

[Shri Dinesh Goswami]

Rules of Procedure. It is a question of Rules of Procedure. (*Interruptions*) Not even one minute would I give. No, please. Please continue, Mr. Minister. (*Interruptions*) If you want to have a discussion you ought not to have asked for observations from the Chair. When the Chair has given certain observations, the matter is finally set at rest. We will never set the precedent that after the observations of the Chair, again a discussion will start. (*Interruptions*) I am telling you, I have asked the Home Minister to take note of the views and to enlighten the House—if he has got anything to enlighten. Even after the Home Minister makes a statement—if he so chooses—there will be an opportunity of discussing it. But I would request the Members: Let there be no such precedent. In that case the Chair would be reluctant to make any observations henceforth.

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह : मैं आपकी बात मान लेता हूँ। होम मिनिस्टर साहब वह बयान दें जो हाउस चाहता है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): In that case, the Chair will not make any observation. Therefore, let us go on with the Budget discussion. The Home Minister has taken note of the entire thing. So the Finance Minister. (*Interruptions*)

THE BUDGET (GENERAL—1980-81 —GENERAL DISCUSSION—contd.

PROF. RAMLAL PARIKH (Gujarat): Sir, before the Finance Minister makes a reply, I would draw his attention to a very heavy and serious loss due to floods in Gujarat. This problem may be covered in his speech by indicating as to what kind of support he will be giving to Gujarat because unless the Central Government comes forward with a massive programme of help, the people there are

going to suffer very much. I would request him to cover this point.

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to the House for the interest they took in the discussion on the Budget. I shall be very brief. I have not taxed the people heavily. Therefore, I will not tax your patience now. I have the humility to learn. I am aware that in a vast administration like the Finance Ministry there are many things which I may not know and it is possible that the Members may have some specialised knowledge in respect of particular things. I have, therefore, heard with very deep attention to all the points of view which have been expressed here; and if in the course of the debate I do not touch some of them, it is not because I do not consider them important or significant but only because I may not have the time to go into each one of these details. At the outset, I would like to thank some of Members on my side who have rendered the task of my reply very easy. In particular, I would like to mention the very valuable contribution made by my esteemed friend Shri N. K. P. Salve and my distinguished friend Shri D. P. Chattopadhyaya. I would like to mention in particular the names of Shri B. Ibrahim, Shri V. P. Munnusamy, Shrimati Sushila Shankar Advarekar, Shrimati Monika Das, Shrimati Amarjit Kaur. And on the AIADMK side...

SHRI KALYAN ROY (West Bengal): Whom did you leave out?

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: I have left you.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: Others also spoke. Their names should be on record.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: I left Mr. Malle Gowda and Shri Hari Singh Nalwa.

SHRI SUNDER SINGH BHAN-DARI (Uttar Pradesh): This is not a proper way to replying.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: Now, going into the criticism that has been levelled by the people who are in the Opposition, I will have to mention them by names. Lest the people on my side should feel that they have been ignored while people who have criticised the Budget have been mentioned, I have taken the precaution to tell them that I have deeply appreciated the contribution they have made.

SHRI SUNDER SINGH BHAN-DARI: Even Mr. Nalwa.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the Budget which I have presented to the country is unique. Never before in the annals of the Indian fiscal history has a Budget, which provides so many concessions to such a variety of people in all sectors of society been presented. Sir, this has been certainly appreciated by all the people through out the country. In fact, the response that came after the presentation of the Budget, was one in which there was a general jubilation that contrary to the expectation that the Budget would impose additional burdens, it came one of great relief in almost every aspect of the activity. Some discordant notes which have been sounded by the Opposition Members here, are, of course, feeble, and yet they only serve to expose how out of tune and out of touch with the mass public opinion the Opposition Members are.

Sir, the second unique feature about this Budget is that for the first time the Budget was prepared in relation to the election manifesto which has been placed before the people. I have taken pains to take up the election manifesto which the Congress put before the country, and item by item I have tried to satisfy the various promises that have been given to the public in the election manifesto, I shall briefly run through a few of them to show that we have attempted

and to a large extent succeeded in meeting the aspirations of the people because it is on this election manifesto that the people have returned us to power.

