SHRI TENNETI VISWANATHAM : This will form a precedent.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH : This is a reflection on the Speaker. I protest.

SHRI R. D. BHANDARE (Bombay Central) : On a point of order.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं उनके ऊपर असद्भाव का आरोप न करते हुए यह कहूंगा कि यदि वह अपनी भूल को स्वीकारते हैं तो उससे न केवल लोकतन्त्र की मर्यादा की रक्षा होती है बल्कि उनकी अपनी प्रतिष्ठा भी उससे बढ़ जाती है।

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH : It is a contempt of the Speaker of Haryana. This should be expunged.

MR. SPEAKER : I can very well say that we can stretch it to your reference to the press report or your reference to the Institute of Constitutional Affairs, but this last line which directly reflects...

श्री मधु लिमये : क्या रेफ्लेक्शन है ? मैं ने कहा कि असद्भाव का आरोप मैं नहीं कर रहा हूं। सुप्रीम कोर्ट के ऊपर भी आप कर सकते हैं लेकिन क्या मैं सभापति के बारे में असहमति भी प्रकट नहीं कर सकता ? मैं ने कहा कि असद्भाव और मैलिस का मैं आरोप नहीं कर रहा हूं। आप दो स्टैंडर्ड न चलाइये।

12.15 hrs.

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

THE PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF FINANCE, MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY AND MINISTER OF PLANNING (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI) : For the last five days or so we have had the debate on the President's Address. I am glad that several Members recognise that this Address marks the beginning of a new phase in our national life. It is reflected not only in the Budget but in the many steps which have been taken and it will further be reflected in other steps. We have had the customary speeches from hon. Members sitting opposite in which they have set forth views, which are expected and well-known from their side. Nevertheless we have always welcomed criticism of all kinds, especially in a debate of this nature which gives us an opportunity of putting forward our own objectives and policies.

The President has beckoned to us to look ahead, to look forward. Some of our friends opposite seem to have turned a deaf ear to this call; this has not surprised us. The debate has succeeded in performing another useful function. The events of the last few months have had the effect of bringing together on the one side people who are largely in favour of progress and on the other side those who look backward... (*Interruptions*.)

श्री रवि राय (पुरी) : क्या बिड़ला को फर्टिलाइजर फैक्टरी देना ही प्रोग्रेस है ?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : In this house we are so absorbed in immediate problems that we tend to take for granted the large intellectual and political forces at work in the world (*Interruptions*). As you have yourself remarked, Sir, neither loud noise nor abuse is a substitute for argument. I was saying that we tend to be absorbed in day to day problems and therefore tend to take for granted the larger intellectual and political forces which are at work in the world today. While we are involved in changing the economic and social structure of our country, technology is changing and transforming the entire world. Modern communication methods are having an impact on young people everywhere including our own country, even in the remoter parts of the country. Let us not forget that what we say and do today must have meaning for young people. Our decisions must stand the test of their approval during the coming years.

I must confess my disappointment at the speech of the hon. Leader of the Opposition. Many of us had hoped that the emergence of a formal Leader of the Opposition would make a difference in the level

of the debate and would strengthen parliamentary convention and civilities. I am sorry that this hope has not been fulfilled. His speech was short on vision, short on perspective, short on facts and short on temper. Frustration breathes through every word he uttered. A sense of defeat and utter helplessness which has enveloped him and his group, I am glad to say that it is not shared by the people of this country or by any of us on this side of the House. At no time have our people felt more imbued not only with the urge for change but also with a growing feeling of their capacity to bring about this change.

Sir, recet events have brought about, as I said just now, a borad division between forward-looking people and those who wish to stay put. In fact, it was the likemindedness among the no-changers that in a way led to the events which have taken place. The debate has given further proof of such likemindedness. Prof. Ranga and Dr. Ram Subhag Singh sounded much alike except for their accent (*Interruption*) I believe that a common mint supplies both of them with the currency for their ideas and their phrases.

The hon. Member, Shri S. K. Patil, sought to resurrect Mark Twain. Mark Twain has been one of my favourite authors when I was a child and, if I may say so, it was not one of his better sayings which was quoted. Mr. Patil spoke of slogans, but few people have used more slogans. He talked also of my being a prisoner. Perhaps, the hon. House has heard the story of the tiger which was put in a cage, but he took consolation in thinking that it was the whole world which was in a cage because he saw it through the bars.

