

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

today? We talk about socialism before our younger generation but build monopoly capitalism. We talk against corruption in our public speeches—as far as these gentlemen are concerned—but indulge in Aminchand Pyarelal and Mundhra deals. What the student community is to learn from them? They are setting not only dual examples, they are setting eminently bad examples and that is degrading to some extent the cultural make-up of our student community. Well, still the student community is standing against all these odds. Therefore I say that we should consider all these matters also. Even Mr. Chagla in his statement has said about inadequacies and so on. Do we have enough schools and colleges? We do not have. Yet, whenever a Minister likes a house or some big people like a house, we get a house made at once. Monies are found. Whenever we think that an emergency demands an increase of our Budget by Rs. 400 crores, there is no dearth of money but if education were to be treated as a supremely urgent pressing national subject could we not find the money? Certainly we could but we do not wish to find it because the capitalist class and the people who are running the Government on their behalf consider that education should be given a back seat, should be given only such assistance that is needed to find some personnel for the bureaucracy or for some of the industries. That again is utterly wrong. Money can be found and here we can give very many examples. Cement and steel are being utilised with the help of the Government for building palaces for the rich people. Go round Delhi and see how many big buildings are coming so that our rich ones could live there and yet we find in Delhi our young students and boys and girls coming from the poorer classes living in a horrible condition, studying under *shamianas*. Why that spectacle should be before us, to the shame of all of us. I ask the Government. Therefore money has to be found and can be found. Hostel accommodation is absolutely inadequate.

It has become prohibitive even for the middle income group people. How many people can send their children for education when the hostel charges and educational charges come to Rs. 150 with the rising prices and no rise in the wages and salaries? Nobody can.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta, you will give way to the Minister, Mr. T. N. Singh to make a statement on the Calling Attention Notice.

CALLING ATTENTION TO A MAT-
TER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPOR-
TANCE

DEMAND FOR STEEL PLANT AT VISAKHA-
PATNAM—contd.

THE MINISTER OF IRON AND STEEL (SHRI T. N. SINGH): Gov-
ernment's thinking in regard to the
pattern of steel production during the
Fourth Plan is firstly an expansion of
the existing plants and the putting up
of one integrated steel plant going up
to 1.7 million tonne production at Bo-
karo with a possibility of its expansion
later. A provision has been made or
preliminary work on new sites to
form the nucleus of facilities which
will be developed into full-fledged
steel plants later.

Government's basic objectives are the best utilisation of available resources in the national interest, dispersal of industry for the greatest possible development of all regions and the spreading of employment opportunities throughout the country. The Government of India are aware of the widespread desire among, and the aspirations of, the people of Andhra Pradesh, Mysore and Madras to have steel plants located suitably in their areas to utilise iron ore deposits found in these areas or nearby. In a democratic set-up such as we have in India it is obvious that the wishes of the people will be fully taken into account in making decisions. The Prime Minister has already said so in

Hyderabad when questioned on the location of future steel plants in India.

It must be realised that a decision on the location of future steel plants is a very complex matter involving a number of economic, technical and other considerations. I would appeal to Members of the House and to the public in general to have patience and to give an opportunity to Government to consider all the factors involved in a dispassionate and objective but, nevertheless, sympathetic way. The leaders of the people and the party to which I have the privilege of belonging will not deny justice to any part of the country while acting completely in the national interest.

SHRI P. K. KUMARAN: Madam, I am rather surprised at the statement. Wisdom has not yet dawned on the Government. Mr. C. Subramaniam, in 1963, wrote a letter to the then Chief Minister of Andhra . . .

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh): A private letter.

SHRI P. K. KUMARAN: Not a private letter.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Whatever it was, it was a letter.

SHRI P. K. KUMARAN: Mr. Sanjiva Reddy announced about that letter in the Assembly in 1963 and then in 1964 that a Consortium was appointed to go into this. You have received the report as long back, about two years back. When Mr. Lal Bahadur Shastri visited Visakhapatnam, he gave an assurance in December 1965 . . .

