

Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta is always alert when he is in the House but when he is outside the House, he is not alert about the business of the House. Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta, if Mr. Baby agrees to yield, in between, then I can allow introduction of year Bill. He is in the midst of his speech, it is for him to concede.

SHRI M.A. BABY: If you want me to yield for introduction of the Bill, I will do so. I do not want to infringe his fundamental right as a Member of this august House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: Thank you for this fraternal consideration.

The Prohibition of Religious, Communal and Sectoral Political Parties and Senas Bill, 1995

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA (WEST BENGAL): Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for prohibition of the formation of religious, communal and sectoral political parties and Senas.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

**THE CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1992
(to amend article 77) Contd**

SHRI M.A. BABY (Kerala): Sir, I have been mentioning about the possible ramifications of WTO and how this would affect the lives of the people. Sir, without going into the details, I want to recall that at a particular stage three State Governments went to the Supreme Court stating that if Government of India is going to be part of the WTO Act signed at Marrakech the lives of the farmers would be adversely affected and agriculture being a State subject would infringe upon the Constitutional framework. Sir, the Constitution provides that Indian Parliament has the authority to legislate in order to give effect to the provisions of an interational treaty even if it affects some matters included in the second list, i.e. the State List. And the Constitutional framers thought

that this authority would be used sparingly by the Union Government. But what has happened in relation to GATT and WTO? I am afraid to submit that the good intentions of the Constitutional framers have been defeated by the actions of the then Union Government. Sir, I would like to underline the point that the present WTO is totally different in its scope to the issues which the present WTO is dealing with. When the Uruguay negotiations started, the developing countries wanted that GATT should confine itself to its chosen topic of trade and tariff. But in the name of trade related intellectual property rights being brought into and trade related investment being brought into the ambit of all negotiations, the services have been brought into the ambit of GATT and later WTO. Sir, through this process almost all important economic activities have been brought under the purview of the present WTO. So it is in this particular context that this Bill was introduced in the year 1992.

This is an unprecedented situation. If the Executive, the Government of India, utilises the authority to enter into international treaties like GATT without taking Parliament into confidence, without taking the people of this country into confidence, without taking with it different sections of people such as industrialists, farmers, scientists, lawyers, intellectuals, etc., then it would adversely affect the interests of India as a country generally and its economic sovereignty in particular. It is in that context that a demand has been made, through this Bill, that any international treaty or MoU or an agreement entered into by the Government of India would come into operation only if the Indian Parliament ratifies it.

In this connection, I would like to draw the attention of this House to certain observations made by some legal luminaries which have been taken recourse to by those who have been defending the extraordinary power of the Executive. Let me first refer to an observation made by Mr. Justice Hidayatulla. If we forget that this is a contextual observation, it may lead one to think that the Executive is empowered with enormous powers to do whatever it wants in

so far as international treaties are concerned. Mr. Justice Hidayatulla said and I quote:

"..... If there is any deficiency in the Constitutional system, it has to be removed and the State must equip itself with the necessary power to give effect to the treaties...."

This is an observation which Mr. Justice Hidayatulla made in a particular context. If this argument is extended, then one would be forced to draw a wrong conclusion — to respect the international treaties, the State must equip itself with power, even by subverting the Constitutional provisions. Constitutional amendments may have to be made. But this is not the spirit of his observation. This observation was made as a contextual reference. Since the Supreme Court had made such an observation, I feel it is all the more important that such matters should not be left in ambiguity. There has to be a clear-cut demarcation in regard to the powers of Parliament and the Executive. I have stated in my Bill that all treaties, MoUs and agreements should be brought under the Parliament's purview and unless Parliament ratifies them, they would have no effect. Though this is the gist of this Bill, I don't stick to that position. I know very well that there would be occasions when the executive Government will have to negotiate with the Heads of States and the Heads of Governments of other countries and enter into agreements and MoUs. All those agreements and MoUs may not be brought before the Parliament.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): Mr. Baby, how much time do you require?

SHRI M.A. BABAY: Sir, this is a very important Constitution (Amendment) Bill and I have to make references to the Constitutional systems of various countries and the practices being followed by those countries. I have also to impress upon the House as to how my Bill would strengthen the Executive. For doing all this, I hope you may have a little more indulgence.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): Certainly. But I also

crave your indulgence. I request you to conclude as early as possible.

Sir, I have been mentioning the context of the introduction of this Bill. When the discussion started on Friday during the last session, I was fortunate that the Minister of External Affairs, I.K. Gujralji was present here on behalf of the Government. He is not here today. But I think this matter relates to his Ministry. Therefore, I would like to remind the hon. Minister of External Affairs, through the hon. Ministers present here, that the rationale of this Bill has been substantiated and vindicated by a report submitted by none other than Gujralji in his capacity as the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Commerce. And these observations are not only of Gujralji, but of the Committee as a whole. I quote, "The Committee suggests that India should actively negotiate to bring about a more reasonable balance in the proposed agreement" —that is, GATT which has been translated into WTO— "which is loaded against the developing countries". This is the observation made by the Standing Committee on Commerce headed by hon. Gujralji. Similarly, the same report says, "India should make a common cause with the other developing countries which have found that the Dunkel Proposals are adverse to their interests". This is also very clear and it doesn't require any further elucidation. The report also says, "India should consider ways in which the sovereign economic space of developing countries is safeguarded". If the Committee is suggesting that the Government of India should take steps to safeguard the sovereign economic space of developing countries, then it is very clear that it is being attacked as a result of these Dunkel Proposals. Due to these reasons — which I can further explain but due to constraint of time, I do not propose to do that — this Bill is being suggested. It is also interesting to note, Sir, that within the next couple of days we would be celebrating the 50th anniversary of the Constitutional process of our country, a few days later there will be another important round of discussions that would take place under the aegis of the WTO at Singapore, and we are discussing this particular legislation here today. I want first of all state as to why very important countries in the world have in their

Constitutions a provision that important treaties should be ratified by their Parliaments. I would like to mention these countries. But apart from ensuring the essence of democracy so that people and their representatives are taken into confidence on all matters, it is also for the benefit of the executive if there is such a provision.

3.00 P.M.

When our negotiators, whether the Ministers or the experts, go for international negotiations on such important issues, they can very well argue with other countries, the developed countries, like the United States of America, Japan, Canada, the U.K., Germany and France that if you are insisting on this kind of provisions, then our national Parliament will not accept it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TROLOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): The United States of America has a provision like this.

SHRI M.A. BABY: Yes, Sir. I am going to make some references to that. So, in order to strengthen the hands of Indian negotiators to say that these are the stringent provisions which would go against the interest of our country and that our Parliament is not going to accept them, there should be some provisions in our Constitution. Sir, this argument could very well practically be advanced if that provision was there in the Indian Constitution. With the present Indian political scenario, since 1989, we have been having minority Governments, one after another. In 1989, we had a minority Government. Then, again we had a minority Government, which was made into a majority through not very honourable means. And again today, we have a minority Government. I don't know how long the wisdom of Indian people would force the political leadership to reconcile with this kind of a situation. Sir, it is therefore, all the more important to have a provision in the Indian Constitution whereby the Executive will not feel arrogant that even though we don't have a majority in Lok Sabha, immediately this Government cannot be destabilised. This has been the experience since 1989. But, of course, there are forces to destabilise any Government like anything, and such forces would try to do that also. But, Sir, we have to develop a culture

of consensus, a culture of consultation, a culture of taking others into confidence, a culture of having faith in other political forces while strongly differing with others on ideological and political grounds. Differences on economic perspectives can be there, but still the political forces should have an attitude of give and take. Though we want all this, we know that in this environment we cannot have all that. Therefore, if you look at it from the reality of Indian political scenario where no political force is a dominant force and an attitude of being realistic to the situation emerges, then is it possible or is it advisable or permissible for some political forces to put down the throat of other political forces an economic philosophy, whether it is the so-called globalisation or free-market economy or liberalisation or the same type of economic planning which existed in the erstwhile USSR or the East Europe? Neither of these economic models can be put down the throat of any other political force. Somebody may defend or we may defend with some modifications - I don't want to go into details. But, the point is there has to be discussion with major political parties.

Sir, at the time of GATT negotiations about 250 Members of Parliament, belonging to different political parties, signed a memorandum and that was submitted to everyone stating you should not yield like this, you should fight. There may be differences of opinion, whether you should be in the WTO or not, whether you should get out of it or not, but what the developing world could have achieved through GATT negotiations could not be achieved due to the failure of a country like India and other developing countries to bring together all their forces and put up a definite fight.

Sir, I want to make a reference to the provisions existing in other Constitutions of the world.

Since you have referred to the case of USA where the U.S. Senate has to ratify the international treaties with two thirds majority, I also would like to recall a particular point. Immediately after World War I, Wilson was negotiating with other countries in Versailles

to bring together countries into the League of Nations and there was the Versailles Treaty. France, Britain and USA were involved in it. Wilson was the shining star in the entire negotiation process. When he went back to his country, the U.S. Senate did not approve the treaty and if my memory is doing justice to me, almost for a decade the U.S could not be in the League of Nations. Good or bad, it was the wisdom of the U.S. Senate. There was an option and an opportunity for the U.S. to persuade, to lobby or to influence. It is an open society and it has to be an open society. Only by taking legislators into confidence and the people into confidence things should be done, I would like to take liberty at this point of time. One of the major reasons for the very big setbacks suffered by the the USSR and the countries of East Europe was the failure of the leadership to take the people into confidence. It was the alienation of the leadership from the people. This is a major lesson for most of us who are living in this historical epoch.

Sir, a number of countries are having provisions for ratification of legislations by their national parliaments. Algeria has this provision; Argentina has this provision; Austria has provisions; Belgium has provisions; Brazil, Bulgaria, Camaroons and Coco islands have similar provisions. Cape Verde, Costa Rica, Cyprus have provisions. In China the provision is that the standing committee of MPC has to ratify it. I am not satisfied with that. I feel it should have been the People's Congress as a whole to discuss and ratify it but their system is that only the standing committee ratifies this. It is almost like a Council of Ministers and a few more people would be there. When Germany was not united, both the Houses of Germany had similar provisions: the then German Democratic Republic as well as the Federal Republic of Germany had provisions. I do not know how they have modified the provisions when they decided to merge. Greece, Hungary, Gabon, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yeman, Denmark, Egypt, Fiji, Finland, France, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, have provisions-even a Gulf country has such provisions. Lebanon, Luxemburg, Male, Malta, Mexico, 'Mangolia, the Netherlands, Nicaragua,

Philippines, Romania, Spain, Somalia, Senegal, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Tunisia, Uganda have provisions. The USSR had provisions to get the endorsement of the President of the Supreme Soviet, which I consider to be quite inadequate. It should have been the Parliament as a whole.

Then we have the United States of America. Sir, the point is that as I mentioned in the beginning, legislation in relation to the country for spending or for collecting taxes from the people should be a subject matter of Parliament. It is an entirely different world where the relations between the countries are increasing day by day. This does not mean, as has already been mentioned, that certain treaties cannot be straightaway accepted without being brought before the Parliament for ratification. There are treaties or international conventions with regard to the defence of human rights. The human rights declarations can easily be appreciated as different from the kind of bad treaties which we encounter time and again. Here it would be in the fitness of things if we divide treaties between good treaties and bad treaties. I feel most of the trade treaties are bad treaties. We have the clear-cut experience of GATT and WTO. We know how this can adversely affects the interests of the people at large. People will have to pay more money for their medicines; education is becoming a commodity and only those who pay more money would get better education; health care has become a health industry; the farmers will have to pay heavily even to get seeds. I* need not have to explain the adverse ramifications. They have been speaking about a new world economic order. But we have a world trade order under WTO today and this is going to adversely affect the interests of the developing countries, the people of the developing countries.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): Please conclude now.

