman, we are told that for the defence of the country we need this. We do not really need the emergency powers to build up our defence. The crux of the thing is military operations. If you read the Defence of India Act, you will find that in order to facilitate and help military operations—and that should certainly be done—it was necessary to invest the Government, the Central Government, with certain extraordinary powers. But then, if the military operations have ceased, if we are in a position to hold the by-elections in the country, after having negated the decision to suspend the by-elections that we had taken earlier, if the Colombo proposals have been accepted by the Government, if the Government have declared that they are not going to take recourse to arms even if the talks fail, but would take to arbitration for the settlement of the dispute, if the prisoners of war in Chinese hands are being released, does it stand to reason that these emergency powers should be so used in order to suppress one of the political parties in the country in this manner, the main opposition party in Parliament, when amongst those who are detained are also leaders of the recognised opposition, at least in two of the State Assemblies? This is a poser I make not in anger but in great sorrow and pain. I know that when I make this an attempt may be made to raise the red herring over this matter in order to by-pass the basic question of conscience, jurisprudence, democracy and politics by political prejudices. I would ask hon. Members not to be carried away by such a view but to consider whether the time has not come to set free everyone who is detained without trial. Should you require the emergency again, the President can invoke it any time and the Constitution gives such powers. Many of the arrangements would have to remain but as far as Defence is concerned, you do not need emergency

powers to boost up defence production. Many of the NATO powers do not need emergency powers in order to build up their huge military machine. England does not have emergency, the United States does not have emergency, France does not have emergency and Italy does not have emergency. They all belong to the NATO and they are able to build up a huge military machine. Portugal has it and Spain has it but these are Fascist countries and you know them very well. Why can't we build up our defence efforts that way? Therefore, Madam Deputy Chairman, we cannot understand the argument of the Government. If it were so that without emergency we could not build up national Defence, then I would still be in favour of continuing the emergency even if it means that all our people have to remain in jail. I think a democratic country can build up even better its Defence potential without an emergency and does not require extraordinary powers. The framers of our Constitution were not unmindful of the need for strong national Defence and they provided for the fundamental rights. This is a task which should have been fulfilled all along the ten or twelve years since the Constitution came into force. If you have not done it in the proper way, then don't punish the people, do not strike down their fundamental rights. On the contrary find out the guilt. That I can understand. Deal with them, rectify the mistakes, rectify the shortcomings in the highest quarters of the Government which deal with such matters but why strike down the fundamental rights and throw them in the dust? I would like the hon. Members and others to consider this in all seriousness.

Madam Deputy Chairman, I have said, consider it, and I would naturally demand the release of all the Communist prisoners who are in jail. I have been telling you this and once again I repeat in this very House that I do not know of a single Communist in the country who is opposed to the

cause of National Defence and who has not paid a tribute to the great services rendered by the Jawans in the frontier.

SHRI C. D. PANDE (Uttar Pradesh): What about Mr. Jyoti Basu?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I know you will raise it and I am prepared. This is what Mr. Jyoti Basu said in the Bengal Legislative Assembly:

"We still hold that the Indian Government is pursuing a non-alignment policy despite the fact that we are taking foreigners. It is good that we buy arms wherever they are available. We are thankful to all those...."

SHRI C. D. PANDE: He said, when this border war broke out, that it was foolish to say that there was aggression from China. This statement has been made by Mr. Jyoti Basu.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam Deputy Chairman, this is what Mr. Jyoti Basu said in the West Bengal Legislative Assembly on the 16th November.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But he is referring to another speech.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: Did he or did he not make a statement to that effect?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is wrong, absolutely. You were interested then but here is the Assembly proceedings and when I take it you are not.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: What is wrong? Whether the statement made by Mr. Jyoti Basu is wrong or whether he did not make that statement at all. I would like to know whether he did or did not make such a statement.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Which statement?

SHRI C. D. PANDE: That it is foolish to say that there is aggression from China.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Jyoti Basu never made that statement.

SHRI T. S. AVINASHILINGAM CHETTIAR: Did he make that statement?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I said, 'No'. Here is Mr. Lal Bahadur who said "we are not dealing with these people for whatever they may have or may not have said before 8th September".

SHRI C. D. PANDE: Mr. Lal Bahadur said the other day that the Communists should be put in mad-houses rather than in jails.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is right. One gentleman can be easily found from this House for the mad-house. You may be in love with Mr. Lal Bahadur. I also respect him, I know, but I have not developed the art of flattery. Here, Madam Deputy Chairman, Mr. Jyoti Basu also said that the battle will be long and hard and that we must, therefore, mobilise the people all over West Bengal through united committees for patient and persistent efforts to increase the war effort. I think when you deal with the Leader of the Opposition and his speech made on some occasion, it should not be totally ignored. It is not in good taste, it is not good politics, it is not prudence, it is not fairness and it is not cricket in our public life. That is what I say. Mr. Jyoti Basu is in jail. You have kept him for six months and I think you should be satisfied by the pound of flesh you wanted of him. I think you have had it now and you should not be more cussed at this stage. I was not talking about individuals but since you raised this point I mention him. This matter should, therefore, be considered. We all together make the parliamentary institution in a democracy, opposition and government and by the will of the people we have

been put as the first opposition in the country. Oust us in the Fourth Elections. You have seen the verdict of the people in the First, Second and Third General Elections. If we have committed any crime or offence, put us before the courts of law, punish us, shoot us if you like but do not deprive the Opposition of its right to function in the country. Do not try to cripple its activities in this manner as you have been doing.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: We have not banned the Communist Party. We have only put those people behind bars who are suspicious.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is what the Britishers used to say. You put some people in jail, some elements, but not the entire party into jail. You do not have such jail accommodation. You have taken in Assam 120 party comrades. How can they function? In Tripura the entire Council membership, the entire leadership and the secretaries of the party in districts are in jail. In West Bengal 700 people are in jail. In Maharashtra 70 people are in jail. In the same way, you had put the entire leadership in Kerala in jail but now, good thing, you have released them. This is what is happening there. So, why are you talking like that Mr. Akbar Ali Khan?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: When we are satisfied we release them as we did in Kerala.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I say, release them and you will have no occasion to regret and if you have any occasion to regret by releasing them, I shall come before Madam Deputy Chairman in sack cloth and ashes and make all amends for it, whatever you command. I cannot say more than that. I met Mr. Jyoti Basu in prison, sought an interview with him. He was shocked and surprised that he should have been treated in this manner and he has expressed the

same sentiments to the other colleagues. Mr. Govindan Nair met him. I would not have said all these things had I not assured myself that what I am saying now will be carried out by the entire Party and you will have no occasion to bring forth further charges against me in this matter. Six months have passed. You have had enough time for the impact of those days to pass. I do not quarrel with them for the present over the past thing but let us look to the future. Let us see whether the situation is such that you can take a bold step, become a little generous, come to the standards of democracy and see that their fundamental rights are not crippled in this manner. And, Madam Deputy Chairman, in this connection I cannot but point out to you that on the 28th of February in the West Bengal Assembly the Finance Minister, Mr. Sanker Das Banerji, had the gumption to say that legislators would not be released as long as the emergency continued. Who authorised him to say that, because under the Defence of India Rules you have provided for a review and in this House and in the other House the Home Minister gave assurances about review? Now, is it not going back on this promise? I could have understood him saying that the matter is subject to review although we want all of them to be released. But he says even before the review takes place that nobody will be released. You can see how Mr. Sanker Das Banerji behaved in the West Bengal Assembly when he spoke summing up the Budget discussion. Was it not telling the reviewing authority, 'Don't release them'? Was it not interference with whatever little assurance for an independent review had been given in this House by Mr. Datar and by Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri in the other House? Somehow he is not to be punished but I am to be punished for it. I am to be questioned for it; my *bona fides* are to be questioned. I can say that this is political vendetta. In West Bengal it is revengefulness which you are seeing. But I say, Madam Deputy

Chairman, this spirit of revenge does not bring about the unity of the country. It is contrary to our good conscience, contrary to our national traditions. It is something against what the Congress itself taught and above all what Gandhiji taught. Imagine what would have happened today if Mahatma Gandhi was amongst us. Suppose we had gone to him and asked his advice and blessings in such a matter. Would he not have advised the Government, 'Don't be carried away by the spirit of political revenge'? Whom shall we go to? The only living man to whom we appealed and again continue to appeal is Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. We consider him not merely as the Prime Minister of the country but as something more than that. That is why time and again with many an injury on us inflicted by the actions of the Government, pained by their behaviour towards us, maligned by them on all sides, we go to him for redress and relief in the hope that the best traditions which Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru tries to impart to the nation live in him now as ever before. I am surprised that even Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru is helpless. I cannot believe that he is happy with so many people in jail because this disgraces the country. It goes against many of his own teachings but what is more, I would like to know, who rules the country, the C.I.D. or Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru? I would like to tell this before the House. Let it be decided as to who rules whether the Central Intelligence Department is ruling the country. Let them say they are ruling the country; I will not have anything to complain about Jawaharlal Nehru except that he has brought about such a state of affairs. But if we are told that Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru is at the helm of affairs, is in the control of the Government, can I not appeal to his good conscience, to his sense of justice, to his pride in the democratic traditions and institutions and seek remedy and relief from him? It is with this object that I appeal to him once again to

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] personally reconsider this matter, discuss with the leaders of the Communist Party, discuss with those people who are in jail, get them out on parole if you like, and satisfy himself that there is no reason to fear. Madam, what shall I say?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have taken 45 minutes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes, I am finishing now. You will remember some time back I referred to the report of the Chartered Accountants into the affairs of the Ruby General Insurance Co. and the New Asiatic Insurance Co. Now I am in possession of this Report—complete text. It is a report by the Chartered Accountants, Mr. Ghosh and Mr. Suresh Mathur. Would you like to have this Report, Madam? If you like, you can have that. I shall read out a quotation from the Report. Here it says that the Company has wilfully manipulated the account books from year to year to the tune of Rs. 18,15,224 in the Balance Sheet for the year 1954-55. It does not represent the true and correct state of affairs of the Company. This is on page 25 of the Report. So all these things are there. I know what the hon. Minister would say. We are told that the Solicitor-General gave an opinion on the two Reports that he thought that no prosecution was called for, that no further action was necessary. I should like, under article 88 of the Constitution, the Attorney-General to come and explain before the House as to why the Solicitor-General gave an opinion different from that of the two Chartered Accountants. Madam Deputy Chairman, we did not inscribe in our Constitution article 88 in order just to have some little fun. In situations such as these the advice of the Solicitor-General or the Attorney-General should be heard by the Members of the House and my demand therefore is, Madam Deputy Chairman, you summon the Attorney-General to come before this House and explain why the Solicitor-General gave advice

to the Government disagreeing with the recommendations made by the two Chartered Accountants after their examination and enquiry into the affairs of the New Asiatic Insurance Company and the Ruby General Insurance Company.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY (Mysore): What is the recommendation?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You ask me to lay it on the Table. Now, there are many things. I do not wish to say very much on this subject.

There are one or two other small things. The army Jawans are suffering, I am told. Army camps are being utilised for the private cars of the army officials. I have got a snap with me here. Here is an army Officer's car No. UPD 2552; it is shown here in one of the 180 lb. tents which can accommodate 12 Jawans. The soliders are not given proper accommodation but the tents meant for them are being used to shelter the cars of officers.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Cars also require protection.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If you give too much protection to the car, you don't give protection to the frontiers. This is what is happening here. Here are the two photographs. I thought it might be of interest to hon. Members to find such things. As far as this is concerned, I think it should be looked into.

Now, I have got only one thing more. I do not understand what Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari's functions are. I would like to know that. We are sanctioning money. He seems to be an elusive Pimpnel of the Constitution, and of our parliamentary set-up; I am here, I am there, I am nowhere, I am everywhere. I do not like in the Council of Ministers an elusive Pimpnel of this sort. Let his functions be defined. What are his functions? What is he coordinating? What is he to carry out and

where does he stand *vis-a-vis* the Prime Minister in relation to the co-ordination of the various functions of the Ministries? Up till now we do not know. Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari is now touring the world, Australia, some other country, the United States of America. If the function is international touring, I can understand it. That is all right; we will give it to him.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is one o'clock. Please wind up now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam Deputy Chairman, you seem to be not much interested in Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari's functions. I am interested a little. Therefore I say we should be told about this.

Finally about the administrative expenditure. It should be brought down. As you will see, in these Budget proposals they have gone up by Rs. 55 crores. I am told that all the Ministers are angry after their electricity and water bills and furniture accounts have been published. All are angry. They are fighting. I do not know if they have a trade union. Otherwise, they would have led a strike. All of them are angry and now they say, find out the Prime Minister's and the Finance Minister's bills. They want to be in good company. I say this matter has to be brought up. We are not satisfied with the mere publication of such a thing. I made enquiries from other countries, from whatever channel I could. In England and other countries it is not so. The British Prime Minister and their Finance Minister do not get all that kind of thing. They get only some free things. The other Ministers are given a salary and they have to live on it. They have to pay. Here salary is an excuse and everything else is subsistence.

1 P.M.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Salary is honorarium.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do not know. And about sumptuary allowance I do not know. Only one of the Ministers invites us.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Who is that Minister?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do not know about the others. I do not wish to go into that, but I think this is a serious matter.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: There is an Act of Parliament wherein these salaries are fixed. If Mr. Bhupesh Gupta objects to that, he can bring forward a Bill to amend the Act, instead of saying all these things here.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: For heaven's sake, Mr. Pande must not make irrelevant interruptions.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: What is irrelevant? This is not the time to speak about it. You can bring forward an amending Bill.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The rules provide Rs. 250 for water, electricity, etc. You are consuming Rs. 500 worth. Are you observing the rules?

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): Do you believe in heaven?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, please do not take note of them. Please wind up because you have taken your time.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: May be, Mr. Pande had at some time more acquaintance of Ministers' houses, but he seems to have lost contact. Now, the position is this. I want a proper enquiry into it. I would not like the matter to stop here. It is no use trying to say that other officers are spending money in the Ministers' houses. It looks as if, as I have said, the whole of the Jumna has been pumped out to bathe our Ministers in their bungalows. I would like to know where the water goes.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Even if all this is admitted, you should not have any extravagance with time. You are extravagant with time.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: About my extravagance with time, it is better to be extravagant on parliamentary time than on the public exchequer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: With neither.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please wind up.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Therefore, I shall take your advice and economise, but let the Ministers also economise.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Well, I think that will do.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, that will not do. I shall just finish with one or two words. What I have said is we are spending very heavy amounts under this Budget and I think that economy measures should be seriously considered. It should begin in high quarters, as a matter of example, not that we can save very much money compared to the Budget of Rs. 9,000 crores or so. But certainly in order to set the tone in the country, we should try to exercise the maximum possible economy in the highest circles of the administration. I think the Government should appoint some kind of committee or commission to go into this question of economy in our administration, so that, broadly speaking, they can give their recommendations to the Government of India in order that they may be implemented to save money. This is all I can say.

Once again, before I sit down, I would ask the hon. Minister to consider the suggestions that I have made with regard to the emergency and the abuse of the emergency powers. I would like the matter to be discussed dispassionately not on the floor of

the House only but outside in committees and meetings, where somewhat outside the acrimony of debate or if you like the heat of the debate we can patiently and objectively discuss whether our Constitution, our democratic institutions need remain in abeyance in this manner, crippled and jeopardised in the name of emergency or whether we can return to the normal functioning of the Constitution and guarantee the Fundamental Rights that the framers of the Constitution of the country gave to the people and the country.

Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 2 P.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at five minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at two of the clock, THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK (Uttar Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, even in normal times the duties of a Finance Minister are difficult. They have become more difficult ever since the Chinese aggression. We have had news some time ago that the Chinese have concentrated forces on the border. There is a threat hanging over our heads from the north, from the east and from the west, and the duties of the Finance Minister therefore have become much more difficult than in normal times.

We have heard today an amazing speech from Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. It has been repeatedly said on the floor of the House on behalf of the Government that it is not the Communists as such who have been detained under the preventive detention law. It is those who were aligned with pro-Chinese activities who have been

detained under that law, and it is as individuals that they were dealt with and not as members of the Party. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has said: "Lift the emergency". He has argued for that and said that defence effort is not prevented by the lifting of the emergency. Now shall we so soon forget that the Chinese Government made a wanton attack, a treacherous attack, after it had given assurances to us in the Treaty of 1954 and at the Bandung Conference? Shall we forget that so soon? Are we expected to forget that at the borders there were anti-Indian propaganda and pro-Chinese propaganda? If Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's argument is a valid argument, then it would mean that we should allow people who have pro-Chinese tendencies, who were engaged in pro-Chinese propaganda and who are engaged in activities which are dangerous to the security of the country to be free when there is concentration of Chinese troops on the border.

Madam Deputy Chairman, is there anyone in this House who would be taken in by arguments like those which have been advanced by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta? Can you carry on preparations for defence when persons who have pro-Chinese tendencies, who are engaged in pro-Chinese activities at the border are free? His argument is that the defence effort shall not be prevented if the emergency is lifted. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta may imagine that anyone in this House will be taken in by the argument that he has made today. I submit that such arguments would insult anybody's intelligence. Therefore, the position is that today we are faced with a situation when there is still danger continuing. There is that threat continuing. No one could give an undertaking on behalf of the Chinese Government that they would not repeat the attack and the Chinese Government is the judge of the time and place of the attack. And even if the Chinese Government were to give an undertaking of this type, no one would be cheated again and no

one would be deceived by such an undertaking after the experience that this country had had.

Now, Madam Deputy Chairman, we have to increase production. We have to proceed with our industrial development according to our Five Year Plans. They involve heavy expenditure. But now our economy is geared to the necessities of the emergency. We must provide up-to-date armoury for our soldiers, we must have air power, and we must have missiles, etc., etc. No nation today can survive if militarily it is weak. Industrial development and economic and social progress will be of no avail if our security is threatened, if our freedom is endangered. We can have no defence preparation in the true sense of the term if there is no industrial development. They must go hand in hand together. Therefore, the lesson that we have learnt from the Chinese aggression we must not forget, and I must congratulate the Finance Minister that he has displayed great ability, great acumen and courage, in formulating the financial proposals. We must also bear in mind that the people have the assurance that he has taken into consideration their paying capacity and their interests also.

Madam Deputy Chairman, when financial burdens are abnormal, the people expect that those burdens will fall equally and justly on all. Otherwise there would be a feeling of injustice in the hearts of those who honestly and willingly bear these heavy burdens. They will feel that there are those in the country who are not affected by the Finance Acts I mean the tax-evaders. However heavily you may tax the people, if there are tax-evaders in the country and they are not touched by our Finance laws, these anti-social elements in the society will flourish at the expense of the honest and the willing. Therefore, it becomes all the more incumbent that the Government machinery becomes more circumspect when the taxes are heavy.

[Shri G. S. Pathak.]

There has been proverbially a perpetual war between the tax-evader and the Government machinery. The methods of the tax-evader are many and ingenious. Sometimes people have money which has evaded tax and which is not to be found in their account books. They are on the lookout for those who deal with them and who can take the money from them, and similarly not put them in their account books. In this deal both succeeds in achieving victory over the Government and in cheating the people of the country. It will be interesting to find out how much tax might have been evaded. There are provisions both in the present Income-tax Act and in the old Income-tax Act which provide that false statements shall be criminally punishable. That provision has been made more stringent in the present Act and it will be interesting to find out how many times the Government has taken action by way of prosecution so far as the tax-evaders are concerned. That tax has been evaded admits of no doubt, because there have been pecuniary penalties imposed by the administration on numerous occasions and therefore it is hard to believe that tax has not been evaded to the extent which makes the evasion of tax criminally punishable under the law. Therefore the question arises: Why is it that these evils still persist? Is there anything wrong with the machinery or is it that the machinery has not been fully applied to meet such cases? Now, these are questions which would arise and which, I am sure, the Government would consider. People have got confidence in the fair-play and justice of the Finance Minister and I am sure that a proper enquiry would be made into the matter of this tax-evasion even in higher quarters. It is gratifying to note that the Finance Minister gave assurance in the other House that nobody, however high he might be could be allowed to escape the due process of law if he were found corrupt or if he evaded payment of taxes. This is a

matter of gratification. The question really is not of any personal investigation by him but of the tightening up of the machinery. The evils are well known to everybody and methods have to be devised in order to destroy those evils. Otherwise the result will be that there will be a growing feeling of injustice in the minds of those who are willing to pay taxes and who do not want to devise any means—who cannot devise any means—to evade them. The foundations of the State rest on justice, and I would appeal to the Government not to allow such a feeling to grow, and action must be taken before it is too late.

Madam, a study of the economic surveys and the various reports which are published by the Ministries would give a true picture, if they are read in a correct perspective, of the progress that our country has been making during these fifteen years and is making now. In recorded history it will be difficult to find any other instance where a country has achieved progress of this magnitude within such a short period of time. It is not merely the economic and social progress that has been achieved, we are moving towards the achievement of a socialistic pattern within a democratic framework, and that makes the task difficult because you can achieve economic progress, you can achieve social progress, in other ways also. We have had the mobilisation—we are striving towards it—of human and material resources. There are training centres for labour; there is an increase in the national wealth and agricultural production, and there is industrial expansion. And it would not do for anybody to say that we have not reached the targets according to the Plan. But it is still important—and it is all the more important—to see whether we are controlling our expenditure properly. On this matter, the Reports of the Public Accounts Committee are very valuable and their perusal is revealing. It may be said that the speed at which we are progressing and the

problems which we have to face do not permit us to have an adequate control. Speed is important in our set-up but there are many instances which are mentioned in the Reports. They are not too many but still there are quite a number of them, which are mentioned in these Reports, which justify the statement that a stricter control is necessary. I will not give you the details of those instances. The very fact that so many countries in the world are prepared to grant us loans, are prepared to grant us aid in money and material, proves that our economic policies have succeeded. They examine facts and figures and they find that the moneys that they give us are properly utilised. Still the question remains whether all that we are doing in the industrial sphere, particularly in the public sector, is something which needs further improvement. These volumes which contain the Reports of the Public Accounts Committee show that in at least one case the loan should not have been advanced, a loan which ran into a high figure, and that Committee recommended . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam Deputy Chairman, democracy is asleep on the Treasury Benches.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU (West Bengal): He has an occult ear, you do not know.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is listening.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: He is thinking too.

Now the loans should not be advanced in this manner, that is, in the manner criticised by the Committee. The pattern should be that Government have all the shares in a corporation or have majority of shares, and investments should be made according to these well-recognised principles which the Government has adopted, and they should be continued.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It seems to have woken up just now.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: In the matter of extension of nationalisation we have to be very careful; we must not have a doctrinaire approach to that question. We must see what are the principles which guide us in the matter of this mixed economy, in the matter of separation of public sector from private sector. It must be a public necessity; it must be the nature of a particular industry which should determine whether that activity should form part of the public sector, and there must be a judicious selection on that question.

Now while reading these Reports I found that there had been a criticism made—it is a valid criticism and I support that criticism—that in the case of factories manufacturing drugs and medicines there should be no profit motive when the factories are run by the Government. The prices of drugs and medicines are high, and we must take into account the necessities of the middle classes in this matter, and the recommendation that has been made is perfectly justified, that the Government, while running the factories, should not be guided by profit motive where the factories are concerned with the manufacture of drugs and medicines.

Madam Deputy Chairman, one last observation I wish to make and it is this—I made this last year also. In the matter of Foreign Service there should be a reconsideration; from public life more people should be taken than they are being taken.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Also from the Opposition.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: I am not criticising the service people. They are very good in their own way. They are making great contribution in the service of the country, and I am casting no reflection on them. They have done good service, but the question is whether it will not be better in the interests of the country if there is a fresher outlook because we know there are people in the country in

[Shri G. S. Pathak.]
public life who command respect in foreign countries, who have contacts in foreign countries and who may be able to make their contribution in the service of the country.

While concluding, Madam Deputy Chairman, I must repeat that, when we are having abnormal taxes, there must be greater effort to prevent tax evasion. I am repeating it because when a poor person steals money so that he may be able to buy bread, he will be guilty of theft and he will be punished. When a petty official who has got a large family takes a bribe, he will be sentenced to imprisonment, but when a tax-evader accumulates wealth, he is not even socially looked down upon, and no stigma attaches to him.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: They are looked upon as pillars of society.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: May I make a suggestion for you?

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: I do not want any suggestion from you; I will be misled.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam, I say, if the lawyers . . .

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: I refuse to take any suggestion from you.
(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Nobody can either lead or mislead . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I do not think you can be misled.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Therefore I make the suggestion. Accept the ruling . . .

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: Therefore, Madam, I again appeal to the Government to devise some means whereby tax-evasion, on the scale at which it is prevalent, may be prevented.

Thank you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I suggest that lawyers should not undertake tax-evasion cases, to defend the evaders.

SHRI G. S. PATHAK: I will undertake even your case. Agreed?

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: Madam Deputy Chairman, when I spoke on the Budget last time I gave full support to the various measures introduced by the Finance Minister in raising resources to meet the emergency. Even now I regard the emergency as a great occasion to be utilised by the Government and by the people, by all people concerned, to make efforts to meet the great demands of both defence and development. Madam, I even regard this emergency as the worst of times and also be the best of times from this point of view, worst of times because we have been challenged, menaced and disgraced militarily by the Chinese brigands.

This is the best of times because it gives us a Supreme opportunity, a rare opportunity, to build up the nation economically, politically and militarily. It gives us an opportunity to convert the present challenge into a chance for growth and development. Therefore, I support the various taxation proposals and I regard that the present budget is one of the titanic efforts made to find ways and means to meet the menace that is before us.

I was glad when the Finance Minister made his speech in the Lok Sabha and disclosed that at least the Finance Ministry in India was aware of the emergency. I expected that this feeling of emergency, this sense of emergency, would be transferred to other departments, to other Ministries. I thought that this sense of emergency really prevailed in every department, in every limb of the Government and in every section of the departments not only at the Centre but also at the State level. But

what do we find? What is the picture? Friends have been arguing about the present emergency. Some want the emergency to continue. Some do not want it to continue. But I want to know what is the present picture.

There is the emergency declared. We are legally under an emergency. But is there any glimpse of emergency in the country, I want to know? I am glad that the Finance Minister at least has not lost sight of the emergency. I am one of those who believe that emergency exists and it will continue to exist whether there are Defence of India Rules operating or not. But I would like to know whether this feeling of emergency is uniformly felt by all concerned notwithstanding the long talk that I am hearing from time to time. Madam, to my disillusionment and disappointment I may say that except in very rare cases emergency has been treated as a most casual thing. People have been behaving and functioning as though there is no emergency.

What is the impact of emergency on the various Ministers particularly? In the A.I.C.C. meeting one Minister, the Minister of Planning, said that there is too much of politics coming in the way of implementing the plans in States. He particularly pointed out that politics had played havoc in the realisation of agricultural targets. The statement was questioned by his own colleague, Shri S. K. Patil, the Food Minister. Again, the Minister of International Trade complained that the Commerce and Industry Ministry had been issuing licences to a few people, to a few families, to a few concerns encouraging thereby concentration of monopoly. That was denied by Shri K. C. Reddy. It was not so, he said, and in turn he complained that Shri Manubhai Shah, when he was in charge of Industry and Commerce, had issued a number of licences and permits even beyond the targets fixed for the Third Plan. There was indiscriminate issue of licences during this period, he observed.

And what do you find in the other Ministries? May I point out to the Members that some time back the Minister of Economic and Defence Co-ordination, Shri T. T. Krishnamachari, spoke of the failure or the shortfall in the various sectors. He pertinently pointed out that aspirations do not become achievements and mere pious wishes do not become realities. He pointed out that there is shortfall in every sector. He also, by implication, said that there had been no co-ordination at all, no co-operation. He is not receiving any co-operation in the matter of co-ordination of functions and activities in the Government of India. But the Prime Minister said that it was not true. He contradicted every word of Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari in this respect. Ultimately the Minister of Economic and Defence Co-ordination said that in spite of that he had a feeling that the whole Government was non-co-operating with him. He complained against the whole Government, all the Ministries concerned.

Madam, I point out a few of these things to show how these Ministries are functioning during the emergency, to know whether these Ministers are really aware of the emergency, whether the Government is functioning as it ought to function during abnormal times. We are in difficult times and abnormal times and the present budget is also abnormal. We supported it because it is necessary, but I do not find the impact of emergency anywhere. The feeling of emergency is not being felt uniformly by all the Ministers, at all levels.

Then, apart from these Ministers, how is this emergency functioning below the Ministerial level, at the level of administration, at the level of States? I have had occasion to meet some of the officers from time to time since the declaration of the emergency and there seems to be a feeling among many people that the emergency is not necessary at all; it is not neces-

[Shri M. S. Gurupada Swamy.]

sary to continue the emergency. That means, according to the officers, emergency is a needless imposition and, therefore, they need not act in a manner that they ought to act during an emergency. They feel that they can go about in the old, usual manner, in a most casual fashion, and to them the Chinese threat has not made any difference. Therefore, I would like to know whether the feeling of emergency which ought to be there is being felt everywhere, whether steps have been taken by the Ministries concerned to see that their Departments at least should react to emergency. I know that time was extended in the offices for the people to function because there is a great load of work during an emergency but what do I find? They say that this extension of time is not necessary at all because there is no work for them, no guidance has been provided and no instructions have been given to them about the extra work that they have to do. Except the extension of working hours, there has been no extension of work, there is no more work cleared. Again in the States I find a remarkable tendency that this emergency should be utilised or exploited for getting certain assistance, certain reliefs, certain help from the Centre. I had a talk with some of the Ministers in some States. They were pointing out that the emergency gave an opportunity to them to make more demands. In the name of emergency they may project extraordinary demands and they may get the necessary assistance . . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: What an unrealistic view!

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: So I say that the whole emergency is misconceived, is not properly conceived and by seeing the working of the Ministries at the Centre and the States, one will have the feeling that the supreme law of contradiction is working very well at all levels. May I therefore ask the Finance Minister

whether any steps have been taken to maintain a climate of emergency? May I know at least whether there is sufficient awareness or realisation and consciousness that the emergency continues and I think except for limited purposes like misusing, there is no emergency existing at all. When I went to my constituency a few days ago, I came across an instance where money was collected for the N.D.F. Receipts were not issued to the parties who contributed to the Fund in the village but later on, when the villagers found out that the officers who collected the contributions had given only a part of the amount to the N.D.F., they made a complaint to the Chief Minister and to my amazement no action was taken. On the contrary, there seems to be shielding of such official elements. I point this out to show how the emergency is being misused. I would like to know whether the Finance Minister has taken steps to see that the emergency measures are carried out fully, truthfully, sincerely and earnestly in every sector and in every department in the Central and the State Governments. So this causes a sort of misgiving in my mind as to whether the funds that the Finance Minister is raising for Defence and development purposes are going to be effectively and properly used during the period. Specially I am sceptical whether the funds provided—Rs. 867 crores—this year would be properly utilised economically, utilised rationally, utilised for the purpose for which the funds have been allotted. I am sceptical because the Government is already thinking of long maturing projects in Defence. It takes a lot of time, it consumes a lot of time and it is not possible for the Government to spend all the money on these projects within the time allotted.