SHRI T. N. SINGH: What assurance?

SHRI P. K. KUMARAN: . . . that the 5th Steel Plant will be located in Visakhapatnam.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Assurance to that effect.

SHRI P. K. KUMARAN: The present Prime Minister, when she visited Visakhapatnam on 25-6-66, in reply to a memorandum submitted to her said: "There is no argument against the location of the 5th Steel Plant at Visakhapatnam. These are the words she used. She repeated the same thing at Hyderabad. You may take refuge behind the niceties of grammar or the twists of the English language but she was speaking to the masses of the people. They do not understand these things. They thought that since 1963 you yourselves told them that they were going to get the steel plant—their aspirations were aroused—the steel plant was coming. Very recently, in her letter to the Chief Minister . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What is the question?

SHRI P. K. KUMARAN: I want to explain because he did not say anything in the statement. She said:

"I am anxious to give a positive response in the matter. What has stood in the way is not any lack of will but the fact that the prospect of external aid is dim. However, I have to-day set up a small Cabinet Sub-Committee to look into the matter on most urgent basis so that we can make an early announcement, which I hope, will be satisfactory to you."

This was published in "The Deccan Chronicle" of 2nd November. On the next day, on 3rd November, it was published in box:

"The Cabinet Sub-Committee appointed to assess the various State claims regarding the location of the Fifth Steel Plant in the Public Sector has reportedly preferred Visakhapatnam to other sites. But it has stipulated that the work will be taken up only when funds are available in the Fourth Plan. Another recommendation of the Sub-Committee is that if resources permit pig iron plants should be established at Hospet and Salem so

[Shri P. K. Kumaran.]

that they provide the nucleus for the sixth and seventh Steel Plants."

Now the Government has not contradicted this report. It was published in all the papers as the decision of the Sub-Committee. That has not been contradicted. What has stood in the way of the Government since? They are not asking that it should come now, only that when you are going to establish a Steel Plant it should come to Visakhapatnam. Having aroused the hope of the people since the last 3 or 4 years what stands in the way of giving an undertaking that it will come there. I want to know that.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Do you want all of them to ask questions?

SHRI T. N. SINGH: I wonder how I can reply to these long counter-statements. If you permit questions only, Madam, it will be easier for me to deal with them. Let there be specific pointed questions and I shall certainly try to answer them, but it is very difficult to cover long statements like Mr. Kumaran's.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You get the essence from the statements. Let me proceed to ask the questions. Now I was in Visakhapatnam and, in fact, I traveled with Mr. Brahmananda Reddy by the same plane from Visakhapatnam, and I got the impression that the Union Government had given a kind of assurance and that an announcement for the location in favour of Visakhapatnam would be made, and that is the reason why Mr. T. Brahmananda Reddy went to persuade Mr. Amrut Rao to give up his fast. Now in a public statement Mr. Amrut Rao says that this is what Mr. Brahmananda Reddy told him. From my talk with Mr. Brahmananda Reddy—I travelled by the same plane—I got also the impression that Mr. Brahmananda Reddy had been told or was given to understand by the Centre that a favourable declaration or announcement would be made in a day

or two. Now, Madam Deputy Chairman, I would like to know why the Government is vacillating in this matter specially when the matter had been gone into and a communication was sent, after proper enquiry by Mr. C. Subramaniam, who was in the Steel Ministry in 1963, to Mr. Sanjiva Reddy, the then Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh, that Visakhapatnam would get the thing. And then Mr. Sanjiva Reddy made an announcement to that effect on the floor of the Assembly based on that from the Union Minister to him. Later on, the whole thing had been talked about time and again. Mr. Sanjiva Reddy himself appointed an expert commission under the Consortium to go into the matter and choose one name out of the five sites he had referred to the Consortium commission. The choice of the Consortium fell on Visakhapatnam. That was also known. Later on, Mr. Shastri, our late Prime Minister, went there, and he said that the opinion of the expert committee would not be lightly treated. It meant a kind of assurance to that effect, to the effect that it would be implemented. Then, well, what had been said by Shrimati Indira Gandhi is also there. Now I should like to know why everything is being washed away. Now even we are told that there is no money. The demand of Andhra is not that, is not, "Give the plant here and now irrespective of the resources position." They only say, "Implement your assurance. Give us an announcement that the location of the fifth steel plant will be made in Visakhapatnam as and when funds are available." This is their position.

