

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

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We had decided to discuss the President's Address up to last Thursday only and it was decided that the hon. Prime Minister would reply today in the morning; but in response to the desire of the hon. Members we have decided that the hon. Prime Minister may be requested to speak in the afternoon. We have got very little time at our disposal and perhaps I will have to call the Prime Minister at about 4-30 P.M. Therefore I would request the hon. Members to restrict their speeches to the minimum possible.

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA (Gujarat): Sir, I have moved 8 amendments to the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address. If I speak at least for two minutes on every amendment, then the time taken by me will be 16 minutes. (*Interruptions*) So please let me know what is the position. Are you going to allow me to speak on every amendment or are you going to allow me to speak just now?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: As the hon. Member knows, not only the Motion of Thanks but also the amendments are before the House for consideration and discussion. Therefore, the amendments will not be discussed separately. They are already under discussion and the question of allowing time to individual Members for discussing their amendments does not arise. I may inform the hon. Member that his Party, i.e., the Congress Opposition, has taken considerable time and there are only 8 or 10 minutes left for his Party.

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA: You have extended by one hour more, because the Prime Minister is going to reply at 4.30. That means one hour extension. According to that, my party should have more than 10 minutes.

AN HON. MEMBER: Two minutes more.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: In view of the fact that the discussion has been extended by one hour, that one hour has been adjusted and the additional time has been allotted to the different political groups. Taking into consideration that additional hour, the time allotted to the CPP(O) is 10 minutes only.

श्रीनिरंजन वर्मा (मध्य प्रदेश): श्रीमान्, मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि आप कृपा करके बतायें कि आपने पहले घोषणा कर दी थी कि अमेंडमेंट के ऊपर नहीं बोला जा सकता।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If the amendments are to Bills, then the amendments are considered separately. These are amendments to the Motion. Therefore the Motion and the amendments are considered simultaneously. This is not a new procedure.

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA: Am I to understand that you will give me 10 minutes?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No. You decide among your party Members and tell me who wants to speak. Sardar Tohra.

सरदार गुरचरण सिंह दोहडा (पंजाब): माननीय डिप्टी चैयरमैन साहब, सम्माननीय राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने ऐड्रेस में सरकार की जिन नीतियों का उल्लेख किया है, उनको पढ़ने, सुनने से हर आदमी का उसका स्वागत करना एक कुदरती बात है। उसमें जो बातें कही गई हैं, वह जन-साधारण और समाजवाद

[सरदार गुरचरण सिंह टोहड़ा]

की तरफ जाने वाली हैं, जैसे कि उन्होंने कहा—अमीरी गरीबी का फर्क दूर करना, कम करना, प्राइवेट सेक्टर के बजाय पब्लिक सेक्टर को बढ़ावा देना, अनाज के मामले में आत्म-निर्भरता प्राप्त करना, सब किस्म के लोगों की बेरोजगारी दूर करना, खेतिहर मजदूर और भूमिहीन किसानों को जमीन देना, सनअती लिहाज से पिछड़े हुए क्षेत्रों में सरकार की ओर से कारखाने लगा कर उनकी सनअती तरक्की करना, बेमकान लोगों को सस्ते मकानों का प्रबन्ध करना, पिछड़े वर्ग के लोगों की मदद करना, साविक नरेशों के प्रिवी पर्स और खास अधिकारों को खत्म करना और पड़ोसी देशों के साथ शान्तिमय सहयोग के आधार पर अच्छे सम्बन्ध स्थापित करना—ये बातें उसमें कही गईं, मगर ये बातें कहने के लिये हों तो निराश होना एक कुदरती बात है और मैं कुछ ऐसी बातों का जिक्र करना चाहता हूँ, जो कि इस एड्रेस में नहीं आईं।

इसमें यह आया कि किसान को पैदावार बढ़ाने के लिये मदद दी जायेगी, ट्रैक्टर दिये जायेंगे और बहुत सी सहायित्वें दी जायेगी लेकिन इसमें जिस जोश के साथ किसान और जवान का जिक्र आना चाहिये था वह नहीं किया गया। हमारे स्वगवासी प्रधान मंत्री श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री जी ने एक नारा दिया था, जो नारा सारे भारत में गूँजा और जिसमें कहा गया था—जय जवान जय किसान। उस नारे से प्रभावित हो जवान ने भी जो लड़ाई पाकिस्तान के साथ भारत की हुई, उसमें इससे उत्साह ले कर चीन की लड़ाई में जो हमारा सिर नीचा हुआ था, वह पाकिस्तान की जंग के समय हमारे जवान ने हमारा सिर ऊँचा किया, लेकिन इस एड्रेस में जवान के लिये कोई बात नहीं कही गई। कहा जा सकता है कि डिसिप्लिन की बात है लेकिन बहुत बड़ी ऐसी हैं जो डिसिप्लिन में रहते हुए भी जवान के लिये कही जा सकती

थी। हमारे जवान लड़ाख और नेफा की पहाड़ियों के ऊपर आज भी 62 रुपये ले कर लड़ रहे हैं और भारत की सीमा के पहरदार बने हुए हैं और इसी तरह जैसलमेर के मरूस्थल में हमारे जवान गर्मियों में देश की रक्षा के लिये तत्पर रहते हैं। इसलिए मैं कहूँगा कि इसमें खुले शब्दों में यह बात आनी चाहिये थी, जब सिविल सर्विसेज के लिये हर दफा पे कमिशन बनाते हैं, तो जवान जो भारत की रक्षा, देश की रक्षा का जिम्मेवार है, उसके लिये भी कुछ न कुछ कहना चाहिये था।

इसी तरह किसान की बात है। किसान के मुताल्लिक बहुत सी बातें कही गईं, लेकिन एक बात जो जरूरी तौर पर कहनी चाहिये थी वह नहीं कही गई। वह क्या थी। वह यह कि किसान पैदावार करता है, खून पसीना एक कर के धरती में से अन्न पैदा करता है और देश के भूखे लोगों का पेट भरने के लिये वह सब कुछ देता है और उसकी पैदावार जिस तरह से इस राज में, इस सरकार के अहद में, लूटी जा रही है, वह आप सबके सामने है। पिछले साल की बात हम सब ने देखी है कि जब गेहूं किसान का आया तो गेहूं का रेट जो निश्चित किया गया वह 62 रुपये से 76 रुपये तक था, उस समय वह रेट था। लेकिन जब किसान के घर से वह चला गया, तो उसके घर से चले जाने के बाद उसी गेहूं का रेट आज 120 रुपये है। इसी तरह कपास को ले लीजिये। कपास की फसल आई, तो उसका रेट 160 रुपये था और आज 250 रुपये है। इसी तरह मूंगफली आई, तो किसान से लेते वक्त उसका रेट 90 रुपये से 100 रुपये था, लेकिन आज 140 रुपये है। तो ये जो मंडी चोर हैं, इन चोरों की जो किसानों के ऊपर लूट खसोट है, उससे किसान को बचाने के लिये इस एड्रेस में कुछ नहीं कहा गया। मैं यह भी बड़े अफसोस के साथ कहता हूँ कि किसान को जो कर्जा दिया जाता है और जो इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट को कर्जा दिया जाता है, उसके सूद में बड़ा

भारी अन्तर है। किसान को 9 प्रतिशत सूद देना पड़ता है जब कि कारखानेदार को 3 प्रतिशत सूद देना पड़ता है।

इसलिए किसानों की यह जो बातें कही गई हैं मैं कहता हूँ कि सिर्फ कहने के लिये हैं, इसमें अमल कुछ भी नहीं है। किसान की हर चीज को ले लीजिये। ट्रैक्टर लीजिये, मशीनरी को लीजिये, डिज़ल पम्पिंग सेट को लीजिये, डिज़ल को लीजिये, जो भी चीज है, उसकी हालत को देखिये। इन सबके रेट हर साल ऊपर जा रहे हैं। यहां तक कि जो खाद है उसको लीजिये। रासायनिक खाद आज से पांच वर्ष पहले 25 रुपये क्विंटल थी, जो नंगल में बनती है वह 25 रुपये, 27 रुपये क्विंटल थी और आज उस खाद की कीमत 60 रुपये क्विंटल के करीब पहुंच गई है। पिछले साल जो खाद टैंक्स लगा है 10 रुपये प्रतिशत तो उसी की वजह से बढ़ गया और उसका रेट हर साल बढ़ रहा है। एक तरफ यह बात कही जा रही है कि हम खाद कारखाने लगाने जा रहे हैं, दो कारखाने इस साल में लगायेंगे। लेकिन अगर कारखाना लगा कर पूँजीपतियों की परवरिश करनी है और किसान को उसका फायदा नहीं देना है, तो मैं कहता हूँ कि यह जो बातें लिखी गई हैं या जिनका एलान किया गया है यह सदाकत पर मवनी नहीं है। यहां मैं कह रहा था कि जब खाद का रेट 25 रुपये, 27 रुपये क्विंटल था तब किसान की गेहूँ का रेट उस वक्त 65 रुपये क्विंटल था। लेकिन अब गेहूँ तो 65 रुपये से 75 रुपये तक पहुंचा, परन्तु जो रासायनिक खाद है उसकी कीमत दुगुनी हो गई है? इसी तरह ट्रैक्टरों की बात है। पंजाब के किसान को ट्रैक्टरों की जरूरत है, आज भी पंजाब के किसानों की 80 और 90 हजार के करीब अजिया पेंडिंग पड़ी हुई हैं, ट्रैक्टर की मांग के लिये। लेकिन यहां की सरकार ट्रैक्टरों का अलाटमेंट किस तरीके से करती है। जो इसने तरीका अपनाया हुआ है वह

एक गलत तरीका है। आबादी की बिना पर ट्रैक्टर दिये जाते हैं, जरूरत हो या न हो और इस तरह से पंजाब का किसान मजबूर होता है ट्रैक्टर ब्लैक में खरीदने के लिये। अगर यह सरकार इस बात की पड़ताल कराये कि पंजाब के किसान ने कितने ट्रैक्टर दूसरे प्रान्तों के किसानों से लिये हैं, तो उनको पता चल जायेगा कि ट्रैक्टरों की कितनी ब्लैक मार्केटिंग हो रही है।

इसी तरह से आप गन्ने को ले लीजिये। पिछले साल गन्ने का रेट 12 रुपये पर क्विंटल था, लेकिन आज इस साल में गन्ने का रेट 7 रुपये 35 पैसा पर क्विंटल का है। मैं सरकार से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जब हर चीज की कीमत बढ़ रही है, तो गन्ने की कीमत क्यों नीचे आ रही है। इसलिये मैं समझता हूँ कि यह किसान हितकारी सरकार नहीं है, किसान दुश्मन है और किसानों की हित की रक्षा करने में फेल हुई है और किसानों को सही कीमत देने में फेल हुई है, जिसे पैदावार पर बुरा असर पड़ने का डर है और आज भी इस ऐड्रेस के अन्दर कोई ऐसी बात नहीं कही गई, जो किसान को हौसला देती हो। मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि इन बातों को देख कर भारत के किसान में निराशा होनी कुदरती है। जब उसको मेहनत का सही फल नहीं मिलेगा, जब उसको अपनी मेहनत का सही दाम नहीं मिलेगा, उसकी मेहनत को मंडी चोरों ने लूटना है, सरकार ने उसकी तरफ कोई ध्यान नहीं देना तो उत्पादन कैसे बढ़ेगा। अपने एड्रेस में यह क्यों नहीं लिखा गया कि हम गारन्टी देते हैं इस बात की कि किसान को उसकी पैदावार की सही कीमत दी जायेगी। आपको याद होगा कि सरदार उज्जवल सिंह जी की सरकारदंगी में एक कमेटी बनी थी, बहुत साल पहले उसने रिपोर्ट दी थी कि प्रति क्विंटल गेहूँ पैदा करने के लिये किसान को 63 रुपये खर्च करना पड़ता है, लेकिन वह पांच छः साल पहले की बात है। आज अगर उस कमेटी की रिपोर्ट मान ली जाय

[सरदार गुरुचरण सिंह टोहड़ा]

तो गहूँ की कीमत 85 रुपये प्रति क्विंटल से कम नहीं होनी चाहिये। किसान इस बात को बुरा न मनाये, अगर खाने वाले को उसी रेट के ऊपर, चाहे वह खाने वाला भाई मजदूर हो या जो भी क्लास हो, गहूँ मिले लेकिन खरीद कर खाने वाले को दाम ज्यादा देने पड़ते हैं। यहां तक कि पंजाब से वही गहूँ दिल्ली आकर खाने वाले को 76 रुपये के बजाये 100 से 110 रुपये तक मिलता है। और यह सरकार बुरी तरह फेल हुई है इस बात में कि देश भर में एक जैसी कीमतें निश्चित नहीं कर पायी और वही गहूँ पंजाब में और रेटों पर है, बम्बई में और रेटों पर है, कलकत्ता में और रेटों पर है। इसी तरह से चावल की बात है। हर बात में सरकार बुरी तरह फेल है। इसलिये मेरा आरोप है कि सरकार किसान के ऊपर कोई ध्यान नहीं दे रही।

आज राजस्थान के किसानों का एक एजीटेशन चल रहा है। क्यों हो रहा है वह एजीटेशन। एजीटेशन इसलिये चल रहा है कि वहां एक एकड़ के ऊपर 148 रुपये पर एकड़ आबियाना, लैण्ड रेवेन्यू सरचार्ज 74 रुपये लगाया गया है। इसलिये मजदूर हुआ किसान कि वह आन्दोलन करे और उससे भी गजब की बात यह देखो कि सिर्फ एक डिस्ट्रिक्ट में ऐसा किया गया, जो गंगानगर का डिस्ट्रिक्ट है, जो पूरे राजस्थान को खाने के लिये खुराक पैदा करके देता है उस डिस्ट्रिक्ट के लोगों ने शान्तिमयी संग्राम शुरू किया। हमारी यह सरकार जो किसान का दोस्त होने का दावा कर रही है। इस सरकार ने वहां अपनी मिलिटरी भेजी, सी० आर० पी० भेजी, किसानों के ऊपर गोलियां चलाई, उस गोलीकांड से तीस, चालीस किसान इस दुनियां से चले गये और बहुत से घायल हुये और हजारों आज राजस्थान की जेलों में बन्द पड़े हैं। क्या चाहते हैं वह। एक इन्साफ की बात चाहते हैं कि एक प्रान्त में एक डिस्ट्रिक्ट के किसानों के ऊपर इतना अत्याचार

न हो। लेकिन यह दिल्ली की सरकार कुर्सियों पर बैठी ही देखती रही और बड़ी शान से वहां मिलिट्री भी भेजी। (Time bell rings) उन किसानों को दबाने के लिये भेजी।

मैं डिप्टी चेयरमैन साहब, एक बात और कहना चाहता हूं। सरकार ने ऐलान किया है कि चण्डीगढ़ हृदबन्दी कमीशन भाखड़ा, व्यास प्रोजेक्ट के बारे में इस बात को एड्रेस में दर्ज किया गया है। इन तीनों बातों का जहां तक ताल्लुक है, मैं उनका स्वागत करता हूं, अच्छी बात है, इन्साफ किया है। इस बात का मुझे शिकवा है, शिकायत है और सारे पंजाब को है कि यह जो इन्साफ था, यह बहुत देर पहले हो जाना चाहिये था। बड़ी देर से वह आया और दोनों प्रान्तों की लड़ाई क्या थी जो यह देर हुई। देरी करके प्रान्तों के लोगों में उकसाहट दी गई और उकसाहट के बाद फिर भी सरकार इस बात पर आ गई। तो जहां मैं इस बात का स्वागत करता हूं, बधाई भी देता हूं, वहां उसमें एक ऐसा फैसला दिया गया है, जो फैसला भारत के इतिहास में एक बुराई का बीज है। फैसला उसमें दिया गया कि चण्डीगढ़ पंजाब को दिया गया और कमीशन की बात भी मान ली गई। लेकिन उसमें फाजिलका के दो थाने हरियाणा को दिये जाने का ऐलान किया गया है वह इलाका है जिस इलाके के लोगों को 1961 की मर्दमशुमारी में बताया गया कि उनकी भाषा हिन्दी है। 1961 की मर्दमशुमारी के बारे में स्वर्गवासी प्रधान मंत्री श्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू जी ने कहा था कि इतनी भारी गिनती में लोगों को कभी झूठ बोलते नहीं देखा है, जिसको वह खुद तसलीम करते थे और जिसे हमारे पुराने गृह मंत्री और हमारे रेल मंत्री श्री गुलजारी लाल नन्दा ने तसलीम किया, एक लेटर लिख कर पंजाब के मुख्य मंत्री को कि भाई आप मुझे कोसते हैं यह मेरे अकेले का फैसला नहीं था, यह कैबिनेट का फैसला था। यह मैं

मानता हूँ कि लोगों ने बड़ी भारी गिनती में झूठ बोला था, 1961 की मर्दमशुमारी गलत थी, लेकिन वह सबने तय किया था कि 1961 की मर्दमशुमारी की बिना के ऊपर पंजाब को तकसीम करना है। तो यह बात मानते हुये भी कि वह सब कुछ गलत था 1961 की बात को मानना . . . डिप्टी चेयरमैन साहब मैं आपका धन्यवादी हूँ कि आपने मुझे ऐंड्रेस पर बोलने का समय दिया, लेकिन आप माफ करेंगे, अगर मैं कुछ ज्यादा समय ले लूँ।

श्री उपसभापति : जैसा मैंने पहले कहा साढ़े चार बजे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहिबा बोलने वाली हैं।

SARDAR NARINDAR SINGH BRAR (Punjab): This is hon. Member's maiden speech. He may be allowed to proceed.

