

MR. SPEAKER: I will look into it. I am not allowing anybody now. Your writing to me is not a command. Daily I receive hundreds of letters from Members. I cannot allow all of them. I allow some.

I am not allowing any Member now. I am now going directly to the further discussion of the no-confidence motion.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI (Calcutta-South): You always allow members to make important submissions under Rule 377....

MR. SPEAKER: No, I have not allowed anybody.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI: Let me make my submission, Sir.

I am not asking you to relax the rules. You must consider the implication of such questions being raised by Members of Parliament. Members of Parliament raise very important issues. They never raise less important issues at all. Sometimes you do not allow. I have myself moved ten or twelve burning issues. Hundreds of working girls are being evicted. They are on the streets. They do not get food. They were evicted from the hostels.

MR. SPEAKER: What is this? Please sit down. Your Committee has decided that so long as a No-Confidence Motion is there no other question will come except this one. Please cooperate.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI: This is a matter to be raised in the House in all seriousness. It is about working girls. They came to my house today, ten or twelve of them; they are in the streets of Delhi; they are not getting food; they cannot enter the hostel; they are evicted from there. They are working girls.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Chirayinkil): In the midnight the police entered their rooms..

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry; I am not allowing. Shri C. M. Stephen.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: May I submit something about the Sugar Commission Report, Sir? The hon. Minister is here. Why are they suppressing this report? It is a very vital issue for the country. The Minister is sitting over here. Is it because they want to collect funds for the coming election? Mr. Maurya is here; let him say about this. Why is he not submitting the Sugar Commission report?

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down. May I inform you that the Railway Minister will intervene at 3 O'clock and the Finance Minister will intervene at 5 O'clock.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: What about the point which I have raised?

MR. SPEAKER: I told you. Don't come up like this off-hand and say like this. By writing to me it does not mean that you get the opportunity.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: The Minister is here.

MR. SPEAKER: I told you. It is difficult to carry on the House if you go on like this.

MR. Stephen, if you do not speak now I will call some other Member.

12.54 hrs.

MOTION OF NO-CONFIDENCE IN THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS—
Contd.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Muvattupuzha): Yesterday I was on the question of the railway strike. The point I wish to make today is this. We are very clear in our mind and very firm in our belief that the attempt in the context of the railway strike was not to forge a trade union struggle but was a conspiratorial attempt for a political subversion and political overthrow.

The reason is so clear that if it was a pure trade union struggle, certainly, an agreement could have been arrived at on the 30th of April when six out of the eight demands were conceded by Government.

But, instead of that, in order that the settlement might be scuttled and in order that the show-down might be precipitated, the leader of the striking committee bolted out from the scene and wired to the International Centres to say that the talks had broken down and that they were heading towards a strike. The point here is that what they wanted was not settlement but a show-down and confrontation that they were after. The reason was that looking at the political and economic scene of the country, with the prices rising and with the inflationary spiral moving up and with the discontent showing up in certain parts of the country and taking a lesson from the developments in Gujarat which, according to them gave a spell of success and, with certain rumblings in Bihar with a new found leadership under Shri Jayaprakash Narain coming forward, they thought that the time was ripe for them to strike. They chose to strike at the nerve-centre of the nation. Not that they thought—possibly they could not expect it—that the railwayment of all the railways would troop in in response to their call. They knew that the National Federation of Indian Railways were against the strike; they knew that the Indian National Congress, with its great moral authority, was moving against the strike and they also knew from the past experience that the railwaymen would not tow the line of sabotage whenever the national interests were involved; but, they drew their inspiration from the experience of the loco strike which took place in 1973 when out of 70,000 loco men they could call in only about 4,000 to strike work. Nevertheless, by their campaign of hatred and intimidation, they were able, as days went on, to get more and more people from their posts. So much so, the striking personnel gra-

dually rose in strength to about 14,000 out of 70,000 or so. If a mere 4,000 people could create a situation and could make it appear that the railways were going to pieces, naturally, they had argued among themselves and thought that with all the trade unions combined with all the political parties behind them they could create a situation in this country which would lead to a firstclass political crisis.

Shri George Fernandes went into delirium with the future prospects of the developments and he went to the extent of saying that the first industrial machinery would come to a grinding halt and that more than half the population would be faced with starvation. That was the declaration that he made.

Now, Sir, with these calculations they went on. But, unfortunately, they failed to take into their reckoning certain basic factors—the factor that the N.F.I.R. with a tremendous moral authority on the railwaymen was opposed to the strike. (*Interruptions*) They failed to appreciate the fact that the Indian National Congress was at variance with them; they underestimated the patriotic sentiments of the railwaymen and the nationalistic compulsions of the railwaymen who never faltered in their attitude where the national interests were at stake. They knew therefore that they would not be able to get the railwaymen in. Nevertheless, drawing from this inspiration they went ahead and, above all, they underestimated the moral authority that the Prime Minister of India could wield by the warning that she sounded and by the way she was able to muster up against the opposition. I found Mr. Bosu, in and out, shouting against the Prime Minister and throwing filth and fume at her.