SHRI M.A. BABY: Sir, I am concluding my observations. Even when you have a provision for the national Parliament to ratify an international treaty, until and unless the executive at different stages of negotiations

takes the Parliament and people into confidence and makes them understand and takes the feedback from them, it make it a *fait accompli*. The executive would go and sign a treaty and then come back and tell the Parliament, "Look, due to compelling circumstances, we had to sign this treaty. Now to save our face, to save our national interest, you have to ratify it." So, the danger of *fait accompli* is there. Therefore, we should have this Constitutional amendment making a provision in the Indian Constitution that international treaties, especially the trade treaties, need to be ratified by Indian Parliament before they come into force. We should make this provision. I want to submit th?t after having sufficient discussion, I am willing to modify this Bill. Instead of a Constitutional amendment, if the Government is willing, I want to make this offer at the very outset so that the discussion can also take note of this observation. A change in the statute would also be sufficient if the Government is willing. But we have to have a vigilant Parliament. Our experience, time and again, when we demanded that this should be discussed on the floor of the Houses, has been that no meaningful discussion on such a serious matter had taken place. Sir, the Members who have been here would remember that no serious discussion on this subject has taken place either in Rajya Sabha or Lok Sabha. There was a namesake discussion. This is self-criticism. The way our Houses have been functioning, the importance of these Houses, the importance of these sovereign Houses, is being undermined time and again.

In view of this entire experience, we have to ensure the accountability of the Executive to people, through Parliament I, sincerely feel that an amendment is required either in the form of a Constitutional amendment or in the form of a Statute. I would also like to take this opportunity to make a reference that in some European countries, not only a provision for ratification exists but also there is a provision for referendum; for example, on matters relating to the European Union. Referenda were conducted in various countries of Europe. In view of the entire experience, I feel, if the august House agrees with me, there should be a provision in the Indian Constitution—either

in the form of a Constitutional amendment or in the form of an enactment—that the Executive should not have unbridled authority to go and sign any treaty, taking the Parliament and the people for granted and after coming back telling the Parliament to ratify.

I would like to make one more observation, with your permission, which is very important and which I forgot to mention due to oversight. Sir, I forgot to mention that there was a provision in the Indian Constitution which enables the Indian Parliament to make legislations to give effect to treaties signed by the Government of India. Just imagine. The Government of India has entered into a treaty with another country or with any of the international organisations like W.T.O, and the Indian Parliament—presently, there is a very complex political situation reflected in both the Houses of Parliament—can very well refuse to endorse the treaty. Due to a convention, the Members of Parliament may stand up and say 'no' to a treaty because it would infringe upon the economic sovereignty of our country though the Executive had signed it. Hence, we are not going to give effect to this particular law. For example, even in the W.T.O, there has to be a patent amendment, trade mark amendment, etc. These are all in the pipeline. What happens if the Indian Parliament refuses to enact various legislations to create in environment which will fit the W.T.O, set-up? It becomes difficult There would be a crisis. The Government of India would be in a bad position. It is all the more important. To avoid such embarrassing occurrences, this provision can be incorporated, either in the form of a Constitutional amendment or in the form of a statute so that the Executive knows that it has to come back to Parliament and get its approval. The Executive will also think that it should do everything in such a way so as to ensure that a majority of the Members of Parliament endorse this particular line of thinking. Therefore, from the practical angle also, this is very necessary. Historically, our Constitution makers did not think of it. One may wonder why?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): Mr. Baby, there was a lot of discussion on that ...(*interruptions*)...

SHRI M.A. BABY: Sir, I am concluding. I am concluding my observations. But I cannot conclude my speech without making a reference to this. I cannot question the wisdom of our Constitution-makers. They were all stalwarts. That was a different epoch. Decolonization is taking place. Countries have been attaining freedom and today the entire world is different—concepts of freedom, human rights, independence, governance of human rights, etc. Most of the international laws are upholding human rights, universal brotherhood and all those lofty ideals. Therefore, no one could foresee a situation which is similar to the one in which we were living during those days.

Sir, it is said about the Constitution that the Constitution should be changed after every generation because the Constitution is made for a generation. Time moves on. Time does not stand still. As time passes, new factors emerge in the world. To incorporate these new factors emerging in the world and in the country, you will have to have a fresh look at the Constitution. This, I feel, is a very, very important task before Parliament itself. But before we have a comprehensive look at the Constitution—of course, the Constitution has been working well, whatever may be the deficiencies or requirements—these are the areas where improvement is required. That is the reason why this Bill is being commended for the consideration of this august House.

Thank you very much, Mr. Vice-Chairman, for giving me time.

SHRI K.R. MALKANI (Delhi): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the Constitution (Amendment) Bill moved by our good friend, Mr. Baby.

Sir, many countries in the world have got this provision. I think we should also have it. All international agreements and treaties signed by the Government of India must be ratified by Parliament before they are implemented. That is the basic thing because of our less-than-happy experience so far in regard to the way Government has been handling international affairs.

After the 1965 War, we signed the Tashkent Declaration, the Tashkent Agreement, handing over territories which we had occupied in Kashmir itself. Sir, we claim that the entire Jammu and Kashmir is ours. With great effort, our troops captured the Haji Pir Pass and other areas, but at Tashkent, we surrendered even this. I am sure, if this agreement which we signed at Tashkent had been submitted to Parliament, it would not have been ratified and we would still have been in possession of the Haji Pir Pass.

A similar thing happened after the 1971 War. We had something like 93,000 Pakistani prisoners of war. We just handed all of them over Pakistan on a mere verbal assurance by Mr. Bhutto. We could have seen to it that Pakistan agreed to a final, satisfactory, solution of the Kashmir issue. But we did nothing of that kind. Mr. Bhutto just gave a verbal assurance 'I will not agitate this issue'. Sir, this is not an issue between one person and another. This is not an issue between individuals. It is, rather, an issue between nations, between states, between peoples. Mrs. Indira Gandhi with all respect to her—and her advisors, our Kashmiri friends, just accepted the word of Mr. Bhutto and handed over the prisoners of war to Pakistan. The Kashmir problem continues. This is not the way to conduct international affairs.

Similar is the way the GATT, the WTO Agreement, has been handled. The last Government, Mr. Rao's Government, did not have a majority in Parliament during the first three years of its office. Even then it conducted negotiations on this treaty without any consultation with opposition parties.

Sir, many aspects of the World Trade Organisation impinge on the interests of farmers and others. Many of its aspects impinge on the State Governments, but State Governments were not consulted. We committed ourselves to amending the patent law without consulting even our laboratories. This is not an acceptable state of affairs. Something has got to be done about it.

During that period, the Standing Committee on Commerce which was presided by none else than our good friend, Mr. Inder Gujral, who is

now Minister of External Affairs had strongly criticised the GATT negotiations. Even that Committee's opinion was disregarded. The end result was that the Government tried to amend the patent law, but it could not.

I am glad Mr. Baby has moved this amending Bill. But The Common Minimum Programme of the UF has a mischievous line in it. The parties which have signed it have undertaken to implement all the international agreements entered into. But I would like to know from Mr. Baby and his allies as to where exactly do they stand on this issue because they have committed themselves to it; earlier, they were opposing the patent law amendment.

Even the USA, Sir, has accepted the WTO only conditionally. The US Congress had said that if the adjudication machinery of the WTO gave a couple of verdicts against it, they would think of reconsidering the matter and walking out of the WTO.

The whole WTO is heavily weighted in favour of developed countries and not developing countries. If they could accept it conditionally, why do we accept it unconditionally? I think, therefore, it is absolutely important that the law should be amended in this respect to the effect that no international agreement or treaty should be implemented unless and until it has been ratified by the Indian Parliament.

Thank you very much.

SHRI R. MARGABANDU (Tamil Nadu). Sir, I rise to support this Bill on the ground that there is globalisation of trade and increasing international trade. Now, if there is a dispute between two countries in respect of execution of the contracts entered into, there is no adjudication agency like the international Court or some such thing to resolve such disputes. In cases where the agreements entered into between different parties one of whom foreign country go unchecked, they create problems. Now, the Executive of our country signs these agreements and there is no participation of the people's representatives in them. If any agreement comes before Parliament, it can be subjected to discussion where all aspects of the agreement could be analyzed, like the legal stand we could take in

case of disputes, the circumstances in which the agreement could be enforced, legal jurisdiction-courts, etc. So this safeguard can be put while amending the law.

Furthermore, if an international agreement or international contract is entered into, it will naturally affect the indigenous industries, the local industries, the home industries. If powerful companies from foreign countries enter into agreements and start manufacturing or producing goods and materials, the cost of production and other things would increase, in which case the products manufactured by our indigenous industries cannot compete with them and, naturally, they will crush our industries. So it will be a deathblow or a death-knell to our internal industries. So there should be a check. Therefore, if it comes before Parliament, the treaty or agreement can be discussed and a viable agreement which can be entered into can be suggested. If there is a certain stand taken and if Parliament's acceptance is there, then it will work very well.

As a matter of fact, as has been suggested by Mr. Baby, with regard to the production of fertilisers and other things, that they will have to sell at lesser prices, it is all right, but when they quote higher prices without giving any subsidy or any such thing. Then also problems would arise. Because our indigenous factories cannot manufacture these things as they do, then also there will be difficulty. So, to have a check over international trade and contracts, it is of vital necessity that these treaties and agreements should be processed through the Parliament of our country. This alone would provide safeguards for both the parties.

Thank you, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): Mr. Sanatan Bisi.

SHRI SANATAN BISI (Orissa): Thank you, Sir, for giving me this opportunity.

The Mover of the Bill has put forward very sound arguments in favour of the Bill. The other colleagues have also put forward their own case. The former Minister, Mr. Pranab Mukherjee, had piloted the discussion on the GATT. At that time, we were very apprehensive as to what will happen to the patent law and

the Contract Act. At that time, it was submitted in the House that in pursuance with the GATT that we were going to enter into with the World Trade Organisation, the relevant patent law as well as the Contract Act would also be suitably amended. So, it was said that there should be no doubt in the minds of the people of the House. It was very ably reiterated by the Minister concerned. Here, my learned friend submitted in support of the Bill that in other countries—he mentioned the names of the countries at length—such provisions are there that the Parliament should give consent to such type of things.

I will submit here the wisdom of the framers of the Constitution. The persons who framed the Constitution had an apprehension about such type of things. I may be permitted a read article 292 for the purpose of elucidation or for the purpose of clarity. At that time, the framers of the Constitution very clearly thought of not giving all the powers to the executive because the executive may do something which may not have the sanction of the House. In article 292 it has been very clearly stated:

"The executive power of the Union extends to borrowing upon the security of the Consolidated Fund of India within such limits, if any, as may from time to time be fixed by Parliament by law and to the giving of guarantees within such limits, if any, as may be so fixed."

My submission to the House is that as and when we sit in the Opposition, we always ask of the ruling party, "Why are you not bringing forward such a legislation in Parliament to limit borrowing because the framers of the Constitution intended that the country as a whole should not be liquidated by the hand of the executive?" The framers of the Constitution thought it proper that such a legislation should be brought in Parliament and that the sanction of Parliament should be obtained.

My learned friend has mentioned about foreign countries. Here I say that article 292 clearly and specifically mentions about fixation of the borrowing limit. So, in this scenario when we are going to the World Trade Organisation, when we are going in for a patent and when we are going in for such other things,

it is apparent and very clear that there should be such a legislation.

Apart from that, in the present scenario we have coalition politics. At present we are having a Government of 13 parties. We do not have the mandate of the people. No party has got the mandate of the people. In such a situation, for the purpose of accountability and for the purpose of sharing it with the people, I submit that an amendment should be brought in that respect.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): Is Mr. Jalaludin Ansari there? He is not present.

Mr. Ish Dutt Yadav? He is also not present at the moment.

Prof. Naunihal Singh.

PROF. NAUNIHAL SINGH (Uttar Pradesh): Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman.

I must congratulate Mr. Baby. The hon. Member is very experienced. He has synchronised his experience, the experience of Parliament and that of this country. He has seen that Parliament has been ignored throughout in various international matters like international agreements and treaties. This is very important because such international agreements and treaties do have an impact on the legislature of this country, Parliament and the State Legislatures. Therefore, this Bill has been brought by Mr. Baby to amend the Constitution of India so that in future no such thing should take place. I wholly support the Bill.

Sir, as has been explained by various hon. colleagues in this House, the state of affairs is that the Government has been pursuing its path. It is signing international agreements and treaties. Even if by default it brought such an important international matter like the WTO and all that to Parliament, it just rushed through it and pushed it, without giving enough time and opportunity for a discussion in this particular House.