Now may I refer in this connection to the Planning Commission? Does the Minister not know that the Planning Commission, well, the Commission or somebody, say, a Sub-committee on Mines or something under the Planning Commission went into this matter? They are also in the Plan papers; in the Formulation of the Fourth Plan there is mention of a steel plant of 1.5 million tonnes capa-

city provided for, coming after Bokaro, naturally the fifth steel plant in the public sector. So from that time on they had been pressing in the Planning Commission and elsewhere the claim of Visakhapatnam for a steel plant. But now we find that the Fourth Five-Year Plan does not contain any such thing in the way it had been treated before. It just provides for a preliminary expenditure of Rs. 80 crores or so on new plants. Therefore, the Government stood committed publicly, publicly in Parliament also but indirectly, and certainly before the Andhra people, that they should get the steel plant. Now suddenly some people came in the way and they are not getting. Now therefore I would like to know why the pledge is not being honoured. Does he not know that Andhra Pradesh has got a very big labour force, perhaps the fourth big labour force in the country?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh): Why not the first three?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Just a minute. Please do not disturb me. It has got a labour force of about 17 crores or so; it is the fourth biggest, after U.P., Bombay and Bihar. But there the *per capita* investment under the auspices of the Planning Commission is the lowest, a State industrially backward, a State where, in many ways, regional disparities are glaring to the prejudice of Andhra. On the merits of the case they had been demanding it. After that a movement was started and the Government is now trying to suppress the movement and 24 people have been killed in the process. Madam Deputy Chairman. I was in Andhra in those days when the movement was going on. It was absolutely universal.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Were you responsible?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It was absolutely universal. They talk about democracy. All parties including the Congress Party were in the movement. I was in Visakhapatnam and in other

parts of Andhra. All parties together demanded, "Implement that pledge. Give us only an announcement to that effect." Now I find they are brushing aside sweepingly this very legitimate demand of the people of Andhra, also, on the contrary, mobilising armed forces and other weapons of repression for further use against them having already killed 24 of them. I charge the Government that they have introduced sectional and party politics in this matter.

SHRI T. N. SINGH: The hon. Member has spoken for five minutes and fifty seconds.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I charge the Government of breach of faith to the people of Andhra. I charge your Government of introducing factional and party considerations in this matter.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is the question still being asked? Have you not yet finished? This is Calling-Attention Notice and you must ask questions. You cannot charge the Government.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why does the Government behave like this?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You may charge the Government on some other occasion.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Last question. Why is this Government behaving in this wholly hostile and indecent manner with the people of Andhra, and Andhra Pradesh as a whole? I should like to know from this Government.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do. Mr. Murahari. Please be as brief as you can be.

SHRI G. MURAHARI (Uttar Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman. . .

SHRI T. N. SINGH: I want to know: are we going to have questions on the statement made, or are we going to have counter-statements from hon Members?

SHRI G. MURAHARI: I am asking questions and direct questions.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY (Madras): After this may I also be permitted to put questions?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Those whose names are there have first claim.