13 hrs.

I do not know what he is going to gain by that. An Adventurist like Don

Quixote that he is in politics, I can perfectly understand his mechanics. But I do not understand why the Marxist Communist Party is putting up this ex-corporal of the British Army, this ex-covenanted officer of the foreign tea plantations and foreign firms, this sort of adventurist in Indian politics, now and then to play the role as if of a hired clown to throw out this filth at the Prime Minister. These allegations deserve no reply at all, and I do not want to reply to them.

Anyway, when the confrontation came between the Opposition parties, the entire lot of them, and about a hundred trade unions all the trade unions except the INTUC combined on one side, and the Indian National Congress and the Government under the leadership of the Prime Minister and in INTUC led NFIR on the other side, and we saw what had happened. It has been conceded that on the first day, five lakh workers went on strike out of 17 lakhs. As the days went on, in contrast to what had happened during the loco-strike, more and more workers reported for duty, so much so that by the 22nd, they found that only 2½ lakh workers had struck work.

Then, they came out with a sort of formula. They created a formula and then they rejected it. But the workers understood that they were being misled. Sand started flowing under their feet. Disowned by the workers in the railways and despised by the people of this country and confronted by the nation as a solid rock they had finally to surrender unconditionally. Now, their attempt is to stage a comeback, and they are now trying to scurry back to the stage with a new slogan and the slogan is 'Avoid victimisation'.

My hon. friend Shri Indrajit Gupta was making a point yesterday that there was some assurance and that assurance was being violated. It is for the hon. Minister to say what assurance was there. But with respect to victimisation there need be

no assurance at all, because it is never anybody's policy that there should be victimisation. Therefore 'no-victimisation' is not a matter for an assurance. What are the grounds for victimisation? They say in the first place...

MR. SPEAKER: How much more time is he likely to take?

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: About 15 minutes more.

MR. SPEAKER: He may continue his speech after lunch.

13 03 hrs.

The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch till Fourteen of the Clock.

The Lok Sabha reassembled after Lunch at three minutes past Fourteen of the Clock

[MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Stephen to continue his speech.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: To come to victimisation, victimisation has got a very definite concept in industrial law. One thing is very clear. What takes place in the due course of law can never be victimisation. Here the complaint is that there is break in service of some people and termination of service of some others. Break in service has been effectuated not by any order; it has been brought about under a specific rule of the railway establishment. The rule says that a strike may be divided into two categories—legal strike and illegal strike. In case of an illegal strike, the absence of the employee concerned is tantamount to break in service and cannot be condoned without the sanction of the President. Therefore, automatically break in service takes place. Now the only action the Railway Board can take is to condone it. Therefore, with respect to break in service, nobody in his senses can say that there is an act of victimisation. It is in the process of law that the break in service has taken place. It is for the

employees concerned to put in their application for condonation. What they must do is to permit those employees to put in their application for condonation and not stand in the way.

The second category is termination of service. It stated here that the services of about 16,000 workers had been terminated. May be correct, may not be correct. But I am told that at least 5,000—6,000 of them have put in their appeal, the appeal has been allowed and they have been put back in service. It is for the others to proceed in due course of law to put in their appeal under the rules. Let not these leaders stand in the way and add to the ruin they have already done on the persons who have been depending on them.

So much was said about casual employees, 3 lakhs of them. I am told that—only 18,000 have lost their lien. There is no question of termination because in the case of the casual employees it is loss of lien. Here also I am told that about 5,000 have been taken back on application. This is a matter which can be pursued under the rules and the law. In spite of the law, these people proceeded to strike. They knew there was a notification under the Defence of India Act, rule 118. Is there any doubt that it was an illegal strike with its legal consequences which have to follow? Once it takes place, rectification must certainly take place. Rectification can be had only if the aggrieved person comes forward. But these friends would not let them come forward. They want to come on the scene saying, "We are going to protect you". I appeal to the minister, let there be no budging on this sort of blustering tactics. The law must take its own course. The railway administration has been considerate with those who came with applications. If they take credit for it, it is their business. Maybe they want some martyrs, some terminations to be confirmed, so that some more forces may be recruited to their ranks to carry

out their nefarious campaign. So, there is no question of victimisation.

Mr. Indrajit Gupta said, some black legs are given incentives. I do not know what he means by black legs. Even if there was no undertaking by the minister that he would give incentives I would plead with him that these workers stood in defence of the interests of the country in spite of the attacks made on them. In the face of grave dangers, they stuck to their posts to keep the wheels of the trains moving. They are not black legs; they are patriots number one of this country. It is not by money alone that their service has to be acknowledged. The acknowledgment must be made in the same manner as is done in the case of jawans who fought against Pakistan. Mr. Gupta calls them black legs. May I put the mirror back to him? We took a definite stand from the beginning that the strike was anti-working class and we asked our workers not to participate in it. But Mr. Indrajit Gupta jumped on the bandwagon and joined the NCRCS. He was with Mr. George Fernandes. He was in the forefront with a plumage on his head, as if he was leading the whole thing. But after a few days, his party declared that the strike is withdrawn and the workers could decide whether to join duty or continue the strike. What a wonderful thing! You ask the workers to strike and when the strike is going on on a national plane, you give the order to the workers saying "You may decide whether to continue the strike or not". Is he not a black leg? If workers joined duty at the behest of Mr. Dange, would you call them black legs? He asked the workers to go on strike and in the middle of the stream, he jumped out of the boat and asked the workers also to get off the boat. If nobody went back to work at his behest, it means a clear admission that his federation does not have any hold over the employees. If they went back to work, it means that Mr. Indrajit Gupta and Mr. Dange are the patriots of the black legs. I heard Mr. Banerjee fretting and fuming when the notice