सरदार गुरचरण सिंह टीहड़ा : मैं यह कह रहा था कि यह बात एक तरफ तो गलत मानी जा रही है और गलत मान कर, फैसला जो था चंडीगढ़ का वह पंजाब के हक में किया जा रहा था। लेकिन दूसरी तरफ उसी बात को तसलीम कर लिया गया फाजिलका का फैसला देकर कि 1961 की मर्दमशुमारी में फाजिलका का इलाका हिन्दी भाषी है, जो उन्होंने लिखवाया था गुमराह होकर और उसकी पड़ताल भी नहीं की गई कि कौनसा गांव पंजाबी है और कौन हिन्दी है। इससे बुरी बात है कोरोडोर की जो छः मील लम्बा एक रास्ता दिया गया। और वह रास्ता एक ऐसा बीज है, जिस बीज ने भारत में फलना फूलना है।

3 P.M.

मैं सरकार से यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर आपने यह फैसला दिया है, तो पंजाब पूरी तरह से इसकी मज्जमत करेगा और उस फैसले को बदलवाने के लिये अपनी ताकत लगायेगा। लेकिन अगर इस गलत बात को गलत देखते हुये उस पर

अड़े रहोगे, तो मैं आपको कहना चाहता हूँ कि भारत में आपको बहुत से कोरिडोर देने के लिये तैयार रहना चाहिये। इस तरह का कोरिडोर हम भी मांग सकते हैं और कई प्रान्त वाले भी मांग सकते हैं, क्योंकि सब के सामने आपने मिसाल कायम कर दी है। इसलिये पंजाब के साथ आपने एक बुराई की है। इस ऐंड्रेस में कौमी एकता की बात कही गई है। हम इस बात की कद्र करते हैं और हम कौमी एकता को मजबूत देखना चाहते हैं, लेकिन जो बात भारत में पिछले 22 वर्षों से कुछ गुन्डागान्सर इस मुल्क में कर रहा है, वह सबको पता है। इस ऐंड्रेस में अहमदाबाद के दंगों के बारे में कहा गया है, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस बात को हर अच्छा भारतीय बुरा और निन्दनीय मानता है कि वहां पर बुरी बात हुई है। हर अच्छा भारतीय अहमदाबाद में या देश के दूसरे हिस्सों में जो दंगे हुये हैं, उनको बुरा मानता है। लेकिन मैं सरकार से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि अहमदाबाद में जो कुछ हुआ वह तो बुरी बात थी ही, लेकिन हरियाणा में पिछले दिनों में जो कल की बात है, इस तरह की बात हुई और वहां पर सिक्खों के धर्म स्थानों को जलाया गया। वहां पर गुरुद्वारों को मजिस्ट्रेट और पुलिस के सामने लोगों ने जलाया। तो मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ क्या यह सरकार और क्या हमारे प्रेजीडेंट साहब इस बात को निन्दनीय नहीं समझते हैं। क्या सरकार इस चीज को नजर अन्दाज करके जाहिर नहीं करना चाहती है कि वह सिक्खों के धर्म-स्थानों को कोई अहमियत नहीं देती है। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर इस तरह की बुराई खत्म नहीं होगी, तो हमारी कौमी एकता कायम नहीं रह सकती है, क्योंकि आज कल कौमी एकता का नारा बहुत जोरों से चल रहा है। इस तरह की जो बातें हो रही हैं, उससे हमारा यह नारा पीछे की ओर जा रहा है। इसका कारण क्या है? इसका कारण एक ही है कि जो लोग इस तरह के दंगे करते हैं, जो लोग इस तरह के दंगों को डकाते

[सरदार गुरचरण सिंह तोहड़ा]

है, जो गुन्ड इस किस्म की बातें करते हैं, उन्हें आज तक किसी को कोई सजा नहीं दी गई है। अहमदाबाद में जो फसाद हुये, जहाँ पर हजारों लोग मौत के घाट उतार दिये गये, वहाँ पर कितने गुन्डों को मौत की सजा दी गई, कितनों को उम्र कैद की सजा दी गई। सरकार इस तरह की एक भी मिसाल नहीं बतला सकेगी कि इस तरह के जो लोग दंगे कराते या भड़काते हैं, उन्हें फांसी पर लटकाया गया, किसी को मौत की सजा दी गई या किसी को उम्र कैद की सजा दी गई हो। इसका कारण क्या है? इसका कारण यह है कि इस तरह के लोगों को कोई सजा नहीं दी जाती है। जो राजनीतिज्ञ लोग हैं, जो आफिसर हुकूमत पर बैठे हुये हैं, वे ऐसे लोगों को पनाह देते हैं और इस तरह से इस तरह के लोग बच जाते हैं। जब वे लोग बच जाते हैं तो उनका हौसला बढ़ जाता है और बढ़े हुये हौसले में फिर वे ही लोग दंगे फसाद कराते हैं जैसा कि हरियाणा में हुआ और वह सबके सामने है।

हरियाणा में गुरुद्वारों को जलाया गया और सिक्खों के जो पवित्र गुरुग्रन्थ साहब हैं, उसको जलाया गया और यह चार दिन तक खुले आम होता रहा। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार चार दिन तक क्यों खामोश रही? मेरा इल्जाम है कि हुकूमत यह चाहती थी कि वहाँ पर कुछ हो। जब हुआ और फिर यहाँ से डाट गई तो एक दिन में सब कुछ खत्म हो गया। सलिये मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जहाँ तक कौमी एकता का मामला है, उसके बारे में यह सरकार बिलकुल फेल रही है।

इसी तरह से हरिजनों की बात को ले लीजिये। हरिजनों की जो बात है, वह बहुत देर से चल रही है। सन् 1950 में पहली बार उनके लिये 10 साल के लिये रिजर्वेशन किया गया था ताकि वे बाकी वर्ग के लोगों

के साथ समान आधार पर लाये जा सकें और इसीलिये इस वर्ग के लोगों को खान रियायतें दी गई थी। मगर यह काम दस साल के अन्दर पूरा नहीं हो सका और फिर दस साल के लिये उन्हें रियायत दे दी गई। इन दस सालों में भी सरकार ने उनकी हालत को ठीक नहीं किया और मुल्क के बाकी वर्ग के लोगों के बराबर उन्हें नहीं ला सकी और हालत यहाँ तक पहुँच गई कि पिछले साल सरकार ने दस साल के लिये उनका रिजर्वेशन और रियायतें और बढ़ा दी हैं। तो मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि दस-दस साल के लिये वह कब तक बढ़ाती रहेगी। मेरा सरकार के ऊपर यह इल्जाम है कि यहाँ पर जो बड़े-बड़े आफिसर हैं, उनके लिये जो भर्ती होती है, उनके लिये जब सिलेक्शन होता है, तो उस सिलेक्शन में हरिजनों के लोगों को नजरान्दाज कर दिया जाता है। मैं यहाँ कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर सरकार ने उन्हें बाकी वर्ग के लोगों के बराबर लाना है, उन्हें रिजर्वेशन की सुविधा दी है, तो उस रिजर्वेशन के आधार पर उनका सिलेक्शन होना चाहिये और उन्हीं लोगों के बीच सिलेक्शन होना चाहिये।

सरकार के बहुत से विभागों को ले लिया जाये, जहाँ पर हरिजनों के साथ न्याय नहीं किया जाता है। अभी हमारे एक मित्र ने रेल विभाग के बारे में कहा था कि वहाँ पर हरिजनों को मुलाजिमत नहीं मिल रही है और दूसरी बड़ी-बड़ी बातें की जा रही हैं। तो मैं यह कहूँगा कि इन बातों पर अमल होना चाहिये और खाली कागज पर लिखे जाने से कोई फायदा नहीं होगा और उन लोगों की भलाई ही हो सकेगी।

अन्त में, मैं आपको धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि आपने मुझे अपने टूटे फूटे विचार प्रकट करने के लिये समय दिया। धन्यवाद।

SHRI M. PURKAYASTHA (Assam):
Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the motion moved by Shri Arjun Arora and seconded by Shri-

mati Lalitha Rajagopalan. This year's President's Address is really good. It contains a list of actions that the Government propose to take during the year. Our President rightly realises the mood of the people when he says that our country today is no longer stagnant but it is inferment. He goes on to say that the aspirations of our people and their hopes have been aroused and they are vocal and impatient, conscious of their needs and rights. It is in this background he says that the Government are resolved to go forward at a faster pace towards the achievement of a social order which is just and humane, by taking particular care of the weaker sections of the community and by ensuring that the meagre wealth of the nation is augmented by hard and dedicated work. He says that it is Government's unswerving purpose to build, brick by brick, a society which is democratic and socialist. A beginning is going to be made in the building of a democratic socialist society in the country and that is why all the State Governments have been asked to accord high priority to land reforms with special emphasis on security of tenure, fair rents, strict enforcement of ceilings, distribution of land to the landless and assured supply of agricultural inputs to small farmers. The land reforms policy is not being implemented properly. In our State of Assam the Zamindari Abolition Act was passed in 1956 and now it is 1970 but still that Act has not been implemented. A new type of intermediary has been created in the name of acquired estates. The lands that were in the hands of the zamindars have not been distributed to the landless labour and the tenants who have got a right over those lands because of their long occupancy. They have still not got the title over those lands. The Government of Assam enunciated a land settlement policy as early as September, 1958 but even today we find that the land has not been properly distributed and as a result there is discontent among the peasants in our State. If the Government do not

move and move at a fast speed I am afraid the peasants will not remain quiet; they will become restless and they will go forward and forcibly occupy the lands. The peasants are ready to get the land even if necessary by force. The State Government are not enforcing land reform measures although so many Acts have been passed. All these Acts have remained on paper and nothing concrete has been done. Recently I was made a Member of the District Land Settlement Advisory Board and we were all surprised to find that the relevant records were not being properly maintained and many of them were missing. The person concerned sent an intimation to the police and he escaped and no further action could be taken. There is so much of corruption in the Land Revenue Department. Since the records are not properly kept the legitimate interests of the peasants are suffering. I would urge upon the Government of Assam to devise some machinery to supervise the State land reform measures, so that these land reform measures are implemented as speedily as possible.

The President's Address has not mentioned the far-reaching constitutional history that is going to be made in Assam. A new chapter is going to be added in our constitutional history by the creation of Meghalaya, an autonomous State, within the State of Assam. The State is coming into force from the 2nd of April and it is going to be a new experience. The creation of Meghalaya will not solve the problems of the north-eastern frontier province. Meghalaya will consist of only two districts. There are problems in the Mizo Hills area. There are problems in Tripura. There are problems in Nagaland. There are problems in Manipur, but the Government is not taking any effective measures to solve these problems. The emergency has been lifted in this country, but in Assam a state of emergency is continuing for the last four years. Over the major part of Assam, no trains run in the night. In the

Mizo Hills area for the last four years the emergency is continuing and the civilian life has not been restored to normal. The security forces there are not trying to restore peace and restore civilian administration in the district. The Mizo rebels have been completely destroyed, but the security forces are behaving in such a manner that civilian administration has become impossible. Regarding the government officials who belong to the Mizo district, they are not free to move. Not only the Mizo citizens, but civilian officials also often harassed. Even an officer of the Intelligence Bureau who was travelling in a jeep was not allowed to go. Though he revealed his identity he was detained by the security forces. This complete handling over of the law and order situation to the security forces will not help to restore peace in the Mizo area. The civilian administration should be empowered to restore civilian administration in the district of Mizo.

Similarly, in Manipur great discontent prevails and some Manipuris have established contact with the Nagas and China and there is a sort of underground government. If Government does not take proper measures immediately, then in Manipur a situation like Mizo and Nagaland will be created. So I want to impress upon the Government of India to give special attention to the problems of the north-eastern frontier State and see that civilian administration is gradually restored in that State.

In this connection I would like to draw your attention to the problem of unemployment in the State of Assam. Unemployment is not only prevalent in Assam, but all over the country. The President has rightly pointed out in his Address that Government is taking measures to combat unemployment, but he has not given any concrete steps which are going to be taken in this matter. If no concrete step is taken to remove unemployment, fissiparous tendencies, paro-

chial claims and discontent will remain and Government will fail to make progress. So, I would urge that concrete measures be taken to remove unemployment from this country. With the question of unemployment comes the question of labour. The labourers in Assam, who are mainly employed in tea plantations, get the lowest wage in the country. Government must take steps to see that the condition of labour in Assam is improved. Those who are working in the tea plantations should get proper wages and they should have security of service, so that they can play their rightful part in raising production. In this connection I would invite your attention to the sad plight of sweepers and scavengers working in the municipal towns and cities of Assam. After rendering service for generations, they are not made permanent. They remain temporary for the whole of life. This is an anomaly. In a socialist State this cannot be allowed to continue. Government should come forward with some measures to safeguard the interests of sweepers and scavengers who are Harijans.

Before I conclude, I would like to mention about the Supreme Court judgement on the bank nationalisation. This has created great disappointment in the minds of the people of this country. If the Supreme Court can rob the people of their rights, hopes and aspirations, then I do not know what these legislators, who are representatives of the people, are meant for. Government should come forward in this Session with a Bill to remove the right to property from the Fundamental Rights. If that is not done, then there will be a revolution in the country. The courts cannot rule the country. It is the legislator who is supreme, being elected by the people. They must rule the country. The Government should not be hesitant about this matter. They should not compromise. They should come forward with legislation removing the right to property from the

Fundamental Rights. We have seen in the past that our national leaders have compromised on vital matters. They compromised on the question of independence and as a result our country was partitioned. They compromised on the question of patriotism and the bureaucracy was retained. The Government should not now compromise on the question of people's interests. The people's interests should be protected and safeguarded by the Government and if that is not done, the country will rise in revolt. Thank you.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI (Maharashtra): Mr. Deputy Chairman, in his Address to Parliament on the 20th February, the President of India highlighted the fact that attitudes, ideas and even habits are rapidly changing. I entirely agree, for this is true of men and women in our country as elsewhere. Nevertheless, it is a matter of concern that some basic values of life are being thrown overboard. If the developments leading to the election of our illustrious President have been sad, the subsequent developments are even sadder, very distressing, for mud is being thrown all round. A morbid sensationalism is being built up in regard to the election of the first citizen of India. The same kind of morbid thinking is to be found in the debate over the settlement of State boundaries. Tempers are being roused as if the settlement is between two sovereign entities. After all, the issues are to be resolved within the territories of our own country. Take the latest position concerning Maharashtra and Mysore. There is the Mahajan Report, but in life accommodation has to be made. There must be give and take. Coming as I do from Maharashtra, I fully appreciate the view-point of the people of Maharashtra, and support it fully. I do hope that the whole matter will be amicably settled.

The economic situation is showing signs of improvement, thanks to the initiative of the people. The country can go ahead if there is less of bureau-

cratic interference and hurdles are not almost religiously placed in the way of initiative and enterprise of those who work on the farm and in the factory. However, we are told off and on by the members of the Council of Ministers that there is need for more regulations on economic activity, and that almost every phase of our economic life should be channelled through State corporations. The prescription is that the internal trade of major agricultural commodities can be taken over by State corporations and all items of import be canalised similarly. General insurance is on the nationalisation menu-card. Are we to look forward to a situation where the common man as well as the business man will be at the mercy of the Government officers and clerks? I almost feel that the nightmare for the common man and the paradise for the bureaucrat is round the corner.

The progress of the economy is being held up because investment in the public sector is not bearing returns and the private sector is being starved of funds. There is the basic insufficiency of savings both with people as well as with Government. The climate for investments has been affected by uncertainty of policies. Apart from controls of one kind or the other and punitive taxation, there is the impending danger of nationalisation of certain industries.

The general public is hardly interested in investing in industrial securities which have shown a downward trend almost since 1962. Unless this interest is revived and what is more the climate for investment is improved in the interest of the economic growth of the country, policies, even if they are well meant, may not be fruitful and will fail to bring about any radical transformation in the standard of living of the people.

It is unfortunate that even after two decades of development a stable economic policy has not emerged. Most policy changes are politically motiva-

ted. No one would deny that economic progress, whether it is brought by the public or by the private sector, should ultimately benefit the large masses of the people. But it must be recognised at the same time that any benefit to the society can come only through larger production. There is no other short cut to economic welfare.

A view is also propagated that State Governments are at liberty to nationalise any industry. Already, the U.P. Government has decided in principle to take over the sugar industry and set up a Committee to suggest the form and procedure for doing it. The Bihar Government has also expressed its desire to appoint a Committee on the lines of Uttar Pradesh to work out a proposal for taking over the sugar industry in the State. The Kerala Government has decided to appoint a two-man Commission to take over foreign-owned plantations.

There seems to be confusion that socialism means change in ownership of the means of production from private to public sector. The question is: Does a change in ownership result in greater income, employment, exports or resource generation? Unfortunately, not. What is needed at the present juncture is the creation of pre-conditions to a welfare economy. Both private enterprise and public enterprise have a place which is supplementary and complementary to each other.

While great concern is expressed about the lot of the common man, he is always at the receiving end of all taxation. Prices go up because of taxes. The middle classes too are hard hit in that the cost of living is continuously going up.

The most disquieting feature, however, is the philosophy being propounded that each State is competent to nationalise any industry within its jurisdiction. There can be no two

opinions that such a step would lead to diverse economic systems in different parts of the country which may well end up with economic disintegration. It might also be the beginning to undermine not only mixed economy but the democratic process itself. If democracy is to survive, Government has to respect the right of every individual and organisation to have its/their own avocations so long as they do not conflict with social justice. In other words, Government must respect the autonomy of individuals and institutions and accept the varied means for the development of their personalities, according to the dictates of free will, and thereby contribute to common good. Social ownership and control should not be used as a weapon to weaken democracy and demoralise institutions and individuals.

Let us again consider the recent decision of the Government on licensing policy. Government has brought back in the licensing list 41 industries which had been delicensed in stages during the recent past. This is contrary to the advice of the Planning Commission to gradually delicense industries which require little or no foreign exchange. A number of restraints have been placed on the 20 big industrial houses. Honest difference of opinion can exist on whether such restraints are advisable. Then again there is the provision relating to conversion of equity into loans by Government financial institutions. This will not only have the effect of freezing some of the funds of the financial institutions but also shy away prospective investors for fear of undue interference. Further there is the danger of the borrowing company becoming over-capitalised. The salutary feature, however, is the extension of the exemption limit for licensing purposes from Rs. 26 lakhs to Rs. 1 crore. But here again there is the disquieting feature that industries falling under the exemption limit will not have any assurance of foreign exchange even for marginal capital

equipment not manufactured in India and raw materials not available indigenously.

The first ingredient of social control is that those who exercise it must be socially responsible themselves. On this basis I view with the greatest disappointment and indeed with indignation that the solemn word that was given by Sardar Vallabhai Patel to the Princes is now being sought to be reversed. Can any member of the present Government prove that the Princes have not discharged their obligations which they were called upon to fulfil by the Sardar? Frankly, I do not understand the compulsions for abolishing the privy purses of the Rulers of the former Indian States. In any case, the Rulers like all of us are mortal. With the passing away of every Ruler, the purses and privileges have shrunk and they will go on shrinking. In about two decades, I suppose, they will vanish in a natural way. Why then all these unconstitutional attempts to force the pace?

Any act of abolition of privy purses and privileges has a wider dimension. No other group in India will have any confidence in Government. What is worse, our friends abroad will lose faith. This is not the way that Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru ran the country.

During the major part of the life of Panditji as Prime Minister, the prestige of India was high. The foreign policy, as practised now is, however, doing great damage in our relations with almost every major political power. Could it be that those who are implementing the foreign policy are themselves unaware of what they are doing? But ignorance cannot be a virtue when knowledge can be acquired.

Thank you.

SHRI K. SUNDARAM (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Deputy Chairman, the Government makes a tall claim of having made a break-through in agri-

culture by achieving the production of 102 million tonnes of foodgrains. This is all not due to the Government. Most of it is due to the efforts of the farmer and the good monsoon that we had before. But even then that is with regard only to foodgrains. But what about cotton and jute? Nothing has been done and we have a long way to go to attain self-sufficiency. It has been said that there has been an industrial recession and then an industrial recovery. We should not forget that during the last eight months import licences have been denied, have not been issued. Therefore, compulsorily the industries are made to suffer. They are working with partial capacity and therefore we have compulsorily saved foreign exchange. This does not mean that it is import substitution that we have achieved. Similarly during the recession there has been little demand for goods in our local markets. Therefore, the industries were forced to export their commodities, and that too with very heavy cash subsidies they were able to export. That is why we see a marginal increase in our exports during the last year. The increase in exports and the reduction in imports have given us a balance of credit in foreign exchange that is available. This cannot be repeated year after year and this is definitely not to the credit of the Government. It is by force of circumstances that this situation has been brought about.

The President has mentioned the unfortunate instance in Ahmedabad and he is right in condemning it. But at the same time he has made a very grave omission in not mentioning the situation that is prevailing in West Bengal. Mr. Deputy Chairman, for the best part of the morning during the Question Hour as well as during the Short Notice Question we had a good and thorough discussion on the situation that is prevailing in West Bengal and how it has been deteriorating from day to day. The President has completely omitted this. What is happening there according to

[Shri K. Sundaram.]

the statement of the Chief Minister of West Bengal? I quote—

“We cannot live with dacoits. I see murder, arson and insult to woman in every part of the State.”

That was some time back. And afterwards, what is happening? Whatever paddy was grown it was looted after the harvest. There was fish looted from the pond. And now there are reports that even the women are being looted from their homes. This is the situation. There is practically no safety for the lives of the people in that State. There is a reign of terror in that State of West Bengal today. The news is effectively blacked out. No news is reaching the rest of the country. That is why this morning you had seen—there is so much of light that has been thrown on the happenings in West Bengal today. The Government of India at this Stage has been denying that there is any problem of law and order. The Government of India is conniving with the Government of West Bengal as Mr. Krishna Menon did in 1962 and before in not disclosing the facts about the Chinese preparations against India. The same thing is happening with the India Government today.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, the President has said about peaceful co-existence. This is what Mr. Kosygin said when he wanted to expand their trade with other countries. And the then Prime Minister fell into the trap. Now the trap is being expanded and it is being sealed, sealed with bilateral and multilateral long-term economic relations and agreements, particularly with Asian countries. Now these agreements, what are they? They are rupee payment agreements. Now, you may ask what is wrong with these rupee payment agreements? Mr. Deputy Chairman, we had been exporting some traditional commodities like textiles, jute, hides and skins, raw silk, etc. These goods were re-sold in other markets and these coun-

tries earned hard currency while in return we got crude machinery manufactured by these developing countries all Iron Curtain countries, and they experimented on us with their newly-developed machines. It has been admitted that all the countries of Eastern Europe except Russia had been doing this reselling or switching the trade in the past. Last year we exported our steel. On account of recession here, we had some surplus steel. All that steel was exported at the cost of the nation starving the local industries of steel. Now what happened? In the international market, the price for steel has been going. Now we are importing steel from other countries paying a very high price for steel that we require.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, last week we had a discussion on the purchase of aircraft from the American Company, Boeing. Now, the Russians have also offered us their aeroplanes of TU-154, the Russian-make, as against the American Boeings 737. Now, a decision on this was blocked for three years and as a result, as per the statement of the Minister, we had to pay three hundred thousand dollars on each aircraft.