Even the Members of Parliament did not have enough time to study, because there were difficult provisions. It was not easy just to peruse those negotiations, which are going on in international affairs and which have impact

on the industry, agriculture and on the people and the nation as such. Therefore, this Bill is going to lay down certain important conditions and obligations on the part of the Government to bring these matters to Parliament and to give enough opportunity to Members of Parliament to study and discuss them thoroughly in Parliament and to obtain the consensus of both the Houses of Parliament. Therefore, I rise to support the Constitution (Amendment) Bill brought before the House by the hon. Member, Shri M.A. Baby. It must also be seen that the State Governments also are brought into the picture. They should actually have the time to study those particular treaties and negotiations so that it may become a sort of springboard for the Parliament to take off from there. Only then you will call it as federalism functioning in this country. Otherwise not.

The W.T.O. is a very burning and latest example. I was here and I have seen, and all the Members have seen, how that was conceded by the Government; how the Minister brought that information to the Parliament and it was just pushed ahead. Today I even do not know the provisions thoroughly as I would like to have known. Certainly it was pushed through and a sort of approval was given and the country knows that it has been passed by Parliament, although we are not aware of the content and the purpose and the details about it. So, the caution, which this Amendment Bill is trying to bring about is to justify the premise that Parliament is a sovereign body and so important provisions which are laid into these international treaties and agreements, if they are going to have future impact on the people and the nation and on the legislatures, and if they constrain the freedom of the legislators to legislate in their own sovereign Parliament in the interest of the people and the nation, they will be restrained. Therefore, it is very necessary to put a stop on the Government's freedom to the extent that they should not have a free rein, just to go about and have certain agreements and treaties signed without the knowledge of the people, the Parliament and the nation. So, I support thoroughly and wholly this very important Bill, which, I think, for the first time during my stay in Parliament I have come to know of. I am so pleased from the

core of my heart on such a Bill which should be given consent by this House and even by both the Houses of Parliament so that this should become an Act binding on the Government not to have a free rein, to avoid Parliament, to lower its importance and its sovereignty. Thank you.

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): While I support this Bill, I am afraid apart from the Constitutional and legal and other aspects, to me this Bill looks as the first step towards what we have been talking for years. We talked about this basic fact, the basic right to information, both within and outside the Parliament. I am treating this Bill as only a tool, as a basic step towards what the present Government is committed to i.e., transparency, so far as the public interest is concerned.

When we talk about the right to information and transparency, what type of information is to be given to the people, to the Parliament, a sovereign body representing the people arises in our mind. The approach has been they furnish some information and say that this is the information which the people deserve to know. But the people would not understand this information. This information would not be known to the people as if it has no bearing on the people with regard to general aspects. I am a person connected with the trade union movement. As a trade unionist, I can tell you very frankly that when we talk about the liberalisation of the economic policy, globalisation and its impact, about the GATT, about the Patent Act and its impact, I have found that employees and executives of the public sector undertakings and even some of us were questioning: What has the worker got to do with them? After all, the employees want money for their work. How are you affected? Why should we involve ourselves in this? Sometimes it has been pointed out, politicisation of trade unions, politicisation of students union, politicisation of teachers union. Then, what is politics? If under a treaty the Government of the day is borrowing some money from an outside agency, a citizen of this country should know about its details. Otherwise, it is called deprivation of information. How much impact does

globalisation and international treaties have on the people? When we are borrowing money from the World Bank and the IMF, there are some conditionalities. If you don't use the word "conditionalities", it means you have taken money from the World Bank.

We are talking about the energy policy. Power is an important component. Without batting an eyelid, they are saying that there is an Orissa model. Why should we have the Orissa model? It is because the World Bank wants it. It has been told that the World Bank has chosen six States in the country. They would give money to these six States so long as they follow what is known as the Orissa model. Now, forget about the common people on whom the power tariff would be levied. Power is not something which would be given free of cost by X, Y and Z. For the last five years a thinking has been going on throughout this country that whatever money they are giving, whatever investments they are making, whatever aid they are giving, they are giving to us out of charity and they want to civilise us and they want to have power plants to supply power to the people as if that power is not costly. As far as power tariff is concerned, it is the man right at the bottom who is concerned and he has to pay that tariff. What is this Orissa model? Sir, you would be surprised to know that many of the electrical engineers, power experts in the country do not know exactly what the Orissa model is. They do not know whether they should follow the Orissa model or whether they should follow the existing model. Where is the transparency? We are talking about international treaties between one nation and the other nation. We are all aware that for four years they have been talking about counter-guarantees for power projects. What is that? It is not a treaty between the two nations. A sovereign country like India has to give counter-guarantee to a company of X, Y, Z countries. How are we involved in this? Many people asked me, "Why did you talk about counter-guarantees? What is that all about?" They also said that Leftist parties have been shouting about polemics. It is not polemics. It can be noticed from the last elections that people also require information. They also want to know what the GATT is, what the Patent

Act is. It cannot be this type of politics which you are talking about. It cannot be this type of administration which you are talking about. It cannot be this type of political system which you are talking about. Sitting in an ivory tower, basing on personality cult, saying so and so *zindabad*, the whole country following him—those days are over.

Now it is the people who have to decide whether the policies are in their interest. How will the people decide on their policies, how will the people find out what exactly is good for them, unless they get the inputs? From where will these inputs come? If you go outside, if you talk of the GATT, for example, the knowledge is limited. I have gone to the villages, to the cities. The worst part is, the poorest of the poor are more interested to know than the so-called opinion-making sections, the intellectual sections. The moment it comes in the newspaper, it becomes politics, it is something of politics, which the professional need not be interested in. The doctor need not be interested to know whether what impact the GAIT is going to have on the country. Why is this happening? It is happening simply because of the fact that transparency has not been there for years together. For the last 50 years, transparency has not been there in the internal administration. Things which are known to outsiders, we are not aware of. How many of us know what type of treaties are being done for joint ventures in oil and petroleum? We are talking of to price of petrol. The fellow there does want to know. The Press people go and ask whether this Government is good or not, 'yes' or 'no'. Some say, 'This Government has increased the price; it is bad': Some say, 'This Government has not increased the price; it is good'. As if that is the issue! No one is telling us how many of these oil fields have been given to joint ventures. What is the production share? Are we paying in foreign exchange? If we are paying, for our own oil, in foreign exchange, then what else is left? If we have to pay, for our own power generated on the soil of this country, in foreign exchange, then, what is left for our country? Mr. Singla is there. In Parliament, we are talking about globalisation. Globalisation has to be not only

in technology. Globalisation cannot be only of business. Globalisation has to be also of the democratic pattern on which other countries are functioning. I have read in some papers. I do not know how much of it is correct. When we are talking about the GATT, about technology and all that, they want no barrier. Mrs. Gandhi said once in the 70's, "Okay, no barrier. No barrier so far as your investments and your projects are concerned. But there should not be any barrier for labour also. I should be at liberty to send my workers from eastern U.P. to America or some other country." When you talk in that language, people understand what is happening.

Have our sovereign interests been maintained? It cannot be restricted to those in power, the Government of the day or the executive of the day, to decide, when we are talking about globalisation, liberalisation and decisions affecting not only the polity, not only the politics, not only the administration, but also the life of each and every individual in this country.

Now, Mr. Baby was talking about the WTO, the GATT. I talk about the public sector. As a member of the Committee on Public Undertakings, I had the privilege of visiting some of these companies. I was surprised to see how things were happening. All of us, all parties, were there on the Committee. We visited a particular public sector company, a blue-chip company, a very, very prominent company for years together, down south. The whole of the discussion, relating to management, etc., was around only one point, joint ventures. How was the factory running? How was the plant running? I put these "questions. The reply was coming only in this form. "For this product, we are going in for that joint venture from this country; for that product, we are having a joint venture with this company of that country". Has this an impact only on the profit and loss of that company? A joint venture also is under Parliament control. While speaking on Bailadilla also, I said this. These are not still under executive control. These public sector units are very much under parliamentary control.

it we are going in for such a venture, the Parliament has the right so know what impact

it will have on the purpose, on the objectives, on the basis of which these public sector undertakings were placed under the control of Parliament. Now, discussions are going to take place in Singapore and all of us are worried about it. We expressed our opinion about it and we expected that the Government would come and say something. It is high time to say. Yes the Government has to come before Parliament and say that this is the agenda, these are the issues, this is our stand, this is the stand that we are going to take and we are going to tell them also that whatever we decide there, it is ultimately the House, it is ultimately the Parliament, it is ultimately the people of India, who have to say whether this is the policy which we have to choose. But this is not happening. In the process it is not that we are only losing. We are not only losing what we call our own interests, our sovereignty, but we are losing the confidence of the people also.

Today, when I am talking about judicial over-activism, which is very much prevalent in this country, some people are talking about judicial over-activism. What is judicial over-activism? Judicial over-activism has come to fore because of the pessimism of Parliament; judicial over-activism is because of the fact that the people of India, the Parliament have been kept in dark. So, they wanted to elicit information and the only forum they thought fit where they can elicit information is the court. When it is a Public Interest Litigation petition, certain words have been spoken about the public or political interest. I have spoken about certain public or political interests right now. Day before yesterday, we had raised a discussion regarding one of these power projects which is being formed. Now, we do not know about it. The Parliament does not know about it. The Press flashes it. People feel that if such a power company comes to this country, their paying capabilities will be affected. They have to pay more tariff. It is for their interest that they have to go somewhere. Now, if Parliament is not there, if Parliament will not take care of that, naturally, they will have to go to a court. Why? Before the issue was discussed in Parliament, people have to go to a court. The State Governments have to approach the court. Why? It is not only the theories, it is not only the ideas, it is not only

the debate, whether you are for it or against it, but it is for eliciting information, it is for transparency, and the people have the right to know if whatever you are going to do, affect them. If you are in a position to say: "Okay, these decisions or these treaties are not going to affect the people. I don't think these matters will come before a court. But whatever treaties are being talked about, right from GATT, WTO, investments, insurance, power, energy, think about it. Whatever is happening has a direct impact on the people, in which case, the people must have the right to know what is happening and the best place for getting it ratified is the Parliament. You may or may not agree there. Mr. Singla and I may disagree on every point. But this will be decided here, not outside.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): Mr. Singla agrees with you, sometimes.

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: Very rarely. But on this point he will also agree. Let us discuss all these issues on the floor of the House. Let the issue be discussed here. When we are talking about the multilateral treaties here, they have their own impact also. Well, I am a student of science. As far as science is concerned, you are expanding its area. You are not restricting yourself to your country only. When you are talking about policies, you are talking about globalised policies. The sphere is increasing. The horizon is increasing. When everything is increasing, the scope of discussion has also to increase. Now the same theory, the way in which we used to take decisions in the North Block or south Block or West Block or East Block, cannot be adopted. The decisions cannot emanate from Bhawans. When you talk about globalisation—I am not able to frame that word—think about the people. They must know the details of these things. These things cannot emanate from Bhawans. You have to win the confidence of the people. They have a right to question you at any time they like. At that point of time, if you do not like it, don't call it a Political Interest Petition. Call it a Public Interest Petition. Don't call it a judicial activism. If there was vacuum and there was no forum for them to raise the issue, they had to go to a court. I am not going

to name anyone. But here, in this Parliament, certain information called from the Ministry.

It was not given in time. What happens if some court asks for the same thing? The same thing, when it is sought by a court, goes there within fifteen days. It is high time that Parliament, on behalf of the people, not as MPs, asserted its rights, and asserted its rights in the wake of globalisation and liberalisation, what you were talking about that every thing might be transparent, discussed and decided over here. And this holds good specifically in the present circumstances in which we are. Sir, in the public sector *.(Interruptions)...* I know that; I can tell you and I can also give you the documents in private discussion. It is not that we were not aware as to what is going to happen, what the decisions are. But if it is our decision, 246 public sector undertakings are there. Now we are discussing whether they are going to stay or whether they are going to be closed. Some companies are sick, some companies can be made healthy, some companies are profitable, but in 1991, there was a list, the list circulated by your own agency. It was available with the bureaucrats, but it was not available with the people, it was not available with the workers! If they had already identified that these many had to be kept in the public sector, these many had to be closed, these many might have to go in for a joint venture, there would not have been any problem. This information was not shared with the workers. If this information is not shared with the workers and if their job is at stake, do you think that they will be silent spectators when all these things are going to be done? Today if it is felt that our economy should be import-oriented, if our economy is totally export-oriented, the decision-making process should involve the people also. Decisions cannot come clandestinely. When you are talking about insurance, today, you are also asking whether private people can also come into the insurance sector. Okay, come out and tell us this is how it is going to come. Let the Parliament discuss about it. Let it not be discussed surreptitiously. That calls for not only parliamentary assertiveness. And that is a question of confidence of the people. People will lose confidence in Parliament if these

things are not rectified in the Parliament, people will lose confidence in the system with which you are working unless you have this transparency. Discuss everything under the sky; discuss it under the sky in this globalised situation in Parliament. With these words, I think, Sir, that it is not only for the purpose of making Constitutional amendments. The way in which the world has been dealing with our political quality for the last fifty years is also being amended. The political climate, the political atmosphere has to bring in the transparency and the right to information. Thank you, Sir.