Again we have got to depend on the military assistance from foreign countries for which a part of the fund is needed. We are not sure whether the military assistance is coming in time, in adequate quantities. As you know,

talks are going on, endless talks, between our representatives and the Governments of foreign countries and I do not know whether the picture is clear, whether this country knows or we know what exactly we are getting and what exact types of weapons we are importing and what types of weapons we have to manufacture in this country. So the picture is not clear. Therefore, we do not know whether we will be able to utilise all the funds provided for the purpose of weapons and other military hardware from other countries. Again we do not know whether the Government has taken steps to see that our factories producing military hardware are being modernised. My information is that there is slowness, inordinate delay, in regard to modernisation of these factories. Therefore my scepticism that the funds we have allotted, that the funds that have been claimed by the Ministry of Defence, might not be utilised for defence purposes. I want to be told clearly whether it is possible to do so during the course of a few months.

Then I would like to raise two or three more important points. I want to know whether the emergency has improved the efficiency and economy of the Administration. This also is a part of the argument that I advanced earlier. Unless the administrative framework, the institutional framework is adequate, to bring about joint planning and execution of projects, it would be difficult to achieve all those things that we want to achieve during this period. I am afraid the efficiency of the Government is very low. Even the emergency has not made any impact, particularly it is the lowest in the matter of agricultural planning. I say that the role of the Administration is worst in agricultural planning. The Government has taken more responsibility for agricultural planning and therefore the Government at the Central and State level have got to be efficient to produce results in agriculture. Unless agriculture is reoriented, transformed and made to yield

better results, it would be difficult for the economy to reach higher levels. In this connection the point of productivity is most important. Unfortunately, all along, we have suffered in productivity, not only in agriculture but also in industry. China, Madam, has no better tools and equipments, or more resources to invest, but China's achievement which is nearly 55 per cent, is largely due to higher productivity. Therefore, I would like to know from the hon. Minister what he has in contemplation to mobilise the manpower potential available in the country and to put it to the task of economic development and growth. The picture is not clear. Emergency has no meaning unless the whole country is mobilised and every village is mobilised and every factory is mobilised. At the same time, emergency has no meaning unless there is budgeting of the capacity of every sector. I do not know whether this has been done. On the last occasion I raised this important question, whether any budgeting has been done with regard to the existing capacity which can be utilised for defence purposes and for civil purposes in each industry, industry-wise. I do not know whether this has been done. It is very important that this is done. This budgeting is important because I would like, during the emergency, to see that the most sophisticated factory and the most sophisticated machinery is put to defence production and the less sophisticated ones, the less advanced ones, or the old machinery, should be put in for the production of civilian needs and civilian goods. I do not know whether this bifurcation has been made. This cannot be done unless a budgeting of the capacities of industries is done industry-wise. I would like to know what the Minister has done in this respect.

Madam, it is very good to say that this is a very abnormal time and therefore, the Budget has to be abnormal and that resources have to be raised in all sorts of ways. I support

[Shri M. S. Gurupada Swamy.]
this. But I would like to know whether these things are accompanied by other concomitant measures which create the necessary climate both for defence and for production. Unfortunately, my information is that this has not been done.

It has been stated by the hon. Member, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, that our industrial growth is rather low, that it is sagging. I referred to this matter when I was speaking on the Budget and here I would like to know whether any concrete step has been taken or planned to see that the existing capacity which is at present unutilised—about 25 per cent. of our total capacity—is utilised in the near future. There are certain steps taken, I am aware, in the steel industry, for instance, where some sizeable progress, some increase in production has been made. But even now in other sectors of our industries, nothing has been done. There are shortfalls and shortfalls and the performance is so low. The claims made by the Ministries seem to be very large, indeed, but these claims and their performance do not go well together. Therefore, I would like to know whether any concrete step has been taken to utilise the existing capacity which has not been utilised so far. Mr. Morarji Desai has been saying often that our people should spend less and save more hereafter, because the emergency demands it. I completely agree with him. I have no quarrel with him at all. But I would like to know whether this precept of the Finance Minister is being followed by his colleagues first, so that it may be followed by others elsewhere. You know even in regard to their electricity charges and their water charges, there was such an opposition from his colleagues and even a sum of Rs. 250 for electricity was not thought enough by our Ministers during the emergency. I do not know whether they are feeling any obliga-

tion for economy during the emergency and whether there is any sense of economy at all on the part of the Ministers. If they cannot cut their own electricity bill to Rs. 250 and that is quite large—how can they expect economy among their own officers, among the Ministers at the State level and among the people? Of course, economy has to be pursued. We have got to be ruthless. But we have to be ruthless to ourselves first before we are ruthless to others. But the Finance Minister wants to be ruthless to others and be very lenient to his colleagues. This dichotomy should not continue. It should not go on. That is why I strongly object to it and I would like to know what measures have been taken to bring about economy in expenditure and whether any steps, any big enough steps, have been taken, to save money in this regard. Mr. Morarji Desai had pointed out in the last Budget speech that he had taken a few steps. But these few steps are very very small indeed, and I did expect him to take really revolutionary, radical steps, to bring about economy all over. Nothing seems to have been done. Let me point out some things to show the tendency for squander mania that we find in some of our embassies abroad, just to show how far we are serious at all in bringing about economy and in punishing those people who are guilty. Here I have certain instances to show how money that is being allotted to the embassies has been spent or mis-spent. The Government of India, according to the Audit Report for 1963, had laid down certain rules with regard to the holding of cash balances by the Missions abroad. They have prescribed a ceiling on the amount that can be held by a Mission. But the Audit Report points out various cases of violation of this important rule. For instance, it gives the example of Djakarta, of Shanghai, of Hong Kong, Kobe and Medan. The average expenditure for six months in the case of Djakarta is Rs. 42,000 and they can hold this amount. But actually the Mission had held in its charge

Rs. 97,000. For Hong Kong also the ceiling was Rs. 47,000 but they held with them Rs. 57,000. Maybe this is not a very glaring omission. But if you go to other items, you will find that in the case of house rents, in the case of motor cars, in the case of the purchase of furniture and so on, there is a tendency on the part of the Missions to spend more and more. Here is something given on page 37 which I shall read out.

"The Government issued instructions in December, 1956, that in no circumstance hotel charges should be incurred for any diplomatic officer so long as a house meant for another diplomatic officer of whatever rank, was lying vacant. But in the following cases, officers were accommodated in hotels when residential accommodation was lying vacant."

3 P.M.

In this way they spent at Khartoum Rs. 2,500 and in Adis Ababa Rs. 2,000 odd and together they spent Rs. 5,600. In Egypt our Embassy spent Rs. 15,600 for special repairs without obtaining any quotations. Detailed particulars and measurements of various items of work done were not obtained at all but money was paid. This is another instance. One more instance has been referred to relating to the year 1956. The Mission took on rent two furnished houses for a period of ten years on a monthly rental of Rs. 1500 and Rs. 650 respectively. The rents for these two houses were far in excess of the controlled rents which were Rs. 150 and Rs. 65 respectively. The extra payment on this account for these two houses amounted to Rs. 1.14 lakhs up to March, 1962. So, the Audit Report gives enough instances to show how our Embassies abroad are functioning and it goes on to point out how our publicity machinery is defunct in many cases and yet expenditure is incurred. I point out these instances to show that no steps were taken in the past. I do not know of

any steps being taken now to bring about economy in expenditure.

Madam, I would like to touch another aspect of the problem and that is about the state of affairs prevailing in regard to certain schemes which have already been approved and sanctioned but which have not been undertaken at all. For instance, we find in various States, for the purpose of achieving better results in agriculture, minor irrigation works have been taken up in all earnestness and special grants have been given by the Centre to the States but I find on going to some of these States that not even blueprints have been prepared but money is being spent. When I asked the officers as to how it was possible to spend money without the blueprint or the project reports being prepared, they pointed out that they had been instructed to proceed with the work and also spend the money because these sums are being received from the Centre and such sums should not be allowed to lapse but should be spent. The same phenomenon is found in various other cases. Therefore, I would say that it is very necessary to appoint a Parliamentary Committee to go into this question, to see whether any economy is being brought about, any effective functioning is being done in respect of various sectors during the emergency. Such a thing was there in the United Kingdom when the United Kingdom was at war with Germany. Such a committee of Parliament was constituted to go into all these questions and to make recommendations now and then and I would like a similar committee to be constituted not only to deal with all questions of economy but also to deal with questions of performance of the various projects in various sectors, both in industry and agriculture.

Madam, I would end up by saying that I am glad and I welcome the concessions announced by the Finance Minister in the other House. They have, in a way, given a certain relief in some circles. By and large, I would

[Shri M. S. Gurupada Swamy.]
say, the Budget as it is is quite good. It has to be supported and the Finance Minister deserves our congratulations in this matter but, as I said, I would like him to see that some sense of emergency, some sense of responsibility prevails in the other Ministries also. There should be complete unity both in planning and execution. There should be thorough orchestration of planning and execution at all levels. Otherwise, whatever the funds we vote, all of them would be largely misspent and the results achieved would be very low. That has been the story all along. I want some lessons to be taken from China, though China is our enemy. We would like to have more efficiency, more performance. That should be our goal; that should be our motto. All the rest are secondary.

Thank you, very much.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Madam Deputy Chairman, the most important feature of the Appropriation Bill is the immense increase in our allotment for Defence expenditure. There is an overall gap of Rs. 454 crores and it arises almost entirely from an increase in our Defence expenditure. Frankly, as one who is somewhat of a pacifist, I feel grieved and distressed at the fact that under the compulsion of events for which not we but our neighbouring State of China is responsible, we shall have to increase our Defence expenditure. As a peace-loving country we had kept our Defence expenditure as low as was reasonably or perhaps not even reasonably proper. As a man of peace, as a humanist, I have regretted this race for armament in conventional weapons but events have happened on our border which have made us all revise our ideas. Unfortunately for us, the people of the Afro-Asian continent, the Chinese intrusion into our border areas which is without any justification whatsoever has perhaps left us with no alternative at all. I find myself, I confess, a little confused. I

find my ideals shattered. I have been somewhat of a unilateralist and I have not entirely given up this specific belief in unilateralism. It is painful for one in the evening of ones life to feel that unilateral disarmament is not what our patriotic friends would call a realistic proposition. I hope, however, that we shall never compete, happen what might, with China in the race for nuclear armaments. We are opposed to nuclear armaments on ethical grounds, and I hope we shall not sacrifice those grounds. I hope we shall bear those ethical considerations always in mind.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: But not at the cost of our honour and dignity.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I will not conceal from the House the grave misgivings and hesitation with which I feel compelled to swallow something which goes against the principles for which I have stood all my life. There is no knowing where it will lead us to. It is a process of going down the incline and once we start doing so we cannot be exactly certain where we shall reach. The India-China affair itself can ultimately only be solved by negotiations and well, strength may be necessary in the immediate future for the purpose of successful talks but we must not lose any opportunity of talking over the matter with China on the basis of the Colombo Plan or something which approximates to the Colombo Plan.

I am, however, happy that our Development programme is not going to be affected by our defence expenditure. I cannot help feeling what a different world we would have ushered in if circumstances had permitted us to utilise the vast sums that we are going to spend on our defence for development purposes. It would have been tragic beyond words if we had allowed this defence expenditure to interfere with our planned pro-

gramme of development. Fortunately, this is not going to be the case. Granting the need for increasing defence expenditure to the extent indicated by our Finance and Defence Ministers, the question which we have to consider is whether the proposals for raising revenues are fair and equitable to all sections of the population. Equity, Madam Deputy Chairman, is a hard concept to define. To work out a scheme of equality of sacrifice for all classes of people is not an easy task. The marginal utility of money for the poor man or for the lower income group people is not the same as for the richer sections or for the big corporation of our country. In answering this question of equality of sacrifice we must remember the background of our country. We are a poor people. Our standard of living is woefully low. We are not an affluent society. Our farmers, our industrial workers, our lower middle classes and even our middle class people have been hit hard by rising prices. The contraction of purchasing power might indeed mean contraction of life itself for them. I include the farmer for though he may look to be somewhat more prosperous than he was before, he is also a consumer. The simple question therefore which the proposals raise is whether the burden distributed by the Finance Minister is fair and equitable to the vast mass of our people and not to a microscopic section of it only who because of their power, wealth and the glory that they possess have perhaps benefited more than others from our planned development. I do not understand how it can be regarded as fair to make all classes share equally in the nationwide effort for defence. There are sections of the population—and they form the vast majority—who are not in a position to have further increases in their daily budgets without their efficiency, their nutrition and their capacity to live a decent life free from worry and anxiety being affected. If their pockets are touched, their standard of living will further go down. Contraction

of purchasing power in their case is bound to result in contraction of consumption of even the things that must be regarded as bare necessities. One's experience is that the rise in indirect taxation, particularly in the case of commodities in common use, has a tendency to shoot up prices beyond those foreseen by the framers of the Budget. It must not be forgotten that there are people who cannot with their limited incomes make both ends meet. Compulsory savings for them may only result in the getting indebted to moneylenders. I do not know—I am posing this as a legal proposition—whether compulsory savings are possible under the constitutional arrangements that we have in this country. That is a question which lawyers will have to consider in law courts. We have not yet been able to provide our people with social security. Surely a poverty-stricken people cannot provide the material for national defence. Compulsory deposit scheme may prove, even in the limited form in which it is going to be placed before us, as a source of harassment to low-paid employees and I should have preferred to have it dropped. The surcharges on all imported goods have gone up and though the incidence of duty on kerosene oil has been reduced yet it will fall heavily on the poor. Increased taxation will lead to increased prices and there is no doubt that there is a good deal of tax evasion. Had all the taxes been collected in time and had there been no tax evasion, we would not have had to bear this heavy burden. I read the other day in the papers that instructions have been issued to income-tax officers not to hurry with the collection of income-tax dues in Calcutta. I hope that there is no truth in that statement.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: The Finance Minister has repudiated it.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: And I hope that it will be repudiated in this House by the Deputy Finance Minister. I am wondering whether it is

[Shri P. N. Sapru.]

possible for us without going as far as total nationalisation—I am not afraid of that word 'nationalisation'; it does not conjure up dreams of a totalitarian society before my eye—to run some industries in which the State can have a controlling interest on a competitive basis with industries in private hands. Is it impossible for us to think of ways and means of increasing our revenues by increasing the efficiency of our State undertakings and running small industrial concerns of our own?

The super profits tax, I find, has been lowered. I shall have to say something about it when it comes up for discussion. Concessions have been made to those affected by it. I do not say that I am opposed to lowering super profits tax for I recognise the limitations of a mixed economy. One of the inevitable incidents of a system of mixed economy is that you have to give incentives to keep up the rate of production. It cannot be allowed to go down. Certainly efficiency in management has to be rewarded. We need to increase our food production and what is most important we should evolve a machinery for price control with which non-officials at all levels, from the village right up to the Centre, should be associated.

I am glad that a Committee has been appointed or is proposed to be appointed to assess the results of the policy of total prohibition. Now, Madam, I hope I am not treading on delicate grounds when I say that I am somewhat of a sceptic in regard to the policy of total prohibition. I am not suggesting that considerations of the welfare of the people should be subordinated to those of revenue. That is not my proposition. But I think that it is possible in this, as in so many other spheres of life, to strike a middle path and I am wondering whether the time has not come for us to review our policy of total prohibition.