from Mr. Rajeshwara Rao was being issued. Mr. Banerjee who shouts and performs gimmicks here thereafter screeched like a lamb and nothing was heard of it. So, persons who are living in a glass house should not throw stones at others.

I am appealing to the minister to take a lesson from last year. You bent to the category unions at the time of the strike by the loco staff and that put courage into the people to call this national catastrophe. Please put a stop to the whole thing. This is not an area for adventurism or ad hocism because railways hold the key to the prosperity and security of the nation. Take a leaf from the past. Let principles not be surrendered whatever may happen. If the loco strike started with 4,000 striking workers and the number of strikers swelled to 14,000 towards the end and as against that in this strike starting from 6 lakhs it went down to 2 lakhs by the time it ended, the picture must be clear.

The picture is that the Railway Board in the strike today had a definite policy and a definite stand, and the Government also had a definite stand, and the patriotic citizens of this country, the patriotic workers rallied behind you. Let that be the policy hereafter. That is all what I have to say.

Before I depart from the subject I do want to pay a public compliment, on my own behalf and on behalf of the workers whom I represent, to the Railway Board, to the Railway Minister, to the railway administration and to the Government for the forthrightness, foresight, clarity of vision and the first class strategy with which they met, I do not call it a strike but a deliberate pre-planned conspiracy against the security of this nation. I do compliment the hon. Minister in this respect.

I may say in passing that of all people Shri Piloo Mody has started pleading on behalf of the workers.

Starting from Shri Piloo Mody and ending with Marxist Communist Party they all jumped into the wagon in order to protect the bonus rights of the workers. Shri Piloo Mody is asking for bonus to the workers! What a wonderful transformation! All compliments to him.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra): I always maintain that Stephen should also get a bonus.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Coming next to the Ordinance, let me be very clear. I have no apology. Let us understand the question. What do the workers want? They want two things. They must have real wage sustained and they must have increase in wages proportionate to the increase in the national income. These are the two principles which should guide the wage policy of any country.

Now, when inflation takes place and prices go up, when erosion in the wages takes place, we had been resorting to the mechanics of escalating dearness allowance in order that that erosion may be neutralised. It worked for some time, but it cannot work for all times to come. Of late one thing became apparent. In economy where inflation has set in, where inflation has started going up, in a country where wages are chasing prices, in an economy where price rise is going beyond control, whatever may be the additional dearness allowance given, the real wages would be sagging. This is the dilemma in which the Indian workers find themselves today. In a developing country like ours, the old method of the neutralisation of the increase in prices by the additional grant of dearness allowance will be no answer to the problem. Some other answer will have to be found.

Two things are clear. If production is going up, of course there is no problem then. But if the production is stagnant, if against a particular quantum of production of commodities more and more money is given, it is very clear that with respect to each

unit of the commodity the prices will go up. Overnight increase in production is not possible. Therefore, what should be done is the question. The answer is that consumption should be restricted. Reference has been made to black money. Certainly, it must be fought against. Assuming that I get Rs. 10 crores overnight, unless it be that I use it for hoarding operations essential commodities by 10 crores of rupees can have no pressure on the essential commodities, essential for the working class, because I as an individual, cannot consume more of the essential commodities than I consumed yesterday. But if 10 crores are distributed among one crore of people, I have absolutely no doubt that pressure will be felt on the essential commodities.

Therefore, the answer is two-fold. One is to increase production and the second is to restrict consumption in the meanwhile. It cannot be restricted to one section only, it has got to be all round. This problem has to be fought on a war basis and that is what is being done.

There is talk of wage freeze. I do not understand what their concept of wage freeze is. Increments are allowed, revision of wages is allowed and increased dearness allowance is allowed. All that is asked for is that you should not consume your increased dearness allowance to the extent of 50 per cent. A question can very well be asked: if the dearness allowance cannot be consumed, what is the dearness allowance for?

I have two types of workers before me—one is the cashew workers whom I am leading and another is heavy industry workers whom also I am leading. The cashew worker gets 2 np for every 5-point increase in the cost of living; the other worker gets 25 np. for every point of increase in the cost of living. Both are workers and producers, producing wealth in the country.