PROF. (SHRIMATI) BHARATI RAY (West Bengal): Sir, I rise to support the Bill. I support the Bill mainly on two counts, Sir. The first is, as my previous speaker said, it is a question of transparency. What happens to us, what is going to happen to us, concern the people of the country. The people have every right to know any contract. This is not just for this Government, for any Government in power. It is a question of information and it is a question of democratic principles. If it is a Government of the people, for the people and by the people, then the people must approve or confirm the negotiations, the proceedings, the Acts which are going to affect them. Tagore had written a beautiful poem, which means tell us where you are taking us to, which the destination is and how long will it take us to reach there. So, this sort of questions, this sort of uncertainties always hang in our minds and, therefore, it should be very clear to the people, the common people of the country where the boat is taking us, how far the destination is and what the time-limit is. Sir, this sort of practices, that is, getting negotiations confirmed and approved by the people, are there in the majority of democratic and developed countries like Japan, France, Spain, Italy, Denmark, Switzerland and the United States.

4.00 P.M.

I am not in favour of the view that whatever advanced countries or the developed countries do, we must do. But the point is that it is a democratic Government and, therefore, that which concerns the people must be approved

by the people. This is one of the basic points which is sought to be emphasised by me. What will happen, if a decision is taken on a Government-to-Government basis or an international contract or agreement is signed in the case of women? In the field of industry, cheap women labour is available in this country. Therefore, the developed countries are trying to build industries here. They are paying our women only a nominal amount for their labour and they get the products of their cheap labour imported to their countries and again exported to us at a higher price. Women, most of whom are at the unorganised level, are suffering immensely because of what I call cheating, cheating them of a reasonable and fair income that could be available to them. In the case of education, what will happen? What will happen if international agreements and contracts are made in regard to education? The fee will go up it has already gone up. If the fee goes up and up, it will be beyond the reach of the common people. What is happening in the case of Intellectual Property Rights and GATT? The WTO was signed without being ratified by the Parliament. We all know that *neem* is being patented by the western people. *Haldi* is being patented *andamla* is going to be patented by the US. All that are known to us for centuries are going to be patented by others. The other day the question of biodiversity piracy came up. When I was a child my grandmother used to give me the juice of a leaf, if I had any stomach problem, and the stomachache or the stomach problem got cured within half an hour. All these things are taken away by the US and we are the recipients of processed juice or products like that and we have to pay high price. These products will be beyond the reach of the ordinary people. Therefore, since these things are possible or may happen or are going to happen or are happening already, I suggest that all international agreements should be first placed before the Parliament, made known to the common people and approved by them. Then only they should be passed by the Government or signed by the Government. Thank you.

SHRI SURINDER KUMAR SINGLA (Punjab): Sir, I am extremely grateful to my friend, Mr. Baby, for prompting me to

participate in the discussion on this Bill. I consider this Bill an extremely important one for a variety of reasons. One would admit today that the whole human society is moving towards globalisation. A lot of international organisations are established and their role and their influence in policy-making all over the world is increasing tremendously. The establishment of these international organisations, whether they are in the field of bilateral or multilateral negotiations and agreements, has a very far-reaching impact on all the societies. India is no exception.

India is no exception. India is experimenting its relations with the outside world. The Government can make mistakes. India can profess for such international agreements. But it reflects the perception of Parliament. Parliament's perception would mean Parliament represents the interests of the entire country. It is possible—I am not saying that it is not possible—that a Government may not reflect the true interest of a country; may be, a certain kind of partisan interest gets into it. It could be useful. It may not be harmful. But this Bill seeks to establish not more powers for Parliament, but more participation of Parliament in the decision-making. It need not really be taken in the sense that somebody is eroding the authority of Parliament. We are saying that the decision-making role should be restored to Parliament. Parliament has the right to know about any decision being taken by the Government so that the interests of the people, in general, are not affected. In this context, I would like to say that ratification of international agreements by discussions in Parliament is a very good idea. It needs to be implemented even if the Constitution is required to be amended, as it has been stated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons. I am happy that my friend, Shri Dipanker Mukherjee, was arguing about globalisation which he normally opposes. There are two things. One thing is, when globalisation is taking place, the supremacy of Parliament is reducing everywhere in the world. Some sovereignty is really becoming a shared sovereignty. For example, in the European Common Market, Parliaments have certain powers. The European Parliament is going to

use those powers. It means, reflecting the sovereign character of nations which are participating in the ECM. Mr. Baby, now we are moving towards the concept of shared sovereignty. When nations meet and take a collective decision, there is a possibility that certain powers of nations or certain sovereign powers of nations would be shared. Multilateral decisions are being taken by Parliaments. There is a possibility of shared responsibility and shared sovereignty coming up. This Bill is virtually trying to say that there is no harm if international agreements are brought before Parliament, not for the purpose of transparency but for the purpose of wider discussions. I am not saying that this Government or that Government or Governments, in general, lack wisdom.

It is always preferable if pieces of advice come from every sector to correct the Government or to help the Government in taking a proper view when a decision is taken. My feeling is that this Bill needs total support. One, it is going to establish the authority of the Parliament; second, it will reflect people's views before an agreement is signed. One would agree that there are numerous agreements which are concluded and these have far-reaching implications for this country. For example, a mention is made of the WTO. It is a very serious issue. Indian Government is going to commit itself on behalf of the people of India and this will decide our trade relations for the next 50 years. A certain section may think that the Government is taking a wrong decision.

The Government should not be the only authority. The Government should come to Parliament before it commits itself to an agreement or treaty. Secondly, this is not out of tune with what the other powers in the world are doing. I was reading a newspaper recently wherein it was stated that in America the President has absolute powers. But when international agreements are made, they are supposed to be ratified by both the Senate and the Congress. It is not mere ratification. In fact, it needs to be passed by a two-thirds majority. It means that this kind of agreement needs a larger consent and a larger support. I gathered that in one of the cases in relation to Mexico,

after an agreement was signed it went to the Senate where it was not approved. The agreement had to be amended. After the amendment, it was ratified and the people of America stood to gain maximum from it. Nobody is questioning the right of the Government to enter into an agreement. Nobody is questioning the right of the Government to negotiate. But before the Government finalises any agreement, there should be a debate and there should be a consensus in Parliament. Parliament's will should be reflected in the decision which is taken by the Government. In this context, I fully support this Bill and strongly advocate that Government should come forward with such a Bill so as to protect our interest.

SHRI E. BALANANDAN (Kerala): Sir, today we are discussing an unofficial Bill which has a bearing on the freedom of the country as a whole. We are living in a new world order. This is a world which is globalised. I request you to see the latest reports of the ILO. They will tell you how globalisation has affected the people of the world. One billion people are unemployed.

Developed capitalist societies today are telling us about the effects of globalisation, liberalisation and privatisation. What is happening in the developed societies today? In United States, in England or rather Britain, Germany and in all the developed societies what is happening today is that, they are in a dilemma. Their productivity increases but at the same time they do not find jobs to give to the people. Eleven per cent is the average unemployment in Germany and it is more than 12 per cent in Britain and in United States officially it is 5.6 per cent but actually it is 11 per cent. In Japan it is said to be three per cent but actually it is more than that. For the last five years the G-7 leaders had to confer four times to consider only one point, i.e., employment. With all the so-called technological and scientific development of the world they find an anomaly, a crisis which is developing in the developed societies. The answer they find is that they want GATT or WTO they find their own mechanism. The era of imperialism was there. We know what happened in the last 200 years. The Britishers

came here for trade and finally snatched away our freedom. That is the history of India. Now, today, after the weakening of imperialism they are now having in their hand scientific and technological advancement. With that they want to dominate the world and they are using two mechanisms for that. One is the World Bank and the other is the IMF. These are twin brothers. Now we are talking about WTO. Everything is discussed by everybody simple herbal medicines in my village will be patented by somebody in England. My father and my mother were using it freely. But my son and myself are now going to be deprived because of the conditions of patents agreed to by gentlemen representing our Government. What we want today is this. The Bill intends nothing very serious. This august House, this Parliament has the power to see what is being done by the Government in international affairs whether in trade or commerce. Any kind of agreement they agree to should come back to the Parliament. The sovereign right of the people is being exercised through Parliament and we in Parliament elect our ministers. They should be accountable to us. When they go for negotiations with anybody on earth they can negotiate. They represent a free country, India. They can take into confidence the people of India. The Parliament is there. They must see that their action should be in the interest of the Indian people, and it is approved by Parliament. But now some kind of a back-door method is being resorted to. In the name of Constitution they come and tell us. I remember some Minister was arguing with me. You might remember. He was saying, "As per the Constitution, I have the right to negotiate." We humbly told them "We have no right, we made you minister. You became very independent from us and you tell us that you have the right to do everything." This kind of method and system cannot be agreed to. Therefore, Mr. Baby's amendment is a major amendment to protect the interests of the country and our freedom. Therefore, Sir, I request everybody in this House including the ruling benches and the House as a whole to agree to this amendment. Sir, the implications of these are very, very serious. What is being done? Now a theory is being sought to be sold to us that in India, what we do is not good. Everything done

in United States is very good and Indian people are such people who do not know anything.

Whatever it is—science, technology, knowledge or trade—don't deal with India. We feel we should not do anything. Let us be dependent on some other countries.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, may I draw your attention to one thing? Yesterday a question was raised about the safety aspects of atomic energy projects. India is a country which can design nuclear power plants. We can produce nuclear energy. We can also take the best possible safety measures in regard to our nuclear plants. This is the kind of technological advancement which India has achieved. Take, for example, the power engineering machines. We don't know what we are going to do with our power engineering industry. It employs about 32,000 workers. It is producing all the power machines which are required for the country. Yesterday, my friend, Mr. Manmohan Singh, was on record saying that privatisation of power industry should be done away with. What did we do in the power sector? When India became independent, we were producing just about 3,000 MW of power. Today we are producing about 83,000 MW of power. Even this much is not sufficient and we require more. But the Government has slowed down investment in the power sector. Why? They talk about globalisation, liberalisation, privatisation. They say that we have to interact with other countries. Perhaps we may not be concerned with our country. We are only concerned about other countries. The advanced countries have found it difficult to sell their power machines. They don't have any market for their goods. So, they want to come to India. How can they come to India? They wish to enter India by exerting pressure on India through the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. They say that if you want loans from the World Bank or the International Monetary Fund, you must agree to our conditions. Every day, day in and day out, the President of the World Bank makes statements that India should do this and India should do that. The dos' and don'ts are prescribed to India by the World Bank officials. Then, are we a sovereign State? yes, we are a sovereign State. But, somehow or other, we have started globalising our

economy, liberalising our economy for the last five years. The globalisation, liberalisation and privatisation business has been going on for the last five years. The effect of all this is that we are going to depend upon other countries, the advanced countries. I would like to tell the House a few more things. Our public sector company, BHEL, took part in global tenders. Out of 31 such tenders, we got 29. How could we get so many contracts? We got them on two considerations. One is that we have established world-class standards. Even price-wise, we are the cheapest. But our Government does not consider this aspect. I am sorry some of our Ministers do not consider this aspect as important.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): You say the Government is not considering. Then it will imply a collective responsibility.