SHRI G. MURAHARI: Madam Deputy Chairman, I would like to know whether it is not a fact that the States of Andhra Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh are two of the States in India which have been discriminated against repeatedly both in the matter of industrialisation and in the matter of electricity, and also in the matter of literacy and in every other respect, and that these two States have been treated badly by the Centre. When the income ratio of Andhra Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh is Rs. 250 and the literacy percentage is below 1.5 per cent in each case, whereas in other coastal districts like Madras it is Rs. 540.5 and 5 per cent. respectively. I would like to know why the Centre has not thought it fit to make straightway an announcement that the fifth steel plant will be located at Visakhapatnam? In spite of all this only had the various sub-committees—recommended its location at Viskhapatnam but also the Consortium had gone into this question, and they had also given a report in favour of Visakhapatnam? In spite of all this the Government has been dilly-dallying with this question, and even today, after such a mass movement in Andhra, where some 25 people have been killed and thousands of people have been injured, and still there is the movement going on, the Government comes out with a statement which is absolutely meaningless and which does not convey anything. Government could just as well have shut up and said nothing. They need not have made the statement at all. What is this statement?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Ask the question.

SHRI G. MURAHARI: I want to know what the intention of the Government is. Are they going to locate the fifth steel plant at Visakhapatnam or not? Let them give a categorical answer. That is what is wanted here. You may say that the finances are not there, that the foreign aid is not there. Now all those are conditional. Leave aside all those conditions. When you get the foreign aid, when you get the finances, are you going to locate the fifth steel plant at Visakhapatnam or not? This is the plain question that is being asked and we want a straight answer.

SHRI Y. A. REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): May I know whether the report of the Consortium is the basis for deciding the steel plant?

SHRIMATI C. AMMANNA RAJA (Andhra Pradesh): May I know from the Minister whether there has been consistency in the statements made by the Minister and by the Prime Minister herself, consistency in the statements made by one at one time, and by another or by others at other times? From the letter which has been read out by Mr. Kumaran, it is obvious that she was wanting to give a positive answer and so a sub-committee had been appointed. Even that was not necessary because the Consortium recommendation was there and she wanted to know by appointing the sub-committee where it should be located. So the whole question was reopened again as if nothing had gone before.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now you are also making a statement.

SHRIMATI C. AMMANNA RAJA: Is it fair to play with the lives of the people, as if we are mechanically driven, as if we are machines? Should there be not a human approach? What is the use of merely blaming the people saying, "It is not right that such an agitation should take place, that such vandalism should take place." Unfortunately it is taking place much against our will. But should we not

have some consideration for them at least by coming out with a statement which is fair to the demand of Andhra?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gurupada Swamy, please be brief.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY (Mysore): Madam, I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether it is fact that the consortium had very limited terms of reference. They were only asked to survey the areas in South India and they were not permitted to survey the areas in the north and the report that the consortium has submitted refers to only such areas as South India and does not take into consideration the areas in the north. Secondly I would like to know, arising out of this very important thing, whether some of the areas in the north are mere suitable, more economical, for starting the steel plant. The third question I want to ask is whether the location of such big plants will be decided in the future on purely techno-economic considerations or whether they are going to be decided as a result of sentiments or emotions expressed by . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: What sentiments, what emotions?

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: I did not interrupt you and I expect you to behave in the same way. (Interruptions) I am putting the question to the Minister; I am not asking you. You are not the Minister.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please ignore the interruptions; you ask your question.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADA SWAMY: I am asking this question. My question is whether the location of the industry is going to be decided in future on the basis of sentiments and emotions expressed by people in certain areas?

(Several Members stood up)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The whole House cannot ask questions on a Calling Attention Notice. Mr. Govinda Reddy.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): From the statement it appears that no decision has yet been taken about the establishment of this steel plant. May I know whether the Government is examining the question *de novo* and going to decide the question on merits and not on pressure tactics?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think . . .

(Several hon. Members wanted to ask Questions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: May I request the House? You will continue to ask questions but let the Minister answer the questions already asked before he forgets half the things said on the floor.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): I want to know . . .
(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Let Mr. Akbar Ali Khan ask.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, you are not . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am only helping him.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: With your permission Madam, I want to ask the Minister this. Is there any sanctity in the promises that his predecessors gave that the late Prime Minister and other Prime Ministers gave or has he independent charge and whenever he can, he can change his mind? That is my first question.

My second question is, is there any other example where expert opinion has been given in favour of a certain place and for over two years the

[Shri Akbar Ali Khan.]