We have a right to expect a higher standard of conduct from our businessmen, those who run our big business concerns. I regret to have to say that a great many of them do not behave like entrepreneurs but behave just like speculators. We need to develop an attitude of firmness in dealing with corruption in high places and when I say 'high places' I mean high places. That word covers almost all places.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Including the Ministers.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Including the Ministers. Including everybody.

AN HON. MEMBER: Including independents.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): Including even Members of the Opposition.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: Everyone. We must show that we are thoroughly honest in every aspect of our life. Corruption is not the monopoly of the small man. It is often the rich man, the more well-to-do person in our society, who corrupts our people. We treat him as a pillar of society. We are not a property-owning democracy and our problems are different from those of affluent Western societies which can provide, what Lord Beveridge would have called, a welfare society.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal): It is now becoming almost a property-owning democracy.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I said we are not a property-owning democracy and I am not prepared to enter into an ideological dispute regarding the extent to which the existence of property should be recognised in a modern State. I am quite prepared to argue it out with him on a scientific basis if science can be associated with the word 'communism'. Even with our limited resources, I feel we should, in order to enthuse our people, provide for them a welfare society to the

extent that it is possible for us to do so.

A suggestion in this connection which I would make in all seriousness is that independent tribunals drawn from parliamentary life on the lines of the institution known in Sweden, Norway and other countries as 'Ombudsman' should be appointed or established and it should be open to the people to bring complaints of inefficiency, incompetence and injustice to the notice of this 'Ombudsman'. He should have the responsibility cast on him of reporting to Parliament from time to time about the complaints received by them. The experiment is being tried in a democratic country like New Zealand. The experiment has been tried for years in democratic countries like Sweden and it is well worth considering this suggestion with an open mind. It may be said that it would impair Ministerial responsibility. Well, there is a lot that can be said for the other point of view and I think it is time that hard thinking was done on this question of the appointment of 'Ombudsman'. They will be drawn from parliamentary life. They will act as watch-dogs of Parliament. They will report to Parliament about the complaints they receive from the people from time to time and Parliament will be kept informed of day to day developments in the country. I would not give the 'Ombudsman' any executive power at the moment.

Then, we should aim at providing our people with full employment. We should stabilise prices, have a well thought out price policy, a policy which would lead to economic growth and a better deal for the consumer. A policy like this would also improve our foreign exchange position. The highest priority should be given to measures which would prevent unemployment, particularly mass unemployment. In this connection I would urge that our effort should be to treat all regions, regions in the South and in the North, alike. It may be necessary to treat the somewhat

backward regions more liberally in this respect. I would also plead for a policy which would eliminate cess distinctions. We should aim at the widest diffusion of economic power. I have always looked upon the wealth tax as rather a good tax. It is one of the good things that Shri T. T. Krishnamachari did for this country. I have wondered whether in order to provide relief for the lower middle-classes and the poorer sections of our community it is not possible for us to raise the wealth tax to about five per cent. of the total wealth of a person owning Rs. 5 lakhs and over. I would leave out the corporate sector for the time being from this proposal. I would only touch individual holders of property by this tax.

Then, let me just say a word about primary education. I was rather disturbed to find that it was proposed to reduce the expenditure on primary education by about Rs. 50 crores. Now, it was visualised in the Constitution that there would be free and compulsory primary education by the end of the tenth year of the inauguration of our Constitution up to the age of fourteen. We have not been able to accept the target of 14 years as yet. We are only working on a target of 11 years and it would be tragic if the allotment for primary education is reduced any further. To reduce the expenditure on primary education would be to put a premium on inefficiency and class inequality in our country.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY (Mysore): It has since been restored.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: I would like to say a word about privy purses. I raised this question also on the last occasion. I was told by the Finance Minister that the Princes had been made to agree voluntarily to a 10 per cent. cut in their privy purses. I am glad that they have voluntarily agreed to a cut of 10 per cent. in their privy purses, but I think in principle it is not right that any class of persons whatever the privileges they may have enjoyed

[Shri P. N. Sapru.]

at one time of their life, should be exempted from taxation. I think the principle of taxation should be accepted by the Princes voluntarily, and they should be made to contribute at least 10 per cent. of their annual income by way of taxation to the exchequer. Even then they will be much better off than I am or they will be much better off than most people in this country are.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE (Bihar): They will not accept that.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: They did not accept many things when the British were here. They were made to accept many things after the departure of the British. It is for us to make them see the light of reason, and just because they will not accept we should not keep quiet. I think therefore it is right that we should rouse their social conscience and tell them frankly and honestly that their exemption from all taxation is unjust to all sections of the population.

Then let me say one or two words in connection with our foreign policy. There is a tendency for us to be inward-looking today in regard to our foreign policy. I rather regret it. There are many issues of a very vital character which affect the world community, and India has in the fifteen years of its independent existence taken a vital interest in foreign affairs. It has made a useful contribution to the solution of difficult problems. It has made as a country which is pursuing an independent foreign policy a contribution of its own to the solution of the world's problems. The Chinese incursions should not make us forget that we have some duties to the international community and that the independence that we have claimed for our foreign policy has on the whole, by and large, paid good dividends. I am not suggesting that in the execution of our foreign policy we have been right in every matter. I think there are many criticisms that can be justly levelled at the manner

in which occasionally our foreign policy has been executed, but I do maintain that by and large we have pursued a right course in our foreign policy, and it will be a tragedy beyond words if we were to depart from the principles which we have so far followed in regard to our foreign policy. The fact of the matter is that the two blocks are coming closer together. President Kennedy and Mr. Khrushchev are both men of peace, and they have been viewing questions from a new perspective. They may seem to be more apart to us than they really are, but both of them want to see a world of peace, a world in which peace reigns, and it should be our effort to help in that process.

I would just like to conclude by emphasizing the need for economy in our expenditure. You will remember, Madam, that towards the end of World War I, a Committee called the Inchcape Committee was appointed to go into the question of expenditure. I should like some such Committee to be appointed to go into the question of the economies that are possible in our expenditure.

With these words I give my general support to the Appropriation Bill which has been presented before us so ably by our respected Deputy Finance Minister.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Madam, the Appropriation Bill which the House is considering is presenting to the country a very staggering burden, and I hope that in view of the unanimity with which the budget proposals have been generally supported notwithstanding minor differences on matters of detail, Government will realise their responsibility and see to it that every pie which is recovered in the form of taxes is properly spent.

Madam, I should like to refer to some of the Votes on this Bill, particularly Vote No. 50 regarding the Ministry of Home Affairs. A good deal has been said about the need for the relaxation of the present state of

emergency. I would not be one of those who would like to weaken the defence effort of the Government, and I think that the time has come in view of our experience of the proclamation of the emergency for us to think in terms of amending the Constitution increasing the powers of the Union Government in respect of the control of the economic life of this country. This should be a part of our regular constitutional framework. What I should like to see is the incorporation of a large number of provisions of the Defence of India Act in the constitutional powers which the Union Government enjoys at present, particularly those powers relating to the economic life of the community.

I am not very happy at the large number of persons who have been detained in jail, and in view of the general relaxation of conditions on the border I think that the time has come for Government to release all persons unconditionally. At present by-elections are being held in various States, which means that the Election Commission as well as the Government of India have come to accept the position that the conditions are so far improved that the ordinary democratic processes can function. If that is the case, there is no need whatever for the detention of persons in jail on account of the emergency. What I would like to recommend to the Government is that, barring the provisions that they have in respect of the control of the economic life of the community, they should allow normal conditions to return.

Now I should like to refer to Vote No. 9 on the Defence Services. I believe it is generally known to this House and the country that recruitment to the Army has not been satisfactory and that a large number of young persons have not come forward to offer themselves for recruitment. There have been pockets of grievances in many States that persons who could not answer well in English at the interview have been rejected, and I believe that a deputation waited

on the Prime Minister to urge upon him the need for review of cases of rejection in Uttar Pradesh as a large number of candidates were rejected because they could not answer questions at the examinations confidently in English. In view of the fact that the official language of this country in 1965 is going to be Hindi, I think that the time has come for the Army authorities to conduct the oral examination at least in the regional languages of the country, the regional languages recognised by the Constitution, and in English and Hindi so that we try to see how far the candidates who offer themselves for examination come up to the requirements of the Army test. I do hope that as a result of the efforts that Government will make in this connection a large number of persons will come forward to offer themselves for recruitment to the Army. Madam, I should like also to refer in this connection to the feeling that persons who offer themselves for recruitment from among the Government servants are uncertain of their future prospects. I believe that under the present laws that exist, if a number of the civil service of the Government offers himself for recruitment and is discharged from the army, he gets all the benefits in respect of his pension but he has got to return his gratuity and other emoluments which he receives from the army and his seniority in the civil service, when he reverts to the civil service after discharge, is not protected. On that ground, a large number of persons who are civilian employees of the Government are not prepared to offer themselves for recruitment to the army. Persons who are in the civilian employment of the Government, persons who have the necessary administrative experience can be usefully utilised for the running of the Supply Corps and the administrative service of the Defence Ministry. I think that Government should waive the present restrictions in respect of civilian employees offering themselves for recruitment to the army and give the civilian personnel the right to seniority on the basis of

[Shri A. D. Mani.]

their army service when they revert to their civilian employment after their discharge from the army. I hope that the Defence Minister will look into this matter.

I would also like to refer to the general feeling of disquiet that is there in this country about defence expenditure. The Report of the Defence Ministry does not give adequate information about what is going on in the Defence Ministry. My good friend, Diwan Chaman Lall, who was a member of the old Central Legislative Assembly will bear me out when I say that under the British Government we got more information about the army than we have from our own Government. I know that conditions have changed, I know that we have got to protect an independent country from invasion and from aggression but there is no need for this veil of secrecy which surrounds the various departments of the Government. We hardly know what is happening in the Defence Ministry. There is a feeling that we are treating all the three fighting Services on the same footing, namely, the Army, the Navy and the Air Force. In the present context of the emergency, there is no need for us to think in terms of expanding for Navy because we are not going to meet any naval invasion in the near future. As far as I can see, it is only on the land frontier and on the air that the independence of the country has got to be defended. I would suggest that Government might conduct an enquiry into the priority which should be given for expenditure in respect of the three fighting Services, whether the Navy cannot afford to take a back place till the emergency lifts and till the threat of aggression is removed.

Madam, I would like to refer to Vote No. 78 pertaining to the Ministry of Mines and Fuel. Whatever observations I wish to make on this subject—I can assure you and the Members of the House—I hope to make them with a due measure of restraint and caution, bearing in mind

that no words shall fall from my lips which will mar the dignity of this House or lower the standard of the debate. I would like to refer to the very unfortunate transactions in which the Minister of Mines and Fuel was involved, and I am glad that he is present in the House because nothing gives me greater pleasure than to tell him in his presence what I most sincerely feel about this matter. I call it an unfortunate transaction because I am not prepared to subscribe to the charges against his personal character and honesty which might have been made by some persons. It is an irregularity, and I would like to show how the irregularity has arisen. If the House goes through the debate that took place on the Company Law Amendment Bill which authorised companies to make contributions to political parties, it will find that in the debate Government made it clear that this was a general practice in England also for political parties to receive money from companies. The matter was referred to a special committee presided over by Mr. Viswanatha Sastry who said that whatever might be the motive of the Government in asking for an amendment of the Companies Act, there should be a resolution of the Board of Directors which should be placed before the shareholders so that the public at large could know what donation had been given. He said that provided this precaution was taken, there could be no objection to the transaction. What the Minister of Mines and Fuel has done was perhaps done by a large number of the members of the Government and probably by many other persons. But this is the first time that the matter has come to the notice of the public.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Many times.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Yes, many times. We are not concerned with the question of the ethics of the transaction, whether a party can take money for political purposes. But it is quite clear from what has been

said in the other House and elsewhere about this transaction that this money was not given in terms of the recommendation of Mr. Viswanatha Sastry for a resolution of the Board of Directors to be placed before the shareholders. If you refer to Mr. Satish Chandra's speech made in the other House when that Bill was discussed, you will find that he pointedly drew attention to the recommendation of Mr. Vishwanatha Sastry that there should be a resolution of the Board of Directors to be placed before the shareholders. This was not a transaction between a political party and a company, this was a transaction between an individual and an individual. It is unfortunate that the individual concerned should have been a person who has had continuous dealings with the Ministry over which the Minister presides. I am just putting all the facts together. It might be that the money was received only for political purposes. But what this House and the country is intent on seeing is that none of these actions as such—those policies and processes of Government—have received parliamentary sanction. One of those policies which has received parliamentary sanction is the Industrial Policy Resolution. According to the Industrial Policy Resolution, the private sector has got only a limited scope in the economy of the country, and I am told that the person concerned who gave that donation was allowed to have manganese leases, was allowed to have leases in chrome. And in the Orissa High Court when the matter was raised in the form of a legal pleading, the Government took the protection of the Official Secrets Act and said that they refused to place on the record of the High Court the transaction regarding the granting of the lease of chrome. So, my object is to see how far that transaction has affected the Industrial Policy Resolution. I am not concerned with the personal aspects of the transaction at all. I am not questioning the motives or the honesty of any of the persons involved. Whether that transaction

has affected any of the policies approved by Government to which parliamentary sanction is given is a public matter into which an enquiry ought to be made.

In this connection, I should like to refer the House to the Report of the Tribunal appointed to enquire into the allegations reflecting on the official conduct of the Ministers of the Crown and other public servants appointed by Mr. J. Chuter Ede, Home Secretary of the Government of the United Kingdom, in 1948. Mr. Chuter Ede appointed three persons, Sir George Justin Lynskey and two Counsels of His Majesty, to go into charges of a similar nature, Mr. Belcher who was an Under Secretary of State was in charge of housing construction. He dealt with a large number of people. In his case, he did not receive any money, he accepted small gifts and as a result of it, the charge was made against him that he was influenced into giving favours to persons who would not have received ordinarily . . .

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: (Maharashtra): It was for personal use.

SHRI A. D. MANI: It was not for personal use.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He never said that he received money for the Conservative Party.

SHRI A. D. MANI: If it had been received by the Conservative Party . .

SHRI B. D. KHOBARAGADE: Labour Party.

SHRI A. D. MANI: It is not in full conformity with the recommendation made by Mr. Viswanatha Sastry to whom a reference was made by the Government of India in what circumstances this money could be accepted. You must have a resolution of the Board of Directors. Firstly, a resolution . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How much the Minister . . .

SHRI A. D. MANI: I am just . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The West Bengal Chief Minister got Rs. 5 lakhs from Mr. Biren Mookerjee. He said it, Rs. 5 lakhs.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: Has he got a free charter to drag in anybody on the floor of the House, the West Bengal Chief Minister or Shri Biren Mookerjee or anybody else?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I must take it. He supported it.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): On a point of order. The rules of the House prescribe that you cannot malign a person who is not present in the House to defend himself, especially when that person happens to be the Chief Minister of an important State. I think these remarks should be expunged.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You forgot it when it was a Kerala Communist Ministry. Madam, this was in the company's books. This was in the company's books—several lakhs.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Any-way let Mr. Mani proceed.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I would like to mention again that I am only interested in examining all those transactions after the payment of this money in so far as the Industrial Policy Resolution is concerned—I am only concerned with that aspect of the matter, if that Policy Resolution has been modified. It is open for us to draw an adverse inference on the transaction—I am keeping an open mind on the subject.