Shri Patil has been a forthright and candid person. He has never hidden his true opinions, no matter how he has voted. I know that his views on nationalisation, on socialism and the privy purse are not shared by all those among whom he now sits. I hope, however, that he will vote with them as he voted with the Congress when it adopted the 10 point resolution. He spoke of privy purses with great passion. Let him convert his own followers to his point of view, before he preaches to the rest of the House and to the the Government.

The House and the country need have no feeling that anything wrong is done either in appreciating the historic role played by the princes when our country became independent or in asking them today to move with history in the same spirit which they had then displayed. I should like to acknowledge the courage and farsightedness which a large number of princes are displaying to bring about social integration even as they helped the political integration of the country.

However, I should like to remind the House that it was no accident that the loudest acclamation during the President's Address was reserved for his mention of the ending of privy purses and the privileges.

Some hon. Members talked of inter-border disputes. I think, Shri Lakkappa mentioned it. The object of setting up Commissions is to assess facts and points of view in depth so that their recommendations can lead to decisions which have a measure of ffairness. Territorial disputes have arisen between our States because of a variety of historical circumstances. The factors are not the same everywhere ; but issues do not get settled unless the action taken will generally satisfy the majority or dissatisfy the least number of the people concerned. Hon. Members will recall that several recommendations made by the States Reorganisation Commission had either to be substantially modified or to be rejected. But in all such cases, the main object was to provide the maximum satisfaction to the people concerned There was a demand also for certain basic principles to be enunciated to solve the present disputes and those that might arise in future. When this was first said, I think it was at the meeting of the National Integration Council in Srinagar, I must confess that the idea seemed attractive but on further consideration it seems somewhat naive to suggest that all human affairs can be reduced to general laws, and I think that there might be more practical wisdom in solving some of the issues, in the light of their own facts

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

and circumstances. It might be hard to evolve principles to fit all cases in a way which would satisfy everyone. Indeed, we know from experience that some solutions create more problems than they solve. I would, therefore, make a plea for us to try to isolate some of these problems rather than to generalise them.

It has been said in this House and outside that we are, or perhaps I am, planning to use the civil service for political purposes. I have denied and contradicted this on every possible occasion and I can say that my remark about committed civil servants has been twisted. I have always held the view that the duty of the civil servants is to give frank and honest advice and not to let their judgment be cramped by fear or favour. I certainly do not want civil servants who are in any way servile or politically convenient because if they were so, they would not be helpful to the Government or to the administration. However, I do think that all people who are in charge of the administration or of projects should have a commitment to the service of the people and their welfare. They should think of people as individual human beings, not merely as statistics. Therefore, when I used the word "commitment", what I meant, as I have clarified on previous occasions, is that they should be loyal to the guiding principles of our Constitution and the objectives which have been adopted by Parliament.

AN HON. MEMBER : Are they loyal ?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I think it is a good question. They are not disloyal but we are all aware that previously there was not great stress laid on attitudes, because Government did not have the great problems of development and change before it. By and large I have found these qualities of courage and conviction at all levels of the civil services.

While talking of the civil service, I am aware that since Government have to assume larger responsibilities, we must constantly aim at greater efficiency, more expertise and more speedy methods of work.

SHRI RANGA (Srikakulam) : And more honest.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Reference was made by several hon. Members to an interview which I gave some months ago to a French magazine called *Elle*. Hon. members have presumably not seen the original and they have referred to a translation. The translated version has appeared in a weekly which I do not normally see and which always has a slant of its own. Only this morning I saw the original article in French, not the whole series—I believe three series have appeared and more are to come but the portion to which reference was made here. The lady who interviewed me seems to have got mixed up about certain things. Immediately before the lines which were mentioned here, she has mentioned my great reverence to Gandhiji. The words which appear afterwards which were quoted here are not in quotation marks They are her own version of what she thought I had said She also says that I told her that Gandhiji lived in Anand Bhavan during all his visits to Delhi. Sometimes, in these interviews, people get a little mixed up. As I said, as regards the reference to village economy, she does not claim to quote my exact words. Hon. members will appreciate that with the increasing number of journals which are cropping up all over the place, it is hardly possible to chase every wrong or twisted article. If one did that, one would not have time for anything else, specially in regard to the journals brought out by some of the hon. member, sitting opposite which seem to have made it their business to deliberately twist the meaning of whatever I say. In Gandhi Centenary Year, there was hardly a meeting where I did not refer to Gandhiji and pay tribute to the inspiration and guidance which he gave to our country in its darkest hour. In this House, I have referred to him as the greatest revolutionary of our times. It is unthinkable and in fact I did not call hir .eactionary. The words "reactionary and mad cap" I put these in quotation marks are presumably Shri Piloo Mody's own contribution to truth !