For the last two years we have been talking about the wagons contract. Huge quantities of wagons required for Russia are to be entered into for a long-term contract. But nothing has happened so far. Very recently we heard from the newspapers that the Russians wanted these wagons at exactly half their cost of manufacture at our Indian State-owned factories. Now, that did not go through. Now they are bargaining. Bargaining for what? For a long-term credit, and they are wanting new conditions to be added there that these wagons should be manufactured in the public sector industries only and that too, we must have the Russian know-how, Russian collaboration and the machines working there must be the Russian machines. Now, you can imagine

what will be the future for those public sector undertakings in India. They will in practice be working for the development of the East European countries as the other satellite countries in Europe are doing for Russia. Even here, they are not prepared to make any firm commitments about the quantity of wagons that they will require in future.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, the President in his speech has said that there is a large demand for tractors. Now we have been talking for the last 10 years about the manufacture of tractors. Licences for indigenous manufacture were delayed. The controversy was whether they should be produced in the private sector or the public sector. And finally what little was licensed were not fully produced. Imported components required for these tractors were not imported, were not allowed to be imported. Therefore, the indigenous manufacturers suffered. Now they want to go in for unlimited imports of these tractors. From where? From the same East European countries. Now, we know—particularly our Indian farmer knows—well about these Russian tractors. They have suffered for want of spare parts or want of service. And Russia is going to dump on us these unwanted tractors many more.

Sir, we have in Madras State the Mardas Surgical Instruments Factory. What do they make? They make instruments that are not required by our doctors. They are the most unsuitable and unserviceable in the country. But yet they manufacture them. And they compel the Government hospitals to use these instruments. And the Russian technician there is not prepared to change the pattern or the specification which our Indian doctors are accustomed to or which they want. That is what is happening. In this Rupee contract, there is a clause about the gold content. All these years this clause has been only for exporting purposes. On the import contracts there was no such clause. You may remember, Sir, when we devalued our Rupee last time, we did not get our full

value particularly from Russia. The other countries agreed to pay us the full value. Russia did not agree and we got something less. Even today the Government is trying to introduce this clause. But some countries have agreed and Russia has not agreed even today.

(Time Bell rings.)

Mr. Deputy Chairman Sir, there has been growing influence of Russia on our Government. Mr. Nijalingappa, the leader of the Congress (O), said the other day that on every domestic matter the Government of India is consulting a foreign Embassy. The consultation is very close, and it is being done every time. The Russian Embassy took the liberty of constructing a cultural centre in Trivandrum. But for the accident of the building during the construction it would not have been brought to the notice of the Government of India and their similar activities would have been going on.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please finish now.

SHRI K. SUNDARAM: One minute and I have done. On account of this Rupee payment although we have developed very close contacts and also increased our trade with these countries we have already lost our economic freedom, and because of these types of consultations, on political matters as well we are not free to take our own decisions. Our political freedom is also in danger. Therefore, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I oppose the motion moved by Mr. Arjun Arora on the Motion of Thanks to the Address delivered by the President of India to both the Houses of Parliament.

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA (Bihar): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the Motion moved by Shri Arjun Arora regarding the Address of the President to the Members of both the Houses of Parliament. Sir, this Address marks the beginning of a new epoch. It does not mean that what has preceded was not good enough. What had preceded during the last two decades required new,

[Shri Awadheshwar Prasad Sinha.]

determined, effective and more suitable steps to be taken to meet the challenges of the new situation. And this Address shows that a definite direction has been taken. And indications of the steps to meet the requirements of the situation also have been made in this Address.

Sir, the people who represent vested interests whatever they talk in a diplomatic and clever language about democracy, do not realise that democracy cannot be saved unless 99 per cent. of the people who are disinherited and dispossessed are brought to their own. These people talk of democracy particularly and they talk of saving democracy. The real and effective way to save democracy is to enrich its socio-economic content by taking measures which will give bread clothing, education, medical facilities, housing and satisfy other things which a human being requires. This attempt has to be made. Without this attempt democracy cannot be saved.

Sir, I am one of those who feel that democracy can only be saved by building up socialism, and I am glad the President has pointed in this direction. That is why I support this Motion.

Sir, this word "socialism" has been used in many senses all over the world. It started with Fabian socialism, parlour socialism and all sorts of socialism. Now here excepting one or two parties everybody talks about it. But when we come to implement measures, there the difficulty arises. Just now my friend, Mr. Chinai, said that Sardar Patel gave word about the Princes and it is being taken away.

AN HON'BLE MEMBER: What is his Party attitude?

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA: My friend asks what is his party attitude. I think his party attitude is "O" and nothing else. Had Sardar Patel been alive today he would have also read the writing on the wall. He would have seen the signs of the time.

Sir, the masses are aroused and their demands are beating and dashing against the walls not only of

Parliament, not only of the State Legislatures, but the schools and colleges, and even the offices and the Secretariats, the huts in the fields and the factories. Everywhere that upsurge of the masses is there and we have to equate our action to that feeling. So, if need be, we have to change the Constitution. We have changed the Constitution already so many times. Therefore, if we have to change the Constitution for the Princes we shall do that because if the people whom we represent want it we have got to do it. Then Sardar Patel carried out the wishes of the people. Now we are carrying out the wishes of the people. Let us understand that. We are taking his line of action. That is all what I have to say.

Sir, before the announcement was made by the President in his Address, Mr. Chinai's friends were very vociferous about the abolition of the Princely order. They said that the Prime Minister and the Government did not want to do it because some Princes were on our side in the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha. Now when it is being done they say that Sardar Patel's word is being violated.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): On a point of clarification. He is very right in saying that our Party has endorsed the abolition of Privy purses. But even at that time there were some Members, either on this side now or on that side, who did oppose. So if Mr. Chinai has given that opinion it is 90 per cent. his personal opinion.

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA: From our side no such opinion will be expressed. That is my point.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You continue.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: I am glad you are not going to have two diametrically opposed opinions . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No interruption.

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA: That is why we have come to the point of facing each other.

Because we were facing such opinions in our party, so we are now sitting opposite to each other. They represent something else and we represent something else. We listen to the masses and they listen to the classes. That is all the difference between us and them.

Now I come to other points. The President has on page 12 referred to the need of maintaining peaceful conditions

"The problem transcends political divisions and the Government seek the co-operation of all political parties, and indeed of all responsible citizens, in dealing with it."

Sir, with respect to this, he has talked of communal matters and other things. Now a new thing has come up, and some of our friends talked about it in the House. I would like to speak on it because I belong neither to Mysore nor to Maharashtra. Just now an hon. Member, the Akali Party gentleman, said that the Government of India is interested in seeing that Haryana and Punjab fight each other. He said "They have given us Chandigarh which was ours and they have taken away Fazilka from us." I do not want to enter into any argument about it. But the Haryana people say "The Shah Commission gave it to Haryana." If the Government of India has taken out from Punjab some area which is Hindi-speaking what fault has the Government of India committed? In this matter, I admire the courage of the Chief Minister of Haryana that he accepted *in toto* the decision, whatever the feelings of his people may be.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: All along you were saying that you represented the people. But now you say "whatever may be the feelings of the people . . ."

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA: If the people are wrong, in parochial matters, and they take the line of provincialism, then the leader-

ship has to take them on the right path.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: It is not convincing.

(Interruptions).

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA: Now, I do not know what the Government of India requested—I am neither curious nor am I entitled to know it—but something was sent from here and the Chief Minister of Maharashtra was good enough to respond to the call. He came here and met the Prime Minister and other leaders of the Central Government. He said "I do not accept the proposal." He went back and asked the people to be calm. To-day there is a *bandh* there. I do not like that *bandhs* should have been organised there but I heard on the radio at 1-40, till then it was peaceful, I hope it will be peaceful. What happened in the other State of Mysore? The Chief Minister could not come. Officers of the Central Government went there. He said "No, give me in writing", as if we are dealing with China or Pakistan or some other country. The Secretary of the Home Ministry, Mr. H. Lal, a very senior officer, went there and he knew what the suggestion of the Government of India was. But the Chief Minister of Mysore said "Give us in writing", and he refused to come. And he did not at that moment ask the people to be calm and all that, as Mr. Naik did when he went back from here. Sir, many things have happened there and even firing has been resorted to. Both the Houses of the Mysore Legislature have passed resolutions that the report of the Mahajan Commission should be accepted. Now this can very well be done by the Maharashtra Legislatures also. Both can play this game. There is tension now in both the States. What should be done about it? I would, as an outsider, appeal to the Chief Minister of Mysore to have a dialogue about it, both with the Central Government and with the Maharashtra Government. Sir, a statement has been issued by some of the Ministers

[Shri Awadheshwar Prasad Sinha]

there saying that not an inch of Mysore will be given. This attitude is not a good attitude. I am glad that no one from the Maharashtra side has said so. I do not stand for any formula, but I do believe that some give and take will have to be done because if one reads this Mahajan Commission's report, one will find that it bristles with inconsistencies. It is sometimes said by highly placed people that it is an award. But he himself has said "I have been asked to make recommendations." So it cannot be an award. Then the Pataskar formula was on the basis of village. I personally consider that also as absurd. The Commissioner refers to a suggestion about a panchayat of 1,500 or 2,000 people as a unit. That is more practical, I agree, but again the Commission refers to the unit of 20,000 or 25,000 people but he does not give any argument in its favour. When he starts his dissertations about Konkani and Marathi it beats my comprehension. In grammar, syntax and vocabulary, these two languages resemble each other. Sir, 60 per cent of words in both the languages are the same. So, it is very difficult for any person to accept this. A give-and-take attitude has to be adopted. Sir, in regard to Bihar and Bengal, so many areas were demanded from Bihar and Orissa also, and a sort of feud went on. I do not know what happened before, but I had the privilege to be present at the last act of the drama. Dr. B. C. Roy came to Pandit Govind Ballabh Pant, who was our Home Minister then, and Shri Sri Krishan Sinha, Chief Minister of Bihar, was kind enough to come to me and asked me to accompany him. When I went there, they started talking and I told Pandiji "Permit me to go". He said "No, you also sit, down." And within 15 to 20 minutes everything was settled. Sir, Dr. B. C. Roy said, "I know that the eastern part of Purnea is Hindi-speaking or Urdu-speaking, but give me a two-mile broad route so that I may go to Dar-

jeeling without passing through Bihar." Shri Sri Krishan Sinha said "How can I? These people are Hindi-speaking people; they are not Bengali-speaking." Dr. Roy said "I was also born in Patna." Dr. Roy was a son of Bihar. After matriculation he went to Calcutta for his medical education. He said, "I have picked up both Hindi and Bengali. And these people also will pick up Bengali." He then said "Out of Purulia District give me Purulia sub-division."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. You have to wind up.

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA: So, within 15 to 20 minutes, everything was resolved on the basis of give-and-take, not on the basis of "Not an inch of land will be given." The latter attitude is bad. This is all I have to say. The Government of India's effort on the question is commendable. If every party says "Head's I win, tails you lose", then nothing will happen. A rigid attitude and a rigid posture from any side will be wrong. And unless they help the Government of India to come to some understanding, this question cannot be resolved. And the people of Mysore and Maharashtra will not excuse us unless we go on to the path of reason, the path of amity and the path of good neighbourliness.

श्री जगन नारायण (हरियाणा) :
डिप्टी चैयरमैन महोदय, मैंने पूरी संजीदगी के साथ प्रेसिडेंट के ऐड्रेस को पढ़ा और सेंट्रल हाल में भी सुना। यह ऐड्रेस बहुत लम्बा चौड़ा है, मगर उसमें कुछ बातें, कुछ ऐसे ग्रहम मसले रह गये हैं, जिनकी तरफ आपकी वसातत से प्रधान मंत्री महोदय की तवज्जह दिलाना चाहता हूँ।

आपको याद होगा कि 1962 में चीन ने हिन्दुस्तान के ऊपर हमला किया था और उसने हिन्दुस्तान का 40 हजार मुरब्बा इलाका अपने कब्जे पर कर लिया है। जब प्रधान मंत्री जवाहरलाल नेहरू थे, तो उनकी लीडरशिप में पार्लियामेंट ने यह हलफ लिया

था कि हम उस इलाके को वापस लेंगे । नवम्बर, 1962 में चीन ने हमारे मुल्क पर हमला किया था, लेकिन आज 1970 भी गुजर चुका है, इस ऐंड्रेस में कहीं भी उस इलाके को वापस लेने का जिक्र नहीं किया गया है कि हम उस इलाके को वापस लेंगे या नहीं लेंगे । मैं अपने प्रधान मंत्री जी से अदब के साथ पूछना चाहता हूं कि क्या हमने वह इलाका राइटऑफ कर दिया है या फिर हम उस इलाके को वापस लेंगे ।

इसी तरह से पाकिस्तान ने हमारे काश्मीर का हिस्सा अपने कब्जे में ले रखा है । क्या उस इलाके को हमारी सरकार वापस लेगी या नहीं लेगी, इस बात का इस ऐंड्रेस में कोई जिक्र नहीं है ।

4 P.M.

इस ऐंड्रेस में अहमदाबाद के फसादात का जिक्र किया गया है और उनको कन्डेम किया गया है । वाकई उनको कन्डेम करना चाहिए था । वे फसादात ऐसे थे, जिनकी कोई भी जीहोश आदमी मजम्मत किये बिना नहीं रह सकता । लेकिन मैं बड़े अदब से एक बात प्रधान मंत्री महोदया के नोटिस में लाना चाहता हूं । उनको यह भालूम है या नहीं कि आज सूवाजात में जो वजारतें बनी हुई है, आज जिस ढंग से माइनारिटीज के साथ सलूक किया जा रहा है, उसकी वजह से वे सेकिन्ड क्लास सिटीजन बन गये हैं । मुझे पिछले साल मद्रास जाने का मौका मिला, कलकत्ता जाने का मौका मिला, बम्बई जाने का मौका मिला, अपने सूबे में मैं हूं ही, मैं देखता हूं कि जो माइनारिटीज हैं, उनको सेकिन्ड क्लास सिटीजन समझा जाता है । बंगालीज बंगालियों को लाइक करते हैं, बंगालियों को ही नौकरी देते हैं, बम्बई में नान-महाराष्ट्रियन्स को कोई जगह नहीं है, इसी तरह की चीज पंजाब में और दूसरे सूवाजात में चल रही है ।

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA: So far as Bengal is concerned, we have got lakhs of Biharis there

and we have no grievance on that account, and Bengalis in Bihar also have no grouse on this score.

श्री जगत नारायण : आप मेरी बात बड़े गौर से सुनिये । फ़ैक्ट यही है कि आज जो माइनारिटीज के साथ सलूक हो रहा है, वह सेकिन्ड क्लास सिटीजन का सलूक हो रहा है । क्या भारतवर्ष की आजादी की लड़ाई हमने इसलिए लड़ी थी कि आजादी हासिल करने के बाद के कुछ मालों में ही हमें सेकिन्ड क्लास सिटीजन का दर्जा मिले । मैं बड़े अदब के साथ प्रधान मंत्री महोदया की खिदमत में अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि वे इस मामले पर रोशनी डालें कि इस मामले में केन्द्रीय सरकार क्या कर रही है । मेरे पास टाइम नहीं है, नहीं तो इसके मुताल्लिक मैं कितनी ही मिमालें दे सकता हूं कि जहां अक्सरियत की हुकूमतें हैं, वहां वे अपने आदमियों को ही नौकरी पर लगा रही हैं, अपने आदमियों को ही आगे ला रहे हैं, माइनारिटीज के लिए वहां कोई जगह नहीं है ।

तीसरी बात, डिप्टी चेयरमैन महोदय, बड़े अदब के साथ प्रधान मंत्री महोदया की खिदमत में रखना चाहता हूं कि आजादी मिलने से पहले 10 साल जो रिक्वोल्यूशनरी है, कांग्रेस वर्कर्स है, कांग्रेस लीडर्स हैं, जिनके ऊपर मुकदमे बनते थे, उनके डिफेंस का काम मेरे सुपुर्द था । हमने वहां पर हाई कोर्ट के और दूसरे वकील रखे हुए थे, जो बड़े लगन से काम करते थे । वे एक बात कहते थे कि एकजीक्यूटिव मजिस्ट्रेट के आर्डर्स की वे जिम्मेदारी नहीं ले सकते कि वे क्या फैसला देगे । लेकिन जहां तक सेशन जजों का ताल्लुक है, हाई कोर्ट के जजों का ताल्लुक है, हम यह कह सकते हैं कि चाहे अंग्रेज हों, हिन्दुस्तानी हों उनमें से बेस्तर ऐसे हैं जो ठीक इन्साफ करेंगे, लेकिन आज जब अपनी हुकूमत है, आज जो सबसे बड़ा सुप्रीम कोर्ट है, उसके फैसले की नुक्ताचीनी शुरू कर दी गई है । मैं यह नहीं कहता कि प्रधान मंत्री नुक्ताचीनी कर रही हैं, मैं कहता हूं कि ऐसे

[श्री जगत नारायण]

अनासिर हैं, जो सुप्रीम कोर्ट के फैसले के खिलाफ नुकताचीनी करते हैं, जो सुप्रीम कोर्ट के जजों के खिलाफ, उनके फैसले के खिलाफ ऐसे रिमार्क्स पास कर देने हैं जो नहीं कहने चाहिए। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह एक ऐसी ऊँची अदालत है, जिसके फैसले का हमें पूरा एहताराम करना चाहिए, चाहे उनके फैसले से हमें इत्फाक हो या न हो। आज अगर सुप्रीम कोर्ट के फैसले का एहताराम नहीं हुआ, तो आपकी डेमोक्रेसी नहीं चल सकेगी। सुप्रीम कोर्ट के चीफ जस्टिस ने कहा भी है कि जो जज हैं वे डेमोक्रेसी को कायम रखने के लिए हैं ताकि अगर डेमोक्रेसी गलती करे या वह गिरती हो तो उसकी तरफ तबज्जह दिलाई जाय।

इसी तरह पिछले दिनों कई जगह पर आईन की बेहुरमती की गई, नेशनल फ्लेग जलाया गया, नेशनल फ्लेग को सलाम करने नहीं पहुँचे। यह जो टेंडेसी है आईन की और नेशनल फ्लेग की बेहुरमती करने की इसकी तरफ मैं चाहूँगा प्राइम मिनिस्टर तबज्जह दें। ये जो चीजें शुरू की गई हैं, मैं समझता हूँ ये मुल्क को पतन में ले जायेंगी और डेमोक्रेसी खत्म हो जायेगी।

मुझे 5-6 दिन कलकत्ता रहने का मौका मिला। वहाँ जो हालात देखे और जो हालात सुने वे वाकई दर्दनाक थे। मैं एक पंजाबी के घर जो रिश्तेदार था खाना खाने गया। उस दिन मैं मुख्य मंत्री को मिल कर आया था, गवर्नर महोदय को मिल कर आया था, टेबिल पर बातचीत हो रही थी कि यहाँ पर कैसे हालात चल रहे हैं। जो उनका बैरा था वह कम्युनिस्ट था, वह सारी बात सुनता रहा, जब हम खाना खाकर उठे, तो उसने हमारे मेजबान के लड़के को कहा कि लालाजी को कह दो कि अगली बार जब यहाँ आएँगे तो बंगाल में बिलकुल ज्योति बसु की हुकूमत होगी और किसी की हुकूमत नहीं होगी। वहाँ हालात क्या हैं? आपने स्टेट्समैन में पढ़ा

होगा एक जोड़ा सिनेमा देखने गया, कार छोड़ कर गया, जब वापस आया तो देखा कि कार नहीं थी, पास की गली में थी, जाकर जब उन्होंने कार को चाबी लगाई तो गुंडे आ गए और आदमी को कहा कि तुम्हारी बीबी को ले चले, यहाँ दो दिन बाद आकर बीबी को ले जाना। स्टेट्समैन में यह सारी खबर छपी है, मेरे पास पड़ा है, टाइम नहीं है नहीं तो पढ़ कर सुना देता। दो दिन के बाद वाकई औरत मिली और वह मुर्दा हालत में मिली।

श्री ए० जी० कुलकर्णी (महाराष्ट्र) :
सुनने वाले यहाँ नहीं हैं।

श्री जगत नारायण : मैं सारे हाउस को सुना रहा हूँ, मैं आपको इसलिए सुना रहा हूँ कि जब कभी हाउस में यह सवाल पैदा होता है, तो होम मिनिस्टर साहब कहते हैं कि लॉ एंड आर्डर इतना खराब नहीं हुआ कि वह दखल दे सकें। मैं समझता हूँ कि वहाँ पर हालात इतने खराब हैं कि हमारी सरकार को दखल देना चाहिए। वहाँ का चीफ मिनिस्टर कहे कि बागी है, डकैत हैं सारी चीजें हैं फिर भी हमारी केन्द्रीय सरकार ऐक्शन न ले और होम मिनिस्टर साहब कहें कि हालात का जायजा ले रहे हैं, लॉ एंड आर्डर खराब नहीं हुआ है, तो यह कोई अच्छी बात नहीं है। ला एंड आर्डर कितना खराब आप देखना चाहते हैं, किस वक्त आप कहेंगे कि इस हद तक ला एंड आर्डर खराब है कि केन्द्रीय सरकार हरकत में आएगी। अगर आप हरकत में नहीं आयेंगे, तो हालात यह होंगे कि वहाँ पर खून की नदियाँ बहेंगी। उसके साथ ही ईस्ट पाकिस्तान भी रेड हो जायगा, आसाम का सारा हिस्सा हिन्दुस्तान से कट जाएगा और माओ-त्से-तुंग की तरह एक नई हुकूमत हिन्दुस्तान में कायम होगी, जो वहाँ से पेनीट्रेट करेगी सारे हिन्दुस्तान में। इस खतरे से मैं आपको आगाह करना चाहता हूँ।

ये तीन चार बातें थीं, जो मैं बड़े अदब के साथ आपके नोटिस में लाना चाहता था; क्योंकि ये राष्ट्रपति के ऐड्रेस में नहीं हैं। आपके थू ये बातें मैंने प्राइम मिनिस्टर के नोटिस में लाने की कोशिश की है। मैं चाहूँगा कि इनका नोटिस लेते हुए वे इन पर कोई एक्शन लेने का कोशिश करें।

SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I have read carefully the Address delivered by the honourable President to find out new hopes and expectations. But I am sorry to say that nothing new has come out in the Address.