Now, the question is whether the lower paid worker has got to be pro-

tected or not. Why should not the lower paid worker be protected? In the Ordinance, there is clause 14 which gives power to the Government to exempt specific categories of workers. It is the job of the trade unions to identify those classes of workers, the lower paid workers, who should be protected against the operation of the Ordinance. They should tell the higher paid workers, "You shall not consume what more you are getting but rather put it back so that the lower paid workers may also sustain in the meanwhile." The persons who are fighting against the Ordinance are fighting for the higher paid workers disregarding the interest of the lower paid workers. We in the INTUC, we in the Parliamentary Wing, we individually will take up the cause of the lower paid workers and will try to get protection for them against the operation of the Ordinance.

As I said, this is a question which has got to be fought on a war basis. Bonus share must be stopped; dividend distribution must be stopped; searches must take place so that black money may be recovered and all that. From different areas, attacks are got to be mounted up. In that the working people also have to contribute their share so that with respect to essential commodities, there may not be any pressure on them and the prices may be maintained. This is a step taken in the interest of the workers. Otherwise, we should have been caught in a vicious circle and the Government is to act on a war footing. The Government is taking steps on a war footing.

A question was asked: Why an Ordinance? The Ordinance has got a psychological impact. It has got to be done in this manner if the issue is to be fought on a war basis. Therefore, with respect to that I compliment the Government. Not that they issued an Ordinance but that they are now aware of the situation and they are going all out to fight the inflationary danger that the country is facing. That is a matter on which the compliment is due to the Government.

Mr. Indrajit Gupta sarcastically said that the Prime Minister was a generalissimo. May I submit, in all humility, that I for one and, I am sure, our party Members are happy and proud of our generalissimo. That generalissimo has led us in the confrontation with Pakistan over Bangladesh; that generalissimo has led us in the fight against poverty and deprivation in this country; that generalissimo has led us in the confrontation against the conspiratorial gang which demonstrated itself in the railway strike. I am sure, that generalissimo will lead us to the future of our dreams of socialist India where equity will prevail, prosperity will prevail and poverty will be abolished. I take this opportunity to reiterate our confidence in our generalissimo, our leader, not generalissimo of the type of clumsy clown that led the Marxist Benches today but the generalissimo of the dignity determination courage and vision that we have in Smt. Indira Gandhi and we reaffirm our faith in her and our party.

With these words, I oppose this No-Confidence Motion. I reject the contentions raised by the move of the Motion. I discard the arguments put forward by him. On behalf of my party, I commend to this House to eject it outright, reiterating our faith in our party and in our leader.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: As already announced, the Railway Minister will intervene at 3 P.M. and the Finance Minister at 5 P.M.

SHRI PILOO MODY: I do not see any reason why they should have reserved time.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: In case you are interested.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Kindly allot me time also. I will intervene at 4 O'Clock.

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी (शाजापुर) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मंत्रि परिषद् में भविष्यवासी के प्रस्ताव पर सदन में चर्चा चालू है। इससे बार-बार भविष्यवासी का प्रस्ताव क्यों आता है। यदि सत्तारूढ़ दल यह चाहता है कि हम उन पर विश्वास करें तो उन्हें कुछ ऐसी बातें करके दिखानी चाहिये कि हम उन पर विश्वास कर सकें, लेकिन जब वे ऐसा करते नहीं हैं तब विरोधी दल का यह कर्तव्य हो जाना है कि वह उनको ठीक रास्ते पर लाये।

आज की जो स्थिति पैदा हुई है उसके लिये जिम्मेदार यह सरकार है। सरकार इस जिम्मेदारी से बच नहीं सकती—राजा कालस्थ कारणम्—राजा ही इस काल का कारण है। यदि यहाँ रेल की हड़ताल होती है या गुजरात और बिहार जैसी स्थिति पैदा होती है, अराजकता का वायुमंडल दिखाई देता है, भ्रष्टाचार का बोलबाला है तो इसके लिये आवश्यक हो जाता है कि हम इसकी जड़ में जायें और यदि हम इसकी जड़ में जायेंगे तो पता चलेगा कि आज की स्थिति इस लिये निर्माण हुई कि यहाँ अर्थ का अभाव है और स्वार्थ का प्रभाव है, यहाँ अनुशासन का अभाव और शासन का प्रभाव है। हमे इसकी जड़ में जाना होगा।

जैसा मेरे मित्र श्री स्टीफन ने अभी कहा—
ये अध्यादेश हम क्यों लाये ?

We want to fight it on a war-footing. I would like to remind Mr. Stephen that war is the last resort. When we have exhausted all avenues to solve the problem peacefully, then only we must resort to war.

तो आप इस बात को लेकर चले कि जब आप युद्ध स्तर पर इसका हल निकालने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं तो शान्तिपूर्ण स्तर पर कौन सा हल निकालने की आप ने कोशिश की.. उसमें आप असफल क्यों हुए ?

हस्ताक्षर कर रहे हैं कि जब जब आप बार-बार लक्ष्य बना-बना कर रहे हैं तो कम से कम हिन्दुस्तान में तो इस सरकार ने ठीक ढंग से बार लड़कर आज तक नहीं दिखाई ।

In War it is taken for granted that it is a fight to finish.