SHRI E. BALANANDAN: Where is the persuasion coming from? The persuasion is coming from the World Bank. The persuasion is coming from the World Trade Organisation. In Karnataka, our farmers are agitating against Neem patenting. I will describe a situation. There is a tree which was planted by somebody. People from different generations have been using it for various purposes. One fine morning, the owners of the tree are told, "see, you can no longer be the owners of this tree because somebody elsewhere has patented it. Some company outside India has patented it and has been producing medicines from it. So, you cannot it. You cannot make use of it in future." The point is: Can we agree to this? Can India be told by somebody else in the US to do or not to do particular things? India is a big country. We are a sovereign country and we are capable of managing our own affairs. Therefore, what I want to say is that any agreement relating to either trade or commerce or anything else, which is agreed to by our Ministers should be subject to the approval of Parliament. This is very essential. In regard to power sector, we are going into a serious situation because of our agreeing to outside counsel. Yesterday I spoke about non-payment of wages to the IDPL workers. I demanded that the Government should change its policy. We have a history of our own. After 1947, we are a

democratic country, a free country. From 1950s onwards, we are following the path of planned development in which we have made a tremendous progress through we have to go further.

But why do you shun your past? Somebody comes and says you should liberalise and, therefore, you liberalise and give up your past. Are we to disown our fathers and mothers? Everything is being disowned. The path is being disowned. For forty-one years, from 1950 to 1991, we were on our own path and we developed certain things. So we developed the Indian Drugs and Pharmaceuticals Ltd. which has six or seven factories. The IDPL produces vital medicines that are available to the people of this country at cheaper rates. Now when the multinational companies are coming, we should see to it that they reduce the prices of their medicines. We are nearly hundred crores of people. All of us are not Birlas. A large majority of our population, which is poor, require cheaper life-saving drugs. The Government had this policy. But why do you change that now? You want us to close our shops and the multinationals to come.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): I think you may like to wind up now. There are seven or eight Members more who have to speak.

SHRI E. BALANANDAN: I was talking about these multinational companies and the multi-lateral arrangements that are being talked about everywhere—Geneve or, for that matter, anywhere. These gentlemen, the Ministers, go there. They are free to negotiate. They must negotiate. But they must negotiate with the confidence that they would be able to sell the idea to the Parliament. They should not think that they can do it privately, from behind the Parliament. They should not do it thinking that there is a provision in the Constitution by which they can escape the Parliament and Parliament's scrutiny. This is the way in which some Ministers were arguing in this House. So, in the present situation, we cannot but agree to this amendment, which is a precious one.

Finally, during our discussions daily in this House, we have been intervening on many questions, including the question of oil. When

the question of oil exploration came, many foreign companies, especially the seven sisters—whether they are famous or notorious—came to India. They could not find oil anywhere. They were drilling and drilling. The oil was available in India. Wasn't it wonderful? Finally, the Soviet team came here. Now, that is a subject for a separate discussion whether the Soviet companies are good or bad. But the point here is that there was no oil in India. The oil was there on the seashores. Finally, our own company, the ONGC, with the technical help of the Soviet Union, found the oil. It was not only that we found the oil, but we became self-sufficient to the extent of 85% of our requirements of oil. Then, to our bad-rack, a theory came! The theory of liberalisation came and we thought that we should not produce oil, we should buy oil from any country. What is there? All right, theories can be sold. But that should be accepted by the Parliament. These should be placed before the Parliament. The Parliament should debate so that we understand the implications. So, this is what is happening now. We have to buy our own oil at international prices. We are now discussing this in the Standing Committee. The Chairman of the Standing Committee is a very efficient man. He is calling all the officers. The officers say that we have to buy oil at international rates. This is our own oil and we have to pay money to these companies for our share. These are the kinds of conditions that are coming. What is it? The essence of it all is that whatever we got in 1947 by way of our freedom is to be taken out by backdoor or by dubious means by these imperialists, utilising the machinery and mechanism of the World Bank and the IMF. And the latest mechanism is the WTO.

Sir, in our country, intellectuals like VR. KRISHNA IYER and others, experts and scientists have studied the Patents Act and have made innumerable documents. They are not interested in anything, they are interested in only one thing—freedom, freedom of our own life. Therefore, Sir, the Bill which has been brought forward by Mr. M.A. Baby is a precious Bill. I request all the Members of this august House to unanimously pass it. Sir, I on behalf of my party support this Bill. Thank you very much, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHR! TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): Mr. Balanandan, your Baby has brought forward a very precious and mature Bill. You must be satisfied with it.

श्री जलालुद्दीन अंसारी (बिहार): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, श्री एम.ए. बेबी जो यह बिल लाए हैं कि संविधान की धारा 77 में संशोधन किया जाए, मैं इसका समर्थन करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ। हमारे साधियों ने इसके सारे पहलुओं पर ध्यान रखते हुए बहुत विस्तार प्रकाश डाला है। हमारे देश की सरकार ने आर्थिक उदारीकरण की नीति अपनाई है और उसके जो परिणाम हो रहे हैं, उससे हमारे देश के उद्योग-धंधों, कृषि में जो तरक्की होनी चाहिए थी वह होने के बजाय उसमें गिरावट आ रही है। साथ ही साथ यह आर्थिक उदारीकरण की नीति हमारे सामाजिक, आर्थिक और राजनीतिक जीवन में भी गिरावट ला रही है। हाल के वर्षों में जो बहुपक्षीय समझौते, सौदे और करार किए गए, उसका भी असर हमारे देश के सामाजिक, आर्थिक जीवन पर पड़ रहा है। इसको ध्यान में रखते हुए व्यापार और ट्रेड संबंधी जो गैट समझौता हुआ, उसके संबंध में भी देश के अंदर और संसद में एक सवाल उठा था कि यह समझौता करने से पहले इसके बारे में संसद में राय क्यों नहीं ली गई? इसके बारे में विचार क्यों नहीं किया गया और संसद से अनुमोदन क्यों नहीं कराया गया? संसदीय जनतंत्र में संसद सर्वोच्च होती है। वह व्यावहारिक दृष्टि से भी सर्वोच्च होनी चाहिए। यह नहीं कि सरकार करार करा ले, समझौते करा ले, सौदे करा ले फिर संसद के पास अनुमोदन के लिए पहुंच जाए ताकि देश की जनता और जनता के चुने हुए जो प्रतिनिधि हैं, वे देश और जनता के हितों पर विचार किए बगैर इस दृष्टि से उस करार और समझौते का अनुमोदन कर दें कि अब तो दो देशों का सवाल है, समझौता हो गया है, इसका अनुमोदन करना ही है। यह देशहित और जनहित में नहीं माना जाएगा और उसके परिणाम आज क्या हो रहे हैं? विश्व व्यापार संगठन है, अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मुद्रा कोष है, विश्व बैंक है, इसकी भूमिका क्या है? ये सारे बड़े देश हैं, विकसित देश हैं।

वे अपने आर्थिक संकटों को हल करने के लिए विश्व बैंक के माध्यम से, अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मुद्रा कोष के माध्यम से और विश्व व्यापार संगठन के माध्यम से विकसित देशों पर बोझ लाद कर अपनी आर्थिक समस्या को हल करना चाहते हैं। हमारे देश में इसके बारे में कम लिखा जाता है लेकिन ब्रिटेन, अमेरिका, जापान और जर्मनी के जो लेखक हैं, अर्थ-शास्त्री हैं वे बहुत सारी किताबें इस संबंध में लिख चुके हैं। उनका मानना है कि इस तरह से वे विकसित

देश अपने आर्थिक संकट का भी समाधान नहीं कर सकते हैं और नहीं कर पा रहे हैं जबकि हम उनकी नकल करने चले हैं, उनके डिक्लेट पर हम चले हैं। आज इन विकसित देशों के अन्दर बेरोजगारी की क्या स्थिति है? महंगाई की क्या स्थिति है? उनके सामाजिक जीवन की क्या स्थिति है? इससे भी स्पष्ट है कि उनके बताये हुए नक़्शे पर चलकर हमारा देश और हमारे जैसे जो विकसित देश हैं, उनकी नीति पर चल कर अपने देश के हित की रक्षा नहीं कर सकते हैं। उनका परिणाम क्या हो रहा है? पांच साल तो बीतने जा रहे हैं। यह भूमण्डलीय नीति की, ग्लोबलाइजेशन की चर्चा बहुत होती है। महोदय, यह तर्क दिया जाता है कि इस आर्थिक उदारीकरण की नीति से और भूमण्डलीय प्रवेश करने से हमारे देश का व्यापार दूसरे देशों में बढ़ेगा। क्या बढ़ेगा? कल ही टेक्सटाइल मिलों के मजदूर प्रदर्शन करने के लिए आए हुए थे। आज टेक्सटाइल मिलों की क्या हालत है? जब हम कपड़ा ही पैदा नहीं कर सकेंगे तो कपड़े का निर्यात हम दूसरे देशों में कैसे कर सकेंगे? आईडीपीएल की चर्चा हमारे मित्रों ने की। पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने इस देश की आवश्यकता को ध्यान में रखते हुए आईडीपीएल को खोला और आज आईडीपीएल की पूरे देश में पांच यूनिट्स हैं। उनकी स्थिति क्या है? इस आर्थिक उदारीकरण की नीति को अपनाते हुए इसको निजीकरण की दिशा में भेजा जा रहा है, संयुक्त क्षेत्र में प्वाइंट वेंचर में भेजने की बात की जा रही है बगैर बताये, बगैर कहे... (व्यवधान)...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री त्रिलोकी नाथ चतुर्वेदी): जलालुद्दीन साहब, आप जरा संक्षिप्त में कहें।

श्री जलालुद्दीन अंसारी: मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि इस नीति का क्या परिणाम हो रहा है, करारों का क्या परिणाम निकल रहा है, अपने देश के आर्थिक और सामाजिक जीवन में क्या नतीजे निकल रहे हैं? अभी हैदराबाद में जो आईडीपीएल है उसमें दो महीने से उत्पादन बन्द है और दो महीने से मजदूरों का वेतन बन्द है। आईडीपीएल की यूनिट्स के लोग भी 10 तारीख को प्रदर्शन करने आ रहे हैं... (व्यवधान)...

उपसभाध्यक्ष: आपको नायदू साहब उस बारे में जवाब देंगे।

श्री जलालुद्दीन अंसारी: मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि फर्टीलाइजर की जो हालत है वह सबको मालूम है। ऐसा करार हुआ कि यूरिया खाद आया ही नहीं और 133 करोड़ रूपया इस देश की जतना का चला गया। अगर ऐसे ही सौदे होते रहे, ऐसे ही करार होते रहे तो हमारे किसानों का क्या होगा? हमारे मजदूरों का क्या होगा?

इसीलिए इससे बेरोजगारी बढ़ रही रही है, मुद्रा स्फीति और मंहगाई बढ़ती चली जा रही है तो ऐसे तमाम कारों, समझौतों से हमारा क्या लाभ होगा? सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र के कारखानों बन्द किए जा रहे हैं, विदेशी निवेश की आवश्यकता है, इसको मैं मानता हूँ, मैं टोटली उसका विरोधी नहीं हूँ लेकिन देश के हित में निवेश होना चाहिए। बहुराष्ट्रीय कम्पनियों का चारागाह हम इस देश को नहीं बना सकते हैं और इसकी छूट नहीं मिलनी चाहिए।

यह तर्क दिया जाता है कि विज्ञान और टेक्नोलॉजी में हम दूसरे देशों से पीछे हैं इसलिए हमको बाहर से मंगाना चाहिए क्योंकि हम अपने देश में तकनीकी विकास नहीं कर सकते। हमारे देश के अच्छे वैज्ञानिकों और तकनीशियनों का यह दुर्भाग्य है कि उनको इस देश में पूछ नहीं जाता है इसलिए विदेशों में जाकर वे अपना करिश्मा दिखला रहे हैं। क्या यह सच नहीं है? इस बात को इस देश के लोग जानते हैं यह सदन जानता है और हमारी सरकार भी जानती है। सही मायनों में जो वैज्ञानिक तकनीकी खोजों के विकास के लिये प्रयत्न देना चाहिए वह हमारे यहां नहीं हो रहा है बल्कि हम विदेशों से तकनीकी लाकर के इस देश को चमत्कारिक करना चाहते हैं। इसलिए मैं इस बिल का समर्थन करता हूँ और संविधान की धारा-77 में संशोधन किया जाये ताकि इस तरह के जो भी सौदे, समझौते और करार किये जायें उनकी स्वीकृति भारतीय संसद से ली ली जाये। यह देश के हित में है। यह जो संविधान संबंधी प्रस्ताव है मैं इसका समर्थन करता हूँ और आशा करता हूँ कि इस पर हमारी सरकार भी ज्यादा गम्भीरतापूर्वक विचार करेगी, इसको चलने की कोशिश नहीं करेगी, यह देश के हित में है, जनता के हित में है। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ।

अशरी जलल الدین انصاری بہار: اپ
سبھا ادھی کشن مہودے۔ شری ایم۔ اے۔
بے بی جو یہ بل لائے ہیں کہ سفود معان کی
دھارا ۷۷ میں سنسود معن کیا جائے میں
اسکا سمرقن کرتا ہوں اور سمرقن کرنے
کیکے کھڑا ہوا ہوں۔ ہمارے ساقیوں نے
اسکے سارے پہلوؤں پر دھیان رکھنے ہوئے
بہت دستار سے پر کاش ڈالا ہے ہمارے
دیش کی سسر کالانے آرٹھک اداری کرن
کی نیہنی اپنائی ہے۔ اور اسکی جو پر بنام
ہو رہے ہیں۔ اس سے ہمارے دیش کے

† [] Transliteration in Arabic script.