Acharya Kripalani has also referred to the Padma Shri award to Shri Ritwik Ghatak. Shri Ghatak is a film maker, and most Indian and foreign film critics think

he is one of the most creative of our film makers. When an artist is honoured, it is for his art-a musician for the quality of his music, an artist for the quality of his painting. Shri Ghatak, I believe, had to go through many stresses He has publicly said, a few days ago, that he had gone through a severe mental crisis and had uttered some unfortunate words Gandhiji's greatness cannot be sullied by such words. Hence, there should be Gandhian forgiveness in such things. We all know the humour and tolerance with which he himself dealt with such matters.

Hon. members have naturally been concerned with our economic policy. I shall not deal with this matter in details today, as it will be discussed later on when the budget and the Plan are considered. However, I should like to mention a few points which, it seems to me, are based on wrong assumptions and imperfect data.

Prof. Ranga sought to develop a thesis of his own on steel. He seems to doubt that there would be any demand for the steel which we are planning to produce He is perhaps under the impression that recessionary trends for the demand in steel and other engineering projects still continue. There was a decline in demand for steel between 1964 and 1968 ; but since then there has been a steady and significant rise. It is well known that there is an acute shortage of various type of steel such as billets, sheets, plates and wire rods. We must remember that any decision on the creation of additional capacity in steel has to be taken, not with reference to today's needs, but the long-term projection of demand. It takes anything from one to seven years to plan, design and comission a steel plant and for it to attain the rated capacity. That is why we have decided on the expansion of Bokaro and Bhilai and have also initiated action for the creation of new capacities.

The House is aware how many States are demanding steel plants. Perhaps Professor Ranga would be so kind as to help us out in dissuading them. Should he agree to this, may I ask him to start with Visakhapatnam ?

AN HON. MEMBER : What about the steel plant for Mysore ?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Do you want him to dissuade Mysore also from getting a steel plant ?

From Prefessor Ranga to Shri Morarji Desai is an obvious transition these days, as they are close to each other, not only in their sitting but perhaps in their thinking also Both of them made critical references to Bokaro. The reason sounded different but there is much likeness even in their reasoning.

SHRI RANGA · It is a costly luxury which you are running after.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I wonder how Shri Morarji Desai computed the capital cost of Bokaro at Rs. 2,860 per tonne. Probably, he has not been told of the extra pig iron production of about 900,000 tonns. Taking this into account, the latest cost estimate would be about Rs. 2,500 per tonne. The main factors which pushed up the cost, as compared to plants such as Rourkela, are (1) devaluation because of which the cost went up by Rs. 75 crores even at the 1.7 million tonne stage; (2) considerable time spent between the completion of the Rourkela plant and Bokaro plant during which period there was considerable escalation of the cost of steel, cement, labour and so on; (3) the cost of domestic and international equipment has also risen continuously. Such over runs in costs in other projects, whether of the public sector or private Sector, due to similar factors are not unkwown.

The Rourkela yield of finished steel from ingots at 1.8 million tonne stage is about 72 per cent. In Bokaro this is estimated to be 81 per cent, which gives considerable advantage to Bokaro. In other words, if the investment costs are calculated per tonne of finished steel, this factor alone would lower the cost of Bokaro by about ten per cent. Calculating in terms of finished steel the cost of Rourkela would be about Rs. 2,750 per tonne of finished steel, against Bokaro's investment cost of Rs. 3,100 per tonne of finished steel.

[Shrimati Indira Ghandhi]

It should also be stressed that there has been a greater element of Indianisation,. ...indienisation.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI (New Delhi) : She is adopting the Jansangh vocabulary.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Indigenisation entails additional cost not merely in respect of steel plants but also many other projects such as power and irrigation projects.

It is understandable that Shri Morarji Desai should refer to the virtues of social control. However, his inference that the position did not significantly improve after the nationalisation of the fourteen banks is mistaken. I am deliberately not going into the matter here, because this matter will come up very soon when the Banking Bill comes up for discussion.