किन्तु हर बार हम हारते जाते हैं । बार जीतने के बाद भी भूमि दे देते हैं, जब हम टैंबिल पर बैठते हैं तो वहा भी हम हार जाते हैं और फिर कहते हैं कि We will fight it on a war-footing.

तो मुझे डर लगता है कि यहा भी कुछ गड़बड़ है । यदि युद्ध की वजह से हमारी जीत होती है, हम को कुछ प्राप्ति होती है, कुछ लक्ष्य पूरे होते हैं तब तो मैं मान सकता हूँ, लेकिन यहा तो कुछ होता ही नहीं । मेरा कहना यह है कि यह स्थिति एक दम से पैदा नहीं हुई है । आप थोड़ा सा आइने में देखिये—क्या आप ने अपने खुद के वायदे पूरे किये ? मैं अपने वायदों की बात नहीं कहता हूँ, आप के वायदों की बात कह रहा हूँ । आज जो लगातार कीमत बढ़ी है और पिछले दो-तीन सालों में 20 से 30 प्रतिशत बढ़ गई है—क्या हर योजना के बाद आप वह नहीं कहते थे—

We will hold the price line

इसको आगे नहीं बढ़ने देगे ?

It was your duty Why did you fail?

हर योजना के बाद प्राइस लाइन क्यों बढ़ती जाती है । देश का राष्ट्रीय उत्पादन बढ़ने के बाद उसका ठीक ढंग से वितरण हो कर सब तक चीजे क्यों नहीं पहुंचती है । डा० महालोबोनिंस की कमेटी क्यों आई थी ? यह देखने के लिये कि योजनाओं के बाद देश के अन्तर्गत जो पूजा पैदा हो रही है, उसका वितरण ठीक ढंग से हो रहा है या नहीं । उस रिपोर्ट पर क्या अमल किया ? हर योजना के बाद विषमता की खाई बढ़ती जा रही है । गरीब और गरीब होता जा रहा

है, अमीर और अमीर होता जा रहा है—यह खाई क्यों बढ़ रही है ? इस खाई को मिटाने के लिए कौन सी कोशिश हमने की ? हर योजना यदि हमारे लक्ष्य की पूर्ति नहीं करती तो क्यों नहीं करती ? बार-बार योजनाये हमने चलाई लेकिन क्या एक योजना के बारे में भी हम बर्ता संकेत हैं कि सारा सामान लक्ष्य के अनुसार चला ? यदि यह नहीं हुआ तो क्यों नहीं हुआ ? हम उस पर सोचते क्यों नहीं ? यदि प्रयत्न करने के बाद भी नहीं होता तो दोष कहा है ? यह कौन देखेगा ? मुझे याद है श्री मोरारजी कामराज योजना के अन्तर्गत जब नीचे आये तो उन्होंने मुझसे दिया था कि हर विभाग ने दस प्रतिशत खर्च की कटौती करेगे तो नये टैक्स लगाने की जरूरत नहीं पड़ेगी । अब कामराज योजना को 12 साल हो गये कितने और कौन से विभागों में यह कटौती करने की कोशिश की गई ? कितना उस पर अमल हुआ, खर्चा कितना कम हुआ और टैक्स में कितनी कटौती आई क्या किसी ने इसको देखा ? अब हमारे चव्हाण साहब वित्त मंत्री के नाते कहते हैं कि रुपये का मूल्य नीचे जा रहा है । रुपये का मूल्य घिमतो घिमतो पहले 40, फिर 38 और अब 29 पर आ गया है । आज रुपये का मूल्य 29 पैसे है । किमी को 100 में 40 मार्क मिलते हैं तो वह फेल होता है लेकिन यहा तो चव्हाण साहब को 29 ही मिन । जब पैसे का मूल्य गिरने लगे तो गेके कसे ? 40 के नीचे गिर रहा है इसलिए मैंने कहा ।

They are not holding the price-line: they are simply be holding the price-line as to how it rises sky-high.

उमको आप देख रहे हैं लेकिन इसको रोकना कौन, यह सवाल है । आपके अध्यक्ष सजीब रेड्डी साहब ने इन्दीर अग्रवेशन के पहले कहा था कि कोई भी कांग्रेसी नेता ही, कार्यकर्ता हो उसे अपनी इनकम की रिटर्न देनी चाहिए । यह आपका है, हमारा नहीं लेकिन क्या किसी ने

दिया ? क्यों नहीं दिया ? आखिर पृथ्वी कितनी बड़ गई, क्यों बड़ गई, कौन से सौँसे से आई यह भालूम हो। इस देश में इतना सारा चलता है, आप लोग कर्ता धर्ता हैं; यदि आप कोई घोषणा देना करेंगे तो उसको देखकर सारी जनता खलेगी। इसलिए जब श्री ज्योतिर्मय बसु कहते हैं तो किसी को झूठा नहीं लगता किन्तु बात यह है कि मारुति का नाम लेने से आप नाराज क्यों होते हैं ?

'Maruti' has become a symbol of corruption.