In this connection, I may mention that the line of criticism which has been put forward by Mr. Surjit as well as Kalyan Roy are based...

SHRI KALYAN ROY: Roy.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: Yes. What did I say?

...based on the criticism that this Budget goes contrary to their economic philosophy. I used another expression on another occasion saying that it goes contrary to their class fixation. That I will not use here. It goes contrary to the economic philosophy of that party. Sir, that party went to the electorate with its manifesto and it has not been given the mandate to govern this country. The mandate which has been given to Congress (I) is on the basis of its election manifesto, and, therefore, it is up to the party which has been elected to fulfil the promises which have been put before the people in its election manifesto.

Sir, we told the people in our manifesto that we would restructure the tax-system in such a way that the middle-class would get relief on account of the prevailing inflation. We have raised the level of exemption from Rs. 10,000 to Rs. 12,000. In their connection, I may mention about Mr. Kalyan Roy's complaint that I had met a number of people, economists, industrialists etc. but that I had not met the trade union leaders. I had met the trade union leaders also individually, and the suggestion that the exemption should be raised from Rs. 10,000 to Rs. 12,000 came, mainly from the trade union leaders because they pointed out to me that on account of the new rule with regard to their over-time and the new additional bonus etc. many of them had

[Shri R. Venkataraman]

some within the tax-limit and that if the exemption limit was not raised many of the people who were working in factories would be obliged to pay income-tax. Sir, by this one measure I have given up Rs. 16.5 crores, and I have saved six lakhs of people from payment of income-tax. The other concession which we have given in this is that the surcharge on income-tax which was 20 per cent levied by the previous Government, has been reduced to 10 per cent. And the result is that income-tax payers numbering 37 lakhs in the country have benefited, some to a small extent, some to a larger extent, in proportion to the income-tax which they pay.

Sir, the second point in the manifesto was that we would encourage voluntary savings and we would encourage investments. Actually we went to the extent of saying that we would provide profitable avenues for investment and also provide relief for provident fund and life insurance premia paid. Now specifically we mentioned this, and you will find in the budget proposals that we have given relief for savings by the middle class people, restoring the exemption limit which was there before 1979.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE (Maharashtra): Undone what was done last year.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: I have undone all things. Therefore, I did not want to say that I have undone only this.

Then with regard to encouraging investment, I have provided an additional depreciation allowance, which means that over and above 10 per cent in the case of one shift and 15 per cent in the case of double shift, the industry is entitled to get 50 per cent of the nominal depreciation

allowance. That is, this 10 per cent will become 15 per cent and 15 per cent will become 22½ per cent, to enable them to make investments in the economy. Sir, this again cost the exchequer somewhere about Rs. 60 crores. Some people were saying in the course of the debate that the Finance Minister is a magician, is a trickster, that he has given Rs. 40 crores by way of relief and has won all kudos from the people. Now, add up these Rs. 16.5 crores for the people who are below Rs. 12,000 in income, Rs. 80 crores by way of reduction in surcharge, and Rs. 60 crores by way of additional relief in the depreciation allowance. If you add these to all the other reliefs which I have given, it is only natural that the whole country is praising the Budget. It is only people who do not know the sum total of the reliefs given that have indulged in somewhat ignorant criticism.

Now, with regard to small-scale industries, we promised in our election manifesto that we would encourage them and see that they grow and play a vital role in the national economy. Hon. Members are aware that the relief that I have given to the small-scale industries is even more than what they themselves asked for. In the pro-Budget representations which are usually made, the Federation of the Small-Scale Industries Associations came and requested me to give relief to the small-scale industry by raising the exemption limit from Rs. 15 lakhs to Rs. 30 lakhs. Not only have I given that, but I have given to the small-scale industry an additional list of items on which they will be entitled to relief; and in respect of those items, I have reduced the excise duty in the case of clearances between Rs. 5 and Rs. 15 lakhs from 100 per cent to 75 per cent. Now, if these concessions will not help the small-scale industry, then I submit nothing else will help. On the contrary throughout the country, the small-scale industries have sent hun-

dreds of telegrams thanking the Government for the relief that it has given. Incidentally this increased the revenue to the posts and telegraphs department as a number of people sent telegrams of congratulations.