Hon. Members are rightly agitated over Rhodesia. The Government of India consider the decision of the break-away regime to declare itself a Republic as totally illegal. Government will continue to support all measures taken by the world community and the African States against the racist regime.

We maintain our firm belief that any constitution for this colonial territory must ensure the principle of "One man one vote" in a multi-racial society We also hold the view that world action should be concerted towards taking effective steps to lead Rhodesia to independence based on the principle of NIBMAR-no independence before majority African rule.

The basic question before us today is what type of society we want to build. It is not merely a question of how much the national or the *per capita* income will go up but how one Indian will deal with another. Will he regard all his countrymen as equal; will he believe that some people have more rights than others; if there are differences which are not unlikely in any society, how will they be resolved-by resort to violence or through discussion and understanding ?

We have inherited certain values not only from the long past but also from our training during the independence movement under Mahatma Gandhi and Jawahar, lal Nehru . (*Interruption*)

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : And Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : ...and Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose although there was a slight difference because at that time Netaji stood for violence, while we were pursuing the path of non-violence.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA (Delhi Sadar) : Do you disapprove of it ?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I am talking about the independence struggle. There we had conciously taken the other path. I do not in any way want to lessen Netaji's image, his influence on the nation or his contribution to the freedom of our country. He holds a unique position and the entire nation has respect and admiration for him.

Let me make it very clear that our picture of India and the methods which we are pledged to pursue are certainly not those of the hon. Member opposite, Shri Vajpayee, and his party. He spoke of Indianisation. In his Address, the President has said that the problems of India require uniquely Indian solutions taking into account our way of life, our history and our tradition.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : (Balrampur) : That is Indianisation.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : If, therefore, Shri Vajpayee wants every Indian to love his country and to be patriotic, nobody can quarrel with that, and I certainly do not do so; nor is any special theory of Indianisation required. But, I think, his theory is not quite so innocent. Shri Vajpayee would not waste his energy in stating something which is so obvious. He and those of his way of thinking have a very definite purpose. Evidently, they have taken upon themselves to be the judges of who is Indian and who is not.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Certainly not

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : This I think is most sinister. Whenever any group sets itself up to decide who is an Indian and who is not, there is bound to be trouble. May I ask the hon. Member as to who will judge the quantum or the quality of Indianness of any individual ?

SHRI OM PRAKASH TYAGI (Moradabad) : Indian culture.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Does he envisage that any tribunal would do it ?

SHRI S. K TAPURIAH (Pali) : How will you decide as to who is progressive and who is reactionary ?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : The two things are entirely different because not being progressive, does not deny anybody any right... (*Interruption*)

What I want to know is : Does the hon. Member envisage a tribunal to go into the matter or does he think that it is his party who should be assigned this task ? We remember vividly the havoc caused in America by some people who declared other Americans to be un-American and, in the entire world, when some Germans maintained that other Germans were un-Aryan and, therefore, un-German. These people have paraded under the banner of ultra-nationalism and have attempted and, unfortunately in some cases succeeded, in undermining the very basis of democratic society. Such assertion of ultra nationalism is a masquerade to disguise the face of reaction. And this must be unmasked. (*Interruptions*) If this course of Indianisation is so simple why should they agrue ? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI M L. SONDHI : Has the Prime Minister answered any specific part of the speech of Mr. Vajpayee ? What is the specific part she has answered we will be glad to know ..(*Interruptions*)

SHRIMATI INDRA GANDHI : I am not yielding at all.

MR. SPEAKER : Will you please sit down ? She is not yielding.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : Like that we can also say . (*Interruptions*)

We will not be cowed down like this. She must help us in understanding. I submit every responsible party in India has a right to understand the Prime Minister. I am against trading in abuses. I would be very grateful if the Prime Minister clarifies specifically where she finds what Mr. Vajpayee said must be approximately to what she says. Let us help the process of political dialogue and not impede it.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : If this task of Indianisation is so simple, why should it arouse fears in the minds of some sections of our people ? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Because you are carrying on a deliberate propaganda to mislead a minority.. (*Interruptions*) I am sorry to say that the Prime Minister does not stand for national integration. She wants division in the society. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK (South Delhi) : She does not consider herself to be above party and the country above her party. That is what is lacking. She must put India first... (*Interruptions*) Therefore, I say, she should be Indianised. (*Interruptions*)

श्री तुलसीदास जाधव (बारामती) : बारबार इस तरह से बीच में प्रधान मन्त्री जी को क्यों टोका जाता है ?