[**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN)** in the Chair].

In para 6 of the President's Address it is stated that socio-economic forces are unleashed and that the Government has recognised that. But unfortunately the Government which is ruling our country for the last 22 years, has done nothing to utilise the socio-economic forces to channelise them with a purpose and direction as a result of which we see today all sorts of frustration everywhere. The unemployment problem has assumed alarming dimensions, and in his Address the President has stated nothing about how to solve this problem. It is really very unfortunate that after three Five Year Plans—and now we are entering into the Fourth Five Year Plan—the problem of unemployment is growing day by day and the number of unemployed boys and girls is increasing every day. I do not know how we can go forward with the task of bringing about a socio-economic pattern when we cannot cope with the problem of unemployment even after planned economy. Unfortunately in his Address the President has stated nothing in this respect. Secondly, Sir, when I went through the Address of the President, it appeared to me that it contained a list of the achievements of his Government, particularly the

Government of India. After all, Sir, India is a federation; it has a number of States; the President of the Indian Republic is not merely the head of the Union Government but he symbolises and represents the whole of India. It was expected that the Address of the President of the Indian Republic the happenings in different parts of the country would be mentioned, particularly the happenings in West Bengal, the State from which I come, have not been stated in any part of the Address. I do not want to say how many murders have taken place in West Bengal, how many women have lost their honour at the hands of the rough and rude gangs of the CPM in West Bengal, I do not want to describe the lawlessness, arson and looting which have become the order of the day in West Bengal, because law and order is primarily a State subject. But, Sir, it is not merely a question of law and order; it is a question of our Constitution, it has its constitutional implications, because every civilised Government is bound to protect the lives and properties of its individuals and if any State Government deliberately neglects its duties, I do not think the Government of India has nothing to do with it, and particularly the President of the Indian Republic, especially when he assumes office by taking the oath that the Constitution would be protected. But there is no mention about it at all in his Address, which is really an unfortunate fact.

The recent controversy in West Bengal between the Chief Minister and his Deputy over the supervisory power of the Chief Minister has some constitutional significance and the President should have taken note of it in his Address. It is not merely a question of two Ministers in a State Government. I do not know how a parliamentary Government can function when a Cabinet colleague of the Chief Minister or the Prime Minister questions the supervisory capacity of the head of the Government. Nowadays

[Shri Pranab Kumar Mukherjee].

so many coalition Governments or Governments of various parties will take place in different parts of the country and it may happen at the Centre as well. Therefore if our parliamentary institution is to go on successfully and if our parliamentary democracy is to function properly, these things must be cleared and the President should have taken note of this fact in the Address.

There is one more thing which I would like to point out. The Prime Minister in her recent visit to West Bengal expressed the hope that West Bengal would be able to play its vital role in shaping the future of India as it did in the past. Naturally it was expected that the Prime Minister would do her best to see that West Bengal could do something in shaping the future of India but in the Address by the President nothing has been stated, although the responsibility of drafting the Address lies with the Prime Minister.

Both politically and economically West Bengal is almost on the verge of ruination. Economically West Bengal has suffered a lot and unfortunately the Central Government is not coming forth with adequate assistance for the State. All of you know that the second bridge on the river Hooghly is going to be constructed and with the construction of this bridge the Calcutta port will improve and the benefit will go to all the neighbouring States which constitute the hinterland of this port. At the same time you should know that a major share of expenditure for this construction is to be borne by the West Bengal Government; the Central Government is not paying adequate financial assistance. Times without number it has been urged on the floor of this House as also of the other that the Central Government should give assistance to the State to solve the problems of Calcutta and even this year when our Development Minister came to meet

the Members of the Planning Commission, the authorities of the Planning Commission straightway rejected the plea of the West Bengal Government for more financial assistance for the development of the Calcutta metropolitan schemes. These things should have been mentioned in the Address of the President.

Then, Sir, the President has pointed out that if we are to bring about social and economic changes, we must have a pragmatic view of the whole situation but he has failed to mention the role of the judiciary which stands in the way of progressive legislation. Recently we have seen that the Supreme Court has declared some provisions of the Bank Nationalisation Act as ultra vires. I do not want to cast any reflection on the role of the judiciary because I have my fullest regard for it but at the same time I would like to point out that after all the judiciary represents the conservative section of the people and the legislature the more progressive sections of the people and in the case of a conflict between the legislature and the judiciary weightage should be on the side of the legislature, not on the side of the judiciary; it is nothing new in our country. We know when President Roosevelt wanted to introduce some new Bills, he had to face a lot of trouble. So I would like to suggest that suitable amendments to the Indian Constitution, so far as the right to property is concerned, be made and such progressive legislations can be implemented with the help of these amendments. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY (Tamil Nadu): Sir, on a point of order. Can an hon. Member read newspapers when the proceedings of the House are going on. Mr. Ajit Prasad Jain who is a senior Member is doing it.

SHRI A. P. JAIN (Uttar Pradesh): I am reading it to find out the relevant portions of the speeches.

(Interruptions).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Order, order.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Everyday, Sir, Dr. Ram Subhag Singh holds a press conference and we have to read the newspapers almost all the time. Where shall we read them?

SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY: In the rules it has been provided that no newspapers can be read when the proceedings of the House are going on.

(Interruptions).

SHRI A. P. JAIN: I was searching from the paper whether the hon. lady Member has made any speech or not.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: I have not made one, for your information.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am extremely thankful to you for providing me this opportunity to say a few words towards the fag end of the debate. We are operating. Mr. Vice-Chairman, in a very difficult situation in this country. Agricultural production has risen, industrial production is on the increase; the economic situation is no doubt improving. But there are forces of regionalism which are not subdued simply because the economic situation improves; they are gaining strength in this country. On the one hand we find, Sir, in every State the people proclaiming the divine right of those who are born and bred in the State to hold offices and to carry on trade. We find that in the extreme north of this country and in the extreme south of the country regional parties which are communal and racially biased, are ruling over important States and what seems disquieting to me is that there is an announcement by the two Chief Ministers, one from a northern State, another from a southern State, that India's destiny demands that these regional parties rule over every State and these regional parties come toge-

ther. I am horrified not only at the expression of these sentiments but at reality that the regional parties henceforth will have a greater and greater sway over more and more States.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If all the regional parties come together, they become national parties.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's logic reminds me of a man who says if we clothe all the asses with the skin of a lion, they will all become hons. But an ass cannot become a lion; a lion is a lion and an ass is an ass. It is a most disquieting development because those who have made a little study of the history of India are aware that in its long course, India was united not once but many times by great rulers and great conquerors. Asoka, Chandragupta, Samudragupta, Akbar and Aurangzeb are a few names that I can mention, but when those great rulers disappeared from the scene, regional forces began to assert themselves till a time came when India as a unit, became unknown to the people living in India and to people outside India. It is in this situation that a most unfortunate thing has come, I mean, the split in the Congress party. I have always felt that this split has been meaningless. I have studied with care the resolutions both at Ahmedabad and at Bombay and I can assure you that found no difference in substance between the resolutions passed at the two august conferences. Maybe there was a difference in approach or in emphasis. Merely because of difference of approach or difference in emphasis, it is not necessary nor is it proper that we should split or bifurcate into groups I was very much heartened when the mover of the resolution, Mr. Arora, said in his speech: 'after all we and the organisation Congress are one'. Mr. Arora, I consider, is one of the wisest men in that party. I am reminded of a certain King of England who was known as the wisest fool in Christen-

[Shri B. K. P. Sinha]
dom but Mr. Arora is the wisest of wise men in that faction, of the Congress which sits on that side. I was more heartened when Mr. K. K. Shah the Leader of the House, in an interruption, told Mr. S. N. Mishra, the Leader of the Opposition: "After all, why should we deviate from the principles and law of action which operated between the Kauravas and the Pandavas" that is, "so far as others are concerned, we are 105. It is just possible that *per se*, in between ourselves we may be 100 and 5." I feel that there is need to strengthen this approach. (Interruptions) You said that. You read the record. I was present here.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Who are the Kauravas?

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN (Nominated): May we ask Mr. K. K. Shah whether he pleads guilty to that statement?

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: This spirit must be strengthened. I feel that there is every reason why we should strengthen this approach. After all those who sit there or those who sit here or a few of us who sit here, are inheritors of the same tradition. We have been trained under the same leadership, the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Maulana Azad and Sardar Patel. We have proclaimed for the greater part of our lives, the same philosophy. There is no reason why we should split at this critical stage when the country is faced with such serious problems. May I remind those who sit here and those who sit there that after all blood is thicker than water. To-day political exigencies may have thrown those who sit here in the arms of some and those who sit there in arms of others but let both the sides realize that blood is after all thicker than water. The same philosophy in the last 50 years has guided our steps and controlled our actions. There is no reason why at this stage we should give a go-by to that common ap-

proach and split into two parties. I am conscious that mine is a lone voice, though I am not alone and there are many people with me. But then I am strengthened. Even though my voice is a lone voice, I am to pursue this line and proclaim it from the house-tops because I am strengthened by the song of Gurudev Tagore:

एकला चलो, एकला चलो रे ।

यदि तो तर डक सुनै केऊ न आये

तवे एकला चलो रे, एकला चलो रे ।

एकला चलो रे ॥

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Here the difficulty is, everybody came at your call but left you.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: My proposal is so reasonable and is so much in conformity with the needs of the situation and the demands of the country that I am sure that wisdom will dawn one day and that very soon, on the warring leaders of the two camps and they shall soon come together. But to begin with with . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Can he say 'warring'? Mr. Morarji Desai is supposed to be non-violent. This is not very fair.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: To begin with, it is not necessary and it may not be possible to come together immediately but could we not avoid the bitterness that we find in the statements of many of the leaders and the followers of the two groups? Could we not be more rational and reasonable in our approach?

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Then the people will lose faith.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Who are the people? I also represent the people. I have moved among the people every-

where at least in U.P. and Bihar. In the villages, I have found a feeling that the two factions in the Congress should come together. Therefore to begin with, let us shed all bitterness. Let us not attack each other and let us consider the policies and professions of each other on their merit. Let us be reasonable in our actions and sayings so that the ground is prepared at least to have a meaningful dialogue which must precede a reconciliation and I am certain that reconciliation will come that way.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Sinha . . .

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: I know why he is uneasy. He does not want us to come together.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: There is another verse:

SHRI G. RAMACHANDRAN: Are we having a mushaira?

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: I find that because of this split, many attitudes are being changed, many irrational theories are being advanced, many instances are being changed. Somebody said two months back 'Support the abolition of privy purses'. After two months that man opposes the abolition of the privy purses. Two or three months before there was a certain conception of what the Government should do and two months after we find that approach is suddenly given up. This is entirely due to or substantially due to our split.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: It may apply to you, not to others.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: I am really referring to the generality of the Members on both sides and particularly addressing the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition. I am not speaking for you, I am speaking for myself. Because of this unfortunate split I find that both the groups are running a race in search of radicalism. All sorts of things are being said and

propounded under the plea that thereby they shall be achieving the goal of socialism. I believe that for a poor, backward country which has come out of colonial rule after several centuries, there is only one path of development and that path of development is the socialist path. But my conception of socialism is different from the conception of socialism that is harboured by hon. Members sitting on this side and sitting on that side. I agree with Mr. Parkinson.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Do you agree with our ideas?

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: I agree with Mr. Parkinson. Mr. Parkinson is a very famous sociologist, a very famous economist, and Mr. Parkinson, not in one speech, but in more than one speech, in two or three speeches, has said that for an undeveloped country like India there are only two paths of development, either the conventional capitalist path, or the communist path and that a socialism which purports to combine the best of both the worlds, in reality bargains for the worst of both the worlds.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh): For the sake of clarity please indicate which of the two alternatives of Dr. Parkinson is preferred by you.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: I have already said it.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: No, you have not. Capitalism or socialism? Which do you prefer?

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: I have said in an earlier speech that one of the sore points of capitalism is that, if you retain that system and try to introduce equality, production is hampered, development is hampered. But then, in the present world you cannot but have equality. We are not operating in the world in which Industrial Revolution came in England, where, because of massive inequality,

[Shri B. K. P. Sinha]
the Industrial Revolution proceeded at a fast place. Today inequality shall not be tolerated, and any artificial equality within the confines of the capitalist system or the mixed economy system will hamper production and therefore it is necessary to adopt an extreme socialist system.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Communism.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please do not interrupt him.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: Therefore it is necessary to adopt a fully socialist order because, in a fully socialist order, equality is not artificial. It is a natural product of that system, and when all suffer, when all have to suffer the same sufferings, when all have to undergo certain hardships, there is a certain idealism in that, and people willingly accept it. Therefore I feel that today we must have socialism, but that cannot be the socialism the goal either of this group or of that group. That socialism can only be the socialism of the type which is being practised at least in the East European countries.

Lastly I would say that there are some who feel that socialism of the extreme type is not possible, that there can be no adjustment between socialism of the extreme type and democracy. But then there is not one brand of socialism in the world today. There is the extreme socialism of China. Then comes Russia. Then comes Poland. And then comes Yugoslavia, and there was a certain conception of socialism of Mr. Dubcek, a reformist leader of Czechoslovakia, though for the time being his conception has been drowned. But then, I am sure, that, as the productive forces in the socialist countries rise, as people become more prosperous, man's urge for expression, man's urge for self development will assert itself, and a day will come when there will be a synthesis between communism and democracy, and that synthesis will be at a higher level.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please wind up now. It is time.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: To end, I feel it is time for the leadership of the two factions of the Congress to sheath their swords, to avoid bitterness and to create conditions in which they can negotiate and then unite. When they unite, only then it shall be possible for the united party to establish a true socialist order in this country, and that socialist order will not be a socialist order of the type. . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please wind up and take your seat now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Confusion takes a little time to be wound up.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please now resume your seat.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: I am resuming my seat. Therefore I say it is only when the two factions unite that a true conception of socialism, a true socialist order could be established in this country.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please do not elaborate the points any more.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: I am not elaborating. I am only paraphrasing, summarising, in four sentences what I have said.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: One sentence please.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA: And that socialism will be achieved at a higher level with a synthesis between democracy and socialism. Thank you.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI-MATI INDIRA GANDHI): Mr. Deputy Chairman, as many hon. Members have remarked, the President's address this year has been much more than a mere formal address. It is not a mere outline of the business before this particular session or during the year. Actually, it is an urgent summons to the tasks which await us as

we enter one new decade after completing another. In fact, it is something even more than this. It marks the transition from one definite stage in our economic development and political evolution to the beginning of another.

Anyone who views modern Indian history with comprehension and a sense of fairness, anyone who is at all conversant with the processes of economic development, knows that today the country is economically and politically stronger than it was before, and also more capable of facing the challenges with which it is confronted. In fact, at no time has there been more enthusiasm and greater self-confidence in the people of India, a greater expectation of change, and also, I would say, a greater capacity to bring about this change.

The Leader of the Opposition, Sir, has used many alliterative adjectives. He has called the Address, if I remember his words aright, dull, dry, and so on.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Mr. Mishra may be dull, not dry.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: It is human, Sir, to see the world in one's own image. The trouble with the Leader of the Opposition and his party is, as one hon. Member said just now, that they have ceased to listen to the voice of the people. They have ceased to notice the urge and the fervour, which is so evident not only to our own countrymen, but also to the many people who have been visiting us from countries from all parts of the globe in recent months. But they, Sir, have unfortunately fallen out of step and got so far behind that they are under the illusion that there is no progress at all. The hon. Member, Shri Mishra, has alleged that we are, or perhaps I am, obsessed with the idea of toppling State Governments. I presume he has in mind Bihar and Uttar Pradesh. Now, Sir,

Bihar is his home State. I do **not** know whether he has some grievance against the ending of the Governor's rule there, because that is the only Government that was toppled in Bihar, and if I remember aright, only some little while ago I was being urged by some of the same people to end the Governor's rule as soon as possible. Now the other charge on which he spent some considerable time was that it was my tours which brought about the fall of the Uttar Pradesh Government. This, change, as I have said during those tours and afterwards, is entirely baseless. My visits to the U.P. were undertaken to acquaint myself with the problems of Uttar Pradesh and also to counteract the accusation made, very loudly and often, there that the Centre and more particularly the Prime Minister and also the two preceding Prime Ministers had been neglecting it. Now, one cannot simultaneously complain that the Prime Minister is neglecting U.P. and also that the Prime Minister is giving attention to U.P. You have to make up your mind which out of the two you mean. My purpose in going whether to U.P. or any other State is to tell the people about the policies of the Government generally and especially with regard to that particular State and I did tell the people of U.P. that while it is true that the State does not get all that it expects from the Centre this happens to be true of all other States as well and also with regard to the Central Ministries; not that they do not get it from the Centre because they are in the Centre but they do not get all that they ask from the Planning Commission or the Finance Ministry. As far as U.P. is concerned more than half the expense on the development plans of that State has throughout come from the Centre. Admittedly this is not sufficient to meet the needs of the State, which is one of the most economically backward in the entire country. That is why very much more has to be done not only by the Government of India but also by the State Government.

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

But the picture that is being painted here, if I may use the word, was rather a romantic one which was perhaps because of the nature of the hon. Leader of the Opposition sitting opposite, I do not know what picture was conjured up before the other Members. . .

SHRI S. N. MISHRA (Bihar): In this set-up is it not very natural to be romantic?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: But any body who did not know the situation and who was listening to him might have got away with the impression that from the helicopter in which I was flying, I was busy shooting down all the politicians who were opposed to me. The only reply that I can make to this is if there was anybody who toppled the previous Government there it was the leader of that Government himself.

One of the amendments moved speaks of totalitarian methods. That is indeed a most extraordinary statement and it shows a certain lack of knowledge of how totalitarian Governments have acted in the past or, where they exist today, are acting today. I think it is crystal clear not only from my words but from my actions that I stand for democracy, unqualified and unchallenged democracy, in the country as a whole, in every State and within every party of our country. Any doctrine or system which encourages a few to think that they are better than the people at large and that they can order about the people at large is repugnant. One has only to see what is happening to dictatorships around the world to know that this system is dangerous and self-defeating even in the short run, to say nothing of the longer run. After the fourth general elections hon. Members are aware that I was the first to proclaim unhesitatingly that the Central Government would respect the will of the people and would extend their full co-opera-

tion to all the State Governments which were established after the elections and we have given our best cooperation to all State Governments, whatever their political complexion. In fact, some of the people who talk of democracy in this hon. House at the same time would like us to change our attitude with regard to those parties with whom they do not happen to agree. This is a strange description of democracy. Some State Governments have been able to appreciate our help, others do not say so openly. That is because every State Government needs a bogeyman on whom they can transfer the responsibility for their own shortcomings and their genuine difficulties. Who can be more convenient than the Central Government? But this has not deflected us from our path of giving constructive—often one-sided—co-operation to all State Governments. Had we not followed this policy, the foundation of our Republic and of our Union would have been weakened after the swift political changes of the last few years.