Sir, we also promised in our election manifesto that we would plug loopholes with regard to income-tax and prevent tax-evasion. For this purpose, we have prevented the division of income, the spread of income over a number of units of the Hindu Undivided Family. We have also plugged the holes in respect of trusts. And it is this which is hurting them, nobody knows. The objection which you see in the newspapers which have come up later is because they realised now that I have plugged the holes of evasion and avoidance in taxation. No longer is it possible for a person to become a member...

SHRI KALYAN ROY: Whenever you talk of tax evasion, why are you looking at Mr. Salve all the time?

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: I was looking at Mr. Kalyan Roy for approbation and at Mr. Saive for disapprobation.

The Wanchoo Committee pointed out that people become members of half a dozen or more Hindu undivided families, split their income over them and thereby pay only the tax due on the income from that Hindu undivided family without paying higher rates which they would have to pay on aggregation of their total income. I have put a stop to that. People ask me: Why did you make it retrospective? I have made it effective from 1st January, 1979 because by that time people would have sent in returns to the income tax office. If I give a prospective date, there will be nothing left and everybody would have divided and the Government would be completely cheated of all the revenues. I have been able to stop this kind of dividing one's income over a number of these units and this has hurt some people and

they are angry. I do not think the masses in the country are worried about these Hindu undivided families or about the trusts or anything of the kind. It is the classes that are worried about it and so long as I am satisfied that this measure is only for the protection of the revenue and will avoid the division of the incomes by spreading it over several units with a view to avoid the aggregated rates of taxation, I have served the cost both of finance and the country.

There is one other....

شری سید احمد ہاشمی

(انپروڈیٹ) پوائنٹ آف آرڈر - ابھی ابھی باغ پت کے مسئلہ پر آپ نے کہا تھا کہ منسٹر صاحب ایک اسٹیٹمنٹ دیں گے -

†[سید احمد ہاشمی (उत्तर प्रदेश) : पाइन्ट ऑफ ऑर्डर। अभी बागपत के मामले पर आपने कहा था कि मिनिस्टर साहब एक स्टेटमेंट देंगे।]

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): Not now.

شری سید احمد ہاشمی -

بات سن لیں -

†[سید احمد ہاشمی : मेरी बात सुन लें।]

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): There is no point of order. Please sit down.

شری سید احمد ہاشمی -

منسٹر صاحب سدن سے باہر جا رہے ہوں۔ اس کے بعد کوئلے وہ اسٹیٹمنٹ دیں گے۔

†[سید احمد ہاشمی : होम मिनिस्टर साहब सदन से बाहर जा रहे हैं। इसके बाद कैसे वह स्टेटमेंट होगा।]

† [] Devanagari transliteration.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): It is surprising how you interrupt the proceedings.

श्री रामेश्वर सिंह (उत्तर प्रदेश) : होम मिनिस्टर साहब से कहिये कि वह जाये नहीं । वह हाऊस से बाहर न जायें ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): Kindly do not interrupt the debate like this.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: We have said that we will develop labour intensive industries in our election manifesto. And for this we have given innumerable concessions to the electronic industries which are highly labour intensive. Anybody who knows about electronic industry will readily agree with me that it provides employment for the largest number of women under most hygienic conditions. There is no pollution at all in the electronic industry. I have provided in the Budget concessions for import of equipment which is not produced in this country or cannot be produced because of the size or sophistication. I have also provided for concessions for import of those raw materials which are not produced in this country. In addition I have given various concessions to this industry so that it may grow.

I have also provided—as hon. Members are aware—relief in respect of radio licences so that if the electronic industry is fixed up, then everybody will be able to keep a radio—whether he works in a factory or field—and enjoy a little music. Sir, the second way in which I have tried to help the labour-intensive industries is to provide less incentives for capital-intensive industries. Up till now, the capital-intensive industries were getting what is known as a tax holiday. The tax holiday was calculated on the basis of the capital invested

and 7½ per cent of the capital employed was given as relief in taxation. Now, on the 1st of April 1981, the relief they will get by way of this will be calculated on the profit which the unit makes. On the profit which the unit makes 25 per cent will be given as tax holiday. The tax holiday will be based or calculated not on the basis of the capital employed, but on the profit made. There will be no incentive whatsoever for people to inflate the capital or use very heavy capital in the industry. On the other hand, they will be induced to go in for quick-yielding results, medium industries and industries which give profit soon and industries which do not require capital intensity and, in this, I do not claim all the wisdom for myself. Actually, this is a recommendation of the...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Why are you allowing the Gillettes to participate in equity in respect of manufacture of blades and so on?