ادیوگ دھندوں مکرشی میں جو ترقی ہونی
چاہیے تھی وہ ہونے کے بجائے اس میں گروتھ
آ رہی ہے۔ ساتھ ہی ساتھ یہ آرٹھک
اداری کرن کی نیہنی ہمارے سماجک
آرٹھک اور ساجھنیک جیوں میں بھی گروتھ
لا رہی ہے حال کے ورشوں میں جو
تھو پکشی سمجھتے۔ مہودے اور کرار کے
لئے اسکا بھی اثر ہمارے دیش کے سماجک
آرٹھک جیوں پر پڑ رہا ہے۔ اسکو دھیان
میں رکھتے ہوئے ویبا پار اور ٹریڈ سمبندھی
جو گینٹ سمجھتا ہوا۔ اسکے سمبندھ میں
بھی دیش کے اندر اور سنسود میں
ایک سوال اٹھا تھا۔ کہ یہ سمجھتے کرنے
سمجھتے اسکے بارے میں سنسود میں رائے
کیوں نہیں لی گئی۔ اسکے بارے میں چار
کیوں نہیں کیا گیا۔ اور سنسود سے انمودن
کیوں نہیں کر دیا گیا۔ سنسود کے جن نتر
میں سنسود سروج ہوتی ہے۔ وہ ویو پارک
درستی سے بھی سروج ہونی چاہیے۔
یہ نہیں سمرکار قرار کرنے۔ مہودے کرانے
پھر سنسود کے پاس انمودن کے لئے
پہنچ جائے تاکہ دیش کی جنتا اور جنتا
کے چنے ہوئے جو پریفونڈ ہی ہیں وچ دیش
اور جنتا کے حقوں پر وچار کے بنیر اس

† [] Transliteration in Arabic script.

درستی اور حقدار اور مسدود سے کاڑھوں
 کر دیں کہ اب تو دو دیشوں کا سوال ہے۔
 سمجھتا ہوں گیا ہے۔ اسکا انوموڈن کرنا
 ہی ہے۔ تو یہ دیش صحت اور جن صحت
 میں نہیں مانا جائیگا اور اسکے پرینام آج
 کیا ہوا ہے ہیں۔ وشنو ویا پار سنگھن
 ہے۔ انترار اشٹریہ مدراکوش ہے۔
 وشنو بینک ہے۔ اسکی مجموعہ میلا گیا ہے۔
 یہ سارا بڑے دیش میں۔ وہ اپنے آرٹیکل
 سنگھن کو حل کرنے کیلئے وشنو بینک کے
 مادھیم سے۔ انترار اشٹریہ مدراکوش
 کے مادھیم سے اور وشنو ویا پار سنگھن
 کے مادھیم سے وکست دیشوں پر برہو
 لاد کر کے اپنی آرٹیکل سمسیا کو حل کرنا چاہتے
 ہیں۔ ہمارے دیش میں اسکے بارے میں تم
 لگا جاتا ہے۔ لیکن برٹین۔ امریکہ۔ جاپان
 اور جرمنی کے جو لیگٹ ہیں۔ اور جو شماری
 ہیں۔ وہ بہت ساری کتابیں اس سمبندھ
 میں لکھ چکے ہیں۔ انکا ماننا ہے کہ اس
 طرح سے یہ وکست دیش اپنے آرٹیکل سنگھن
 کا بھی سارا جان نہیں کر سکتے ہیں۔ اور
 نہیں کر پارہے ہیں جبکہ ہم انکی نقل کرنے چلے
 ہیں۔ لکھ ڈیکٹ برہم چلے ہیں۔ آج ان
 وکست دیشوں کے اندر بے روزگاری کی

† [] Transliteration in Arabic script.

کیا استحق ہے۔ مہنگائی کی کیا استحق ہے۔
 ان کی سماجک جیون کی کیا استحق ہے۔
 مہنگائی کی کیا استحق ہے تو اس سے بھی
 اسپیشٹ ہے کہ کہ بتائے ہوئے نقشہ
 پر چلکر ہمارا دیش اور ہمارے جیسے
 جو وکست دیش ہیں انکی ذمہ پر چلکر اپنے
 دیش کے صحت کی رکشا نہیں کر سکتے ہیں
 انکا پرینام کیا ہوا ہے۔ پانچ سال تو
 بیٹھے جا رہے ہیں۔ یہ بہو منڈل کرن
 نہیں کی۔ گلوبالائی زیشن کی جبر جا بہت
 ہوتی ہے۔ ہوا ہے۔ یہ ترک دیا جاتا
 ہے کہ اس آرٹیکل اداری کرن کی ذمہ
 سے اور بہو منڈل کرن میں پرویش کرنے
 کرنے سے ہمارے دیش کا ویا پار دوسرے
 دیشوں میں بڑھے گا۔ کل ہی ٹیکسٹائل
 ملوں کے مزدور پرویش کرنے کیلئے
 آئے ہوتے تھے۔ آج ٹیکسٹائل ملوں
 کی کیا حالت ہے۔ جب ہم کپڑا ہی پیدا
 نہیں کر سکیں گے تو پیرے کا زیاہ ہم
 دوسرے دیشوں میں کسے کر سکیں گے۔
 آئی۔ ڈی۔ بی۔ ایل۔ کی چرچا ہمارے
 معروہوں نے کی ہے۔ جو اہل لال ٹھرونے
 اس دیش کی آوشیکٹا کو حیان میں
 رکھنے ہوئے۔ آئی۔ ڈی۔ بی۔ ایل۔

† [] Transliteration in Arabic script.

کو ٹھکرا اور بیچ آئی۔ ڈی۔ پی۔ ایل کی پروپوزیشن میں پانچ یونٹ ہیں۔ انکی استغنی کیا ہے۔ اس آرٹیکل ڈیریکٹ کی نیٹی کو اپناتے ہوئے اسکو نجی کرن کی دشا میں بھیجا جا رہا ہے سینیٹ ٹیسٹر میں جو اسٹ وینچر میں بھیجنے کی بات کی جا رہی ہے بغیر تباہے۔ بغیر کچھ۔۔۔ مداخلت۔۔۔ اپ سبھا ادھیکش شری تر لوک ناٹھ چتر ویری: جلال الدین صاحب آپ ذرا سنشپت میں کہیں۔

شری جلال الدین انصاری: میں بتانا چاہتا ہوں کہ اس نیٹی کا کیا پرینام ہو رہا ہے۔ کراچی کا کیا پرینام نکل رہا ہے۔ اپنے دیش کے آرٹیکل اور سماجک جیون میں کیا نتیجے نکل رہے ہیں۔ ابھی حیدر آباد میں جو آئی ڈی پی ایل ہے اس میں دو پیسے سے اتپادن بند ہے۔ آئی ڈی پی ایل کی یونٹس کے لوگ بھی دس تاریخ کو پورڈش کرنے جا رہے ہیں۔۔۔ مداخلت۔۔۔

اپ سبھا ادھیکش: آپ کو نائیڈو صاحب اس بارے میں جواب دیں گے۔ شری جلال الدین انصاری: میں کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ فرٹیلڈ کرو کی جو حالت ہے۔ وہ سبکو معلوم ہے۔ ایسا کراچی اور کیریا ٹھکانہ آیا ہی نہیں اور سو سو کروڑ روپے

† [] Transliteration in Arabic script.

اس دیش کی جنتا کا جلا گیا۔ اگر ایسے ہی سو دے ہوتے ہے۔ ایسے ہی کرار ہوتے رہے۔ تو ہمارے کسانوں کا کیا ہوگا۔ ہمارے مزدوروں کا کیا ہوگا۔ اسلئے اس سے بے روزگاری بڑھ رہی ہے۔ دیش کی آرٹیکل استغنی میں سدا سدا کے بہانے اور کراوٹ آ رہی ہے۔ آرٹیکل استغنی اور بگڑ رہی ہے۔ سدا اسٹیفٹی اور مہنگائی بڑھتی چلی جا رہی ہے تو ایسے تمام کراؤں۔ سبھ توں سے ہمارا کیا ہوگا۔ سدا آرٹیکل ٹیسٹر کے مداخلتے بند کے تباہ رہے ہیں۔ دیش نویش کی آوشیا کتا ہے۔ اسکو میں مانتا ہوں۔ میں ٹوٹل اسکا اور دہی نہیں ہوں۔ لیکن دیش کے صحت میں نویش ہونا چاہیے۔ بہوڈا شری کے کمپنیوں کا چراگاہ ہم اس دیش کو نہیں بنا سکتے ہیں اور اسکی چھوٹ نہیں منی چاہیے۔ یہ ترک دیا جا چاہیے کہ وگیان اور ٹیکنالوجی میں ہم دو سو سے دیشوں سے پیسے ہیں اسلئے ہم کو باہر سے منگانا چاہیے کیونکہ ہم اپنے دیش میں تکنیکی وکاس نہیں کر سکتے۔ ہمارا دیش کے اچھے وگیانوں اور تکنیشینوں کا یہ درجا انیم ہے انکو اس دیش میں بوجھا نہیں جا رہا ہے اسلئے دیشوں میں جا کر وہ اپنا کوشش دیکھا رہے ہیں۔ کیا یہ سب

† [] Transliteration in Arabic script.

نہیں ہے۔ اس بات کو اس دیش کے لوگ
 جانتے ہیں یہ سب جانتا ہے۔ اور ہماری
 سرکار بھی جانتی ہے۔ سبھی معنوں میں
 ویکٹائیٹ تکنیکی کھوجوں کے وکاس کیلئے
 پراس ہونا چاہئے وہ ہمارے یہاں نہیں
 ہو رہا ہے۔ بلکہ ہم وڈیشنوں سے تکنیک
 لڈر کے اس دیش کو چھٹکارا کرنا چاہتے
 ہیں۔ اس لئے میں اس بل کا سمرٹن کرنا
 ہوں۔ اور سنوڈھان کی دھارا کے میں
 سنشوڈھن لکھا جائے۔ تاکہ اس طرح کے
 جو سروسے۔ سمجھوتے اور کرار کے کوائس
 انکی سوئی کرتی بھارتیہ سنسوڈھان سے لے کر کی جائے
 یہ دیش کے صحت میں ہے۔ یہ جو سنوڈھان
 میں سنشوڈھن پرستار ہے میں اسکا سمرٹن
 اتا ہوں اور آتھا کرتا ہوں کہ اس پر ہماری
 سرکار میں زیادہ گھیبیئر تاہر وک وچار
 کرے گی۔ اسکو ٹالنے کی کوشش نہیں کریں گی۔
 یہ دیش کے صحت میں ہے۔ جنتا کے صحت
 میں ہے۔ ان شہیروں کے ساتھ میں اپنی
 بات سہایت کرتا ہوں۔ دختم شوڈھان

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): My request to other speakers would be that they should be brief because we are running against time.

SHRI TARA CHARAN MAJUMDAR (ASSAM): Thank you very much, Sir. I will take only one minute. I support the amendment that has been brought forward by Mr. Baby. Sir, there is no place for any hush-hush in a

democracy like ours. People have a right to know as to what the move of the Government is going to be in a particular matter. This Bill is meant to ensure transparency and the right of the people to know. Decisions should not be taken behind the back of the people, without the knowledge of the representatives of the people. They should not be taken by surprise by any such decision which is carried out by a small coterie of people in the Government. We in the North-Eastern Region have suffered a great deal in this respect. The Members in this house are knowledgeable and they know that the decisions which affect the people should not be taken without the knowledge of the people themselves. Sir, this amendment has got a special implication for our people in the North-East. I wholeheartedly support the amending Bill. Thank you, Sir.