Madam, there are reports published by the Home Ministry, by the Vigilance Division, of *chaprasis* being sacked, of lower division clerks being demoted and punished, coats taken off their backs. If you are going to maintain this public sector, if you are going to maintain the high incorruptibility of administration, all our actions must be open to scrutiny—I am keeping an open mind, as I say.

When the Mundhra deal came to light, one of the Ministers was subjected to a public enquiry, and I happened to attend the enquiry conducted by Mr. Justice Chagla in Bombay, when Mr. M. C. Setalvad was representing the Government. I saw the Governor of the Reserve Bank taking his seat among the witnesses and watching the proceedings. The result was, the publicity of the Mundhra enquiry was so much that the Life Insurance Corporation has been put on guard—everybody knows—lest there should be another Mundhra enquiry. This is the way in which we protect democracy.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Let us appoint a Parliamentary Committee to enquire into the conduct of all Ministers.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I would like to quote here what Mr. Stanley Baldwin—he is not a socialist, but he is a Conservative Party Member . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: A die-hard.

SHRI A. D. MANI: . . . said on the 11th June, 1936, in the House of Commons when the Jimmy Thomas case came up for consideration. I would commend it to this Government and to the Minister also:

"We owe that duty not only to this House but to democratic government and to the servants of the State. There are many attacks made on democratic government to-day, and any action of the nature of utilisation of a public position for private gain cuts at the root of democratic government. The corruption which accompanies dictatorships is generally hidden; the corruption which enters into a democracy is brought to light and must be dealt with drastically, and if there is any suggestion at all, it is that, as a democratic assembly, we are bound to take action. Consequently, we cannot treat an offence, or a mere mistake, in high quarters less severely than we should do if

it occurred among those whose responsibilities are far less. We are proud of the probity of our public servants, and exact rightly a very high standard. We cannot accept a lower one for the Members of this House or the Members who hold positions in Government."

Madam, I would like to address these observations of Mr. Stanley Baldwin to the Government, and I would suggest that this matter should be enquired into by a public tribunal of the kind which was set up in the Mundhra case. If this is not done, the feeling will get abroad that there is discriminatory treatment between one Ministry and another. Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari is a recent Congressman, not a senior Congressman; he does not belong to the iron cadre of the party, but let not those impressions proceed abroad that there is some kind of discriminatory treatment between one Minister and another. Now that the matter has come up . . .

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh): He is as good a Congressman as any other.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I am very glad to hear it from Mr. Arjun Arora who has been an old Congressman. I hope he is not a recent Congressman, more recent than another, and that he is very much respected in the Congress Party.

(Interruptions)

Madam, Government will have a very weak case in talking to Government servants about honesty and about being above corruption if they do not conduct an enquiry into the cases and amend the Constitution to deal with them. Where a person in high authority has committed a mistake, it would certainly be a mistake, an irregularity. I only want to see how far it has affected the public policies of the Government.

I am very happy, Madam, that the Minister for Mines and Fuel is here. I hold him in great respect, particu-

larly for the very daring policies he has initiated, and I do hope that as a result of the enquiry it will come to light that this has been a purely political transaction and that it had nothing to do with administrative favours. But I would make one further observation. The time has come for us to amend the company law, making it obligatory for publication in the Gazette of India and in the Gazettes of the States of all donations made to individuals and political parties for political purposes so that if a man fights an election . . . (Interruptions) I must get the information; it should be published in the Gazette, and this was the essence of the recommendation made by Mr. Justice Chagla when the Tata Iron & Steel case came up, when he said that this matter must be put before the public in a very square fashion. Now the time has come for us to amend the company law.

Madam, I have got many other things to say, but I conclude for want of time and I thank you very much.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I think, since the Minister is here, he should speak on the subject—the Minister for Mines and Fuel. I hope he will speak.

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी: He can intervene.

उपसभापति महोदया, मेरे मित्र श्री मणि ने जहाँ से समाप्त किया है मैं वहीं से आरम्भ करता हूँ। देश में सिराजउद्दीन कांड की बड़ी चर्चा हो रही है। इसके साथ केन्द्र के मंत्रियों के भी नाम जुड़ गए हैं, उन मंत्रियों ने वक्तव्य दिए हैं। एक ने कांग्रेस पालियामेन्टरी पार्टी में और दूसरे मंत्री महोदय ने दूसरे सदन में। उन वक्तव्यों से उन्होंने इस आरोप का खंडन करने का प्रयास किया है कि सिराजउद्दीन एंड कंपनी से रुपया प्राप्त करके उन्होंने उसे कोई अनुचित सुविधाएं पहुंचाई। उनका यह वक्तव्य जहाँ तक जाता है वहाँ तक ठीक है। लेकिन इससे जनता के मन में जो सन्देह

[श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी]

और भ्रम पैदा हुए हैं उनका पूरी तरह से निराकरण नहीं होता। प्रश्न केवल औद्योगिक नीति के बदलने का या उसे विकृत रूप से लागू करने का नहीं है। प्रश्न यह है कि हम अपने राजनैतिक और सार्वजनिक जीवन में आचरण का कौन सा स्तर निर्धारित करना चाहते हैं। जो सत्ता के सिंहासन पर बैठे हुए हैं उन्हें न केवल सदेह से परे होना चाहिये बल्कि सन्देह से परे दिखायी भी देना चाहिये। यह भगवान राम की भूमि है जहाँ एक व्यक्ति के लांछन लगाने पर सीता जी का परित्याग कर दिया गया।

श्री शील भद्र याजी : वह सीता जी के प्रति अन्याय था।

कुमारी शर्मा वशिष्ठ (दिल्ली) : क्या वह ठीक किया।

श्री शील भद्र याजी : बहिन जी कह रही हैं एक गलत काम किया रामचन्द्र जी ने।

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : लेकिन जिन्हें शासन संभालना है उन्हें स्वयं को, परिजनों को, परिवार के जनों को दुख देकर भी आचरण की मर्यादाएं निर्धारित करनी होंगी।

“स्नेहं क्यांच सौख्यं च यदिवा जानकीमपि आराधनाय लोकानाम् मुजाचतो नास्ति मे व्यथा।”

4 P.M.

प्रजा की आराधना के लिए आवश्यक हुआ तो सीता का भी परित्याग कर देंगे, यह लोक रंजन राम का आदर्श था। आज पत्नी छोड़ने के लिए कोई नहीं कहता लेकिन काठ की कुर्सी से तो इतना मोह नहीं होना चाहिये। मेरा निवेदन है कि यह भ्रम, सन्देह तब तक दूर नहीं होंगे जब तक सारे काण्ड की खुली निष्पक्ष और आबालती जांच नहीं की जाती। इस संबंध में

श्री मणि ने जो मांग की है मैं उसका समर्थन करता हूं। क्या यह एक आकस्मिक घटना थी कि माननीय खान मंत्री ने खान के एक मालिक से ही रुपया लेने के लिए आदमी भेजा? हो सकता है यह आकस्मिक घटना हो या उसके पीछे कुछ और भी बातें हों। लेकिन तथ्य क्या है, तथ्य क्या नहीं है, सत्य क्या है, सत्य क्या नहीं है, इसका निर्णय तब तक नहीं हो सकता जब तक निष्पक्ष जांच की कसौटी पर सारे प्रकरण को कसा नहीं जाता। माननीय मालवीय जी के वक्तव्य को मैं एक बार मान भी लूं लेकिन श्री कृष्णमाचारी के वक्तव्य को मानने से पहले मुझे दो बार सोचना पड़ता है। पुराना इतिहास साक्षी है कि मुंदड़ा काण्ड में उन्होंने ऐसे वक्तव्य दिये निष्पक्ष अदालत के सामने, जिनमें बम्बई हाई कोर्ट के उच्च न्यायाधीश और मध्य प्रदेश के उच्च न्यायाधीश अध्यक्षता करते थे और उन्हें कहना पड़ा कि उनके बयानों पर, वक्तव्यों पर भरोसा नहीं किया जा सकता है। इस सदन में इलाहाबाद हाईकोर्ट के भूतपूर्व जज उपस्थित हैं। मेरा संकेत श्री सप्रू से है, उन्होंने उस समय क्या कहा था, मैं उसकी ओर सदन का और आपका ध्यान खींचना चाहता हूं। मैं उनके शब्दों को उद्धृत कर रहा हूं।

“The evidence of Mr. Krishnamachari makes very painful reading... I venture to assert with some confidence that if his evidence is placed before a body of hundred judges taken from all parts of the world, the painful conclusion they will come to is that the man is not frank, that the man is one upon whose word no reliance can be placed.”

प्रधान मंत्री जी इन आरोपों को “विरोधी दल द्वारा लगाये जा रहे हैं”, यह कह कर जनता का समाधान नहीं कर सकते हैं। यह शासन का और

विरोधी दल का प्रश्न नहीं है। यदि देश में लोकतन्त्र को जीवित रखना है तो हमें व्यक्तिगत जीवन में और सार्वजनिक जीवन में भी आचरण के कुछ मानदण्ड निर्धारित करने होंगे। स्वतन्त्रता के पन्द्रह वर्षों में हमारा सार्वजनिक आचरण गिरता जा रहा है, इससे कोई इन्कार नहीं कर सकता। एक मौका आया है दृढ़ता के साथ कदम उठाने का। शासन के, प्रधान मंत्री के, जिन मंत्रियों के नाम लिये जाते हैं उनकी प्रतिष्ठा दांव पर लगी है और उनके हित में भी यही है कि निष्पक्ष जांच की जाये और हम कामना करते हैं कि उस परीक्षा में से वे निष्कलंक प्रमाणित होकर निकलें। लेकिन अगर लांछन है तो वह सत्तारूढ़ दल का घरेलू मामला नहीं है और उसे विरोधी दल द्वारा लगाया बता कर उसके उत्पन्न होने वाले भ्रम को दूर नहीं किया जा सकता है। उससे तो सन्देह और मजबूत होता है कुछ बात छिपाई जा रही है, तथ्यों को प्रकाश में आने से रोका जा रहा है, यह धारणा बढ्दमूल मालूम होती है। यह शासन के लिए ठीक नहीं है, हमारे सार्वजनिक जीवन के लिए भी ठीक नहीं है। मुझे विश्वास है कि मान्दवीय मालवीय जी और श्री कृष्णमाचारी जी स्वयं इस प्रकार की जांच का समर्थन करेंगे, स्वागत करेंगे, मांग करेंगे जिससे स्वतन्त्र और निष्पक्ष ट्रिब्यूनल के सामने उपस्थित होकर वे अपनी स्थिति को स्पष्ट कर सकें। लेकिन यदि प्रधान मंत्री जी ऐसा नहीं करते तो मुझे कहना चाहिये कि उनके ऊपर भ्रष्टाचार को छिपाने, दबाने, का आरोप लगाया जायेगा। ऐसी आवश्यकता न पड़े इसलिये समय रहते इस संबंध में पग उठाना चाहिए।

दूसरी बात जिस की ओर आपका ध्यान खींचना चाहता हूं वह यह है कि सुरक्षा के लिये हम धन दे रहे हैं। हम विश्वास करते हैं कि उस धन का ठीक तरह से विनियोग किया जायेगा और देश की रक्षा सामर्थ्य बढाई

जायेगी। लेकिन इस के साथ ही साथ चीन के आक्रमण के प्रति हमारी नीति क्या होनी चाहिये, इस संबंध में कुछ दिनों से परस्पर विरोधी बातें कही जा रही हैं। कभी कहा जाता है कि चीन आक्रमण करेगा, कभी कहा जाता है कि चीन आक्रमण नहीं करेगा सुरक्षा मंत्री लोक सभा में खड़े हो कर कहते हैं कि चीन युद्ध पिपासु है, युद्ध में विश्वास करता है, कभी भी आक्रमण कर सकता है। और उड़ीसा के मुख्य मंत्री जी उसी दिन नई दिल्ली के विश्वविद्यालय में क्या कह रहे हैं? चीन आक्रमण नहीं करेगा। मैं नहीं जानता कि उन्हें कोई इलहाम हुआ है या अमरीका यात्रा में उन्हें कोई संकेत मिला है।

श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा : अमरीका से बहुत से संकेत मिलते रहते हैं।

श्री ए० प्री० बाजपेयी : आप भी उन संकेतों को समझने लगे हैं, यह बड़ी खुशी की बात है। लेकिन क्या यह आवश्यक है कि राष्ट्र के जीवन मरण के प्रश्न पर हम संदिग्ध बातें बोलें? चीन आक्रमण करेगा या नहीं करेगा, यह प्रश्न नहीं है। आक्रमण तो हुआ है, आक्रमण तो कायम है। वह आक्रमण कैसे हटाया जाय, यह प्रश्न है। मगर हमारी सारी शक्ति उस विवाद पर खर्च हो रही है कि चीन हमला करेगा या नहीं करेगा। हमला तो है लेकिन मुझे यह देख कर खेद हुआ है कि इस हमले का दृढ़ता पूर्वक सामना करने का संकल्प जगये और बनाये रखने के बजाय अब पंच फैसले की बात कही जा रही है, आबिटेशन की चर्चा हो रही है और यह अभी तक स्पष्ट नहीं किया गया है कि क्या आबिटेशन चीन का आक्रमण चलते हुए होगा। मैं आप के सामने प्रधान मंत्री जी के १२ सितम्बर, सन्, १९५६ के वक्तव्य के एक अंश को रखना चाहता हूं जो उन्होंने संसद् में दिया था :

[श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी]

"There can be no mediation, conciliation or arbitration about these demands of the Chinese about large chunks of territory. It is quite fantastic and absurd basing their demand on what happened in past centuries."

सन् १९५६ में पंच फ़ैसले की बात ठुकराई गई और १९६३ में उसे माना जा रहा है ? क्या अब चीनी आक्रमण आक्रमण नहीं है, क्या भारत की भूमि पर उनका बड़ा कब्जा नहीं है ? क्या अपने कल्पित दावों को मनवाने के लिए उन्होंने शस्त्रों का प्रयोग नहीं किया है ? प्रधान मंत्री जी ने दुनिया भर के राष्ट्रों के प्रधानों के नाम जो पत्र भेजा था उस में उन्होंने लिखा था कि यह सीमा का विवाद नहीं है, यह आक्रमण है, लेकिन जब आल इंडिया कांग्रेस कमेटी में बैठते हैं, या संसद् में बैठते हैं तो चीनी आक्रमण सीमा विवाद बन जाता है । प्रधान मंत्री जी ने राष्ट्रों के मुखों से जो कुछ कहा है उसे याद रखना चाहिये :

"This is not a mere boundary dispute or a question of small territorial frontier adjustments but of standards of international behaviour and whether the world will allow the principle of 'Might is right' to prevail in international relations."