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: I am not going to be interrupted in my speech because if they have questions, they will have to put them separately.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Have I said anything unparliamentary, Sir?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): It is for him to yield or not to yield.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: I am not yielding, because I have a big answer to give and there are people who have participated and I cannot deprive them of their answers and then go on answering those who just jerk and put some questions.

The point I was making was that in respect of the industries, the Committee constituted to go into the ques-

tion of labour intensity in employment, has recommended that our own tax holiday provision encourages the employment of more capital and, therefore, we should change it from capital incentives to incentives based on profits and we have accepted the Dandekar Committee Report and it is based on that.

Then, Sir, a number of things we said in our election manifesto. We want to please everybody. For instance, we said, the frustration among the scientists would be alleviated which we have done. We said that the handicapped people will be given facilities, and the blind and handicapped people have been given. Then we have said that pensioners will be taken care of and my friend knows that we have done even that. Now, we also said that we would provide facilities for the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes and we have provided a hundred crores every year for the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes' welfare. And then, utilisation of the rural manpower: We have provided Rs. 340 crores. Now, I will mention these things when I come to them or, I will deal with them now itself. Here, Sir, my esteemed friend, Shri Raju was, rather harsh on this scheme. In fact it surprised me because Mr. Raju is a very senior Member of the House and has been a Minister in a State and he has held that office with distinction and has also contributed to rural welfare in that area. Now, what we have done here is this: We took the original scheme of the Food for Work Programme and ten improved upon it by providing a cash component to it so that durable assets might be created in the villages. Originally, in Mr. Charan Singh's Budget, he had provided only Rs. 50 crores for the Food for Fork Programme. Unfortunately for the country, the drought came, and, therefore, the Food for Work Programme had to be extended and when we extended the programme, more food was given for the purpose of giving em-

ployment. But those grants did not have a cash component with the result that it was spent only on roads, on things for which cement could not be bought, steel could not be bought and some of these things could not be used. Many of these assets were wasted. Probably it is because of that Mr. Raju said that it is not 'Food for Work', it is 'Food for Fraud'. We have improved the whole thing. By providing the cash component, we have not only provided work and food for work, but we will also provide money for the purpose of buying cement, steel and other things for building culverts, having minor irrigation works, small buildings, etc. and everyone of these things will be durable. I humbly request Mr. Raju not to treat this as "Food for Fraud" but as 'Food for Thought'. He will improve his knowledge if he just understands the whole complexity of this scheme.

Then we have provided in the manifesto that we will provide drinking water and we have included in the budget drinking water facilities for 35,000 villages and provided Rs. 100 crores for that. We said we will provide facilities for handloom and we are not only starting a Handloom Corporation, we are also going to see that some technical institutions are established. The first will be in the North-East region. The handloom people are happy that while emphasis was given by the Centre only on mill-made textiles up till now, the Government have come forward for the first time to provide an apex institution which will take care of handloom in the country. Sir, this is only a part of the election manifesto which we have fulfilled. Somebody said that the budget which I have prepared is 'command performance'. I concede it. It is in obedience to the command which the people of the country gave us. It is in obedience of the command which the electorate gave us. You will be surprised to know that side by side with the election manifesto on the

[Shri R. Venkataraman]

left hand, the budget proposals were prepared on the right hand. We have worked to see that every one of the election manifestos is implemented. There is one thing which I have overlooked and which the watchful eye of Mr. Sankar Ghose has been able to point out and that is that in the election manifesto we had said that we would provide employment at least for one person in each family. Sir, I thought that this was a matter in which the Planning Commission should come forward to frame a plan and hereafter the budget should provide the allocation for. Since the Planning Commission is now engaged in the task of preparation of the Plan for the next five years. I am positive that the Planning Commission will take note of the point made in the House and give emphasis to this election promise of trying to provide one employment at least in each family.