Another hon. Member, Shri Dahyabhai Patel, spoke of the needs of Gujarat. In the past years, Shri Patel used to roam about during such a debate, all over the world, if I may put it that way, from China to Peru but this time he restricted his field to merely Gujarat and Taiwan. I do not know whether he has found some link or affinity between the two. He has been pleased to observe that the notes which the Chief Minister of Gujarat gave to me last month when I went to Ahmedabad ably summed up what Shri Patel himself has been saying for years.

Now, Sir, the notes contain certain legitimate demands but there are also certain proposals which would be extremely difficult to accept. If I may give an example, there was a demand for a steel mill there. Now I do not have to go into steel economics here, but the setting up of a steel mill, thousands of miles away from any

source of iron ore or coal would certainly make steel very costly and I doubt if it is a proposal which could be acceptable to any Government.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Perhaps they were thinking of synthetic steel.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: A complaint was also made that we are going slow with regard to oil exploration in Gujarat. This is a most unjust complaint. The hon. Minister is sitting here and I have no doubt that he has spoken on this matter earlier and the House is aware of the detailed negotiations in regard to offshore drilling along the coast of Gujarat. I believe that the first deep sea operation should start any day now. As the President's Address has rightly observed, oil is next only to steel in taking us nearer to self-reliance.

The hon. Shri M. P. Bhargava has rightly cautioned the Members of this House against speaking loosely about the Supreme Court. Just now in my presence also many Members have touched upon this subject. Now, I do not think anyone in this House or even outside would like the name of the Supreme Court to be brought up lightly. After all, it is well recognised that one of the pillars of our democracy is the independent judiciary. Accusations have been made that I made disparaging remarks about the Supreme Court after its judgment on bank nationalisation. May I make it very clear that I have done no such thing? On the contrary, I stressed the importance of not saying anything without a full study of the Supreme Court judgment which at that time I had not seen and since then I have not spoken about that matter at all.

SHRI C. D. PANDE (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Khadilkar did.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Mr. Khadilkar will speak for himself. He has already spoken; I am not going into what he has said.

However, I did refer to the difficulties in the path of progress. This is a self-evident statement. Many Bills of reform and Acts of legislation which were meant to serve the cause of progress have met with setbacks. Many of our land reform Acts have been taken to the courts and have been invalidated either in part or in full, but we went back to the Legislature and to the Constitution and took the necessary remedial measures. This has happened in other countries also to which reference has been made by several hon. Members. No human institution is infallible. Those familiar with the constitutional history of the United States must have heard of the celebrated Dred Scott decision, when the US Supreme Court declared that slavery was legal and that the anti-slavery legislation passed by a State was *ultra vires* of the US Constitution, but within a few years the US Constitution itself was also changed. I do not want to go into the history of the New Deal and the conflicts which arose between the Legislature and the judiciary in the USA and the very open and forthright statements which the then President of the US made about their own judiciary. All organs of the Government are subject to the same historical forces and have to be receptive to the same needs and compulsions in evolving a social order. There is in Parliament and outside a widespread feeling that Parliament should not be divested of the power to amend the Constitution. I believe all political parties, with the expected exceptions, are in favour of Parliament having the power to make laws for the country, especially in regard to social justice and social progress. The Nath Pai Bill seeks to remove any doubts that might have arisen about the competence of Parliament as a result of the judgement of the Supreme Court in the case of *Golaknath vs the State of Punjab*.

Some hon. Members—in fact, many hon. Members—have spoken of the

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

increasing violence in West Bengal and other parts of the country. In his Address the President has expressed concern at the continuing resort to violence by certain extremist political groups which pursue disruptive aims. Violence feeds violence, whatever be its origin, whether it is communal, regional or economically or politically motivated. I do not think that any kind of violence can be justified at any time, but this is a problem which needs the concerted efforts of all sections of society. We must strengthen the fibre of our people to resist violence. I was a little surprised to hear one hon. Member making rather contradictory statements. While, on the one hand, we should not interfere with the Government of Bengal, on the other hand, we should do something about what is happening there. Now, Sir, it is not possible to do both. In this sort of situation the responsibility is of the State Government. It is up to the parties forming the Government there not only to take action themselves, but also to create the type of public opinion which will not stand for this kind of action, this kind of taking the law in their own hands by a few people, causing not only loss of life and other harm, but disrupting the daily life of the majority of the people. It is only by doing this that disruptive and anarchical groups can be made to realise that violence does not pay.

I should like to turn now to the field of economic development. My hon. friend opposite sought to convey the impression that the economic outlook is not bright. Shri Dahyabhai Patel, not surprisingly said that the progress which the President has depicted, was illusory. On the other hand, many hon. Members have pointed out the opposite. Now, the President's Address has tried to set out only the salient facts of our progress and has indicated the trends in the immediate future. The progress in agriculture is

there for all to see. I do not exaggerate this progress and I have been specially careful in my speeches to avoid the phrase 'green revolution'. The progress is there and cannot be denied. The new programme involving the package of improved agricultural techniques based on the use of high-yielding varieties of seeds, intensive application of fertilisers and extension of irrigation facilities, has made a definite impact on the rural economy. Industrial production also has picked up significantly. Treads in production in the current year so far point to an increase of more than 7 per cent. There is no doubt that the economy is now much better polished for growth than ever before.

There was also reference, at some length, to the present trends in price, but may I request hon. Members to look at the situation on the proper perspective? Can it be denied that 1968 was characterised by a considerable degree of price stability? It is true that since the middle of November, 1969, prices have been under pressure. This is due mainly to the downward revision in the crop estimates of cotton and groundnut and the delay of winter rains in many parts of the country. Between November 1969 and February this year there was a contra-seasonal rise in prices, but over the last one month the position has again become stable because of a number of measures taken by Government and the Reserve Bank. In the last few weeks, while the Reserve Bank has taken a number of measures to tighten its credit control over bank advances against commodities which are subject to demand and rice pressures, Government has been building up a sufficient buffer-stock. Foodgrains, as we all know, play a very important part in influencing price trends. Production in the current year, I am told, may be of the order of 100 million tonnes. By the end of this month the total stock

with the Centre and States should be about 4.5 million tonnes. We are thus better placed now to influence the prices of foodgrains. However, there is no doubt that Government will continue to be vigilant. We know that a rise in prices causes considerable hardship to people, particularly the poorer sections of society, but some critics are raising the bogey of prices because they want outlays in the public sector to be kept down. They do not reckon with the heavy toll which a reduction in public sector outlay takes in terms of increased unemployment and economic stagnation. We have, therefore, to keep in view the objectives of growth and stability in formulating our economic strategy.

Now, Sir, I share the concern expressed by many hon. Members regarding unemployment. I have spoken on this matter on many occasions and the President has also mentioned it. I have mentioned it in my Budget Speech. I think some hon. Members tried to quantify this problem of educated unemployed by referring to a 7 per cent increase in unemployment. Now, reference has also been made to inequalities of income. I have said on previous occasions that the two problems, i.e., unemployment and economic inequalities, are not separate but very closely interlinked. The concept of economic equality itself should be raised from the level of the income redistribution of existing wealth or incomes to an altogether different plane. We aim at an equitable distribution of income-earning opportunities. It is only in this way that we can harmonise the two important objectives of augmentation of production 5 P.M. and enlargement of employment opportunities. I should also like to say that a solution to the unemployment problem has to be found within the framework of the Plan. There cannot be a separate or independent solution, and looked at in this way by far the most effective remedy for unemployment is the

vigorous implementation of the Plan. Our labour force is growing at the rate of 2.5 per cent per year. An annual growth rate of anything less than 5 to 6 per cent will therefore prove inadequate to provide opportunities for the absorption of this growing work force. Therefore, the need is to step up the outlay on the Plan and to raise the rate of investment. This is what Government is trying to do. All those who are earnest about tackling this major problem should support the efforts to raise the level of Plan outlay. In the coming financial year we are enlarging it of the order roughly of Rs. 400 crores in the States' and the Central Plans together. This is not an insignificant increase and it will contribute materially to a faster tempo of development and creation of more job opportunities. It is also necessary to impart a conscious employment-bias to our development programmes. The new Budget has made special provision for programmes such as those relating to rural works and small farmers, land reclamation and improvement, renovation of minor irrigation works, proper maintenance of irrigation channels, construction of roads linking the villages with marketing centres, etc. All these could be and should be undertaken as part of the programme and in their totality they will make, as I said earlier, a significant contribution to rural development as also to the generation of additional employment. The details of some of these programmes have been given in the brochure entitled "Growth with Social Justice" circulated along with other Budget documents.

Growth with social justice is particularly relevant to our industrial development. The new industrial licensing policy keeps this objective in view. Government have tried to remove the impediments to a fast rate of growth in the industrial sector, while providing safeguards against the concentration of economic power and monopolistic trends. The raising of the

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

limit for industrial licensing is intended to broaden the base on which our industrial structure must stand.

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) :

कुछ बजट के लिए छोड़ दीजिए ।

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: It will provide opportunities to small and medium entrepreneurs. Credit policies are also being reoriented so as to assist small and medium entrepreneurs, and I know that this will make a difference.

Now, Sir there has been a lot of noise here and elsewhere with regard to the Goa Fertilizer Project, I am afraid that some of this criticism is rather ill-informed. As perhaps the hon. Minister has said, this project was before the Government since 1964. Approval was given and a firm licence was issued in December, 1966. The requisite clearance for financial assistance from some international agencies and the Cooily Fund was also given some time ago. But towards the end of December, 1969, the Government were called upon to take a view only on two limited points. One was what should be the condition which the public financial institutions might stipulate before underwriting the public issue of shares by the company; and the second was whether the Government should agree to a further small increase in the drawal of loan assistance from the Cooily Funds to match certain changes in the pattern of financing of the project. So far as the first issue is concerned, Government have ensured two seats on the Board of Management. Regarding the second, having already agreed to a loan of Rs. 18.5 crores from the Cooily Funds, Government could not have taken serious objection to a further drawal of Rs. 3 crores. There is no doubt that our preference is and will remain to have such projects in the public sector. In fact, in the crucial field of fertilizer production, the public sector already occupies a commanding position. We have 8 plants in ac-

tual production with a capacity of 0.65 million tonnes; 7 plants with a total capacity of 1.03 million tonnes, these are in different stages of actual implementation. Besides, 7 plants, including 3 coal-based plants, have been allotted to the public sector which, when implemented, will result in additional capacity of 1.17 million tonnes. As against this, there are only 5 plants in the private sector now in production with a capacity of 0.43 million tonnes, and the Goa plant will mean an addition of only 0.17 million tonnes. Letters of intent have been given to a few other projects, but at this stage it is doubtful whether they will come up as on previous occasions many of these have not materialised because of the difficulties relating to finance, feed-stocks and other problems which remain unresolved.

श्री राजनारायण : खत्म कीजिए न ।

बहुत बोर हो रहा है ।

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: But even assuming that the requisite resources could have been found for an additional project in the public sector the only feasible course of action, months in bringing the project up to the stage already reached by the Goa project. Government therefore opted for the only feasible course of action, taking care to ensure that the basic idea underlying the joint sector concept was incorporated in the scheme.

There is continuing discussion on nationalisation. I am not afraid of nationalisation, nor do I believe that it is an answer to all our difficulties. I think that any proposal for nationalisation should be subjected to two tests.

श्री राजनारायण : नेशनलाइजेशन का अर्थ भी जरा बताइयेगा प्रधान मंत्री साहिब कि नेशनलाइजेशन का अर्थ क्या है ?

श्री उपसभापति : आप सुनिये ।

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I just said that two tests should be applied.....

श्री राजनारायण : जिस तरह से बैंक का टेक ओवर हुआ वह एक्वीजीशन है, नेशनलाइजेशन नहीं है। अधिग्रहण है और अधिग्रहण को प्रधान मंत्री साहिबा नेशनलाइजेशन कहें तो उसे मैं नहीं मानता।

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Firstly, we should see whether it is necessary from the point of view of enabling the public sector to occupy a key position in the economy and, secondly, whether it does further our social objectives.

श्री राजनारायण : प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर। मेरा प्वाइंट ऑफ आर्डर है। You will have to hear my point of order.

मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि यह कैसी संसदीय व्यवस्था है कि कोई भी व्यक्ति चाहे प्राइम मिनिस्टर हो या कोई सदन का सम्मानित सदस्य हो, बिना शब्द का अर्थ समझे बोलता चला जाय। इसी लिए मैंने आपके द्वारा निवेदन किया कि नेशनलाइजेशन का अर्थ प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहिबा क्या करती है, यह मैं जानना चाहता हूँ। आप इस पर अपनी व्यवस्था दीजिए।

श्री उपसभापति : आप बैठिए।

श्री राजनारायण : आप इस पर रूलिंग दीजिए।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order.

श्री राजनारायण : संसदीय व्यवस्था में मुझे अधिकार है कि मैं चेयरमैन से पूछूँ कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहिबा नेशनलाइजेशन का अर्थ क्या करती है, यह हमको आप समझा दें।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: Do not raise slogans.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Sir, I do not want to raise an argument here. Otherwise, much could be said on the question of slogan-raising.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Do not interrupt now. Please listen patiently. आप बैठिये।

श्री राजनारायण : हम नहीं बैठेंगे। संसदीय व्यवस्था में हमें हक है कि यह पूछें कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहिबा जो नेशनलाइजेशन शब्द का प्रयोग कर रही हैं, उसका अर्थ क्या है। उसके अर्थ को मैं क्या समझूँ। आप समझे इसका अर्थ?

श्री उपसभापति : आप बैठिये। आपने प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर रोज किया है और उसमें प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर कुछ नहीं है। नेशनलाइजेशन और सोशलाइजेशन और डेमोक्रेसी का बहुत सा मतलब हो सकता है, उसको आप सुनिये, जो मतलब आप निकाल सकते हैं वह निकालिये।

श्री राजनारायण : यह संसद् है, इट इज नाट ए पब्लिक मीटिंग।

श्री उपसभापति : आपको भी संसदीय प्रथा कायम करनी चाहिये।

श्री राजनारायण : हम तो बिल्कुल विद इन राइट्स है। यह संसदीय प्रथा है कि हम पूछें।

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Our approach must be realistic and practical. At any moment if any privately-owned industry is operating against the national interest or is impeding social progress, we should not hesitate to take it over. At the present moment, our priority is the acceleration of development so that the problems of unemployment and inequa-

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

ilities are solved, and this calls for not only the right policy but unremitting hard work, higher savings and greater investment. The emphasis should, therefore, be on the flow of the scarce public capital into new areas of production. The economic battle which lies ahead requires many weapons in our armoury and nationalisation is only one of these weapons, and it is one which should be used judiciously and with great care. It is against this background that I would urge upon the hon. Members to consider the various suggestions which have been made either during the course of the debate or in the amendments for the nationalisation of the different sectors of the economy.

The problem of Centre-State relations, more particularly financial relations, has also been raised now as it has been in every debate for quite a long time. Various issues pertaining to this problem have been debated in different forms, in Parliament and also in the National Development Council. They have also been studied in depth by expert bodies such as the Planning Commission and the Administrative Reforms Commission. I do not think that there is any conflict between the interests of the States and the Centre. Both are charged with the responsibility of promoting the good of the people in the fields respectively assigned to them. Some sources of revenue are assigned to the Centre under the Constitution and these are a little more elastic than those allocated to the States. Let us look into this matter. If our objective of common citizenship and the free movement of goods and service within the country is to be assured, is it possible for sources such as income-tax or excise duty or customs to be assigned to a unit smaller than the Union Government? The founding fathers of our Constitution, therefore, wisely assigned these revenues to the Union. At the same time, they did realise that

the needs of the States which were responsible for such vital functions as law and order, education, public health, would be constantly growing with development. So they laid down a scheme for the sharing of the resources of the Centre with the States and also provided for a periodical review through an independent body, namely, the Finance Commission. As far as I know, in none of the older federations is there a body comparable to our Finance Commission. The resources transferred from the Centre to the States in accordance with the recommendations of the Finance Commission have steadily grown. The amount transferred to the States under the Award of the Finance Commission in the First Plan period was Rs. 386 crores. But it is estimated to be Rs. 4,066 crores during the Fourth Plan period. Over and above this, the Centre has also been providing assistance for the implementation of the States Plans and for some of the weaker States, the Central assistance will be as much as 90 per cent and even more of the total size of their Plans.

The States have also considerable latitude in drawing up their programmes with reference to the local problems. Central assistance is now being provided in the form of block loans and block grants in accordance with the decisions which have been reached jointly by the States in the National Development Council. The problem now is to ensure how these State programmes will fit into the national frame-work and fulfil our basic objectives.

As hon. Members know, the Central Government is constantly asked what it is doing for the backward classes, the backward regions and for items such as rural water supply, etc. Now, how is the Centre to discharge those responsibilities unless it has certain sanctions at its disposal? Complaints are also made that a large number of villages are still without drinking

water. Now, if you look at the overall provision for drinking water supply, it is not inadequate in our Plan. And I feel that even with the existing provision, substantial impact can be made on this problem. But it is necessary to ensure that funds meant for rural water supply and for the development of backward areas are not diverted to any other purpose. Unfortunately, sometimes it does happen.

When we speak of the backward areas, we should remember that even the so-called advanced States have backward pockets and the policy which we propose should be such as to promote accelerated development of all these pockets wherever they may be.

श्री राजनारायण : द्रौपदी की चोर की तरह बढ़ता ही जा रहा है। कितना बढ़ेगा ?

सरदार रघुबीर सिंह पंजहजारी : आप सुनिये तो ।

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: The policies of the financial institutions are also being reoriented in favour of the development of industries in such areas and as the President's Address has pointed out, all these schemes will be fruitful only if the infrastructure for development is built up expeditiously in all these areas.

Shri S. N. Mishra spoke of the Fourth Plan being out-dated. I honestly do not understand what is meant by this. The immediate tasks before the nation in the economic field are to reduce disparities swiftly while adding to production; also to achieve and consolidate agricultural and industrial self-reliance and to lay the firm basis for further technological change from our own capacity and known-how. While doing this, we must pay special attention to the problem of the educated unemployed on the one hand and the rural landless

on the other. Now, the Fourth Plan does set out to do this and whatever re-thinking or enlargement we have done in the last few months has been in order to do this more effectively. So it is not as if the Fourth Plan was drawn up some 15 years or more ago and has now merely been touched up and presented to the country anew.

Now, I come to the points raised by some hon. Members relating to foreign affairs. Many of these have been discussed in this House on several occasions. I hope the House will excuse me but it does seem as if the thinking on foreign affairs of some Members has got stuck somewhere. The Plan has not got stuck, it is not the Plan, it is the thinking of some people that gets stuck up while the world itself has changed and moved very much further.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: My points are not being met; I made some points.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Many Governments have noticeably given up their rigid and inflexible postures of the past whether in concept or in expression. But I noticed, while I was in the House before speaking, that some of our Members have obviously not done so. Our own endeavour has been to keep pace with the changes in the world and even, if possible, to anticipate them so that our national interests are safeguarded at all times. Hon'ble Members will agree that no country can claim that however right or strong its policies the expected results are always realised. We have to persevere with patience and determination and not give up what we consider to be right and moral because of some temporary setback.

Sir, we have been strengthening our friendship. I was astonished to learn that some Members have thought that there has been a deterioration in our relations with our neighbouring coun-

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

tries. As the President in his Address said we attach great importance to our relations with Afghanistan, Burma, Ceylon, Iran and Nepal and have devoted special attention to these countries. We are making sincere and earnest efforts to increase our economic and political co-operation with these countries. Some differences or minor difficulties might arise occasionally. But these will always be resolved in a spirit of goodwill, understanding and cordiality.

As regards our two other neighbours, Pakistan and China, there have been no dramatic developments. The House knows that it is my view that we should keep trying to make Pakistan realise the importance of resolving all bilateral differences in a peaceful manner. I feel that this is as much in their interest as it is in ours to give up attitudes of conflict and confrontation. It is unfortunate that China continues to see the realities of India through a distorted mirror.

Sir, an hon'ble Member here said that we did not outline what steps we would take in this regard in the President's Address. I am sure the House will appreciate that these are hardly matters which one can outline beforehand. The whole world has changed and is changing today, and I think we are trying to keep pace with these changes. In this fluid and delicate situation it is better not to say too much.