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : बिलकुल टोका जायगा । प्राइम मिनिस्टर को इस तरह से गलत बातें नहीं बोलनी चाहिए । (व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय, जब मैंने भाषण दिया था तो प्रधान मन्त्री सदन् में नहीं थीं । उन्हें रहना चाहिए था । मुझे शक है कि उन्होंने भाषण पढ़ा है या नहीं पढ़ा है । मैंने जो कुछ भाषण में कहा वह उसका उत्तर नहीं दे रही हैं मेरे विभाग में क्या है वह उसमें घुसने की

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

कोशिश कर रही हैं। यह कोई तरीका नहीं है जवाब देने का। हम जो कुछ चाहते हैं वही कहते हैं और जो कुछ हम कहते हैं वही करना भी चाहते हैं। हमारी वाणी, कर्म और वचन में कोई अन्तर नहीं है।

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : If I might quote Shakespeare, it seems the lady protesteth overmuch.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : Who is the lady ? (*Interruptions*)

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : If what I am saying is not correct, the hon. Members need not be bothered about it. Why are they so concerned.....(*Interruptions*)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : We cannot allow it to go unchallenged. If it is incorrect, it has got to be challenged here and now.

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : हम यह आशा करते हैं कि वाजपेयी जी ने जो कहा है उस का जवाब दिया जयगा। अगर जवाब आपके पास नहीं है तो कह दीजिये कि जवाब नहीं है। दरअसल आप के पास जवाब तो है ही नहीं उसका।

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I have thought over deeply about what Mr. Vajpayee said here and what his other colleagues have said. I think, it is time that all these statement should be replied to. (*Interruptions*) I would just say that the test of any statement is not how you yourself interpret it, but what impact it has on the people about whom you make that statement. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : What do you say as to what impact it has on others ? (*Interruptions*)

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : To me, every child who is born of Mother India is a good Indian. There is the law of treason and there are competent courts to decide if anyone is guilty of treason. This cannot be left to be decided by any political group or party. No oratorical devices can hide the real intentions of those who advocate the Indianisation of their fellow countrymen.

Either Shri Vajpayee's doctrine means the obvious which, as I have said, needs no reiteration, or it is hiding something. And to find that out, Shri Vajpayee's colleague, Shri Madhok, is a better guide. (*Interruptions*) He bluntly says what he means and the House is aware of his numerous utterances on this subject.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : Yes.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : In this House, Shri Vajpayee, I think, has acted only as a kind of a make-up man to Shri Madhok's ideas. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : Madam Prime Minister is a make-up woman. I am a made up man. I am not a make-up man.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : In fact Shri Vajpayee himself disclosed in his speech that he knew something about woman's hair-dressing. With his eloquence he has tried to prettify an ugly thought. Shri Vajpayee was aggrieved-he mentioned it just now that I was not present when he spoke. But I have read his speech in cold print. His true intentions...

AN HON. MEMBER : Is it too cold ?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : His true intentions come out better...(*Interruptions*) When you are speaking, you are in the heat of the moment but when it is written down, it is cold. (*Interruptions*) I think his true intentions come out better when shorn of his ringing cadences Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am not moved by some of the rhetorical questions which he has asked as to what is wrong with humanising a human being.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : She is not moved. She is cold. (*Interruptions*)

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : We should be on guard against fine phrases which hide extremist designs, whether of the extreme right or of the extreme left.

Another spurious coin was put into circulation with the help of his considerable speaking skill. I refer to the so-called swadeshi plan which is being propagated to-day by his party. This swadeshi plan is apparently...(*Interruptions*)

I have learnt that the exercise is done by an economist who has just arrived from Harvard University. I should like hon. Members to study this document in detail.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : Have you studied it ?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Then they will discover that it is a mere outline which, promises much, but tells too little about how that promise is to be fulfilled.

It promises rapid acceleration of the rate of growth to over 10% per annum with full employment; the raising of the lowest 10% of the population, significantly above the poverty line; and, please note, with the immediate termination of all foreign aid This is not all. This Santa claus also promi ses a programme of investment for a full nuclear arsenal as well. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : Here and now, will you admit that the nuclear non-proliferation treaty which is being ratified tomorrow will be expressly rejected by us in the national interest ? Various political parties have demanded it. Tomorrow is a crucial day to express yourself forthrightly on your nuclear policy.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : We have not signed it.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : I wish, you express your strong voice against it, since it discriminates against India and endangers Indian national security.