Now, I shall seek to deal with a number of criticisms which have been levelled against the budget. The first one was, and in it almost everybody agreed, that there was a deficit of 5000 crores of rupees and that I had somewhat juggled with the figure and shown it only as 1400 crores of rupees. If there is any juggling, I am afraid it was on their side because the price of petroleum like the price of any other commodity is outside the budget. The price of administered commodities like coal, steel, fertilizers of all these things must be according to the cost of production, the cost of imports. And on that basis, what we have done is that we have asked the people to pay the price which we are paying ourselves when we import these commodities. For instance, we are importing the fertilizer whose cost at the distribution point is somewhere Rs. 2400 per tonne and we cannot continue to distribute it at Rs. 1400 per tonne. Similarly, we are importing crude oil at different prices from different countries. We cannot continue to sell

it at a lower price. If the coal price is raised, they will say that the prices have been raised for the Budget. If the steel price are raised, they will say that these have been raised for the Budget. I fail to understand logic; I fail to understand the economics also. In fact, one cannot buy dear and sell cheap. The surest way to bankruptcy is to buy dear and sell cheap. Do they want the Government to go bankrupt by buying dear and selling cheap? This is the point. Well, I said that this is not economics. I am not surprised that the argument was raised because my esteemed friend, Mr. Morarka—I don't think he is here...

SHRI R. R. MORARKA (Rajasthan): I am here.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: Sir, my esteemed friend, Mr. Morarka, referred to a cartoon and said that what I have done is not economics. Sir, I learnt economics from text-books, and Mr. Morarka seems to have learnt economics from cartoons. Sir, if you put aside the commodities, the prices at which they are bought and sold, it is a matter which will not enter into any Budget. And, therefore, to say that the cost of petroleum products has risen, the cost of fertilizers has risen and, therefore, the Budget has a deficit of Rs. 5,000 crores is something which, at least, persons who have studied economics in colleges and universities could not accept. The real point is, if you buy it at a higher price and sell it at a lower price, then to that extent, it is the common man who subsidises the user. A man who pays the Customs and Excise duties, a man who is not using it, is asked to pay the price. It is simple logic, simple economics that the user must pay for it. If I travel, I must pay for the travel. If I eat my food, I must pay for my food. If I wear the clothes I must pay for them. I should not be subsidised by a person who does not travel, I should not be subsidised by a person who does not use it. Therefore the user must pay for it. And it is by making

this clear-cut difference between the users of commodities on the one side and the Budget provisions on the other that I have saved the economy from the morass into which the previous Government had taken it. If you look at the deficit, it is only Rs. 1,417 crores. My friend, Mr. Morarka said, "Your Budget deficit is Rs. 1,400 crores as against Rs. 1,300 and odd crores of Mr. Charan Singh's Budget; Rs. 25 crores more than Mr. Charan Singh's Budget deficit." At the same time, all these people were saying, "the prices have gone up by 20 per cent; if you index according to the price rise, your Plan expenditure is less than that of last year; your allocation for agriculture is less than that of last year." You reduced it by indexisation by 20 per cent. May I not ask you to index also the deficit and say that if you reduce Rs. 1,400 crores by 20 per cent index, it will come to Rs. 1,120 crores and, therefore, it is less? But this is a cheap argument in which I am not going to indulge. This is not enough. I am going to answer that when I come to the Plan. But I want to point out the fallacy of this kind of indexisation. Now, if you say that expenditure should be indexed, would you also allow me to index the revenue, would you allow me to raise the income-tax by 20 per cent, would you allow excise duty to be raised by 20 per cent all round? Therefore, this indexisation argument has no meaning and I thought it necessary to just prick the bubble here. I will deal with it scientifically when I come to the question of the Plan.