Some hon'ble Members have allowed anger and frustration to cloud their thinking. Some have said that our political freedom is being endangered. Quite different reasons were given by the different parties. Now, political freedom can be endangered basically only by one thing, and that is when the people themselves are weakened, whether they are weakened by communalism, i.e., by lack of trust among themselves or whether they are weakened by any one group thinking that

they know all the answers and the people need not be consulted. Both are equally dangerous to democracy.

The Government are fully aware of the difficulties faced by the minority communities and are doing everything possible to try and help them. As I said on a previous occasion, this is not a matter which can be dealt with purely administratively or by making laws. It is something in which very consciously and determinedly we have to create a right, social atmosphere. It is for the hon'ble Members to judge whether all political parties in our country are helping to create such an atmosphere.

Sir, the purpose of the Opposition is obviously to oppose ...

SHRI RAJNARAIN: Not only to oppose but to satisfy the public and change the Government.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: That is the purpose. But when they find that it is not possible to change, then the Opposition fumes in the form of frustration and anger. Personally, Sir, I have always welcomed opposition because when life is easy one tends to become flabby and it is not good to be flabby. But in opposing the Government's policies, I want our honourable Members not to sap the self-confidence of the nation. In fact, I would go a step further and submit to them that the way in which the public of India is reacting or is acting—because it is we who are reacting to what they do, it is they who are giving the direction, it is they who have the momentum for progress and change—they will refuse to shed their self-confidence however much some individuals might try to say all these things.

In my Budget Speech I set out our socio-economic thinking but it has a political counterpart as well. Just as we have avoided the extremes of doing too little or attempt too much in economics so also do we wish to

avoid the political extremes. We are convinced that there is no path better than the democratic, secular, socialist path to which we are pledged. I think it was in this House that somebody said that democracy comes first and socialism comes second or something like that. I want to make it very clear that I think there cannot be true democracy without socialism and secularism. Nor do I think there can be true socialism without democracy. All these are parts of the same whole.

Now, Sir, when I was talking earlier about the opposition I was not saying that they should not oppose. I was merely drawing their attention to the roots of our culture where it is said that because of anger and frustration, one is not able to think clearly, to speak clearly or to act clearly. As the Bhagwad Gita warns us, from anger comes confusion. And I think a lot of the confusion that has been generated in this House recently, has come from anger and frustration. So I would request all hon'ble Members to think calmly and clearly about all these questions. I have no doubt that if we keep determinately to the path which I have outlined, we shall overcome all the obstacles in our way.

Sir, I commend the Motion of Shri Arjun Arora to this honourable House.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are a large number of amendments, about 166.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS (Uttar Pradesh): The real difficulty is that Mr. Mishra always opposes, opposes and opposes. He never proposes.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमान्, एक पौइन्ट आफ़ ऑर्डर सुन लीजिए । यह सही है कि धन्यवाद का प्रस्ताव प्रस्तुत किया श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा ने और प्रधान मंत्री साहिबा ने जवाब दिया, उनका हक़ है वह बोल सकती हैं, मगर यह हमने नहीं देखा कि जो प्रस्तावक है वह अन्त में एक शब्द भी न बोले ।

श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा : मैं तैयार हूँ ।

श्री राजनारायण : नहीं तो इसमें अर्जुन अरोड़ा की बेइज्जती है, यह सदन की बेइज्जती है । यानी प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहिबा ने अर्जुन अरोड़ा को इतना इन्सिग्निफिकेंट बना दिया कि प्रस्तावक बेचारा महत्वहीन हो गया । देखिये, अब यह सब मत सोचिए कि अर्जुन अरोड़ा से हमारा व्यक्तिगत राग द्वेष है, मगर मैं कहता हूँ संसदीय प्रथा है, प्रधान मंत्री इन्टरवीन कर सकती हैं । जो प्रस्तावक है उसका अन्तिम जवाब होना चाहिये । वह यही कह दे खड़ा हो कर कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहिबा ने जो कुछ कहा उससे ज्यादा हमें कुछ नहीं कहना है ।

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: Mr. Deputy Chairman, the hon. Prime Minister was pleased to say that the Opposition sometimes opposes only for the sake of opposition. I want to tell her that certainly she has lent charm to the President's Address which it otherwise lacked.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: Only a lady is being charmed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: As I have already said, there are a large number of amendments, and I shall put before the House the amendments standing in the name of one Member simultaneously.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: No, no.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): That is not correct. They should be put one by one.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is not necessary to put the amendments one by one. If it is the desire of the House that there should be a division on any particular amendment, then that particular amendment should be put separately. But if the House does not want a division on any amend-

[Mr. Deputy Chairman]

ment, then it will not be necessary to put them separately.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Theoretically, Sir, I do not know—I do not know who sometimes advises—how you can do it because one Member may have given several amendments and they may be contradictory. I am sure some of the amendments of Mr. Rajnarain would be contradictory. I may like to vote in favour of some and I may not like to vote in favour of some others. Therefore, they cannot be lumped together. Suppose in one amendment he says that the Five Year Plan should be re-cast and in another amendment he says that private enterprise should be given more freedom, I may, like the first amendment but may not like the second one. So, they cannot be lumped together. You can ask hon. Members to choose the amendments on which they want division, and then the other will be treated as a formality. But technically, it is illogical because a person may give 100 amendments and even from Mr. Rajnarain one amendment may be good. But from Mr. Mishra, there may not be anything good; but that is a different matter. I have given only one. . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I agree with the views expressed by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. There is no doubt about it. But the only question is, if there is no division going to take place on any particular amendment, it will be desirable to save the time of the House by putting such amendments together, instead of putting them separately. Therefore, I crave the indulgence of the House. Now, amendment Nos. 1 and 2. Mr. Bhargava.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I have not been able to explain my amendments. So I am not pressing them.

*Amendment Nos. 1 and 2 were, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Amendment Nos. 3 to 26. Mr. Rajnarain.

श्री उपसभापति : श्री राजनारायण जी, जरा सुनिये ।

श्री राजनारायण : यहां पर सुनने का सवाल नहीं है बल्कि यहां पर महत्वपूर्ण बातों को कहना है । मैं आप से निवेदन कर रहा हूँ कि आप मेरी बात को सुन लीजिये । आपने यह कह दिया कि आप श्री भूपेश गुप्त की राह को पसन्द करते हैं । उस समय हम बोले नहीं । अगर आप यह कहते कि हम उनकी राह को पसन्द नहीं करते तब हम खड़े होकर बोलते । आखिर में यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि ऐसी स्थिति पैदा न की जाय जिससे असंसदीय काम हो । आपको हर अमेंडमेंट को लाना होगा और उस पर वोट लेना होगा । मैं अपने अमेंडमेंट को अलग अलग प्रस्तुत करूँगा । मैं एक साथ अपने अमेंडमेंट्स को प्रस्तुत नहीं कर सकता हूँ । हमारे हर अमेंडमेंट के अलग अलग गुण हैं और हर अमेंडमेंट की अलग अलग खूबियाँ हैं । इसलिये इस सदन के बहुत से सम्मानित सदस्य किसी अमेंडमेंट को चाह सकते हैं और किसी अमेंडमेंट को नहीं चाह सकते हैं ।

श्री उपसभापति : जैसा कि सम्मानीय सदस्य ने कहा कि वे हर अमेंडमेंट को प्रस्तुत करना चाहते हैं । अगर उनकी यही इच्छा है, तो मुझे वैसा करना होगा । लेकिन संसद का समय बचाने के लिये उनसे मैं अनुरोध करूँगा . . .

श्री राजनारायण : अगर समय बचाना चाहते तो आप प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहिब से सब बातें साफ करने के लिये कहते । यह क्या तरीका है ।

*For text of amendments, vide Debate dated the 23rd February, 1970.

श्री उपसभापति : मेरी गाय में तो यहां पर अमेंडमेंट पढ़ने की जरूरत नहीं है ।

श्री राजनारायण : आप पढ़ दीजिये ।

श्री उपसभापति : सब सदस्यों के पास अमेंडमेंट की कापियां हैं, इसलिये यहां पर उसको पढ़ने की जरूरत नहीं है ।

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमान्, मैं तो यहां परेशान हो जाता हूं कि यहां पर इस तरह की अनियमितता क्यों बरती जा रही है । इस चीज को संसदीय तरीके से देखा जाय क्योंकि बहुत से सदस्यों के पास अमेंडमेंट की कापियां नहीं हैं । (Interruptions) यहां पर हल्ला करने की कोई जरूरत नहीं है यहां पर अमेंडमेंट को पढ़ा जाना चाहिये और यही सभ्य और संसदीय तरीका है ।

श्री उपसभापति : यहां पर पढ़ने की जरूरत नहीं है ।

श्री राजनारायण : पढ़ने की जरूरत है ।

श्री उपसभापति : सदन में इस तरह की प्रथा रही है कि जिस का अमेंडमेंट होता है, उसका नाम और नम्बर सिर्फ बोल दिया जाता है ।

श्री राजनारायण : पहले राज्यसभा में रहीस आया करते थे और अब पोलिटिकल वर्क्स आये हैं और वे अपने जज्बात को जहां पर जाहिर करेंगे । आप को उन्हें इस तरह से नहीं बताना चाहिये और यह जो तरीका है वह कोई भी सभ्य और संसदीय तरीका नहीं है कि जहां पर बिना पढ़े हुए अमेंडमेंट को ले लिया जाय और फिर वोट द्वारा गिरा दिया जाय ।

श्री उपसभापति : पढ़ने की कोई जरूरत नहीं है ।

श्री राजनारायण : पढ़ने की जरूरत क्यों नहीं है । आप किसी राजनीतिक सम्मेलन

या किसी संसद का हवाला बतला दीजिये, जहां पर अमेंडमेंट पढ़ा न गया हो ।

श्री उपसभापति : सम्मेलनों में ऐसा होता है कि वहां पर अमेंडमेंट्स की कापियां सर्कुलेट नहीं की जाती हैं, लेकिन यहां रर कई दिन पहले से अमेंडमेंट सर्कुलेट कर दिये जाते हैं । माननीय सदस्य को भी मालूम होगा कि अमेंडमेंट पहले से ही यहां पर सर्कुलेट हो गये हैं ।

श्री राजनारायण : यह डेमोक्रेटिक नहीं है । आप हमें रूल दिखनाइये

श्री उपसभापति : रूल देख लीजिये सभी सदस्यों को मालूम है कि अमेंडमेंट्स क्या हैं और अमेंडमेंट्स में क्या लिखा है और क्या नहीं लिखा हुआ है ।

श्री राजनारायण : मैं आप से बिनती करता हूं कि आप हाथ उठा कर देख लीजिये कि कितने लोगों के पास अमेंडमेंट की कापियां हैं । मैं चाहता हूं कि सदन के सम्मानित सदस्य अपने को ऐसा न बनायें कि केवल यहां पर उन्हें भत्ता बनाना है और 51 रु० लेना है ।

SHRI JAIRAMDAS DAULATRAM (Nominated): Mr. Deputy Chairman, we will be setting up a new precedent if we follow the procedure which is now suggested. For years together, amendments have been put to vote by mentioning their number.

MR. RAJNARAIN: No, no.

SHRI JAIRAMDAS DAULATRAM: It is assumed that every Member discharges his responsibility and has understood the amendments. All these days they have been dealt with like this.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I would like to point out that if somebody wants to press his amendment—I may not

[Shri A. D. Mani]

agree with Mr. Rajnarain's amendments—he has got a right to explain what the amendment is by reading it. Either you read it out or allow him to read it out.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is not necessary.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमान्, आप कृपा करके रूल पढ़िये ।

श्री उपसभापति : आप पढ़िये ।

श्री राजनारायण : यह कैसे हो सकता है कि बिना पढ़े अमेंडमेंट पर वोट हो जाय । अगर हमारी इच्छा पढ़ने की नहीं है, तो यह दूसरी बात है, लेकिन अगर हम पढ़ने के लिये आग्रह करते हैं तो बिना पढ़े वोट कैसे हो सकता है । यह कोई संसदीय प्रथा नहीं है । इसलिये मैं जोरों के साथ आप से विनती करता हूँ कि यहां पर ऐसा तरीका अख्तियार न किया जाय जो ब्योरोक्रेटिक हो और जो संसदीय तरीका न हो ।

श्री उपसभापति : इस राज्य-सभा को बने हुए दो, चार दिन नहीं हुए हैं बल्कि करीब 18 सालों से यहां पर यह प्रथा चलती आ रही है ।

श्री राजनारायण : अगर हम पढ़ना चाहते हैं तो पढ़ेंगे ।

श्री उपसभापति : अभी तक इस तरह से अमेंडमेंट पढ़ने का मौका नहीं आया है । इस तरह की प्रथा अभी तक नहीं रही है । यहां पर सब लोगों को मालूम है कि कितने अमेंडमेंट हैं और किस किस के हैं । इसलिये मैं श्री राजनारायण जी से अनुरोध करूंगा, प्रार्थना करूंगा कि सदन का समय बचाने के लिये वे अमेंडमेंट्स को पढ़ने पर जोर न दें । जो प्वाइन्ट आफ आर्डर रोज किया है वह कोई प्वाइन्ट आफ आर्डर नहीं है ।

श्री राजनारायण : हम तो अपना अमेंडमेंट पढ़ना चाहते हैं ।

श्री उपसभापति : पढ़ने की जरूरत नहीं है ।

श्री राजनारायण : हमको आप कृपा करके रूल कोट कीजिये । मैं आपसे प्रार्थना कर रहा हूँ कि आप राज्य-सभा की नियमावली से पढ़ कर सुनाइए, जिनमें लिखा गया गया हो कि संशोधन को बिना पढ़े ही वोट ले लिया जायेगा । मैं फिर विनती कर रहा हूँ कि समय बचाने की गरज से कोई ऐसा तरीका अख्तियार नहीं किया जाना चाहिये, जिससे जनतंत्रीय पद्धति और प्रणाली पर आंच आए । हमारी यह आपसे बार बार प्रार्थना है, अनुनय विनय है कि एक स्वस्थ परम्परा चलाये ।

श्री उपसभापति : जो अभी तक चल रही है, वह भी स्वस्थ परम्परा है ।

श्री राजनारायण : अगर सदस्य मान गए हों तो दूसरी बात है । लेकिन अगर सदस्य यह कहें कि हम अपने अमेंडमेंट को पढ़ेंगे, इस पर वोट करावेंगे तो चेयर को काम्प्लीटमें में यह नहीं है कि वह यह कहें कि हम पढ़ने नहीं देंगे । यह हमारा संसदीय परम्परा का भाष्य है ।

SHRI M. M. DHARIA (Maharashtra): Mr. Deputy Chairman, so far as the point raised by my friend, Mr. Rajnarain, is concerned, I thought Rules 231 to 233 would apply to this procedure. Under Rule 232 notice of an amendment to a motion shall be given at least one day before. So, it has been given in writing. All the amendments are supposed to be before the House and with the Members. Then, under Rule 233(2) in respect of any motion the Chairman shall have the power to select the amendments to be proposed, and may, if he thinks fit, call upon any Member who has given notice of an amendment to give such explanation of the object of the

amendment as may enable him to form a judgement upon it. So far as the reading of the amendments is concerned, there is no mention in the Rules. And when there is no mention in the Rules, then, naturally the conventions of the House should prevail. The conventions of the House are very clear. No amendment is that way read in the House and Members are aware of it. Let us go according to the convention. It is in your discretion that if you feel that a Member who has given notice or an amendment should explain it, then, you can allow that; otherwise, there is no question of reading the amendments.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, मैं बहुत ही प्रसन्न हूँ कि मोहन धारिया जी ने आपके सामने रूल को कोट किया और मैं चाहूँगा कि अब उस नियम को मैं आपकी खिदमत में पढ़ दूँ ---

“233 (1)---सभापति किसी ऐसे संशोधन पर मत लेने से इंकार कर सकेगा, जो उसकी राय में सारहीन अथवा निरर्थक हो।”

सभापति ने किसी भी संशोधन को सारहीन और निरर्थक यहां नहीं बताया जिस पर मत न लिया जाय। इसलिए सभी संशोधन सार-प्रुक्त और तथ्ययुक्त हैं। अब 233 (2) पर आ रहा हूँ। वह कहता है---

“सभापति को किसी प्रस्ताव के सम्बन्ध में प्रस्थापित किये जाने वाले संशोधन को चुनने की शक्ति होगी”---“शक्ति होगी” मार्ग कीजिये इस शब्द को---“और यदि वह ठीक समझे तो वह किसी सदस्य से, जिसने संशोधन की सूचना दी हो, उस संशोधन के उद्देश्य की ऐसी व्याख्या करने के लिये कह सकेगा जिससे कि वह उस पर कोई निर्णय कर सके।”

चेयरमैन साहब बहादुर ने हमारे संशोधनों को पढ़ा नहीं, पढ़ा तो सुना नहीं कि कौन से संशोधनों को चेयरमैन समझते हैं कि उन पर मत लिया जाना नितान्त आवश्यक है और अगर चेयरमैन किसी संशोधन को ऐसा समझते हैं, तो सम्बन्धित सदस्य को कहेंगे कि इसके बारे में तुम कुछ बोलो, इसके तर्क को समझाओ। अब धारिया जी कहते हैं कि बिना संशोधन को पढ़े ही उसका तर्क समझाया होगा। दुनिया के समझदार लोगों की बुद्धि में यह वान आने वाली नहीं है। बिना संशोधन को पढ़े तर्क समझाया ही नहीं जा सकता। इसलिए इस नियम के अनुभार भी हमें हक है कि हम अपने संशोधनों को पढ़ें और उन संशोधनों के बारे में ऐसी व्याख्या करें जिसको आप भी सुनें, मोहन धारिया भी सुनें और दूसरे सदस्य भी सुनें कि हमारा संशोधन उचित है या अनुचित है।

SHRI SYED HUSSAIN (Jammu and Kashmir): We have to go by the majority view. It is a question of common-sense.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: Sometimes the majority consists of fools.

SHRI SYED HUSSAIN: No, the majority view is . . .

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Will you please resume your seat? There is no question of majority or minority. Every single individual Member is equally privileged . . .

SHRI SYED HUSSAIN: But he says . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no. It is not a question of majority. Every individual Member has equal rights. There is no question of majority or minority.

[Mr. Deputy Chairman]

I thought I would be in a position to get the cooperation of the House to save the time of the House. If it is a question of fundamental rights and privileges of honourable Members, I would do my level best to safeguard and uphold those rights and privileges. At the same time I would request the honourable Members that we should try to save the time of the House and conduct the business of the House in such a manner that we can devote more time for other purposes, that we can utilise the time of the House in a better manner. If the honourable Member insists that he should read his amendments, he will be creating a bad precedent by that and we will be wasting the time of the House in that manner. Therefore, I would request and appeal to all Members that they should not insist on reading their amendments. Let us proceed with the business as we have been doing in the past. This is my personal appeal to Mr. Rajnarain?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would suggest a compromise formula. Let Mr. Rajnarain read one or two amendments which he thinks are particularly important.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right. I conceded this point. He may read one or two amendments which he thinks are important.

श्री ह्यातुल्ला अन्सारी (उत्तर प्रदेश) : डिप्टी चेयरमैन साहब, मेरा ख्याल है कि श्री राजनारायण जी ने अपने रिजोल्यूशन्स खुद नहीं पढ़े हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : आप हमसे बार बार आग्रह कर रहे हैं जो मैं समझता हूँ कि चेयर की तरह से होना नहीं चाहिये। अगर मैं आपके आग्रह को नहीं मानूँ तो लोग कहेंगे कि हम हठी हैं लेकिन हमने गांधी जी से "सत्याग्रह" शब्द सीखा है, सत्या—आग्रह। पहले था सदाग्रह,

फिर गांधी जी ने सत्याग्रह किया। आप हमको ऐसी स्थिति में डालना चाहते हैं कि हम कहे कि हमारा कौन सा संशोधन ज्यादा महत्वपूर्ण है और कौन सा संशोधन कम महत्वपूर्ण है। तो मैं बिल्कुल सफाई से कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे सभी संशोधन समान महत्वपूर्ण हैं और सभी एक दूसरे के पूरक हैं। अगर मैं एक को छोड़ देता हूँ तो दूसरा अधूरा रह जायगा।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I suggest, let him read either the oldest amendment or the youngest amendment.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: On a point of order, Mr. Deputy Chairman. If your ruling is that the amendments right from the first to the last the amendments should be read in the House, and we shall sit here. It cannot be the privilege of one Member—Mr. Rajnarain—to read his amendments. It cannot be the privilege of Mr. Rajnarain. If it is your ruling that they should be read, you can say that it is your ruling. But I would urge upon you to consider my point. There is no question of reading the amendments. It is your choice. If you feel that a particular amendment is frivolous, you need not put it to vote. If you feel that you want an explanation to be given, you can call upon the honourable Member concerned. But if it is your ruling in this House that the amendments should be read, then, it cannot be the privilege of Mr. Rajnarain alone. It should be the privilege of every other Member and every amendment should be read.