अभी तो चीनी हमला कायम है और विवादों को जिन में मध्यस्थता और पंचफ़ैसला भी कायम है, शान्तिपूर्वक तरीके से हल करना हम मान सकते हैं लेकिन विवाद विवाद रहना चाहिये । शस्त्रों के प्रयोग से उस विवाद को अगर आक्रमण में बदलने की कोशिश की जायेगी तो फिर मध्यस्थता के लिए और पंचफ़ैसले के लिए गुंजायश नहीं है । आक्रमण का सामना करने का एक ही तरीका है कि आक्रमण का प्रतिरोध किया जाय । अगर चीन हमारी छाती पर बैठा है और हम अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय अदालत का दरवाजा खट-

खटायें, चीन भारत के विशाल भू भाग पर जमा रहे और हम पंचफ़ैसले की बात करें, यह जनता के मनोबल को या चीनी आक्रमण के प्रतिकार के लिए जनता को सन्नद्ध करने का तरीका नहीं है । पहली बात तो चीन से यह कही जानी चाहिये कि वह अपनी सेनायें हटा ले । फिर अगर भारत की भूमि पर, हमारी सीमा पर उन के कोई दावे हैं और उन दावों के समर्थन में उन के पास कोई संधियां हैं, कोई दस्तावेज हैं, कोई कागज हैं, तो उन्हें पेश करें । फिर हम अदालत में जा सकते हैं, हम पंचफ़ैसला मान सकते हैं । लेकिन जब तक आक्रमण कायम है और केवल नेफा में ही नहीं, लद्दाख में भी, तब तक आर्बिट्रेशन की बात कैसे हो सकती है । आर्बिट्रेशन और एग्रेसन साथ साथ नहीं चल सकते । जब इसी संदर्भ में काश्मीर के सवाल पर प्रधान मंत्री जी से मध्यस्थता की बात, आर्बिट्रेशन की बात कही गई, तो उन्होंने उस को नहीं माना । उन्होंने कहा कि भारत की सार्वभौम सत्ता है, पंचफ़ैसले का प्रश्न ही नहीं है, हम अपनी भूमि की रक्षा करेंगे और सीमाओं को अक्षुण्ण रखेंगे । लेकिन जो बात पाकिस्तान के बारे में नहीं मानी जा सकती, वह आज चीन के बारे में कैसे मानी जा सकती है । संसद् में अचानक प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कह दिया, कैंज्युली यह कह दिया कि हम अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय अदालत में जायेंगे, जैसे अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय अदालत का फ़ैसला चीन मान लेगा । अभी तक अलबानिया ने वर्ल्ड कोर्ट का एक फ़ैसला नहीं माना जो ब्रिटेन के साथ एक डैम के सम्बन्ध में था, तो चीन वर्ल्ड कोर्ट के फ़ैसले को मानेगा, इसकी क्या गारंटी है, मध्यस्थ जो फ़ैसला करेंगे, पंच जो फ़ैसला करेंगे, उसे चीन सरकार स्वीकार करेगी, इसकी क्या गारंटी है ? लेकिन हम यह कह कर अपने पक्ष को दुर्बल कर रहे हैं, हम चीन के इस प्रचार को बल दे रहे हैं कि यह आक्रमण नहीं है, सीमा का झगड़ा है ।

और कहा जाता है कि हम रक्षा के लिये तैयार हो रहे हैं। मेरा निवेदन है कि हमारे देश में ऐसा नहीं हो सकता कि नेता शांति की बात करे और जनता लड़ाई की तैयारी करे। यह चीन में हो सकता है। वह मुंह में राम बगल में छूरी रख सकता है। हम ऐसा नहीं कर सकते। इस देश की संस्कृति में यह गुण नहीं है। हमें शिक्षा दी गई है, हमारे ऐसे संस्कार हैं कि मन में, वचन में और कर्म में एकरूपता होनी चाहिये। चीन के नेता शांति का ढोंग रच सकते हैं और अपनी भूमि को बढ़ाने की तैयारी कर सकते हैं, मगर हमारे देश में ऐसा नहीं हो सकता। प्रधान मंत्री जी और वित्त मंत्री जी शांति की मध्यस्थता की और पंचकैसले की बात कहें और फिर जनता से कह कि तुम लड़ाई की तैयारी करो, ऐसा नहीं हो सकता। इस देश की प्रकृति को हमें समझना चाहिये। मैं ऐसा नहीं कहता कि नेता लड़ाई का ऐतान करते फिरे, मगर हमें ऐसे प्रसंगों को अपने भाषण देते समय टालना चाहिये कि चीन हमला नहीं करेगा, चीन के लिये हमला करना फायदे में नहीं है। इस समय आर्बिट्रेशन की बात क्यों कही गई, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा था कि वे संसद् की राय लेंगे, वे संसद् से पूछेंगे, मगर न संसद् को मौका दिया गया इस बात पर वाद-विवाद का और न संसद् की राय ली गयी, बल्कि अपने भाषण में उन्होंने यह कह दिया जो विदेश के नेताओं को चिट्ठियां लिखी गई हैं, उनमें भी आर्बिट्रेशन की बात कही जा रही है। यह तो देश के मामले को कमजोर करना है। इस तरह की बात बन्द होनी चाहिये, ऐसा मेरा निवेदन है।

मैं एक प्रश्न की चर्चा और करूंगा। जो भी टैक्स लगाये गये हैं, उन पर विस्तृत चर्चा वित्त विधेयक के अवसर पर होगी। लेकिन आम जनता में यह धारणा घर कर रही है कि टैक्सों का बोझ बराबर नहीं

बांटा गया है। स्वतंत्रता की रक्षा के लिये सबको त्याग करना चाहिये, बलिदान करना चाहिये, यह बात ठीक है, लेकिन देश में जो विषमता है, उसको देखते हुए त्याग और बलिदान का भार भी इस तरह से वितरित किया जाना चाहिये कि जो अधिक उठा सकते हों, वे अधिक उठाएँ और जिनके देने की क्षमता कम है, उनके ऊपर अधिक भार न डाला जाये। मुझे खेद है कि वित्त मंत्री महोदय ने कम्पलसरी डिपॉजिट स्कीम पर नये सिरे से विचार करने से इनकार कर दिया है। किसानों को पांच रुपये तक की छूट देने का कोई अर्थ नहीं है, अपर्याप्त है। छः रुपया लगान दो, ५० फीसदी अनिवार्य बचत के रूप में जमा करो, जब कि राज्यों में लगान पहले से ही बढ़े हुये हैं। समान दरें नहीं हैं। फिर उसको वसूल करने में कितना खर्च होगा, इसका भी शायद ठीक तरह से अनुमान नहीं लगाया गया है।

मिट्टी के तेल में कुछ सुविधा दी गई है, लेकिन उसके बाद भी घटिया किस्म के मिट्टी के तेल की एक बोतल खरीदने के लिये छः नये पैसे हर आदमी को ज्यादा देने पड़ेंगे। यह कम बोझा नहीं है। जीवन की अन्य आवश्यक वस्तुओं पर जो टैक्स लगाये गये हैं, वे भी घटाये नहीं गये हैं। जनसाधारण के परिवार के बजट बढ़े हैं, सरकार मूल्यों को बढ़ने से रोक नहीं पा रही है और इसका नतीजा यह हो रहा है कि लोगों में असन्तोष घर कर रहा है। साथ ही इस बात का भी ध्यान रखना होगा कि चीनी आक्रमण के समय जो एक देशभक्ति का उभार आया था, वह दब गया है। हम उसे बनाये नहीं रख सके। इस समय जब हम आम आदमी पर अधिक कर भार डालते हैं तो फिर युद्ध के प्रयत्नों के लिये, जैसा वातावरण उत्पन्न होना चाहिये, वह नहीं होता।

मेरे मित्र ने संकटकालीन स्थिति की चर्चा की है और उसमें नजरबन्दों का

[श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी]

हवाला दिया है। कुछ लोग जेल में बन्द हैं। मैं उन्हें जेल में रखने के लिये बहुत उत्सुक नहीं हूँ। लेकिन इस संकटकाल में केवल कम्युनिस्ट ही नहीं पकड़े गये, और भी कुछ लोग पकड़े गये हैं। जहाँ जो हाथ में आ गया वह पकड़ लिया गया। मेरे दल के भी एक व्यक्ति आसाम में और एक राजस्थान में पकड़े गये हैं।

श्री अर्जुन अस्रोड़ा : यह बड़ा गजब हुआ।

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : अभी जालंधर के एक दैनिक पत्र के सम्पादक और प्रकाशक पकड़े गये हैं। समाचारपत्रों की स्वाधीनता सीमित करने के प्रयत्न हुये हैं। कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी में भी कुछ ऐसे मामले हो सकते हैं कि जिनमें गलत रूप में लोग पकड़ लिये गये हों। लेकिन विरोधी दल में होते हुये भी मैं यह कहने के लिये तैयार हूँ कि शासन ने जो असाधारण अधिकार प्राप्त किये हैं, कुल मिला कर उनका ठीक तरह से उपयोग हुआ है। कुछ लैप्सेज हैं, कुछ गलतियाँ हैं, कुछ कमियाँ हैं, कुछ खामियाँ हैं, कहीं अधिकारी अपनी हद से बढ़ गये हैं, कहीं प्रांतीय शासन उन अधिकारों का समुचित उपयोग नहीं कर सका है, लेकिन कुल मिला कर शासन ने संयम से काम लिया है, यह जहाँ आश्चर्यजनक भी है, वहाँ आनन्ददायक भी है। अधिकारों का दुरुयोग करने की शासन में प्रवृत्ति होती है।

श्री अर्जुन अस्रोड़ा : इस शासन में नहीं है।

श्री ए० बी० वाजपेयी : जब मैं कहता हूँ कि थोड़ी जगह ऐसा हुआ है, तो आप प्रवृत्ति से इनकार नहीं कर सकते। संभव है कि यहाँ विरोधी दल आलोचना करते रहते हैं, इस कारण वह प्रवृत्ति दब जाती हो, पार्टी के कुछ लोग अपनी पार्टी में आलोचना करते हैं, उसका भी असर होता है।

एक बात मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि कुल मिला कर इस संकटकाल में केंद्रीय शासन का जो रूप जनता के सामने उभरा है, वह कोई बड़ा अच्छा नहीं है। मंत्रियों का चयन करना प्रधान मंत्री का काम है, उसमें किसी के दखल देने का सवाल नहीं है, लेकिन मंत्रिमंडल संयुक्त उत्तरदायित्व के सिद्धांत से तो चलना ही चाहिये। नियोजन मंत्री कहते हैं कि मंत्री भी एक दूसरे के विरुद्ध काम करते हैं—अगर विरुद्ध काम करते हैं, तो उन्हें ठीक किया जाना चाहिये। वे एक दूसरे के विरुद्ध काम करें, एक दूसरे के विभाग पर आरोप लगायें, समन्वय कहीं दिखाई न दे—केन्द्रीय मंत्रिमंडल में, केन्द्र में, प्रान्तों में—तो फिर शासन में जनता की निष्ठा को धक्का लगता है और यह शासन कांग्रेस पार्टी का है इसलिये उसके प्रति जनता की निष्ठा को धक्का लगाया जाये ऐसा मैं कहने के लिये तैयार नहीं हूँ, मानने के लिये भी तैयार नहीं हूँ। शासन किसी का भी हो उसमें लोगों की निष्ठा होनी चाहिये, शासन की निष्पक्षता में, संयुक्त उत्तरदायित्व के आधार पर मंत्री लोग मिल कर काम कर रहे हैं, उस सिद्धांत में, निष्ठा होनी चाहिये। मगर जो तस्वीर आई है—जैसा मैंने निवेदन किया है—उसमें ऐसे काले घब्बे हैं जो पता नहीं विदेशों में क्या असर डालते हैं, मगर अपने देश में अच्छी प्रतिक्रिया पैदा नहीं करते हैं। यदि प्रधान मंत्री जी को अपने कुछ मंत्रियों पर विश्वास नहीं है, तो उनको बदल दें, अगर राज्यों के किन्हीं मुख्य मंत्रियों का यहाँ नई दिल्ली आना आवश्यक है, तो उन्हें सीधे दरवाजे से ले आयें, विदेश मंत्रालय की छोटी खिड़की से लाने की जरूरत नहीं है। अगर सुरक्षा के बारे में बात होनी है, तो सुरक्षा मंत्री के द्वारा होनी चाहिये, राज्य के किसी मुख्य मंत्री के द्वारा नहीं। यह फेडरल कांस्टीट्यूशन है, डिफेंस केन्द्र का विषय है—पता नहीं दुनिया वाले क्या कहते होंगे कि राज्य का एक मंत्री केन्द्र के विषय के बारे में विदेशों में जा कर बात करे। यह जो नये सुरक्षा मंत्री

नियुक्त किये गये हैं, इनके बारे में भी पूरे विश्वास का परिचायक नहीं है। अगर उन्हें बम्बई से लाया गया है, तो उन्हें पूरी छूट दी जानी चाहिये, मगर सड़कों के विकास के लिये जो बोर्ड बना है, उसके पुराने सुरक्षा मंत्री वाइसचेयरमैन थे मगर नये सुरक्षा मंत्री उसके वाइसचेयरमैन नहीं हैं। पहले उसमें सभी अधिकारी थे, अब पुराने सुरक्षा मंत्री भी उसमें विद्यमान हैं। ये चीजें ऐसी नहीं हैं, जो लोगों के मनोबल को बढ़ाती हैं।

आज हम एक संकट के काल में से निकल रहे हैं, यह संकट किसी पार्टी पर नहीं है, व्यक्ति पर नहीं है, सारे देश पर है। राजनीतिक, आर्थिक प्रश्नों पर मतभेद होते हुए भी यदि इस संकटकाल में से हम राष्ट्र की नौका को ठाक तरह सीढ़े कर नहीं ले गये, तो कोई दल तो रहेगा ही नहीं, देश का अस्तित्व भी खतरे में पड़ जायेगा। इसलिये आलोचनाओं को यह कह कर ठुकराने की कोशिश न की जाये कि यह प्रतिक्रियावादियों की तरफ से आती है। कौन प्रतिक्रियावादी है? कौन प्रगतिशील है? प्रतिक्रिया की व्याख्या क्या है? प्रगति की व्याख्या क्या है? क्या आर्थिक, राजनीतिक या सामाजिक प्रश्नों पर मतभेद होना कोई पाप है? क्या यह देश को बांटने वाली बात है? लोकतंत्र में मतभेद होता है, मुंडे मुंडे मतभिन्नः, लोकतंत्र तो मतभेद के आधार पर ही फलता है, फूलता है। लेकिन संकट के काल में इन मतभेदों से ऊपर राष्ट्र आता है और जब विदेशी आक्रमण का सवाल है, तो यह प्रतिक्रियावाद और प्रगतिशीलता का भेद खड़ा कर के अगर हम राष्ट्रिय एकता को तोड़ने का प्रयत्न करते हैं, तो केवल उन लोगों का खेल खेलते हैं जो कि राष्ट्र की सुरक्षा की घोषणायें तो करते हैं, मगर राष्ट्र को मजबूत देखना नहीं चाहते।

शोर मचाया जा रहा है कि हम अमेरिका से हथियार ले रहे हैं तो हम अमरीकी गुट में चले गये और रूस वाले हमसे नाराज हैं। यह रूस के अखबारों से हमको पता नहीं लगता, यह बम्बई से प्रकाशित एक साप्ताहिक मोटे अक्षर में छापा है—पता नहीं वह किस के हित का संवर्द्धन करता है? हम तो हथियार लेकर किसी गुट में गये नहीं, लेकिन जब भारत का एक साप्ताहिक पत्र, जिसे ऊंचे स्तरों से संरक्षण प्राप्त है, यह कहता है कि हम गुट में जा रहे हैं, हम गुट में जा रहे हैं, तो इससे तो देश की स्थिति अच्छी नहीं होती है।

श्री अजुन अरोड़ा : क्या आपका मतलब करेंट अखबार से है?