श्रीमति चन्द्रकला पांडेय (पश्चिमी बंगाल): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, माननीय सांसद एम. ए. बेबी जो विधेयक यहां लाये हैं मैं उसका समर्थन करने के लिए खड़ी हुई हूँ। एक कहावत है—

यह तो बेबी का विधेयक है जितनी मदर्ज और सिस्टर्ज हैं उनको ज्यादा वरीड होना चाहिये। इसलिए मैं सबसे पहले एक मां और बहन होने के नाते इसका समर्थन करती हूँ। इस विधेयक में पहली बात जो उद्देश्यों और कारणों का विवरण करते हुए कही गई है वह यह है कि राष्ट्र की नीतियों और उनके सामाजिक-आर्थिक जीवन में अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय संगठनों द्वारा किये गये हस्तक्षेप और उनके कारण बढ़ती हुई भूमिका कुछ देशों द्वारा द्विपक्षीय और बहुपक्षीय स्तर पर किये जा रहे सौदों तथा समझौतों के दूरगामी परिणाम को देखते हुए इस बात की संभावना दिखाई पड़ रही है कि.....।

उन्हें इस बात की संभावना थी कि आज का यह करार, यह समझौता देश के व्यापारिक और भौगोलिक हितों के विरुद्ध होगा। व्यापारिक करार की वार्ताओं के संबंध में इस बात की व्यापक रूप से मांग की गई कि देश की आर्थिक प्रभुता के माहोल पर प्रभाव डालने वाले इन मामलों पर कोई निर्णय लिए जाने के पूर्व संसद और लोगों को विश्वास में लिया जाना चाहिए। श्री एम. ए. बेबी का प्रस्ताव जो हमारे सामने आया है इसका समर्थन इसलिए किया जाना चाहिए क्योंकि भारत एक महान देश है और इस महान देश की महान संस्था, जिसमें जनवाणी गुंजती है संसद है और जनमन की विश्वास उसके मूर्तरूप देता है। अगर कोई समझौता या करार किया जाता है

जिससे देश के व्यापक हितों की रक्षा नहीं हो पाती है तो उससे देश के लोगों के बीच में एक ऐसे विश्वास का जन्म होता है कि लोग सोचते हैं कि क्या सचमुच में हमारे जो लोग, हमारे जो जन-प्रतिनिधि चुनकर संसद में बैठे हुए हैं, वे हम सब की बातों को सुनकर, हम सब की बातें समझकर, विश्व व्यापार स्तर पर जो समझौते हो रहे हैं क्या उनमें जनता की पहलकदमी होती है, सारे जनमन का प्रतिनिधित्व उसमें हो पाता है। जब लोगों को ऐसा लगता है कि ऐसा नहीं हो रहा है तो लोगों का विश्वास खंडित होता है। अभी कुछ दिन पहले की बात है। उन दिनों गैट समझौते को लेकर सारे भारत में विविध आंदोलन हो रहे थे। जहां तक हमारा सवाल है हम इस प्रकार के राष्ट्रीयकरण के बिल्कुल विरुद्ध नहीं हैं। लेकिन क्योंकि इसमें पारदर्शिता कम थी इसलिए कहीं चोरी-छुपे कुछ हो रहा है ऐसा जनता को लग रहा था। संसद में भी यह प्रस्ताव नहीं आया था और इस पर पूरी तरह से बहस नहीं हो पाई थी। इसलिए जन-प्रतिनिधि होने के नाते हमारा कर्तव्य है कि हम जनता की आवाज को यहां तक पहुंचावें। लेकिन शायद जनता के प्रति जो हमारा रवैया रहा; उसको हम ठीक से स्पष्ट नहीं कर पाए। महोदय, मैं यहां पर एक घटना रखना चाहती हूँ। एक दिन मैं एक आटो से यहां आई। मैंने उसको 6 रुपए दिए कहा कि एक रुपया वापस दो। उसने मुझे बड़ी घूर आंखों से देखा और कहने लगा कि आप एक रुपया मांगती हैं। मैंने कहा कि अगर मैं ऐसा करती हूँ कि इसमें क्या बुराई है। उसने कहा कि आप इस संसद में जाती हैं। आपको मालूम नहीं कि कितना गैट हो रहा है। आप यहां प्रश्न उठाती भी हैं या नहीं। मैंने कहा कि कई प्रश्न उठाते हैं और इसके लिए हम इतना आंदोलन कर रहे हैं। मैंने फिर कहा कि अगर तुम्हें इतना मालूम है तो मैं एक रुपये की जगह पर तुम्हें 5 रुपए देती हूँ जो जनतंत्र के बारे में तुम्हें इतनी जानकारी है, इसलिए तुम 5 रुपए के अधिकारी हो। इसलिए लोगों के मन में उथल-पुथल हो रही है कि विश्व व्यापार में विश्व संगठन के आधार पर कुछ ऐसा हो रहा है जिससे हमारा देश फिर से गुलाम हो जाएगा इस गुलाम भारतवर्ष में यहाँ के लोगों ने, यहाँ के कवियों ने यहाँ के शायरों ने गीत गाए। उनका दुख क्या था? उनका यह दुख था। हमारे देश में भारतेन्दु हरिश्चन्द्र एक महान कवि हुए हैं। उन्होंने लिखा था कि:

अंग्रेज राज में हम सुखी हैं, बड़ा आराम है लेकिन दुख क्या है कि वह हमारे देश के कच्चे माल को, हमारे देश की बौद्धिक सम्पदा को बाहर ले जा रहे हैं। दुख हमें इस बात का था और इसलिए आजादी की लड़ाई लड़ी गई

विश्व बंधुत्व का जहाँ तक सवाल है, विश्व बंधुत्व की बात हमारे प्राचीन शास्त्रों से हमारे अन्तर्मन तक है। हम सार्वभौमिक विश्व बंधुत्व की बात बहुत पहले से करते आए हैं। महात्मा गांधी ने आजादी की लड़ाई यहाँ से शुरू नहीं की बल्कि अफ्रीका से शुरू की। विवेकानन्द जी ने शिकागो में जाकर सर्वधर्म सम्मेलन किया। इस देश का इतिहास, इस देश का भूगोल यह बताता है कि हमारे बाहरी देशों से अच्छे संबंध थे। लेकिन गैट को लेकर विरोध इस कारण शुरू हुआ कि न तो संसद को विश्वास में लिया गया था और न यहाँ की जनता को विश्वास में लिया गया था। अगर विश्वास में लिया होता तो हमें यह मालूम होता कि यह जो अनुबंध किए जा रहे हैं वे हमारे हित में हैं, वे देश की बेहतरी के लिए हैं, वे देश की खुशहाली के लिए हैं तो शायद इतनी जोर से इसका विरोध नहीं होता। अगर होता तो वह अपनी शर्तों के लिए होता क्योंकि वे सब अपनी शर्तें लेकर आए थे और इस देश की बहु-राष्ट्रीय कंपनियों का चरागाह बनाने की दृष्टि से आए थे।

जब इस देश की मिट्टी परख कर यह देख रहे थे कि कैसे अपने देश के फलन-फूलन की सामग्री यहाँ से उपजा कर ले जा सकते हैं तो विरोध इसीलिए हुआ। मेरे कई माननीय सदस्यों ने कहा कि नीम का पेटेंट कर दिया गया, हल्दी का पेटेंट कर दिया गया और भी बहुत सारी चीजें हैं जो उनकी शर्तों पर विदेशी में चली जाएंगी। यह हमारे विरोध का कारण था। जैसे मीडिया को लेकर मुझे कुछ विशेष कहना है। मीडिया जगत में जैसे अनुप्रवेश हुआ है जैसे पूरी की पूरी भारतीय संस्कृति में विदेशी संस्कृति आ कर कहीं धुलमिल गई है। हम देखते रह गये हैं कि हम कौन थे, क्या हो गये हैं और अभी क्या होंगे। इन शब्दों के साथ उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस विधेयक का तर्हेदिल से समर्थन करती हूँ। मैं चाहती हूँ कि मंत्री महोदय जब जवाब देंगे तो मैं उनसे यह आश्वासन चाहूंगी कि जब भी कभी ऐसे कोई करार या अनुबंध किये जायेंगे तो संसद, को बिना विश्वास में लिये हुए, इसे देश की करोड़ों जनता की वाणी को बिना अपने आप में समाहित किये हुए कोई अनुबंध नहीं किये जाएंगे। धन्यवाद।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री त्रिलोकी नाथ चतुर्वेदी): धन्यवाद, चन्द्रकला जी। श्री ईश दत्त यादव। श्री अमर सिंह जी।

श्री अमर सिंह (उत्तर प्रदेश): धन्यवाद उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय। मैं आपको बहुत धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि श्री एम.ए. बेबी द्वारा प्रस्तुत संविधान संशोधन विधेयक पर बोलने का आपने मुझे मौका दिया। हमारे पूर्ववर्ती वक्ताओं ने विस्तार से इस मामले पर प्रकाश डाला है। मैं इस महान

सदन के सामने यह कहना चाहूंगा कि भारत जो एक महान देश है, इस देश को एक मंडी के रूप में विदेशी ताकतों इस्तेमाल करती रही है। और आज भी करना चाह रही है। हमको यह नहीं भूलना चाहिये कि हमारा अपना एक इतिहास है। एक ईस्ट इण्डिया कंपनी को हमने यहां आने की इजाजत दी थी और उस एक ईस्ट इण्डिया कंपनी ने यहां आ कर के पूरे के पूरे देश को पराधीन बना दिया और गुलामी की ज़ंजीरों में बहुत दिनों तक जकड़े रखा। मैं अपने पूर्ववर्ती वक्ताओं की इस बात से सहमत हूँ कि विकासशील देश जिनका तकनीकी विकास हुआ है, औद्योगिक विकास हुआ है, अब उनके माल की खपत नहीं हो रही है चाहे ब्रिटेन हो, जर्मनी हो और जापान हो, अपने उस माल की खपत करने के लिए हिन्दुस्तान को चारगाह के रूप में बदलना चाहते हैं। मैं ग्लोबल विलेज के कनसेप्ट का विरोध नहीं करता हूँ लेकिन उस कनसेप्ट का जो एक्सप्लेनशन किया जा रहा है, मैं एक छोट-मोटा व्यावसायी खुद भी हूँ, मुझे मालूम है कि इस तरह के उदारीकरण का क्या लाभ हुआ है। आज इस उदारीकरण का बड़े-जोर-शोर से प्रचार किया जा रहा है। यह कहा जा रहा है कि इस आर्थिक उदारीकरण का बड़ा लाभ होगा। आज आप स्टॉक एक्सचेंज को देख लीजिये। क्या बुरा हाल है। आज बड़ी-बड़ी वित्तीय संस्थाओं को देख लीजिये। मैं रोज बैंकर्स से मिलता हूँ। अभी हाल ही में मैं स्टेट बैंक आफ इण्डिया के सेंट्रल बोर्ड पर मੈम्बर था। बैंक्स आर फ्लरड विद फंड्ज। उनके पास बहुत पैसा है लेकिन कोई उद्यमी उनके पास नहीं जा रहा है अपने उद्योग का प्रस्ताव ले कर के। यह आपके आर्थिक उदारीकरण का प्रभाव है। बम्बई के कई प्रमुख उद्योगपतियों ने आपस में बातचीत कर के विचार-विमर्श किया। उन लोगों ने "बम्बई क्लब के नाम से एक क्लब" बनाया। आर्थिक उदारीकरण को कांग्रेस पार्टी ने इस देश में आगे लाया उस पार्टी के सम्मानित सदस्य श्री प्रणव मुखर्जी ने भी लेवल प्लेईंग फील्ड की बात कही। आज यह बहुत ज़रूरी है। इस विषय में हम लोग विशेष रूप से देखें। आर्थिक उदारीकरण से पहले गवर्नमेंट के अन्दर कई तरह की एजेंसियां होती थी जो इस बात पर विचार-विमर्श करती थी कि एक विशेष औद्योगिक प्रस्ताव को उसके सामने रखा जाए या नहीं रखा जाए। आज आर्थिक उदारीकरण के माहौल में ऐसी किसी तरह की एजेंसी नहीं है। आज के वातावरण में यह भी ज़रूरी हो गया है कि ऐसे किसी भी प्रस्ताव को, किसी भी करार को संसद, के दोनों सदन समझें, परखें और उसके बाद अनुमति देने के बाद ही उस को कार्यरूप में लाया जाए। विशेष रूप से मैं बहुत प्रसन्न हूँ इस संशोधन प्रस्ताव पर बोलते हुए, हमारे दो बड़े नेता