मैं चाहता हूँ सब कुछ साफ साफ हो। किसी पर कोई आरोप लगे यह अच्छा नहीं लगता है किन्तु आप यह न भूलें कि इस देश में सीमा जैसी सती पर भी आरोप लग गया। अग्नि देव में, उनका चरित्र शुद्ध है, यह पता लगने के बाद भी यदि कुछ समय के लिए पर-पुरुष के घर में बह रही है तो यहाँ इस देश का समाज आरोप लगाता है और उसका भी जवाब राम को देना पड़ता है, राजा के नाते, प्रजा अनुरजर्ना होने की वजह से उनको जवाब देना पड़ता है, कर्तव्यनिष्ठ होने की वजह से देना पड़ता है। इसलिए समाज में जब हम खड़े होते हैं तो बिल्कुल शुद्ध धवल खड़े हो। यदि कोई आरोप लगता है तो उसकी जाच हो। उसमें कुछ नहीं विगड़ता है।

सभानाम कमेटी हमने नियुक्त की, क्यों की ? उसने अपनी सिफारिशें दी कि यदि दस विधायक भी किसी के बारे में मेमोरेंडम देते हैं तो उसकी जाच हो। जाच होने में क्या बठिनाई है, यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता। बंगाल में जब कांग्रेसियों ने मांग की—दूमरो ने नहीं—तो कमीशन बैठ गया लेकिन यहाँ बशीराल जी के खिलाफ इतनी मांग होने के बाद भी कुछ होता नहीं है। क्यों नहीं होता है ? क्योंकि एक बार प्रधान मंत्री जी को उपकृत किसी ने किया तो उनको लगता है कि मूझ को मॉटिफिकेट मिल गया, मैं चाहे जी करूँ, झंझावूँ करूँ, धातक मचाऊँ। यहाँ सबाल व्यक्ति का नहीं है,

सबाल लोकसंत का है, सबाल अपनी जीवन-पद्धति का है कि आखिर इस देश में न्याय नाम की कोई चीज है या नहीं ? ऐसे आदमी रण्डे जयिगे, उनकी धावाज कोई सुनेगा नहीं, आखिर यह क्या हो रहा है ? यानी हरयाणा के शिक्षक यहाँ आये और सत्याग्रह करें, हरयाणा के हंरिजन दिल्ली में आकर सत्याग्रह करें—यह क्या है ? इतना धातक क्यों है ? आप सोचते क्यों नहीं हैं ? मैं यह नहीं मानता कि कोई गलती ही नहीं करता, जो भी गद्दी पर बैठेगा वह गलती करेगा। जैसे हर एक को बीमारी होती है लेकिन सबाल यह है कि बीमारी को कोई छिपायेगा तो वह खुद उसका शिकार नहीं बनता बल्कि औरों को बनाता है इसलिए डाक्टर के सामने स्पष्ट बता देना चाहिए और बीमारी को छिपाना नहीं चाहिए। जैसे मैं देखता हूँ कि यहाँ पर ऐसे कितने ही निवृत्त न्यायाधीश हैं जिनकी आज तक किसी कमीशन में नहीं लिया—सुब्बा राव है, हिदायतुल्ला हैं, छागला हैं—इनको क्यों नहीं लिया ? आप न्यायाधीशों के मन में यह बात क्यों बिठाते हैं कि हम सरकार की जी-बुझरी करेंगे तो बाद में हमें कुछ मिलेगा ? जो भी न्याय और कर्तव्य निष्ठा से सरकार का विरोध करेगा उसको कमीशन पर नियुक्त नहीं करेंगे। जो भी सरकार का विरोध करेगा उसको कमीशन पर नियुक्त नहीं किया जायेगा। यदि आप ऐसे व्यक्ति को नियुक्त करते तो जन-मानस खुला हो जाता किन्तु जब हम देखते हैं कि उन्हीं उन्हीं लोगों को कमीशन मिलता है तो मतलब यह होता है कि इसमें भी कुछ कमीशन जरूर होगा। तो आखिर न्याय निष्ठुरता से, कार्य दक्षता में कोई करे या न करे ? हम चाहते क्या हैं ? बुद्धिया मर गई इतना सबाल नहीं है, मृत्यु ने दरवाजा देख लिया यह ठीक नहीं है।

जब डिफेन्सन्स शुरू हुए तो उसके नित्य एक कमेटी बनी जिसके माननीय चन्हाण अध्यक्ष रहे और जब कमेटी ने सिफारिश की, 10 प्रतिशत प्रदेशों में और 11 प्रतिशत केन्द्र में, महिलाओं की संख्या रहे तो क्यों महिलाओं की