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Sondhi, please resume your seat.

SHRI M. L. SONDHI : Sir, I am telling her her own potentialities.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : When I saw this document the simile that came to my mind was that of the famous Indian rope trick about which so much is said and so little seen. I hope the hon. Member Shri Vajpayee will tell us how he proposes to force the community to save 50 per cent of the additional income generated. How will the rate of growth of agricultural output be increased to 6.5 per cent a year ? And, if foreign aid is to be discontinued immediately,-and even after allowance is made for some unused capacity in the machine-building industry,-how and in what concrete ways, will such a vastly expanded programme be sustained ? From where will the investment come ? I think that a sober and objective examination of this so-called Swadeshi Plan will probably bring disenchantment. May I invite the hon. Member to have his plan examined in a professional and technical manner for its internal consistency and for the soundness of its economic analysis ? One should examine the validity of its data and, what is even more important, its social and political implications for the kind of society we have been endeavouring to evolve in India. It seems to me that Shri Vajpayee's party has a different set of political and social premises in mind, premises which are outside our system and which he is not prepared to articulate. In this plan there is a monopolistic conception of social order and its inconsistency is apparent in a democratic social system. It is true that I have given a good deal of time to Shri Vajpayee's thoughts because I think that they merit it. I have tried to see through his words, behind his sweet phrases and his beautiful Hindi.

SHRI MANOHARAN (Madras-North) : Dangerous thoughts.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Dangerous thoughts.

AN HON. MEMBER : There is open alliance on the floor of the House.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Shri Morarjibhai has referred to my speech in Ujjain and also to what I said in the other House on the Supreme Court.

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

Sir, in Ujjain, I barely referred to the Supreme Court, except to say that the news of its judgement had come just come.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : The Press is most unloyal to you.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I have never wanted the Press or anybody else to be loyal to me. Loyalty should always be for a larger cause and if Mr. Madhok had taken the trouble to attend any one of my meetings, he would have found out what I said.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK : I have attended your meetings but you have not attended any one of my meetings.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I want to say very categorically that our reverence to the Supreme Court is total. In fact, everyone in this land should have the highest regard for the judiciary. The Constitution has clearly laid down the rôle of the Courts. And, all three parts of the Government,-the Legislature, the Executive, and the Judiciary,-are pledged to upholding the Constitution. But, Sir, the Constitution has also given us certain Directive Principles. In realising them, difficulties of interpretation might arise. This is not a new development. We have gone through this before Many of our Bills on land reform and soon have met with reverses, and this was what I had referred to in Ujjain, just in one very brief sentence.

13 hrs.

But whenever any of our Acts has been struck down, we have taken the necessary remedial action within the framework of the Constitution, for every living Constitution contains within itself the capacity to respond to changing needs and to new forces of history.

As I said at the beginning of my speech, the pace of change in the entire world and in our own country is much faster now. This is something which is beyond our control. It is the technological and scientific changes which are coming about which are bringing this about. But in the last year, it did look to our people as if the pace of change in India in some directions was slowing down. This is what had created restlessness and disturbance in the minds of many and especially of the younger generation. Now, we are again in a position to go forward. Let nothing be said which will hold back our people, which will sow doubt in their minds or deflect them from their determined path. Mistakes are sometimes made; wrong things are also being done; Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee made mention of some of them; but basically, the people are on the move. They are impatient only because they see that change can be faster; they are impatient because they see that their difficulties and their hardships can be removed. Let it be said that responsible representatives of the people acted at this difficult time with vision and courage and with faith in the people of India.

As I said, I remain deeply convinced that the democratic path is the only path for India to solve its problems. But there can be no true democracy without socialism and without secularism. There can be no true socialism without true democracy. So, let us move forward with this ideal, for only then shall we be able to reach our goal and overcome all obstacles .. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai) : Perhaps without nationalism. All of them have been avoiding that word. She has been avoiding. Shri Y B. Chavan has been avoiding it.... (*Interruptions*) What about inquiry into Netaji's death ? So many Members have raised that point ? Will she say a few words ?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I have spoken to him already on this.

SHRI BAKAR ALI MIRZA (Secunderabad) : What about Telengana ?

MR. SPEAKER : I would like to know the numbers of amendments which are being pressed, because there are about 640 of them.

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH (Buxar) : I am pressing my amendment No. 493.

SHRI RANGA : No 52.