श्री राजनारायण : क्या बोल रहे हैं ? हमने कभी नहीं कहा कि हमारी ही प्रिविलेज हो, मगर जो सम्मानित सदस्य छोड़ चुका है अपनी प्रिविलेज . . . (Interruptions) अनावश्यक गरमी दिखा रहे हैं। इनकी सीट अब सीक्योर हो चुकी है।

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I have a request to make. There has been a convention in the House, but technically Mr. Rajnarain is correct.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: Yes.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: If any honourable Member insists that before putting to vote his amendment should be read either by the Chair or by himself, you cannot object to his right.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: Yes.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: If the honourable Mr. Rajnarain wants to cooperate with the House, it is well and good; otherwise, he should be allowed to read his amendments, or you should read them if he thinks all the amendments are very important. And I do not agree with my friend, Mr. Dharia, that if Mr. Rajnarain does not agree to the request of the Chair and the House, all other Members should not agree.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: No, no. I did not mean that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right, we have had enough discussion now. आपको क्या कहना है राजनारायण जी ?

श्री राजनारायण : मेरा तो यही विनम्र निवेदन है कि आप हमारे ऊपर असीम अनुकम्पा करें और हम अपने अमेंडमेंट्स को धीरे धीरे पढ़ते हुए चले जायें ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

3. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address makes no mention of the murder of civilised democratic values by

the Prime Minister and adoption by her of totalitarian methods'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

4. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address makes no mention of the toppling of the Kerala, Manipur, Bihar and Uttar Pradesh Governments, which did not function at the back and call of the Prime Minister, by her direct intervention and the constitution of Governments devoted to the Prime Minister by exerting pressure on the Governors'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

5. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address makes no mention of the obstruction by the Prime Minister to the maintenance of free and independent relationship between the Union and the State Government'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

6. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address makes no mention of the use of as many as three helicopters by the Prime Minister for toppling State Government'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

7. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret that the Address makes no mention of the issue of a new licence to Birlas for setting up a fertiliser factory in Goa in contravention of the Constitution and the industrial policy'."

The House divided.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Ayes—25; Noes—91.

AYES—25

Anandan, Shri T. V.
Annapurna Devi Thimmareddy, Shrimati.
Basu, Shri Chitta.
Chaudhary, Shri Ganeshi Lal.
Chavda, Shri K. S.
Chengalvaroyan, Shri T.
Das, Shri Banka Behary.
Gautam, Shri Mohan Lal.
Gowda, Shri U. K. Lakshmana.
Gupta, Shri Bhupesh.
Kaul, Shri B. K.
Kemparaj, Shri B. T.
Menon, Shri Balachandra.
Mishra, Shri S. N.
Mitra, Shri P. C.
Mohammad, Chaudhary A.
Mokherjee, Shri Pranab Kumar.
Muniswamy, Shri N. R.
Murahari, Shri Godey.
Narayanappa, Shri Sanda.
Parthasarathy, Shri R. T.
Rajnarain Shri.
Reddy, Shri Nagi.
Roy, Shri Kalyan.
Yashoda Reddy, Shrimati.

NOES—91.

Ahmad, Shri Syed.
Amla, Shri Tirath Ram.
Ansari, Shri Hayatullah.
Antani, Dr. B. N.
Appan, Shri G. A.
Arora, Shri Arjun.
Bachchan, Dr. H. R.
Baharul Islam, Shri.
Bhatt, Shri Nand Kishore.
Chandra Shekhar, Shri.
Chattopadhyaya, Dr. Debiprasad.
Chaudhri, Shri N. P.
Chetia, Shri P.
Dass, Shri Mahabir.
Deshmukh, Shri T. G.
Dharia, Shri M. M.
Dikshit, Shri Jagdish Chandra.
Dikshit, Shri Umashankar.
Goswami, Shri Sriman Prafulla.
Gujral, Shri I. K.
Hasan, Prof. Saiyid Nurul.
Jain, Shri A. P.
Jairamdas Daulatram, Shri.
Khaitan, Shri R. P.
Khan, Shri Akbar Ali.
Kollur, Shri M. L.
Krishan Kant, Shri.
Kulkarni, Shri A. G.
Lalitha (Rajagoplan), Shrimati.
Mani, Shri A. D.
Mehta, Shri Om.
Mishra, Shri L. N.
Mohta, Shri M. K.
Mohideen, Shri S. A. Khaja.
Momin, Shri G. H. Valimohmed.
Naidu, Miss M. L. M.
Neki Ram, Shri.
Panda, Shri Brahmananda.
Panj hazari, Sardar Raghbir Singh.
Patil, Shri G. R.
Patra, Shri N.
Phulrenu Guha, Dr. Shrimati.

Prithwi Nath, Shri.
 Punnaiah, Shri Kota.
 Purkayastha, Shri M.
 Ramachandran, Shri G.
 Ramiah, Dr. K.
 Ray, Shri S. P.
 Reddy, Shri K. V. Raghunatha.
 Reddy, Shri M. Srinivasa.
 Reddy, Shri Y. Adinarayana.
 Salig Ram, Dr.
 Samuel, Shri M. H.
 Sangma, Shri D.
 Sanjivayya, Shri D.
 Sarojini Krishnarao Babar, Dr.
 Kumari.
 Satyavati Dang, Shrimati.
 Savnekar, Shri B. S.
 Schamnad, Shri Hamid Ali.
 Seeta Yudhvir, Shrimati.
 Sen, Dr. Triguna.
 Shah, Shri K. K.
 Shukla, Shri Chakrapani.
 Shukla, Shri M. P.
 Shyamkumari Devi, Shrimati.
 Siddalingaya, Shri T.
 Singh, Shri Bhupinder.
 Singh, Shri Dalpat.
 Singh, Shri Jogendra.
 Singh, Shri S. K.
 Sing, Raja Shankar.
 Sinha, Shri Awadheshwar Prasad.
 Sinha, Shri R. B.
 Sinha, Shri Rajendra Pratap.
 Sisodia, Shri Swaisingh.
 Sivaprakasam, Shri S.
 Somasundaram, Shri G. P.
 Sukhdev Prasad, Shri.
 Sundaram, Shri K.
 Tankha, Pandit S. S. N.
 Untoo, Shri Gulam Nabi.
 Upadhyaya, Shri S. D.
 Usha Barthakur, Shrimati.
 Vaishampayan, Shri S. K.

Varma, Shri C. L.
 Vero, Shri M.
 Vidyawati Chaturvedi, Shrimati.
 Villalan, Shri Thillai.
 Vimal Punjab Deshmukh, Shrimati.
 Yajee, Shri Sheel Bhadra.
 Zaidi, Col. B. H.

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

8. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address makes no mention of arbitrarily increasing the prices of steel and vanaspati'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Amendment No. 9.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, मेरी एक रिक्वेस्ट है। मैं आपसे प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ कि अमेन्डमेंट नं० 9 की थोड़ी सी व्याख्या करने का मुझको मौका दें।

कई माननीय सदस्य : नहीं नहीं।

श्री उपसभापति : अब कोई जरूरत नहीं है।

श्री राजनारायण : मैं नियम के मुताबिक कह रहा हूँ।

श्री उपसभापति : अब कोई जरूरत नहीं है। आप बहुत समय ले रहे हैं, अब और ज्यादा समय महरबानी कर के न लीजिये।

श्री राजनारायण : नियम में लिखा है इसलिय मैं कह रहा हूँ।

श्री उपसभापति : अमेन्डमेंट का मकसद क्या है, मतलब क्या है, यह सदन के सभी सदस्यों को मालूम है।

श्री राजनारायण : देखिये, और पार्टियों के लोगों को अपील की है कि वहाँ का आन्दोलन इस समय बन्द हो। देखिये, 15 हजार आदमी गंगानगर में जेल में गये हैं।

श्री उपसभापति : इसके बारे में आपने अपनी स्पीच में जिक्र किया। लोगों को मालूम है, सदस्यों को मालूम है, इसके बारे में अब कहने की कोई जरूरत नहीं है।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

9. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address makes no mention of the ejection of farmers from their lands in Ganganagar (Rajasthan) by the pro-Prime Minister Government and of the firing and lathi-charge on democratic-minded and peaceful farmers and the arrest and imprisonment of fifteen thousand farmers who rose in protest against it.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

10. "That at the end of the the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address makes no mention of the issue of orders for supply of coal by Government bodies, against the policy of the Government, to those coal-mine owners who did not implement the recommendations of the coal wage board.'

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

11. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address makes no mention of the incapacity of the government to check poverty, unemployment and corruption'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

12. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address makes no mention of the framing of the lay relating to the acquisition of banking companies in collusion with the big capitalists in such a form that it was declared invalid'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

13. "That at the end of the the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address makes no mention of the need of removing economic disparity by limiting individual income and expenditure to rupees fifteen hundred per month and by fixing the ratio of one to ten between the low and the high incomes'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

14. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address makes no mention of the fixing of the prices of commodities essential to the people at a maximum of one and a half times the highest cost of production'."

The motion was negatived.

श्री राजनारायण : नोज़ तो कट गई प्रधान मंत्री की ।

श्री उपसभापति : बहुत कमजोरी से “हां” निकाला आपने । शायद आप थक गये ।

श्री राजनारायण : हमने “हां” कहा तो ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

15. “That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

‘but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the indifference of the Government towards the implementation of the scheme of reclamation of cultivable waste land by organising a land army.’”

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

16. “That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

‘but regret that there is no reference in the Address to the failure of the Government to organise a teachers’ force to eradicate illiteracy in the country without delay.’”

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

17. “That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

‘but regret that the Address makes no mention of the insult to the nation by the Government by not replacing English by the national languages.’”

The motion was negatived.

श्री उपसभापति : अब फेवर मे भी नहीं बोलते है, “हां” भी नहीं कहते हैं ।

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, मैं यह देख रहा था कि अंग्रेजी का जो अनुवाद है वह कुछ गलत है । मैं कह रहा हूं कि अंग्रेजी का अनुवाद कुछ गलत है । हमारा है कि “किन्तु खेद है कि अभिभाषण में अंग्रेजी को हटा कर...” “—पहले अंग्रेजी हटे । फिर है—राष्ट्र भाषाओं को उसकी जगह प्रतिष्ठित न कर के सरकार द्वारा राष्ट्र का अपमान किया जाना ।

श्री उपसभापति : यह ठीक तो है, इंसल्ट टु दि नेशन आया है, नाट रिप्लेसिंग इंगलिस है, अपमान है, हटाना है, ठीक है ।

श्री राजनारायण : पहले हटाना है । जब अन्धकार हटेगा तब ज्ञान प्रतिष्ठित होगा । अंग्रेजी को मैं अज्ञान मानता हूं, अज्ञान हटे तब ज्ञान की प्रतिष्ठा हो ।

श्री उपसभापति : वह है, वहां पर दोनों । है है तो कि अंग्रेजी भाषा हटनी चाहिये ।

श्री राजनारायण : अंग्रेजी भाषा पहले हटानी है । अनुवाद जो है वह बहुत अनहेल्दी-- है ।

श्री उपसभापति : ठीक है । जो आपका था वह है ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

18. “That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

‘but regret that the Address makes no mention of the need of introducing at all levels a uniform and inexpensive education scheme.’”

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

19. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address makes no mention of the need to provide special opportunities to the backward classes, Harijans, Shudras, Adivasis, and poor Muslims and of the need to reserve at least sixty per cent of the places for them in every sphere of life'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

20. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the anti-national, method of running the Government at the Centre by entering into immoral and unholy alliances by the minority Government at the Centre'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

21. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address does not outline the relationship between the President and the Prime Minister'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

22. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the dangers posed by the Chinese and Pakistani forces on our national borders and uncalled for arms aid to Pakistan by foreign powers'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

23. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that there is no mention of the wrong policy being followed by Government in regard to Nepal, Sikkim and Bhutan causing unnecessary tension and deterioration in relation'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

24. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of entry into the country of foreign money on a large scale and corrupting the members of Parliament and State Legislatures and inducing them to defect from their parties by the ruling party in order to increase its domain of influence'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

25. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address does not denounce the continued rapid increase in the prices of commodities, and in the number of cases of drinking, rowdyism,

murders, corruption and prostitution'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

26. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address makes no mention of the danger to the country from the flood of anti-national undemocratic and totalitarian forces'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are other amendments now in the name of Shri Sundar Singh Bhandari.

SHRI JOACHIM ALVA (Nominated): I want to submit to you that you have set up a very dangerous precedent. If on the next occasion he insists on, say, a thousand amendments, you will have to read them out.

श्री राजनारयण : आल्वा महोदय के मन्त्रिक की यह एक परेशानी है। इसका आ। ख्याल न करें।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now come amendments Nos. 27 to 60. They are in the name of Shri Sundar Singh Bhandari.

श्री सुंदर सिंह भंडारी (राजस्थान) : उपसभापति जी, मैं आपसे यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि मेरे मशौधन प्रस्तावों को पढ़ने की आवश्यकता नहीं। लेकिन वह इस आधार पर नहीं कि उनका महत्व और आवश्यकता नहीं रह गई। परन्तु चूँकि पहले अमेंडमेंट्स टेक्नीकली मूव हो चुके हैं, इसलिये मैं उनको दोबारा पढ़े जाने की आवश्यकता नहीं समझता। मैं चाहूँगा कि मेरे इन सारे अमेंडमेंट्स पर आप एक साथ मत लें।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am really thankful to the hon. Member and I hope other hon. Members also will emulate his example in future.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

27. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret the failure to find a suitable solution to the problem of Chandigarh'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

28. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret the failure to find a suitable solution to the problem Telengana problem to the satisfaction of the people of the area'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

29. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret the failure of the Government to establish a second oil refinery in Assam'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

30. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret the failure of the Government to implement the recommendations of the Gajindra-gadkar Commission regarding the removal of disparity and discrimination between the different regions of the State of Jammu and Kashmir'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

31. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret the failure of the Government to check war-like preparations of Pakistan'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

32. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret the failure of the Government to prevent subversive activities in various parts of the country'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

33. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret the failure of the Government to set up the Third Pay Commission and provide interim relief to the Central Government employees'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

34. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret the failure of the Government to remove the disparity in grades and allowances of the Government employees of the Union territory of Chandigarh existing between employees who have joined before 1st of November, 1966, and after 1st of November, 1966'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

35. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret the failure of the Government to build houses for the Central Government employees in Chandigarh'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

36. "That at the end of the motion the following be added, namely:

'but regret the failure of the Government in its foreign policy, more especially in maintaining good relations with Nepal and other neighbouring countries'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

37. "That at the end of the motion the following be added, namely:

'but regret the failure of the Government in arresting the rise in prices of essential commodities'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

38. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret the failure of the Government to uplift the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

39. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret the failure of the Government to solve the gigantic unemployment problem'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

40. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret the failure of the Government to remove the present disparities in incomes existing between the various sections of the society'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

41. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret the failure of the Government to make the Fourth Five Year Plan completely swadeshi depending upon the country's own resources'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

42. That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the deplorable law and order situation in West Bengal, where the Chief Minister was manhandled in the Vidhan Sabha premises'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

43. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the oppression committed on the people of Haryana by the army and the police on innocent citizens who were protesting against the decision of the Government denying Chandigarh to them'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

44. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret the failure of the Government to maintain democratic and constitutional norms regarding the Governors of Bihar and Uttar Pradesh who have installed minority Governments'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

45. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret the deintegration of the Supreme Court by certain political parties and individuals after their decision invalidating the Bank Nationalisation law'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

46. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

"but regret that the Address does not spell out the acceptance of the popular demand for the

[Mr. Deputy Chairman]
manufacture of nuclear weapons'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

47. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret the failure of the Government to nationalise all foreign banks and foreign oil, tea and jute companies'."

The motion was negatived

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

48. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret the failure of the Government to provide even drinking water in certain areas of the country'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. The question is:

49. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the slow growth of industrialisation in the country owing to the non-utilisation of installed capacity'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

50. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address that even after 20 years of independence untouchability exists in the country in one form or the other'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

51. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret the failure of the Government to implement the directive principle of the Constitution regarding complete ban on the slaughter of cows, calves and other milch cattle'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

52. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the misuse of power and position by the Prime Minister of undertaking tours of Uttar Pradesh and Gujarat in helicopters and defence planes in order to topple the Governments in those States'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

53. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the non-implementation of the recommendations of the Wage Board for non-journalists'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

54. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret the failure of the Government to introduce prohibition throughout the country even after 20 years of independence'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

55. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret the failure of the Government to scrap automation in L.I.C., Railways and other public undertakings'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

56. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret the failure of the Government to secure the implementation of land reforms throughout the country'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

57. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the misuse of the All India Radio by the party in power and discriminatory treatment to the opposition parties'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

58. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret the failure of the Government to provide adequate relief to the drought-affected areas of Rajasthan and Gujarat'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

59. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret the disgrace brought to our nation by attempted participation in Rabat Muslim Conference'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

60. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret the failure of the Government to check the increasing corruption in the administrative machinery'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

61. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address has not mentioned any drastic measures by which untouchability in the society may be abolished soon, nor does it take up the matter of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes seriously so that the percentage of these down-trodden people in the services may be fulfilled and economic disparity in the society removed'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

62. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address does not mention the firm resolve to eradicate untouchability in the country at the earliest and to obviate the necessity of amending

the Constitution every now and then'."

SHRI RAJNARAIN: Division.

SHRI G. A. APPAN: On a point of order, sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: When the amendment is being put to vote, there can be no point of order.

SHRI G. A. APPAN (Tamil Nadu): Is it the policy of this Government not to abolish untouchability?

श्री राज रायण : श्रीमन्, मैं निवेदन कर रहा हूँ मैं इस पर डिबिजन चाहता हूँ। इस संशोधन द्वारा चाहा गया गया है कि देश में यथा शीघ्र छुआछूत का उन्मूलन हो ताकि संविधान में बार बार संशोधन करने की आवश्यकता न पड़े। 23 साल हो जाने के बाद भी छुआछूत इस देश में रहे और राष्ट्रपति इस पर एक शब्द न बोलें यह राष्ट्र का असम्मान है। इस देश में सरकार छुआछूत को आज जिस प्रकार चला रही है, उसमें अस्पृश्यता निवारण नहीं हुआ है।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. mover is not pressing for a Division.

श्री राज रायण : मैं इस पर डिबिजन चाहूँगा, अगर आप इसको टेक्निकली रूल आऊट करते हैं।

SHRI B. T. KEMPARAJ (Mysore): Let there be Division on this issue.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right. The question is:

62. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address does not mention the firm resolve to eradicate untouchability in the country at the earliest and to ob-

viate the necessity of amending the Constitution every now and then'."

The House divided

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Ayes—21; Noes—83.

AYES—21

Anandan Shri T. V.

Annapurna Devi Thimmareddy, Shrimati.

Antani, Dr. B. N.

Chaudhary, Shri Ganeshi Lal

Chavda, Shri K. S.

Gautam, Shri Mohan Lal

Kaul, Shri B. K.

Kemparaj, Shri B. T.

Mishra, Shri S. N.

Mitra, Shri P. C.

Mohammad, Chaudhary A.

Mohta, Shri M. K.

Muniswamy, Shri N. R.

Murahari, Shri Godey.

Narayanappa, Shri Sanda

Panda, Shri K. C.

Rajnarain, Shri

Reddy, Shri Nagi.

Somasundaram, Shri G. P.

Villalan, Shri Thillai.

Yashoda Reddy, Shrimati.

NOES—83

Alva, Shri Joachim.

Amal, Shri Tirath Ram.

Ansari, Shri Hayaullah.

Arora, Shri Arjun.

Bachchan, Dr. H. R.

Baharul Islam, Shri

Bhatt, Shri Nand Kishore.

Chandra Shekhar, Shri.

Chattopadhyaya, Dr. Debiprasad.

Chaudhri, Shri N. P.

Chetia, Shri P.

Dass, Shri Mahabir.