सह्या बढ़ती है ? फिर बिहार में जब अष्टाचार के विरोध में आंदोलन छाती है तो 44 की जगह मंत्री बट कर 14 रह गये। ऐसा क्यों है ? तो फिर डिफेन्स कमिटी क्यों बनायी ? खुले रूप से खरीदना, बेचना शुरू हुआ। तो ऐसा क्यों हुआ ? अभी अभी मणिपुर में क्या हुआ। यह कब तक चलेगा। एक एक स्तम्भ जिम पर लोकतंत्र मजबूत होता है उसको हम ताड़त जायेग तो भाग चल कर उसको गैर-इस्तेमान करने वाली पाटिया अधिभार न आयेंगी तो क्या करेगी यह कहना मुश्किल है यदि स्वस्थ परम्परा हो तो फिर लोकतंत्र ठीक ढग में चलता है। जब केन्द्र में ही बरीयता का कोई ध्यान न देते हुए मनमाने ढग से काम करेग तो उसका अनुसरण पंजाब ने किया। पंजाब में भी यही हुआ पंडित साहब के साथ। मेरा मवाल तरीके का है। एक बार केन्द्र ने शुरू किया तो प्रदेश भी शुरू करते हैं और ऐसे ही बीमारी फैलती जाती है। मनमाने ढग से कुछ करने की जब बात की जाती है तो लोकतंत्र ठीक ढग में नहीं चलता।

आज तक जिस को हम इकोनामिक डिमिप्लिन कहते आये इस को हम फ्लाउट करते आये हैं लगातार। आज सरकार मुद्रा प्रसार रोकने के लिये कोशिश कर रही है। मुद्रा का प्रसार किसने किया ? क्या कोई प्राइवेट प्रिंटिंग प्रेस है जो नोट छाप रहा है ? यानी 1955-56 में जो 2,000 करोड़ की मुद्रा थी वह आज 10,000 करोड़ तक पहुच गई है। कौन कर रहा है, क्यों कर रहे है ? यही पर चम्पान साहब ने खडे हो कर कहा कि महाराष्ट्र का अकाल दूर करने के लिये नोट छापेंगे। हर योजना असफल होती है। पता चला

because of the huge borrowings, dependence on foreign aid and ever-mounting taxes इस को रोकने,

कम करो। कौन करेगा। यानी प्राइवेट उद्योगपति तो लगातार बढ़ता जा रहा है, कुछ ही मुट्ठी भर एजीपतियों के हाथ में देश की पूंजी लगातार इकट्ठी हो रही है,

क्या इस बस से आप इन्कार करते हैं ? उन को अपने उद्योगों में मुनाफा होता है, 40, 50 करोड़ वाला 500 करोड़ तक पहुंच जाता है, और हम केन्द्र की तरफ से 5,000 करोड़ रुपये की लागत से लगाये गये उद्योगों में घाटा उठाते हैं। अगर इतनी पूंजी पर 10 प्रतिशत का भी मुनाफा न हो तो फिर क्यों चलाते हैं ? यह सारा बोझा देश पर आता है। तो जब तक इकोनामिक डिमिप्लिन हम फौलो नहीं करेंगे तब तक काम नहीं बनेगा। अध्यादेशों से आर्थिक स्थिति नहीं सुधरेगी। आज भी यदि सरकार को लगता है कि इकोनामिक डिमिप्लिन फौलो करे ता बड़े उद्योगों पर जोर देने का विचार है इस को छोड़ दीजिये। इडस्ट्री का पैटर्न चेज कर दीजिये। डीसेन्ट्रलाइज्ड लेवल पर गावों तक ले जाये। बिजली जा रही है और पांचवी योजना के अन्तर्गत बिजली की कमी को बजह से सुझाव आ रहा है कि रूरल इलेक्ट्रिफिकेशन स्टोप करो। गावों में पानी तो है ही नहीं लेकिन कम से कम अंधरे में पानी है कि नहीं इस को देखने के लिये तो उजाना चाहिये। उस को भी बन्द कर रहे है। हम कहते है कि गावों तक बिजली ले जाओ, इकोनामिक ढांचा बदलो। इसी के साथ साथ कृषि के साथ जो खिलवाड किया जा रहा है यह नहीं चल सकता।

परती भूमि के वितरण का काम था क्या आज तक परती भूमि के वितरण का काम हर जगह हो पाया है ? जिन को मिलना चाहिये था उन को मिला है ? नहरे निवालने के बाद जिन को पता था कि कहा कहा से निकलेगी वहा की भूमि आप ने ली नहीं है। वह मिली गरीब किसान को ? जमीन की मर्यादा ठीक ढग से लगाओ, अगर भूमि बचें तो भूमिहीनों को दो। लेकिन क्या किसी को दी ? यदि नहीं तो क्यों नहीं दी ? जोतने वाले को जमीन, इस सिद्धान्त को हमने स्वीकार किया। फिर मंत्रियों के नाम पर क्यों जमीन रखी जाती है। जैसे प्रधान मंत्री को ही में, सवाल सत्ता चार, या पांच एकड़ का नहीं