Central Government is sitting over it, sleeping over it, and not coming to a decision?

SHRI M. P. SHUKLA (Uttar Pradesh): I will tell you the example.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: In this case I want to say this. It is not at all a question of sentiments; it is not a question of any rowdyism. The only question here is that merit is ignored and that also when the Anglo-American consortium has given expert opinion and when it has been said—I won't repeat—that according to the expert opinion the Government of India will come to its decision. Even after that you do not do anything. Lastly the Cabinet Sub-Committee appointed by the Prime Minister gives a decision which is broadcast and on that assurance we go and beg the people not to agitate and we ask them to break the fast. And then the Minister comes and makes a statement which is vague and absolutely non-committal. Is it fair? I ask the Minister, is it fair? If he is a man, not a Minister, but a person representing a certain State will he accept that position? Will he not agitate? I am not saying as man or woman I would like to know what would be his feeling and how he would react. I am one of those who told them that this is an all-India question. I told them: I do not want you to introduce Andhra or Mysore or any other State but when injustice is done I want to know what remedy is there for it.

SHRI KOTA PUNNAIAH (Andhra Pradesh): I would like to know from the hon. Minister what exactly came in the way of the establishment of the fifth steel plant at Visakhapatnam after obtaining the technical report and ascertaining the possibilities, whether it was politics or economics.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY: I would like to ask the Minister whether he is aware of the fact that his predecessor,

Mr. Subramaniam, when he was the Steel Minister, gave a categorical assurance to the people of Madras that the fifth plant would come to Salem and on the basis of that assurance.... (Interruptions) He said so; I can prove it. On the basis of that promise of Mr. Subramaniam, the then Steel Minister, the Madras Government started doing pilot work there and even today the Madras Chief Minister, Mr. Bhaktavatsalam is assuring the Madras . . .

(Interruptions).

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, Order. Let him finish.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY: On the basis of the assurance given by Mr. Subramaniam the Madras Government started doing the preliminary work at Salem and even today Mr. Bhaktavatsalam is making statements in the Madras Assembly that the Salem project is going to be there. And lastly a deputation came from Salem and that deputation was headed by our erstwhile Member, Shri T. S. Pattabhiraman. The Deputation waited upon the hon. Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi, Mr. Asoka Mehta and some of the Members of the Planning Commission and also Mr. Kamaraj. It is reported to have been told that it is a certainty that the Salem plant is coming and later, Madam, the Delegation went back to Madras and on reaching Madras issued a statement that appeared on the front page, columns 4, 5 and 6 of *the Hindu*, prominently, saying that the Salem plant is going to come there. I am asking the hon. Minister to say categorically whether they are going to give the Salem plant or whether they are going to dupe everybody as they are duping the Vizag people, the Andhra people and others.

SHRI M. V. BHADRAM (Andhra Pradesh): Madam, I come from Visakhapatnam where 10 people have been killed but I am not going into that aspect now. The hon. Minister

has stated that the decision on the location is a very complex matter because economic, technical and other things are involved. Is it a fact that Mr. T. N. Singh has written a letter to Mr. T. Viswanathan? When he asked the Minister what the comparable cost of the big plant and a small plant was the Minister replied that no assessment has so far been made; is it a fact or not? The second question is, a letter is reported to have been written by the Prime Minister to the Chief Minister of Andhra State and it is reported to have been shown to Mr. Amrit Rao before he broke his fast.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He himself told me.

SHRI M. V. BHADRAM: He told me also when I met him in the aerodrome. Now, what are the contents of the letter of the Prime Minister? The third point is the Cabinet Sub-committee has gone into this question and some reports have appeared. What are the recommendations of the Cabinet Sub-committee on this question? These three points I want the Minister of Steel to clarify.