हमारे संयुक्त मोर्चे के माननीय देवेगोड़ा जी जब प्रधानमंत्री नहीं थे, जब मुख्य मंत्री भी नहीं थे, सामान्य सांसद के रूप में उन्होंने गैट प्रस्ताव का बड़ा प्रबल और प्रखर विरोध किया था। और साथ-साथ समाजवादी पार्टी की भी नीति रही है कि हम स्वदेशी के प्रति जोर दें। अभी कल ही जो एस. यू. 30 के बारे में खरीद की बात सदन के पटल पर हमारे अध्यक्ष श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव जी ने रखी, रक्षा मंत्री जी ने रखी उससे साफ-साफ यह प्रस्ताव उन्होंने रखा कि हम रूस से सिर्फ़ पैसे देकर जहाज नहीं खरीदेंगे बल्कि रूस को जो पूरी की पूरी उनकी तकनीकी सुविधाएँ हैं वे भारत को देनी पड़ेगी और भविष्य में भारत में ही इस तरह की तमाम चीजों का निर्माण होगा। आज भारत देश को एक मंडी बनाने की प्रक्रिया चल रही है और पहले एक ईस्ट इंडिया कंपनी थी आज कई ईस्ट इंडिया कंपनियाँ सामने आने की चेष्टा में हैं। उनको रोकने का प्रयास हम लोगों को करना चाहिए। यह कोई नयी बात नहीं है। यहां तक कि अमेरिका में भी जब वहां दुनिया भर की जापानी गाड़ियाँ हो गयीं और अमेरिका मंडी में डम्प कर दी गयीं तो वहां की सरकार को सोचना पड़ा, वहां के लोगों का सोचना हुआ, अधिकारियों का सोचना हुआ और उन्होंने जापानी गाड़ियों की बिक्री पर रोक लगायी। यह एक समस्या है। जब अमेरिका जैसा विकासशील देश भी आज जापान जैसे छोटे देश के आर्थिक हमले से घबड़ाकर सोचने पर मजबूत हो रहा है जिसको कि वर्ल्ड की सबसे बड़ी सुपर पावर कहते हैं तो भारत को उस मामले में क्या बिसात है। हमारी विदुषी साथी चन्द्रकला जी ने ठीक कहा कि ग्लोबलाइजेशन की जगह वासुदेव कुटुम्बकम की बात हम लोगों को सोचनी चाहिए, विचार करनी चाहिए और साथ-साथ हमारी जो स्वदेशी की नीति है उस पर अमल लाना चाहिए। इसको पूर्व हमारे देश में इस बात को महात्मा गांधी जी ने समझा था जबकि उन्होंने चर्खे को टेक्सटाइल की मशीन से ज्यादा महत्व दिया था। घर-घर में चर्खे चलाने की बात उन्होंने की थी ताकि खादी घर में बने और लोग उसको पहनें। विदेशी साम्राज्यवाद से महात्मा गांधी जी ने लड़ाई लड़ी, राष्ट्रपिता ने लड़ाई लड़ी। मुझे बड़ी खुशी है कि कांग्रेस पार्टी में हमारे सुरिन्दर कुमार सिंगला जैसे साथी हैं जो उदारीकरण की नीति का प्रतिपादन करने वाली पार्टी के सदस्य होने के बावजूद लेविल प्लेसमेंट? उद्योगों की समस्याओं की बात को समझते हैं और उन्होंने बड़े अच्छे तरीके से सारी समस्याओं को सामने रखा।

मैं एक और बात बताना चाहता हूँ कि उदारीकरण का कितना दुःप्रभाव पड़ा है। हमारे सामने की बेंच पर अभी कम साथी हैं। वे शायद उत्तेजित न हों। उत्तर प्रदेश में ज़ोर

का उत्पादन जहां बहुतायत में होता था और जो शीरा एक रसायनिक उद्योग में लगता था, उदारीकरण का पहला कार्यक्रम यह हुआ कि जो शीरा केमिकल इंडस्ट्री में चूज होता था वह शीरा उत्तर प्रदेश से मध्य प्रदेश में केडिया के शराब उद्योग में जाने लगा। जो लोग संस्कृति और नीति का नाम लेते हैं उन लोगों ने अपने चुनाव मसौदे में लिखा कि नहीं शीरे का जो उदारीकरण हुआ है उसका हम लोग स्वागत करते हैं और रसायनिक उद्योग की जगह शराब उद्योग बनने इसका भी हम स्वागत करते हैं। क्षमा कीजिएगा, मैं कोई आप लोगों पर आरोप नहीं लगाना चाहता हूँ लेकिन मैं आप लोगों के ध्यान में यह बात आकृष्ट करना चाहता हूँ कि इस तरह से जो उदारीकरण हुआ है जगह जगह उस उदारीकरण से कई उद्योग, कई धंधे ठप हो गए हैं और इसलिए आज की परिस्थिति में यह एक बहुत ही आवश्यक बात है कि कोई भी इस तरह के अंतर्राष्ट्रीय मसौदे की बात पर उसकी स्वीकृति लें जैसे अभी मेरी बहिन चन्द्रकला जी ने नीम के बारे में बताया। आज आप उद्योग और तकनीकी की बात करते हैं तो बड़े उद्योग ऐसी कोई समस्या नहीं है। आज पृथ्वी मिसाइल भी हम अपने दम पर बना रहे हैं। हमारे देश के इंजीनियर, डाक्टर जब विदेश में जाते हैं तो उनको नोबल पुरस्कार मिलते हैं लेकिन हमारे देश में जो हमारी मैन पावर है उसका हम सम्मान नहीं कर पाते हैं। तो आज आवश्यकता है कि हम अपनी मैन पावर का सम्मान करें। अपनी संस्कृति को समझें, अपने देश को समझें और ईस्ट इंडिया कंपनी की तरह कई तो बहुराष्ट्रीय कंपनियां आ रही हैं, जो मंजूर बना रही हैं यहाँ तक कि रोटी बनाने वाली कंपनियां भी आ रही हैं, उनको रोके। मत बताइए कि हम रोटियां नहीं बना सकते, मत बताइए कि हम मंजूर नहीं बना सकते। तो रोटी और मंजूर बनाने के लिए बहुराष्ट्रीय कंपनियां उदारीकरण के नाम पर आ रही हैं। थोड़े दिनों में आप देखेंगे कि आटा बनाने की भी कंपनियां, बड़े-बड़े बैगों में आटा पैक करके आना शुरू हो जाएंगी और हमको विदेश का आटा खाना पड़ेगा। अगर कोई बड़ा उद्योग हो, ऐसी तकनीकी समस्या हो जिसका कोई निदान न हो उसके लिए अगर आप सहयोग सहकार लें तो समझ में आता है लेकिन जो छोट छोट कंप्यूटैरिज्म बढ़ रहा है इसको देखते हुए आज के परिप्रेक्ष्य में मेरा यह मानना है कि एम. ए. बेबी जी का यह विधेयक बहुत ही महत्व का है और बहुत ही संजीदा है और इसके बारे में सरकार को, इस सदन को और इस महान देश को तथा इस महान सदन को माननीय अध्यक्ष जी आपको विशेष रूप से सीखना चाहिए। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि भारत देश के महान भविष्य के बारे में चिंता कोई चिंता, बहुराष्ट्रीय

कंपनियां न करें भारत की तुलान? यह है कि - यह पथ मुझे नहीं ले आया, मैं खुद आया। पथ ने कब दी मुझको छया, मैं तो धूप-धूप खुद चलकर आया। धन्यवाद।

5.00 P.M.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): Thank you.

This was Mr. Amar Singh's maiden speech.

At five o'clock clarifications will be sought from the Minister of Civil Aviation.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): Sir, it should be at 5-05 p.m. because we took up the Private Members' Bill at 2-35 p.m.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI): That is right. That is what I was going to say. Thank you, Mr. Narayanasamy..... (Interruptions)...

Mr. Muthu Mani.

SHRI S. MUTHU MANI (TAMILNADU): Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman for giving me this opportunity to speak.

The Bill has been introduced by our senior Member, Mr. Baby, to amend the Constitution to the effect that all international treaties should be ratified by our Parliament. While introducing the Bill, Mr. Baby has mentioned particularly that forty per cent of the nations including the USA, have a provision in their constitutions for such ratification. I am extremely sorry to say that all the economic policies introduced in our country have been in consequence of international negotiations on the GATT or with the WTO. The GATT is only with regard to international trade, but the WTO is telling upon the entire economic system of the globe. Therefore, it means that the WTO is nothing but a government of all governments. We have had discussions on the GATT and the WTO on some occasions in our House, but no treaty has been ratified in Parliament. There is no provision in our Constitution to ratify treaties of this kind. The economic policy adopted by the previous Government was a result of international negotiations on the GATT. That economic policy was totally opposed to the earlier policy, but our Government introduced the new economic policy in our nation.

The workers are the worst affected by this. The Government is always saying that it is providing financial aid for revival of sick private companies and PSUs. It is true in words, but the policy has not been implemented practically till date. The Government is doing well in closing the indigenous industries through the BIFR. This is one way. The other way is that in the name of golden handshake each and every day thousands and thousands of workers are being thrown out on the streets. This is true of PSUs also. Because of the indifferent attitude of the Centre, lakhs and lakhs of workers in private sector industries are being retrenched. What plan has the Centre got to protect these workers? Nothing is there.

Sir, though you, I want to say that when international treaties are affecting our society, our economy, our trade, our defence etc., they should be ratified before they are implemented.

The people of India in our democratic country should be ruled by the Indian Government which is elected by the people of India. Foreign countries should not be allowed to encroach on the sovereignty of our nation. This is for your kind information. It is my bounden duty to record the strong and bold action taken by our hon ex-Chief Minister. The ex-Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu filed a case in a judicial forum. When India signed the GATT, opposing that, our ex-Chief Minister filed a case. This is an example. The case has reflected the feeling of the people of the nation. The case has been filed to show that the State's right should not be curtailed. My view is that without the control of the Parliament over international contracts and treaties, our nation's sovereign rights and our Fundamental Rights, provided in our Constitution will be pledged to the supremacy of international agencies. Hence every contract and treaty entered into with any international agency must be subjected to the security ring of the Indian Parliament. So, this amendment is very essential. The Members, who are now part of the Central Government, were in the Opposition when we expressed these views on that day. I hope their views will not change now. It is high time this Government came forward to accept the amendment brought here

by the hon. Member, Shri Baby. With these few words I conclude, and on behalf of my party, AIADMK, I support this Bill.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKI NATH CHATURVEDI : is already 5 o'clock and the Members would like to seek clarifications on the statement on air crash.

श्री मोहम्मद सलीम (पश्चिमी बंगाल): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने आप के पास एक रिक्वैस्ट रखी थी।

[[شری محمد سلیم : آپ سے بلا ادھیاکشن
مہو دے۔ میں نے آپ کے پاس ایک ریکویسٹ
رکھی تھی۔]]

एअरक्राफ्ट डिसआस्टर के रिप्लाय के पहले ही बोलना चाहते हैं?

[[شری محمد سلیم : اس سے پہلے ہی بولنا
چاہئے۔]]

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI TRILOKINATH CHATURVEDI): Mr. Salim had been to Jammu and Kashmir. Probably he has seen something of the blast and wants to make a reference of it. He had made a request for it earlier. Shri Salim.

RE. BLASTS NEAR MAZAR OF SHER-E-KASHMIR AND AT OTHER PLACES IN JAMMU AND KASHMIR ON 5.12.1996.

SHRI MD. SALIM (West Bengal): When the blast took place yesterday morning, I immediately rushed to the place. The CPI(M) meeting was being held at Kulgaon on 4th December. In the blast eight people died. After reaching Srinagar, I found there was another blast near SMHS hospital in the bunker. The Chief Minister of Jammu and Kashmir, Farooq Abdullah, was to go near the Mazar of Sher-e-Kashmir, because that was his birth anniversary. There too a blast took place.

† [] Transliteration in Arabic script.