Do I have to finish by one o'clock, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): Not at all. It is your choice.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: Sir, I may take about half an hour more. I will go on till one o'clock, unless the House feels tired and bored by my speech.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): I think we will adjourn for lunch at one o'clock and then reassemble at 2 o'clock. Is that the pleasure of the House?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: We can go on till 1.30 P.M.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: We will close at 1 o'clock.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): There seems to be a difference of opinion. Let me understand what the trend of the House is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: We can go on up to 1.30 P.M.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: We will adjourn at 1 o'clock.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): Everybody is not agreeing. I will adjourn the House at 1 P.M. and then we will reassemble at 2 P.M.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: While dealing with the question of fertilisers, I would like to state that there is a valid point made by Shri Bhanu Pratap Singh. He stated that a proper balance between agricultural prices and industrial prices should be achieved—a proposition on which nobody will quarrel. But even in advanced countries it has not been possible to achieve that kind of a balance between the agricultural prices and industrial prices. It will be the endeavour of this Government to see that as far as possible a measure of this balance is achieved in the course of the years. We will not allow agricultural prices to lag behind to the detriment of development of agriculture in our country. The very fact that we have come forward to remove agricultural land from wealth tax must be an earnest of our desire to see that agriculture is protected in this country and is developed to its fullest extent. Therefore, I give this

[Shri R. Venkataraman]

solemn assure that no measure which this Government will undertake will in any way affect the interests of agriculture or go to the detriment of agriculture and to the development of industry.

Sir, the next point which I want to deal with is inflation.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI): I think you can deal with this point after lunch.

The House stands adjourned till 2 P.M.

The House then adjourned for lunch at fifty-nine minutes past twelve of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at one minute past two of the clock. [The Vice-Chairman (Shri R. R. Morarka) in the Chair].

RE. CERTAIN REMARKS MADE IN THE HOUSE—contd.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I have a request to make, and my humble request to you. Sir, is to convey it to the Chairman that the words that Mr. Khuswant Singh use against me, calling me*** and a ***, should not be expunged. The hon. Chairman gave the ruling and I would request him, through you, to reconsider this ruling and retain these words used against me***because I would like the country to know that I have been called by this name and that I am such a person. Therefore, my honest request through you, Sir, to him and to the office is that these two words which have been expunged, by the Chairman—even if they are unparliamentary—should be retained. It is my request, and an humble request,—I am the aggrieved party—to restore these two words in the proceedings

and direct the press to publish that this gentleman called me***.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Sir, it is a question of the dignity of the House. Something which is unparliamentary, cannot be allowed to remain on the record of the proceedings of the House, and, Sir, if Bhupeshda says something which is unparliamentary, we protest against it. He is our senior leader and if someone else says something which is unparliamentary, we would certainly want that to be expunged, and this is not a matter which he should look upon emotionally. You should convey our sentiments also.

श्री लाडली मोहन निगम (मध्य प्रदेश) :
उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा निवेदन यह है कि
यहां की जो सारी कार्यवाही आप दर्ज करते
हैं, वह आज के काम के लिए नहीं है। कौन
आदमी क्या कहना है, इससे मुझे मतलब नहीं
है, क्या पार्लियामेंट्री है और क्या मालियामेंट्री
नहीं है, इस पर बहस नहीं है। मैं चाहता
हूं कि हिंदुस्तान की आने वाली पीढ़ी जब
चालीस-पचास वर्ष के बाद हमारे
(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is my privilege, Sir, to have the words which have been uttered against me, retained. After all,....

श्री लाडली मोहन निगम : मैं चाहता हूं
कि चालीस-पचास वर्षों के बाद हिंदुस्तान की
आने वाली पीढ़ी जब इन सदन की कार्यवाही
पढ़ें तो वह इन लोगों का मल्यावन कर सकें।
इस वास्ते ऐतिहासिक दृष्टि से जो आज यह
घटना हुई है ताकि पता चल सके कि जो लोग
ऐसे शब्द इस्तेमाल करते वे इसके पात्र हैं कि
नहीं की वे इस सदन में बैठे या नहीं। मैं आने
वाली पीढ़ी के लिए आपसे गुजारिश बख्शंगा कि
कम से कम आज की कार्यवाही इतिहास के
लिए दर्ज होनी चाहिए, ऐतिहासिक दस्तावेज
रद्द न करें। यही मेरी गुजारिश है।