श्री निरंजन वर्मा (मध्य प्रदेश) :

उपसभापति महोदय, माननीय मन्त्री महोदय दो प्रश्नों का उत्तर दें। एक यह कि विशाखा-पत्तनम के लिए जो झगड़ा चल रहा है उस प्लान्ट के लिए सारा का सारा कच्चा माल, लोहा और कोयला इत्यादि, क्या मध्य प्रदेश से आएगा? अगर मध्य प्रदेश से ही सारा आने वाला है तो क्या मध्य प्रदेश में ही बेला-डीला स्थान पर इसको लगाना उचित होगा?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal): Is it true—it appeared in the papers—that you were going to make an announcement that the fifth steel plant would be located at Visakhapatnam and then suddenly the Prime Minister made a statement that there was no firm commitment? At one point did you decide that the fifth steel plant would be located at Visakhapatnam and then you went

back on the decision a day or two after? Is it a fact? Please note it. Is it because of personal politics between Andhra and the demands of Mysore and Madras? If so, what is the difficulty in the way of the Government saying that the fifth, sixth and seventh steel plants would be located in the southern belt, whenever they can be located?

श्री महाबोर प्रसाद शर्मा : महोदय, मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि यह फिफ्थ स्टील प्लांट चौथी पंचवर्षीय योजना में लगने की कोई सम्भावना है अथवा नहीं। यदि है तो फिर इस प्लांट के लगने के पहले सारे देश में क्या इस बात पर विचार किया जायगा कि आर्थिक दृष्टि से और टेक्नीकल दृष्टि से कहाँ इसे लगाना उपयोगी होगा?

SHRI A. D. MANI: From the statement it appears that Visakhapatnam seems to be the only party to the dispute about the location of the steel plant. In regard to this matter the Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh issued a statement some days ago pointing out that if it is being considered because the people of Andhra agitated for the location of a steel plant at Visakhapatnam, the people of Madhya Pradesh also can do the same for the location of the plant at Bailadilla. There is a good deal of feeling on this matter that Madhya Pradesh is being neglected and I want the Minister to give us an assurance. (Interruptions.) I should like the Minister to give us an assurance that not only techno-economic considerations would be taken into account, but also strategic considerations. We cannot locate a steel plant in the coastal belt of Andhra because Visakhapatnam is exposed to naval assault. We think it is necessary that the steel plant should be located in the interior of the country, at Bailadilla, and I would like the Minister to answer that.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Misra, please be very brief.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa): At the outset I would like hon. Members to know my mind. I am very much in favour of the Visakhapatnam steel plant, but the point is whether it is Visakhapatnam or Madras or Hospet or anywhere else, the raw material would be had from Orissa. It is a very serious thing. I would like the hon. Minister to reply to this. The Expert Committee that visited from Japan probably suggested the location of the steel plant only in Konai in Orissa. That was an Expert Committee. Here sits the Cabinet Subcommittee. They are supposed to be experts on everything. If they decide in favour of having a steel plant in Visakhapatnam, or a steel plant in Hospet or in favour of a steel plant in Salem—I am for these steel plants . . .

SHRI A. D. MANI: What about Bailadilla?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Particularly what I want to emphasise is that the source of the raw material is Konai which is in Orissa. I would like the hon. Minister to reply to this particular question whether the Expert Team suggested the location of the plant in Konai itself and nowhere else.

(Hon. Members stood up)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I cannot go on extending this Calling Attention Notice. You yourselves know that we should be within reasonable limits. Mr. Mulka Govinda Reddy.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): The Minister has made a very bald statement. We have accepted a planned programme and we have appointed a Planning Commission. We have gone through three Plans and the Government should have the courage to tell us that on the basis of availability of raw materials, on the basis of the needs of the society and the needs of the country, the country is programmed to have steel plants, fifth, sixth and seventh,

in the places mentioned or in the States mentioned and they should have the courage to come forward and make a statement. He is shirking his responsibility for taking a decision, may be because of some pressure or other. He should come forward and make a statement that the fifth, sixth and seventh steel plants will be located in the localities or in the States mentioned.