श्री ए० बी० बाजपेयी : जी नहीं, मेरा मतलब ब्लिट्ज अखबार से है।

श्री ए० डी० मणि : ब्लिट्ज आपका पेपर है।

श्री ब्रजकिशोर प्रसाद सिंह : आप जानते हैं कि एक कोयल से बसन्त नहीं आता।

श्री ए० बी० बाजपेयी : मगर एक कोयल के साथ कुछ कौवे भी हैं।

मेरा निवेदन है कि इस प्रकार के प्रचार बन्द होने चाहियें। राष्ट्र की रक्षा के प्रश्न पर मतभेद नहीं है, उससे उत्पन्न एकता का लाभ उठा कर चीनी आक्रमण को दूर हटाने के लिये और सुरक्षा के साथ विकास को जोड़ने के लिये दृढ़ता के साथ एक योजनाबद्ध प्रयत्न होता चाहिये। धन्यवाद।

SHRI P. C. MITRA (Bihar): Madam Deputy Chairman, it is gratifying to note that practically there has been no criticism, whether in this House or outside, against the proposed estimated expenditure.

†[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY) in the Chair]

[Shri P. C. Mitra.]

Of course, there is certain criticism about the imposition of certain taxes and the enhancement of the rates of taxation. But it is a matter of gratification that everyone feels the justifiability of the estimated expenditure and it is also a matter of common-sense, because there is practically no alternative proposal to augment the resources, it can be taken for granted that the proposals put forward by the Finance Minister are sound and wise.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, it has been justly stated that this Budget or these proposals in the Budget are defence oriented. It has been proposed to provide Rs. 867 crores for Defence as against the estimate of Rs. 505 crores and the original estimate of Rs. 376 crores, in the current year. The whole country is one on this one issue, namely that no effort should be spared to make all defence preparations to meet the Chinese menace. Peking may attack us again or may not attack us. But we should not forget that the Chinese are still in occupation of thousands of square miles of our territory. The whole country to a man is ready to bear all burdens in order to face this menace. I would only appeal to the Finance Minister to bring home to the Defence Ministry the need to use all these huge sums of money that are being allotted, judiciously, with a view to equipping our army, and air force with a swift and deterrent striking power. It is a common saying that attack is the greatest defence. In the present atomic age to make preparations for defence is practically an impossible task and therefore, the only preparation that we can make is to make an effective preparation of attack. I must admit, Sir, that it gives me pain to hear from leading statesmen or defence personnel of friendly countries open declarations to the effect that our defence preparations were neglected for many, many years, that the Indian army is so ill-equipped that they are not a match even for Pakistan and so on. I would like to

draw to your attention to this matter and then to ponder over the situation as it stands now. Simple arithmetic will show that proper planning and imagination were wanting in our defence production. During the Chinese invasion, the value of U.S.A. emergency aid in arms and equipment, according to the American estimate, came to Rs. 50 crores only. Armaments and long-term aid were valued at Rs. 500 crores. It was one billion dollars, which comes to about Rs. 500 crores. Now, during the last 15 years on an aggregate, we have spent not less than Rs. 4,000 crores on Defence. Was it not possible to spare Rs. 500 crores to equip the Army? We say that the quantum of the long term aid we require would be of the value of about one billion dollars or Rs. 500 crores only. Thus it can be said that proper planning and imagination was wanting and the country now expects that no pains should be spread to improve the quality and the quantum of the equipment.

There are many age-old rules and regulations in the Army that require change and rationalisation. We cannot fight a war without a fully satisfied set of Defence personnel. I give a few instances which may cause legitimate grievance in the lower ranks of the Army. The new Defence Minister is trying to change certain rules and has already changed certain. According to the old rules even the junior Division clerks in the Army, they are called the Havildar Clerks, they are not army men, have to retire after twentyone years' of service with the option given to Government to extend the service by seven years more. Thus, people who enter service at the age of twentyone may be made to retire at the age of fortytwo, with a paltry pension of Rs. 45 only whereas a Jamadar or a JCO could serve up to fifty-five years of age which has now been extended to fifty-seven years of age. There is another provision which says that no Havildar Clerk can be promoted after he attains

the age of forty-four years to the post of Jamadar or JCO even after receiving training and passing the test. I know of cases where training was given after this age with a written undertaking that the persons qualifying would be promoted as JCO but when the whole thing was over, after the training and even passing of the test, they were told that as they had crossed the age limit, they would not be promoted. Why then were they sent for training after they had reached the age of forty-four? I know that the Defence Ministry has now extended this age and made it forty-six. But it requires further relaxation. Even if they want to be relieved, they are not relieved but are made to work for seven years more under their juniors. They are trained, in good health and efficient and yet they are not promoted but are compelled to work under their juniors. There are many other rules like this. I do not want to dilate on them and I wish the Defence Ministry would go through these things and change them according to the necessities of the times, equity and justice.

Now I would like to draw attention to the speech of the Finance Minister while moving the Budget, Part A, page 15.

"By far the largest expenditure in the country is incurred by Governments at the Centre and the States. There cannot be any question that economy and efficiency in public expenditure are the very heart of the matter in mobilizing resources. We have taken a number of steps at the Centre to effect economies in several directions. But essentially, the task of achieving the utmost economy in public expenditure is not merely a question of cutting or reducing some items of expenditure or of laying down this or that rule of procedure. What we need is more performance with less expenditure of resources in every sphere of public activity; and what such economy through efficiency requires is an attitude of mind—a spirit of vigilance and responsibility

—on the part of all those who are entrusted with the expenditure of the people's money . . ."

There cannot be two opinions about this and everybody should endorse this view. He also said that we must cultivate voluntary restraint on expenditure but the question is whether this is being followed in every Department of the Government, this direction given by the Finance Minister. I come from Ranchi where the new Heavy Machinery Building Plant is being set up. The outer walls of the officers' houses are being polished with snow-white cement. Everybody knows that this is very costly and this can be avoided. This expenditure can be avoided but nobody cares to economise expenditure. The only economy they resort to is, as I mentioned the other day, to stop the house rent allowance of Rs. 7.50 given to the low grade employees. I would like Government to bring this factor to the notice of all concerned Departments so that they follow strictly the instructions given by the Finance Ministry in this regard.

I would like to mention one factor about the maintenance of the price line. Repeatedly it has been said that Government is determined to maintain the price line and after the Chinese invasion we congratulated the traders many a time for maintaining the price line but now we find prices rising gradually and no effective steps taken to check them. Take, for instance, sugar. Yesterday, the hon. Minister said that the price should come to Rs. 1.17 per kilo but still in Delhi it is being sold at Rs. 1.25 per kilo. A few days ago, about a month ago, it was available at Rs. 1.15 per kilo. That being so, how does the Minister say that the fair price should be Rs. 1.7 per kilo? Has there been any attempt made to bring to book the persons who are the real culprits? I know that the millowners actually give wrong cash memo and invoice and the wholesalers also do the same thing. The retailers are the people who suffer. Generally the retailers

[Shri P. C. Mitra.]

are blamed and they are caught hold of while the wholesalers and the mill-owners pocket all this extra money by charging extra price. I want to know whether any of the millowners have been arrested under the Defence of India Rules for this black-marketing in sugar. It is the same with other articles. Even small things are becoming dearer now. In Delhi particularly, even vegetables have become so costly that it is very difficult for the common man to have vegetables. The Government profess now and then that they are determined to maintain the price line but no effective measures have so far been taken. I feel that the hon. Finance Minister should take strong measures against the blackmarketeers so that the people may be saved from such exploitation.

Thank you.

SHRI N. C. KASLIWAL (Rajasthan): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I rise to support the Appropriation Bill under discussion and I propose to confine my remarks to the foreign policy of the Government, the defence policy and the industrial policy. But before I deal with matters relating to foreign policy, I would like to mention two or three matters because certain new developments have recently taken place. I refer to the formation of the United Arab Republic in its new context and I like to send my congratulations to the Arab people for having consolidated themselves and their nationalism. I also mention that President Nasser is the natural leader of Arab nationalism and it is a matter of pleasure for us that our relations with President Nasser are continuing to grow more and more friendly.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would also welcome something which has happened but in an altogether different context and that is the break-up and disintegration of the Central African Federation. I know that the people of Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland were fighting not only for their freedom but for their very lives and now

after a long and protracted struggle they have been successful in breaking away from Southern Rhodesia. I am sure that the people of Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland will prosper in their newly-found liberty and freedom.

There are other signs also of some more Federations coming about. I am confident that under the able guidance and leadership of Mr. Julius Nyerere of Tanganyika and Mr. Jomo Kenyatta of Kenya and Prime Minister Mobota of Uganda an East African Federation is almost in the offing and I am confident also that our relations with that Federation will be very friendly indeed. Similarly there are signs that in West Africa also some kind of a Federation of the smaller States is coming into being.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I have been referring to these particular developments in a particular context and that context is the context of the policy of non-alignment. Very often the policy of non-alignment has been attacked and very wrongly indeed because those who have attacked the policy of non-alignment have never understood the position of our country in the international sphere. If they had only that understanding, they would realise that the policy of non-alignment which is now being largely accepted all over the world is the right policy. Often it has been said that we should align ourselves with the West or with the East. I would like to tell the friends both of the West as well as of the East that if our policy of non-alignment were at any time deviated from, it is those very friends of ours both in the West and in the East who will find themselves in an embarrassing position.

I want to refer to a few other matters. Firstly, about the cessation of nuclear tests. Mr. Vice-Chairman, the 18 nation Disarmament Commission is still sitting in Geneva and trying its level best to reach agreement on the issue of halting nuclear tests, and a closer approach is emerg-

ing today. And I am very glad to say that our Delegation which is headed by a very able serviceman of ours is doing its level best to see that as far as possible the cessation of nuclear testing comes about soon. Only today you may have seen that the eight non-aligned nations who are also members of this Commission have also agreed that for some time they should cease their efforts and let the two great blocs discuss among themselves so that if there is anything special or if there is any gap to be filled, they could come forward with their solution and try to fill it. I am very happy that the Government of India is continuing to be vigilant and active in this matter.

Now I want to refer briefly to another small matter and that is about the Colombo proposals. You will recall that we had a debate on the Colombo proposals and on this side of the House so far as we were concerned we stood solidly for the Colombo proposals and said they should be accepted as they had been accepted by the Prime Minister. It is the Opposition which said, 'No, they should not be accepted'. Now, who have been proved right? Are we in a tight corner because we have accepted the Colombo proposals or are they in a tight corner because they said they would not accept the Colombo proposals? I think it is they who are in a tight corner; it is China which finds itself in an uncomfortable position because we have accepted in toto the Colombo proposals and the Prime Minister has said more than once that unless China accepts the Colombo proposals in toto there is no question of going to the conference table with China.

Here I want just to refer to some remarks which Mr. Vajpayee had made previously about arbitration. Now, so far as our Constitution is concerned, it is very clear. If there is an international dispute, the dispute can be referred to arbitration. But apart from that we are the

original signatories to the Charter of the U.N. Article 33 of the Charter says that before anything happens the dispute must be decided by mediation, conciliation or arbitration. It is imperative. Suppose we don't do this; then the matter is something which would only come to this that we have in some way violated the Charter. I am quite sure that there is no nation today which can afford to violate the Charter in that fashion. You will recall that only last year there was plenty of trouble about Cuba but the United States themselves, one of the most powerful countries in the world, went to the Security Council and made a complaint. There was a heated debate, a full-dress debate in the Security Council and the matter was decided there and subsequently everything was over. Supposing the United States had decided to attack Cuba, things would have turned out very differently.

Now, having said this with regard to our foreign policy, to which I fully lend my support, I will now deal with our defence policy. I was present in the gallery when our able and distinguished Defence Minister made his speech in reply to the Demand for Grant of his Ministry. I was very much impressed by the quietness of his manner. It reflected a kind of a steel-like quality and I was happy to note that he was very vigilant about the defence forces. He said many things. He said that there should be four or five mountaineering divisions, new divisions, to be formed and he also said that our armed forces would be almost doubled. I was happy to note that there was this realisation that our armed forces should continue to grow. Merely the doubling of our Forces today, in the context in which the world is at present, is not enough. Suppose we have one million troops, a standing Army of one million, I feel that it is not sufficient, we should have a standing Army of two million people. Then alone it is possible to say that our strength and our influence will

[Shri N. C. Kasliwal.]

be felt more and more in the world. Apart from that, we will be in a far better position to defend our borders.

AN HON. MEMBER: China has a standing army of 7 million.

SHRI N. C. KASLIWAL: China may have an army of 7 million, but I am confident that if we have only 2 million, we can defeat a force of seven million.

Now, the Defence Minister was good enough to say about many things, about the increase in our aircraft production, about the Navy and so on, but one point he did not mention. That was about guerilla warfare. Guerilla war really means little war. 'Guerilla' is a Spanish word which means little and guerilla warfare has been accepted as a norm of warfare. It destroys the supply line and other things of the enemy. Now, I am quite confident that the Defence Minister must have been vigilant about these matters, but he never referred to it. So, I want to refer to this question of guerilla warfare. I happened to read a book about the tactics of the Chinese. What are the tactics of the Chinese with regard to guerilla warfare? There is a saying of Mao: 'Shamelessly attack the weak. Shamelessly run away before the strong.' That is the motto of guerilla warfare so far as Mao Tse-Tung is concerned. I am not suggesting for a moment that we should have such a motto. All I am saying is that our troops, our Armed Forces, must have adequate training in guerilla warfare.

Then, I shall refer to the question of production of armaments. Today in our House there was a question with regard to the manufacture of tanks. I am very happy to note that armaments are coming into production and there will be tanks also. It would be very difficult to say whether we will be completely self-sufficient in respect of armaments. To a great extent we should try to be self-suffi-

cient in armaments and not only to a great extent but also as early as possible. I would like to remind the Defence Ministry that this is one aspect which they must keep all the time in mind.

The question has been raised here more than once that we should acquire atomic weapons. I remember that in some of the speeches last time two or three Members of this House happened to speak on it. They said we should also have atomic weapons or atom bombs. I think it is a ridiculous approach. An atom bomb or hydrogen bomb really means nothing. It really proves nothing. Ultimately it is the conventional forces which will have a say in the final victory. Why should we waste so much money so far as acquisition of atomic weapons is concerned? If it is a question of an atomic war, the great and final war so to say, if an atomic war breaks out, rest assured that India will not remain the prime possessor of atomic weapons whatever. To say that we should manufacture atomic weapons at this stage is ridiculous in the extreme. So many millions and millions of rupees will have to be diverted to a channel which will be more or less fruitless.

I have referred to the foreign policy and to the defence policy. Now, I want to refer, in brief, to the industrial policy. Our industrial policy is governed by the Industrial Policy Resolution. We had a feeling that as we proceeded along the path of a planned economy, our public sector would continue to grow. But that does not happen to be so. On the contrary, the industrial policy has become slightly lop-sided. So often we hear that instead of the public sector undertakings, certain licences are being granted to the private sector. You will recall that there was a question in the last session in this very House and the Minister of Steel and Heavy Industries replied that three licences for fertiliser projects were returned—they had been granted to the private sector—because they

were unable to instal the machinery, they were unable to manufacture and they were unable to produce. Then, why was all this done? If all those projects had been taken up in the public sector, by this time we would have had far more quantities of fertiliser available for our agricultural production than what we have today.