Deshmukh Shri T. G.
 Dharia, Shri M. M.
 Dikshit, Shri Jagdish Chandra.
 Dikshit, Shri Umashankar.
 Goswami, Shri Sriman Prafulla.
 Gujaral, Shri I. K.
 Hasan, Prof. Saiyid Nurul.
 Hussain, Shri Syed.
 Jaihindas Daulatram, Shri.
 Khaitan, Shri R. P.
 Khan, Shri Akbar Ali.
 Kollur, Shri M. L.
 Kothari, Prof. Shanti.
 Krishan Kant, Shri.
 Kulkarni, Shri A. G.
 Lalitha (Rajagopal), Shrimati.
 Mani, Shri A. D.
 Mehta, Shri Om.
 Mishra, Shri L. N.
 Mohideen, Shri S. A. Khaja.
 Momin, Shri G. H. Valimohmed.
 Naidu, Miss M. L. M.
 Neki Ram, Shri.
 Panda, Shri Brahmananda.
 Panj hazari, Sardar Raghbir Singh.
 Patil, Shri G. R.
 Patra, Shri N.
 Phulrenu Guha, Dr. Shrimati.
 Punnaiah, Shri Kota.
 Purkayastha, Shri M.
 Ramachandran, Shri G.
 Ramiah, Dr. K.
 Ray, Shri S. P.
 Reddy, Shri K. V. Raghunatha.
 Reddy, Shri M. Srinivasa.
 Reddy, Shri Y. Adinarayana.
 Salig Ram, Dr.
 Samuel, Shri M. H.
 Sangma, Shri E. M.
 Sanjivayya, Shri D.
 Sarojini Krishnarao Babar, Dr.
 Kumari.
 Schamnad, Shri Hamid Ali.
 Seeta Yudhvir, Shrimati.

Sen, Dr. Triguna.
 Shah, Shri K. K.
 Shukla, Shri Chakrapani.
 Shukla, Shri M. P.
 Shyamkumari Devi, Shrimati.
 Siddalingaya, Shri T.
 Singh, Shri Dalpat.
 Singh, Shri Jogendra.
 Singh, Shri S. K.
 Sing, Raja Shankar Pratap.
 Sinha, Shri Awadheshwar Prasad.
 Sirha, Shri R. B.
 Sinha, Shri Rajendra Pratap.
 Sisodia, Shri Swain Singh.
 Sivaprakasam, Shri S.
 Sukhdev Prasad, Shri.
 Sundaram, Shri K.
 Tankha, Pandit S. S. N.
 Untoo, Shri Gulam Nabi.
 Upadhyaya, Shri S. D.
 Usha Barthakur, Shrimati.
 Vaishampayan, Shri S. K.
 Varma, Shri C. L.
 Vero Shri M.
 Vidyawati Chaturvedi, Shrimati.
 Vimal Punjab Deshmukh, Shrimati.
 Yajee, Shri Sheel Bhadra.
 Zaidi, Col. B. H.

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

63. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

"but regret that the Address does not mention any constructive suggestions for curbing increasing goondaism, Naxalite activities and fissiparous tendencies in the country."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

64. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address does not suggest ratification of the I.L.O. conventions No. 87 (Freedom of association and protection of the right to organise convention, 1948) and No. 98 (Right to organise and collective bargaining convention 1949)'."

The motion was negatived.

*Amendment Nos. 65 to 75 were, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

76. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address has failed to mention the nationalisation of all banks, foreign and Indian'."

The motion was negatived

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

77. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address has failed to mention the legal and other steps for abolition of privy purses and privileges of ex-rulers before the presentation of budget on February 28, 1970."

The motion was negatived

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

*For text of amendments, vide cols. supra, in the Debate dated the 23rd February, 1970.

78. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address has failed to mention the nationalisation of general insurance, of import and export trade, etc.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

79. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address has failed to mention the steps to restore the right of the Parliament to amend the Fundamental Rights and removal of property right from the Chapter on Fundamental Rights in the Constitution'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

80. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address has failed to mention concrete measures to remove disparity in income pertaining to the rural and urban sectors and administration'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

81. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address has failed to mention positive steps for fixing of ceiling on urban property'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

82. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address has failed to enunciate the steps to resolve disputes between the Centre and the States on different matters'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

83. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address has failed to mention the acceptance of the recommendations of the Committee on Defection'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

84. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address has failed to mention the enunciation of concrete steps to eradicate corruption from the public and administrative life and to curb ostentatious expenditure'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

85. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address has failed to mention the steps to nationalise in a positive manner the commanding heights of the economy and to streamline the

administration in the public sector industries to make it more efficient and remunerative'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

86. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address has failed to mention the immediate setting up of the Third Pay Commission'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

87. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address has failed to mention the steps to constitute a development authority for the famine stricken areas'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

88. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address has failed to mention the steps to institute federal metropolitan authority for development of metropolitan cities and rehabilitation of people living in slum areas'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

89. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address has failed to mention the steps

[Mr. Deputy Chairman]
regarding the political develop-
ment of an anti-national, anti-
democratic and communal nature
in certain States of India'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The
question is:

90. "That at the end of the
motion, the following be added,
namely:

'but regret that the Address
displays a spirit of smug compla-
cency and claims illusory achieve-
ments in the fields of agriculturc,
industry and employment which
are entirely unrelated to the grim
realities of the common people's
plight'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The
question is:

91. "That at the end of the
motion, the following be added,
namely:

'but regret that while taking
note of the manifestations of vio-
lence in the country, the Add-
ress—

(a) does not refer to the
situation in West Bengal
where, according to the Chief
Minister of that unfortunate
State, there exists an 'uncivil-
lised and barbarous Govern-
ment', nor contains any state-
ment of intentions as to how
the Union Government pro-
pose to deal with the situation
which involves a complete
breakdown of the constitutional
machinery and of law and
order;

(b) fails to take note of the
widespread seizure of crops in
the State of Kerala with the
connivance and encouragement

of some of the parties in power,
both in the past and at present;
and

(c) ignores a factor which ag-
gravates the violence in the
country, namely the incitement
from the highest quarters to-
wards a disregard for the rule
of law, for the fundamental
rights of the citizen and for
the Judiciary'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The
question is:

92. "That at the end of the
motion, the following be added,
namely:

'but regret that while dealing
with a regional arrangement for
economic co-operation in South,
South-East and East Asia, the
Address indicates no readiness or
intention to take steps to develop
corresponding measures of politi-
cal co-operation and for the de-
fence of the region'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The
question is:

93. "That at the end of the
motion, the following be added,
namely:

'but regret that while giving
expression to an unrealistic ex-
pectation that the Chinese Com-
munist regime would respect our
sovereignty and territorial integ-
rity, the Address fails to make
any mention about steps to redeem
the pledge given in Parliament on
22nd November, 1962, for the re-
covery of the territory which con-
tinues to be wrongfully occupied
by Communist China'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

94. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that in regard to the continued hostilities in Vietnam, the Address, while advocating a facile and one-sided withdrawal of foreign troops, makes no corresponding demand for the withdrawal of the North Vietnamese aggressors from South Vietnam or Laos'."

The motion was negatived.

*Amendment Nos. 96 to 101 were, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

102. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that while referring to the perverse concept of untouchability the Address has failed to propose concrete steps to remove it lock, stock, and barrel from the country.

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

103. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that while referring to the deficiency of the monsoon in some parts of the country such as Western Rajasthan, Saurashtra and Kutch there is no mention in the Address of the failure of the Government to provide adequate Central assistance in respect of the relief expenditure in the scarcity affected areas of Gujarat'."

The motion was negatived.

*For text of amendments, vide cols. Debate dated the 23rd February, 1970.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. The question is:

104. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address failed to announce the removal of Zonal and other barriers to free movement of foodgrains throughout the country'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. The question is:

105. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that no mention is made in the Address for the removal of the poverty of agricultural labour'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

106. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the failure of the Government in the execution of the Railway works in the scarcity affected areas of Gujarat'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

107. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that while referring to the food position being satisfactory the Address does not contain any announcement of the adequate supply of foodgrains to the famine affected areas of Gujarat'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

108. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the failure of the Government to give employment to the Scheduled Castes educated persons though there is reservation in services of the Government'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

109. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of steps to arrest the rise in prices of the essential commodities of food'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

122. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

"but regret that the Address was delivered in English and not in any Indian language'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

123. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of the constitution of Governments in Uttar Pradesh and Bihar in an unconstitutional manner'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

124. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of providing employment or unemployment allowance to the unemployed youth'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

125. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address does not contain any directives to State Governments for the abolition of land revenue on unprofitable holdings and for the demarcation of holdings and their redistribution'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

126. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address makes no mention of the provision of the same type of schools up to the primary stage and of compulsory free education'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

127. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address makes no mention of the nationalisation of oil companies and plantations'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

128. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of ending the imbalance prevalent in administration by abolishing the domination of high caste and rich people in it and by providing special opportunities to the people of economically and socially backward classes'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We will now take up Amendment No. 129.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: Sir, I want to say that this is a good practice in a sense that the amendments are being read out but I would only submit that hon. Members who have given notice of a number of amendments should select out of them one or two. That is the practice which prevails in other countries and our Rules of procedure also lay down the very healthy principle that one should try to explain the bare objectives of the amendment. Now this amendment, which I have sought to move—I would like it to be read out by you—I would like to explain it in just one sentence, (*Interruptions*). This is my right. I would crave the indulgence of the House; I would say only one word, I have moved only this amendment; there is no other amendment standing in my name. I have by your kindness a certain status and I would like that the amendment of the leader of the Opposition, whosoever he might be, must receive the attention of the House. Now I will read out my amendment and I will explain why I am pressing it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No; no more speeches now.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: If you say that, I will go by the Rules of procedure, which says that the objectives

of the amendment can be explained. My amendment reads:

"but regret that the Address contains no positive proposals to ensure fulfilment of the basic minimum needs of every individual in respect of food, clothing, housing, education and health by a definite target date."

I have moved this amendment to remind the other side of the House that this was a commitment given by us to the people of India in the Bhubaneswar Resolution, in the election manifesto, 1967, and also repeated, in the celebrated 10-point programme. I have moved this only to remind the other side of the House that was stand committed even as a joint party, to the fulfilment of this target by 1975-76. But unfortunately this target has been shelved by the Fourth Plan draft which has been approved by the Cabinet under the present leadership.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I would as one question only. Is he prepared to accept a slight modification to add the words even after the departure of the syndicate Congressmen? Then I will vote for it.

(Interruptions)

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: I would say even with the addition of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta to the ruling party we are finding ourselves in this position.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Usually when any motion is discussed, amendments are moved along with the motion and the motion and the amendments are together taken up for consideration by the House and when Members are speaking in the House they express their views on the motion as well as on the amendments and therefore when the amendments are put to vote it is not necessary to express views on the amendments.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: But the Rules of Procedure provide for that and I should say that this is the first time that we are taking up the amendments seriously. Otherwise the amendments were being moved in a non-serious manner.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order please. When the Members get a chance to express their views on their amendments during the course of the discussion, it is not necessary to express their views on the amendments at this stage also.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS: Whatever Mr. Mishra has said may be taken to be his final appeal to the Members.

SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA: In your amendment you have said 'regret', but we have no regret.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

129. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address contains no positive proposals to ensure fulfilment of the minimum basic needs of every individual in respect of food, clothing housing, education and health by a definite target date'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Amendment No. 130.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I follow him . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No please.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I follow the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is only an exception.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: My amendment I will read out:

130. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'having considered the same, the House notes that the Address does not show due awareness of the serious threat posed to the nation's future by the newly-mounted counter-offensive of the combined forces of Right reaction including communalism, nor does it spell out a fighting line against these dark forces in terms of economic, political and administrative measures'."

I am an old Member of the Opposition, not the Leader of the Opposition. Therefore, my amendment should also receive attention.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: What is meant by 'right reaction'?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

130. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'having considered the same, the House notes that the Address does not show due awareness of the serious threat posed to the nation's future by the newly-mounted counter-offensive of the combined forces of Right reaction including communalism, nor does it spell out a fighting line against these dark forces in terms of economic, political and administrative measures'."

The House divided.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: AYES—6; NOES—75.

AYES—6

Basu, Shri Chitta

Das, Shri Banka Behary

Gupta, Shri Bhupesh

Menon, Shri Balachandra

Mokherjee, Shri Pranab Kumar

Purkayastha, Shri M.

NOES—75.

Amla, Shri Tirath Ram
 Ansari, Shri Hayatullah
 Arora, Shri Arjun
 Bachchan, Dr. H. R.
 Baharul Islam, Shri
 Bhatt Shri Nand Kishore.
 Chandra Shekhar Shri
 Chattopadhyaya, Dr. Debiprasad
 Chaudhri, Shri N. P.
 Chetia Shri P.
 Dass, Shri Mahabir
 Deshmukh, Shri T. G.
 Dharia, Shri M. M.
 Dikshit, Shri Jagdish Chandra
 Dikshit, Shri Umashankar
 Goswami, Shri Sriman Prafulla
 Gujral, Shri I. K.
 Hasan, Prof. Saiyid Nurul
 Hussain, Shri Syed
 Jairamdas Daulatram Shri
 Khaitan, Shri R. P.
 Khan, Shri Akbar Ali
 Kollur, Shri M. L.
 Kothari, Prof. Shanti
 Krishan Kant, Shri
 Lalitha (Rajagopalan), Shrimati
 Mehta, Shri Om
 Mishra Shri L. N.
 Momin, Shri G. H. Valimohmed
 Naidu, Miss M. L. M.
 Neki Ram, Shri
 Panda, Shri Brahmananda
 Panjhajari Sardar Raghubir Singh
 Patil, Shri G. R.
 Patra, Shri N.
 Phulrenu Guha, Dr. Shrimati
 Punnaiah, Shri Kota
 Ramachandran, Shri G.
 Ramiah, Dr. K.
 Ray, Shri S. P.
 Reddy, Shri K.V. Reghunatha
 Reddy, Shri M. Srinivasa

Reddy, Shri Y. Adinarayana
 Salig Ram, Dr.
 Samuel, Shri M. H.
 Sangma, Shri E. M.
 Sanjivayya, Shri D.
 Sarojini Krishnarao Babar, Dr
 Kumari
 Satyavati Dang, Shrimati
 Seeta Yudhvair, Shrimati
 Sen, Dr. Triguna
 Shah, Shri K. K..
 Shukla, Shri Chakrapani
 Shukla, Shri M. P.
 Shyamkumari Devi, Shrimati
 Siddalingaya, Shri T.
 Singh, Shri Dalpat
 Singh, Shri Jogendra
 Singh, Shri S. K.
 Singh, Raja Shankar Pratap
 Sinha, Shri Awadheshwar Prasad
 Sinha, Shri R. B.
 Sinha, Shri Rajendra Pratap
 Sisodia, Shri Swaisingh
 Sukhdev Prasad, Shri
 Tankha, Pandit S. S. N.
 Untoo, Shri Gulam Nabi.
 Upadhyaya, Shri S. D.
 Usha Barthakur, Shrimati
 Vaishampayen, Shri S. K.
 Varma, Shri C. L.
 Vero, Shri M.
 Vidyawati Chaturvedi, Shrimati
 Yajee, Shri Sheel Bhadra
 Zaidi Col. B. H.
The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:
 Amendment Nos. 131—145.

The question is:

131. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that while the Address claims to take steps to curb the growth of monopolies,

[Mr. Deputy Chairman]

the Government has sanctioned big increases in steel prices which will help the flow of further huge resources into the hands of the monopolies'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

132. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret to note that the Government in violation of its declared policies have granted a new licence to the Birlas to set up a huge fertilizer factory in Goa with foreign collaboration'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

133. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret to note that the Cenral Reserve Police are being used indiscriminately in Kerala to suppress mass movements and oppress the people'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

134. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that in order to put down the just struggle of peasants in Rajasthan for the distribution of irrigated land to the Cultivators in the Ganganagar District, the State Government have used the army and other oppressive forces made available by the Central Government'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

135. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address does not mention anything about the deleterious effect of the continued inflow of large-scale foreign capital into Indian economy and the serious consequences in the drain of our resources resulting from it'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

136. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that despite the experience of the last hundred and fifty years of the domination of foreign monopoly capital over our economy the Government continues to encourage and woo fresh foreign imperialist capital into the country with fresh concessions'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

137. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Government in violation of the industrial policy resolution is continuing to grant majority participation to foreign capital in industries being set up in the name of export-oriented industries, etc'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

138. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret to note that the Government is utterly indifferent to the serious consequences of its new policy of allowing foreign monopoly capital to set up private companies for research and development which will have a very damaging effect on the development of our national science and technology and will render superfluous the large number of national laboratories and research institutes already set up in the country and in which our Indian scientists and research workers have achieved commendable results'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

139. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address has not given any attention to the serious problem of Centre-State relations especially in regard to the problem of the financial autonomy and self-sufficiency of the State in view of the unanimous and persistent demand of the State Governments for transfer of greater resources from the Centre to the State'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

140. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address has not elaborated a consistent and effective socio-economic policy towards the solving of the problem of mounting unemployment'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

141. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added namely:—

'but regret that despite serious situation of unemployment the Government is going ahead with and encouraging the mechanisation of agriculture which will throw out millions of agricultural labour from their traditional occupation and render them destitutes'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

142. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that in utter disregard of the necessity of increasing the employment avenues the Government is going ahead with and helping the private capitalists to enforce automation, rationalisation and such other devices which will reduce both the present labour strength and the potential employment in the affected industries'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

143. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that while the Address talks of the necessity of carrying out land reforms has failed to analyse and locate the basic causes which led to the non-implementation of even the mild measures of land reform already on the statutes of most States and ignores the iron grin of the landlords and rich peasants on the Government's bureaucracy, police

[Mr. Deputy Chairman.]
an other apparatus of State machinery'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

144. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Government have not still resiled completely from its policy of victimisation of the Central Government employees who took part in the 19th September, 1968 strike and regret to note that still a large number of employees are out of job or facing various other disciplinary proceedings in the different departments of the Government of India'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

145. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret the failure of the Government to recognise Democratic Republic of Germany and the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam and thus support peace and oppose aggression'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Amendments No. 146 to 155. Mr. Appan.

SHRI G. A. APPAN: I am not going to press my amendments, but I have certain observations. I do not like to trouble the House . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No observations.

SHRI G. A. APPAN: The Government should help the Harijans. Simp-

ly because this House votes it, it will be a mockery of democracy. I want these people to be honestly helped and not by lip service alone.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You may withdraw your amendments then, i.e., 146 to 155. You need not make any observations.

SHRI G. A. APPAN: I think the Leader of the House and the Deputy Chief Whip have not put my points to the Prime Minister. I want to explain it. (*Interruptions*). I have mentioned there or four points regarding compensation . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No speeches.

SHRI G. A. APPAN: I beg leave to withdraw my amendments.

*Amendment Nos. 146 to 155 were, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Amendments Nos. 156 to 166.

The question is:

156. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address has failed to declare that foreign banks in India will be nationalised forthwith'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

157. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address has not mentioned the Government's failure to declare its inten-

*For text of amendments, vide cols. *supra* in the Debate dated the 23rd February, 1970.

tion to nationalise General Insurance'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

158. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address does not mention Government's failure to declare its intention of nationalising the whole of export and import trade of the country'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

159. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address does not mention Government's failure to declare intention of nationalising foreign oil monopolies'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

160. "that at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address has failed to mention that any unemployment allowance Bill will be brought forward'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

161. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret the Address does not emphasise the necessity of suitable constitutional amendments in order to push through

urgently needed agrarian reforms'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

162. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added namely:

'but regret that the Address has failed to declare moratorium on peasant indebtedness and division of credits for the labouring peasantry in order to free them from the clutches of usurious money-lenders'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

163. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address has failed to pinpoint the necessity of taking over some of viable big concerns of the big capitalists'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

164. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address does not declare that a thorough probe be undertaken in order to locate and weed out bureaucratic elements who sabotage progressive reforms'."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

165. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address does not promise full autonomy to

[Mr. Deputy Chairman]

the States pending immediate grant of legislative, executive and financial powers to implement a radical democratic programme and plan for the rapid industrialisation of the States and execute progressive agrarian reforms."

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

166. "That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:

'but regret that the Address does not mention Government's failure to declare any intention of withdrawing annually repressive measures and acts like C.R.P. and Industrial Security Force etc.'"

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, I shall put the motion to vote:

The question is:

"That an Address be presented to the President in the following terms:

"That the Members of the Rajya Sabha assembled in the Session are deeply grateful to the President for the Address which he has been pleased to deliver to both Houses of Parliament assembled together on the 20th February, 1970."

The motion was adopted.

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

The House then adjourned at forty minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 3rd March, 1970.

AT