MISS MARY NAIDU (Andhra Pradesh): May I know from the hon. Minister of Steel, even from the economic point of view, whether it was not decided that Visakhapatnam would be the best place? That is my first question. Secondly, could you kindly listen to me? You stressed on the point of national interest. In regard to the industries that are now existing, on what national interests were they given to the different States? Andhra is very much backward industrially plus there is the fact that Andhra has so much of labour without any job. There is no other industry at all in Andhra except agricultural labour. Please excuse my saying so, when it comes to agricultural labour, agriculturists and the implementation of the national Plan, you are not prepared to take over the Nagarjuna Sagar dam. The national interest does not come into the picture at all. I would like to know why that stepmotherly treatment is being given to Andhra.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now the Minister.

SHRI T. N. SINGH: Madam, there have been a spate of statements. *(Interruption)*. A number of statements have been made and also assertions about what this and that person said. I do not want to go into any of those questions for the very simple reason that I have not come across any definite, categorical assurance from anybody as referred to in the previous statements of hon. Members.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why not?

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: The Cabinet Sub-committee has said it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now you must listen to him.

SHRI T. N. SINGH: I have the highest respect for my friend, Mr. Akbar Ali Khan. He is one of the most sober persons.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Do not flatter him.

SHRI T. N. SINGH: But I am really rather horrified to find him excited about this. I expect of him to apply the same cool judgment to which he is accustomed and which is so natural to him.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Very good of you, but you do not know how they feel about it in the South.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You have humiliated people like Mr. Akbar Ali Khan.

SHRI T. N. SINGH: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta spoke for 6 minutes and 20 seconds while putting his question and yet he is not satisfied. He can speak for another five minutes and I shall sit down.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Not at all. You better say that Visakhapatnam will get it.

(Interruptions)

SHRI T. N. SINGH: Has his speech ended?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, it has not.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Singh.

SHRI T. N. SINGH: I think it is improper. I think he must have some sense of propriety in making such statements. I strongly object to such accusations.

1290 RSD—7.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I will repeat it.

SHRI T. N. SINGH: What do you repeat?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I repeat that it is incapable of decent, democratic, honourable thinking.

SHRI T. N. SINGH: Madam, one can be discourteous but it takes a lot of good breeding and culture . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You had culture? You gave assurance to the people of Andhra and violate it and you talk about culture. You shoot 24 people there. Do not talk about culture. You are talking of breeding. What breeding have you got? I know it. In Andhra Pradesh, I have seen a five-year old child being shot in Visakhapatnam. You talk about culture and breeding.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI T. N. SINGH: No personal attacks on individuals.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am concerned with public policy. Madam, in Visakhapatnam a child of five was shot dead, and he talks about culture.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think there should be no interruptions when he speaks. Order, order.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Singh, you are a good man, but as Minister of Iron and Steel * * * *

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
माननीया, मैं समझता हूँ कि श्री भूपेश गुप्त
ने इंडियन कल्चर पढ़ा है मगर कांग्रेस कल्चर
नहीं पढ़ा है।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You please sit down.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Should these people talk about culture?

****Expunged as ordered by the
Chair.

श्री राजनारायण : प्रधान मन्त्री का यह
खत है या नहीं ?

(Interruption)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order,
order.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: A five-
year old child was silenced to death.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If the
House is not in a mood to listen, I
shall adjourn the House. You must
listen to his reply without interrup-
tion.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY:
Madam, the words uttered by Mr.
Bhupesh Gupta * * * * should be
expunged.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That
would go out.

(Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Do you
want him to answer the question you
have put? Then you must take your
seat.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I must
say whether he knows . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What-
ever Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has said
now should not be taken down.

SHRI K. K. SHAH (Maharashtra):
May I request Mr. Bhupesh Gupta
that he should not make personal
attack?