Similarly, in so many other ways the private sector is receiving money from the public sector. My very good friend, Mr. Pathak, referred to a company to which a large amount of money has been recently granted. I believe he was referring to the Jayanti Shipping Company, a private company. To them Rs. 20 crores were given. It is an extraordinary thing that a private sector company should be given such large amounts. So many people have all the time been objecting why Tatas had been given Rs. 40 crores from the public funds without interest. Now, who is the beneficiary? The beneficiaries are only the private shareholders. It is they who are all the time getting dividends. It is they who enjoy the money. They enjoy the money of the taxpayer. I want to stress this point that no longer such large sums should be handed over to the private sector. The public sector must grow. It is the public sector which ultimately will be beneficial. If the public sector produces more profits, as it is bound to do, sooner or later, then our tax burden can go down to some extent. But at this time because public funds are being given to the private sector, there is greater concentration of wealth in the hands of a few people than ever before. If this tendency is checked, I am quite sure that the concentration of wealth in a few hands will be reduced. A large private sector is not amenable either regulation or control in a planned economy. All the public sector undertakings are available for everybody's scrutiny. They can be easily criticised, diagnosed, hanged and quartered, whatever you may say. But so far as the private sector

is concerned, it is a closed book. You are all talking now about the Vivian Bose Commission's Report, as to why this has been done and why that has been done. One does not know how many more things are being done by many more companies in the private sector. I wanted to stress this point that no longer large funds should be diverted for the use of the private sector from the public exchequer.

Having said this, I do not propose to go into any more points. I fully lend my support to the Appropriation Bill.

Thank you.

5 P.M.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would have been extremely reluctant to participate in this debate, but I was pained by certain references to certain individuals occupying high positions in the Government by two Members opposite. I was reminded when I was listening to their speeches and when I read some of the newspapers of the recent area in the U.S.A. which is known as the Macarthy era, an era of witch hunt, a period in which charges were easily levelled and conveniently bandied about. I was pained especially because the Prime Minister and the Home Minister have made it very clear that the issues that arise out of what is now known popularly as the Serajuddin affair have been referred to a gentleman of great judicial probity and eminence, the Attorney General of India. He is going into that matter. Not in a technical sense but in a substantial sense, that matter is *sub-judice*. There is a rule of prudence, a rule of propriety that when a matter is under investigation and especially when that matter involves charges which fall broadly in the sphere of the criminal, in such a situation nothing shall be said and nothing shall be done which prejudices the defence or fair trial or fair enquiry of the persons concerned. But I find unfortu-

[Shri B. K. P. Sinha.]

nately that outside this House, and even inside the House since freedom of speech is guaranteed to us under the Constitution, this rule of prudence, this rule of propriety is not being adhered to. It is being violated and violated with ease and with impunity. After the statements of the Home Minister and the Prime Minister I feel that this matter should receive a repose till the report of the Attorney General comes.

PROF. M. B. LAL (Uttar Pradesh): Would it be published?

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Published or not published, I can assure the Members on that side that we on this side, our Prime Minister and our Government are as anxious as Members on that side that high standards of integrity and probity are maintained in the administration, and if this report of the Attorney-General in the slightest way indicates that there is something improper . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How do you know? Have you seen the report?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY): He does not say that there is a report.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The hon. Member should throw light. He made certain remarks about the report of the Attorney-General. He said . . .

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY): You have not heard him properly. He was going to say; the report which the Attorney-General is going to submit. Not that there is a report now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How do we know?

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: My friend is in a very fortunate situation; that is, "where ignorance is bliss it is folly to be wise." Anyway I can assure the Members opposite that if that report will indicate anything sus-

picious about the transaction, our Prime Minister and Government and the gentlemen concerned will rise to the occasion.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We want that report. Do you want it to be placed?

PROF. M. B. LAL: Unless it is placed on the Table of the House how can we know that the Prime Minister acted on the recommendation of the report?

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Let me clarify my statement since the misunderstanding is in two quarters. I said that when the report comes, if it indicates anything wishy-washy about the transaction, the Prime Minister, the Ministers concerned and the Government will take suitable action. That is what I said, if and when the report comes. Please be patient, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I cannot understand you.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Sir, Mr. Mani put the case rather mildly. But all the same his speech was full of insinuations and innuendoes. The hon. Member from Uttar Pradesh went further and made direct charges, and all this before the investigation is complete. They are hon. gentlemen, I have no business to object to their speeches, but then when I hear these charges being levelled, I am reminded of not too recent history and not too distant history either; the history of the Third Reich in Germany. I am reminded of Adolf Hitler, I am reminded of his great Propaganda Minister, Dr. Goebbels. Herr Goebbels proceeded on two bases. A lie to be believed must be a great lie and an extraordinary lie.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: A big lie.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: A big lie. The other principle on which he based his propaganda was that a lie of repeated was a truth established.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is the same with the Home Ministry.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: When I hear these charges bandied about, I am reminded of these two principles of propaganda.

Now what is there in these transactions? If we believe all that has been said and that has appeared in the newspapers, it comes only to this that a certain sum of money on the recommendation of a certain Minister was advanced to a candidate for fighting elections.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: A common occurrence here.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: It is a common occurrence here and more common with the Members there . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We do not have Ministers.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: . . . whose activities are confined not only to this country but go very much beyond. Anyway, that is by the way. In Mr. Mani's opinion the transaction was merely irregular. He based his charge of irregularity on two counts: firstly, that the money was not advanced in pursuance of some resolution of the company. In this connection he referred to the report of Shri Viswanatha Sastry. He referred to an undertaking by the then Minister, Shri Satish Chandra. But I will tell Mr. Mani to go deeply and fully into that report and that undertaking. It is only if a company is a limited company with a large number of shareholders and with certain directors that the necessity arises for placing the matter before the Board of Directors and before the shareholders. But if a company is composed of a few persons, it is a family concern, it is a partnership, then in that case that directive of Shri Viswanatha Sastry and that statement of Shri Satish Chandra do not apply. Messrs. Serajuddin and Company is precisely a company of this nature. It is a

family affair, it is almost a partnership. Therefore, I see no irregularity on this count. Mr. Mani again referred to another aspect, that mines' and minerals' leases had been given to this company in violation of the Industrial Policy Resolution.

There are two types of inaccuracies. One is *suppressio veri* and the other is *suggestio falsi*. If you suppress a part of the truth, even that is an inaccuracy. Mr. Mani had taken great care to read the debates in the other House. But it seems that his memory failed him in one respect because in the discussion in that House it has been made very, very clear that the areas that were leased out to Messrs. Serajuddin & Company were areas which were not reserved for the public sector. The areas that were leased out to them were free areas, areas which the State Governments were free to lease out to private individuals. Then, where is the question of the violation of the Industrial Policy Resolution? Therefore, the charge of impropriety or irregularity falls on the second count also.

Mr. Mani made a plea for a high-level enquiry. The Prime Minister has made it very clear—so has the Home Minister—that if some *prima facie* case is made but, they will not hesitate to hold an enquiry. We know that the individual Ministers of the Government, like Caesar's wife, must be above suspicion. But we also know that it is extremely improper for a Government to yield to wild charges, to yield to witch-hunt in an atmosphere, in a situation, where witch-hunting has become very, very common and very very easy. For while it should be the concern of the Government to maintain higher standards, it should equally be their concern to see that people do not suffer because a handful of people take it into their heads to throw mud at

[Shri B. K. P. Sinha.]

others. And I am sure—let the Members on the opposite side rest in peace—that if a strong, *prima facie* case is made out, an enquiry will follow.

AN HON. MEMBER: You want them to rest in peace?

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Not in grave, but here.

Mr. Vajpayee, unfortunately, referred to gentleman who was not present in the House. He is a Minister of the Government of India. He is now moving about in other countries. He is doing a tremendous amount of work for us. He is going to Australia, New Zealand and the United States of America to seek assistance for us . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Really good time.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: . . . in our hour of trial. And when he is busy with that work, in his absence we get up in the Parliament of India and bring charges against him. Mr. Vajpayee made some unfortunate remarks and referred to the opinion of an eminent Member of this House expressed in a debate. But that was the opinion of one eminent Member only. Let us go into the whole case, that case which gave rise to the Chagla Enquiry. What is the substance of that enquiry and what was the gravamen of that charge? It was that the department entered into some unbusiness-like and imprudent transactions which were unprofitable. The charge was not that Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari was a party to it; the charge was that Mr. Patel entered into the transaction. The matter was referred to Mr. Krishnamachari. He did not repudiate it but in a way approved of it or acquiesced in it and therefore both Mr. Krishnamachari and Mr. Patel were held responsible by the Chagla Commission. Similar was the report of the Commission which

was constituted, presided over by Mr. Justice Vivian Bose. But then the matter did not end there. The case of Mr. Krishnamachari could not be referred to the Union Public Service Commission, and Mr. Krishnamachari, honourable that he is, as soon as the Report came out, resigned and went out. But then, since Mr. Patel was a civil servant, his case was referred to the Union Public Service Commission and the Union Public Service Commission, after going into all the records that were placed before the Chagla Commission and the Vivian Bose Committee and after going into more documents and more papers, came to the conclusion that the transaction which was entered into by Mr. Patel was neither unbusiness-like nor imprudent nor unprofitable and they absolved Mr. Patel. If Mr. Patel who was primarily and directly responsible for that transaction could be absolved, I do not see how the charge against Mr. Krishnamachari can stand. If the charge against Mr. Patel fell, the charge against Mr. Krishnamachari also fell. That is the irresistible conclusion to which any reasonable man will come.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: He does not understand all that.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: And as subsequent events have proved, that transaction itself has proved very, very profitable and not unprofitable, unbusiness-like and imprudent.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Then take Mr. Mundhra out of the jail. It is a simple thing to do.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Mr. Mundhra is in jail in connection with other cases, not in connection with that case.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Such a good man; he was profitable to your transaction. Why keep him in jail?

AN HON. MEMBER: There are other factors also.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Therefore, Sir, the reference . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That matter is under consideration.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: . . . to these two gentlemen was unfortunate. It is part of a witch-hunt. I am sure that if some evidence comes up, the matter will be subjected to an enquiry but till that comes up, let us all keep silent, let us await the report of the Attorney-General.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Mundhra in his testimony before the court said, I believe, that he paid Rs. 1 lakh to the Congress Election Fund in Calcutta. I think it is relevant in this context.

(Interruption)

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: I do not know what Mr. Mundhra said. I know that the Bank of China disclosed many accounts, about the money that had been advanced to many parties in this country. I wish the Finance Minister placed the account books of the Bank of China on the Table of the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY): Please proceed with your other points.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Lastly, after finishing with these two cases, (Interruption) I would briefly hereafter refer to the issue of the production of atomic weapons, a different issue altogether.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is better to come to it.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: My hon. friend who preceded me, peace-loving that he is, though he comes from the martial land of Rajasthan, considered the production of atomic weapons an improper thing. I come from the land of peace, the land of the Buddha and Mahavira, but I feel differently. We know that too much of admiration for peace, too much of admiration for

non-violence, has times without number landed this country into the lap of foreigners. I wish that history were not to be repeated today. This morning the Government, through the Prime Minister, made it clear that at this stage they were not prepared to go in for the manufacture of atomic weapons. I respectfully differ from the Government and the Prime Minister in this respect.

AN HON. MEMBER: At all stages.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: It is not our plea, it is not my plea at least that we forthwith start the production of atomic weapons. Our technical apparatus, our scientific apparatus, our know how are not yet adequate for the purpose. But let us not give up the project for all time to come. It is only if we make a start now that we shall, in the not too distant future, be in a position to produce atomic weapons. This is an atomic age, and in an atomic age, whether we like it or do not like it, warfare must be atomic. And in a situation in which an adversary possesses atomic weapons in any future conflict between us and that adversary or enemy, either we give up our policy of non-alignment and align with some atomic power, or even from now on we start making preparations for the production of atomic weapons. And if the policy of no-atomic weapons continues, I am afraid, one day, under the stress of a foreign attack, the policy of non-alignment shall have to be given the go-by. If we want to protect our freedom, if we want to protect our freedom of action, if we want to remain non-aligned in the real sense of the term, let us follow the example of the United Arab Republic where, even though their resources are much less than our resources, even though they are inferior to us in scientific knowledge and technical knowledge they have made a start towards the production of atomic weapons. They may not be producing it now, but then, the research and the development, they are pushing in that direction. And I have

[Shri B. K. P. Sinha.]

made it clear that at this stage we cannot produce them. But then let us not think that if after ten years we want to produce atomic weapons, in a day we shall be able to produce them, because so much has to go before a nation is in a position to produce atomic weapons. Scientific knowledge and technical knowledge must reach a certain standard. Keeping this in mind, I simply want that from now on we should make an effort to advance scientific knowledge, to attain technical perfection, so that in the not too distant future we are in a position to produce atomic weapons. Sir, let us not be too much addicted to peace, too much be in love with peace.

AN HON. MEMBER: We are doubling our forces.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Let me tell this House a story which you get in the Tibetan version of the life of the great Buddha.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY): You have already taken up your time.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: I thought there was no other speaker.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY): There is another speaker.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: All right, Sir; then let me finish; I shall take only two minutes.

As I was saying, this is the story we get in the Tibetan version of Buddha's life. Buddha converted his whole tribe, the great tribe of Sakhyas, to non-violence and peace. Now the Sakhyas were invaded by the mighty and martial Koshals. The Sakhyas were great marksmen, were so good at marksmanship that their arrows aimed at would just cut the pendants that were hanging from the ears of persons. They were such good marksmen, but since they were the followers of Buddha and votaries of

peace and non-violence, they hesitated to shoot down the Koshals who were besieging their city. And the result was that after a certain time the resistance of the great tribe of Sakhyas was broken, and the whole tribe of Sakhyas were put to the sword, and the race was obliterated. Now let this story make us careful. While Buddha has gone down in history as an angel of peace, the Sakhyas have been obliterated. Let us not today behave as Buddha behaved, and let us not make the great Indian nation meet the same fate as befell the Sakhyas.

Thank you.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to give my hearty support to the Appropriation Bill that has been under discussion. Of course, as is expected, under the present stress arising out of the Chinese invasion of India, the appropriations are very heavily weighted in favour of Defence; it could not be otherwise.

Sir, when I just glanced through, I found that under Defence a sum of Rs. 723 crores odd has been set apart. This is a staggering figure—a figure never before, in the history of our infant independent India, had been reached—and this figure, nobody will consider it as very excessive in view of the situation that we are facing today.

Sir, many speakers have referred to this very unfortunate, unprovoked aggression of China against India. It is still a mystery. A lot of research has got to be made why, at all China, which had been friendly with India for centuries, which had been friendly up to the time their aggression against us took place, with whom we had assiduously cultivated friendship through all the period of our post-independence, why—I do not know why—they had inflicted on us such a heavy and lasting mortal wound. Certainly we cannot take it lying down. Therefore it is, with a great resolve

and with a great spirit of sacrifice, we took a determination, we took an oath to resist them, and therefore it is, Sir, may; whatever might be the cost, without minding cost we are prepared to resist this aggression, come what that such a heavy and huge sum of Rs. 723 crores has been set apart. Not only that. Everyone in this country, today, is concerned to resist this aggressor and throw him out from this country. Therefore, Sir, we give our hearty support to the Finance Minister who has taken bold steps for taxing the people. Certainly sacrifices must go with maintaining the independence and the integrity of the country. Therefore it is that heavy taxation is levied and therefore it is that such heavy sums for the defence of the country have been set apart. We do not grudge them.

It was only this morning, Sir, I was reading in some paper, in some journal, the causes of the attack by China on India. Many people, many learned people now assess that the causes of the Chinese attack on India is not territorial; it is only to inflict

humiliation on India, a prosperous India, a developing India, an influencing India, an India which had scored over every other big country, and whose influence was spreading not only in the West, not only in the East but all over the world, on account of the policies of our illustrious Prime Minister. The foreign Policy and the national policies under the able guidance of our Prime Minister have been such that they have earned for us, in the short period of fifteen years or so, the highest reputation.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY): You may continue tomorrow, Mr. Reddy.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY: Thank you very much.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY): The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow:

The House adjourned at thirty minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Wednesday, the 24th April, 1963.