SHRI G. MURAHARI: He has not
made a personal attack. It was an
attack on Congress culture. (Inter-
ruption)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order,
order.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: (Con-
tinued speaking)

SHRI T. N. SINGH: Madam, I have
already stated that I am very dis-
tressed when emotions run high on

****Expunged as ordered by the
Chair.

such issues. I think these issues
require very calm consideration and
a thoughtful mind should be applied
to such things. Nobody should object
to that. I think we have made a
statement which is fairly well-
balanced and it represents the posi-
tion correctly. A reference has been
made to the Cabinet Sub-Committee
and about the reports which appear-
ed. Hon. Members will recall that
I made a statement in the other
House that such reports are given
out by the press in order to get a
definite statement from the Govern-
ment. They are speculations, in-
spired speculations. (Interruption).
I do not intend to be caught into
that trap. Therefore I would not
like to make any statement relating
to that report. I am referring to
the statement which said in the
press . . . (Interruption) I think the
hon. Member should allow others to
speak. I never interrupted, when he
was speaking.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I
think you should allow the Minister.
Otherwise what is the meaning of
a call attention notice? You must
listen even if it is unpalatable to
you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Am I
not entitled to know . . .

SHRI M. P. SHUKLA: They have
put the question. They do not want
to listen. In spite of the Minister
replying they do not want to listen.
For an hour they have been inter-
rupting.

SHRI T. N. SINGH: I am very
much distressed . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I would
like to know whether Brahmananda
Reddy bluffed or Mrs. Indira Gandhi
bluffed

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If
this cross talk is going on, there is
no need for the Minister to give a
reply. I am appealing to the House to
give him a completely silent hearing.

SHRI T. N. SINGH: I have stated, as I said at the very beginning, that the statement covers the whole situation very correctly and properly. It does not need any further amendment or addition to that. As for some statements which have been made in regard to this or that person having said this or that thing, I have already stated that these statements are not correct. I want to see whether any such categorical statement was at all made. In regard to the Cabinet Sub-Committee to which a reference has been made I have said already that the reports in the press are entirely incorrect. Beyond that I do not want to make any other statement. I am an experienced journalist and I know how such speculations do appear in the press, and I am not going to be caught in that sort of thing. I do not think that is the correct interpretation. The purport of the letter is entirely misconstrued.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It all depends on the purport you make.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He has not finished.

SHRI G. MURAHARI: It only amounts to this . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: One submission to you . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He has not finished. Mr. Singh, have you finished?

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE (West Bengal): What are the contents of the letter of the Prime Minister. . .

SHRI T. N. SINGH: I do not accept the purport of that letter which the hon. Member has said. I would look into it. *(Interruption)* Madam, will you permit me to sit down?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Have you got anything further to answer?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On a point of order.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think the Members of the opposition are in no mood to let the Minister continue. *(Interruption)*. Order, order. Take your seat, take your seat. No one shall stand up and no one shall interrupt until Mr. Singh has finished whatever reference he makes to letter or newspaper or any other fact that he has.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: On a point of order.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: A document has been referred to, and more than one hon. Member referred to no other authority than the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh. His letter had been received by him. He said this is not the letter. Therefore, I think it is in the interests of the House that the letter which actually has been written to Mr. Brahmananda Reddy should be laid on the Table of the House, and Mr. Brahmananda Reddy has committed a grave impropriety.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is no point of order.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: Madam, on a point of order.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What is the point of order?

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: I am seriously raising a point of order. There has been a reference to a letter written by the Prime Minister. The Minister does not deny that letter. The Minister merely says that it is not the purport of that letter. He cannot say that. He has no right to interpret a document. If he admits the existence of the document, he can only produce it, and it is for the House to interpret it . . . *(Interruption)*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No more. Otherwise, I will adjourn the House. Please take your seats. Mr. Singh, have you anything further to add? Any more information you can give on the question?

SHRI T. N. SINGH: For the time being, I shall only refer to the Cabinet Committee. I said, there was nothing like a decision as reported in

the Press. I deny that. Beyond that, I do not want to say anything.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is all right.

The House stands adjourned till
11:00 a.m. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at twenty two minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Wednesday, the 9th November, 1966.