है, कच्छाटीबू का सबाल धाता है तो कहते हैं कि उदार हो कर देते हैं। लेकिन एक एकड़ जमीन किसी जोतने वाले को नहीं दी। विनोबा जी ने सम्पत्ति दान का प्रान्दोलन चलाया, लेकिन भ्राज तक किस ने सम्पत्ति का दान स्वयं नहीं किया। इन्कम टैक्स वाले जबरदस्ती ले जाये वह बात दूसरी है। भूमि सुधार का कार्यक्रम नहीं चलाया, भूमि वितरण नहीं किया, छोटे उद्योगों को पनपने नहीं दिया। छोटे उद्योगों के लिये जो आवश्यक चीजें हैं, इनफ्रास्ट्रक्चर है, वह नहीं किया। कहा जाता है कि पिछड़े हुए क्षत्रों से लोग उद्योगों को ले जाये। लेकिन कोई नहीं ले जा रहा है क्योंकि पहले वहा यातायात, पानी, बिजली और रा-मैटीरियल की बात आती है, जिस का भ्राप प्रबन्ध नहीं करते। तो कौन जायगा ऐसी जगह उद्योग लगाने? यदि भ्राप को विकास करना है तो इनफ्रा-स्ट्रक्चर तो होना चाहिये। ऐसी विपरीत आर्थिक स्थिति से जब भ्रादमी खडा होता है तो फिर मजबूरन उसको हडताल करनी पडती है। कोई प्यार से नहीं करता।

रेल कर्मचारी जब हडताल करता है तो मजबूरी से करता है एक बात पर आपत्ति मैं करता हू वह यह है कि
the way in which the strike was handled

वह हमारे कर्मचारी है, इस देश के नागरिक है। गलती उन से हो सकती है। मिश्र जी ने कहा था कि यह मेरे परिवार के लोग है, मैं इस का स्वागत करता हू, किन्तु परिवार के लोगों को कोई यह कहता है कि जो दुश्मन भी इस देश का नहीं कर पायेगा वह तुमने किया? ऐसा होता है? गलती के लिये क्या ऐसे लताटेयें कि नू गहार है। फिर जो लोग हडताल पर नहीं गये वह नाथल और जो हडताल पर गये वह डिसलायल। लोकतन्त्र से यह स्वीकार की हुई पडति है जिस को सामूहिक बारगेनिंग कहते हैं। जैसे काम करने का लोकतन्त्र में अधिकार है, वैसे ही काम न करने का भी अधिकार है। हम ने सबिधान से बेगारी को बन्द किया। तो

जो उन्होने मागें रखी थी, हमारे माननीय स्टीफन भी कहते हैं कि जहां तक मागों का सबाल है मैं भी उस को स्वीकार कर रहे हैं और स्वयं माननीय ए० पी० शर्मा जी से मैंने पूछा था तो वह कहते हैं कि मागें ठीक हैं। तो फिर हडताल को क्यों क्रिटिसाइज करते हैं? मिया भाई की सिफारिशे अप्रैल 1972 में भ्रा गई, उन को इम्पलीमेंट क्यों नहीं किया? फरनान्डीज साहब ने जो एक फंडरेशन के अध्यक्ष हैं और जिन की युनिथन रिकमनाइज है उन्होंने स्ट्रिक बॉलट लिया और नोटिस दिया और 15 अप्रैल तक भ्राप को समय दिया। लेकिन भ्राप ने कुछ नहीं किया। और जब एकबुली स्ट्रिक का निणय 15 अप्रैल को लिया तब बार्ना शुब की और बारियर साहब को भेजा बारियर कहते हैं कि वह तो पोस्टमैन की तरह थे पोस्टमैन को क्यों भेजा, पोस्ट मास्टर जनरल को क्यों नहीं भेजा? फिर कुरैशी साहब भ्रा गये लेकिन दुर्भाग्य से उन के पिता का देहान्त हो गया जिस बजह से वार्ता लम्बी चली, और फिर 27 स ठीक ढग से वार्ता करके भ्राप को ठीक ठीक बताया था। किन्तु उधर कहते हैं कि 2 मई की वार्ता होने वाली है और फिर यह कहना कि प्लेन के भ्राने में देरी होगी इस लिए रेलवे बोर्ड कार भेजे और सीधे फरनान्डीज साहब को वार्ता की टेबल पर ने भ्राये। लेकिन ऐसा न करके उन को पकडा और जेल में बन्द कर दिया। यह कौन सा तरीका है? जो भ्राप करे खुली रीति में कीजिए कि भ्राप की 6 माग में से दो हम को मजूर है, शेष नहीं। जब भ्राप ने स्वग 8 33 प्रतिशत की बात मानी, खाडिलकर फोरमूला के नाम में, तो अब खाडिलकर जी को गवर्नर बनाकर भेजने से तो वह फारमूला समाप्त नहीं हो जाएगा, वह तो रहेगा, तो जब भ्राप प्राइवेट एजेंसी से कहते हैं कि 8 33 प्रतिशत बोनस दे, तो फिर हर एक माग करेगा और भ्राप को तो माडल ऐम्प्लायर होना चाहिए। सारे कहते हैं कि रेलवे कर्मचारी हडताल पर नहीं थे, सक्नेसफुल नहीं थी हडताल। यदि यह बात भी तो हडताल 8 मई से होने वाली थी

उससे पहले 1 मई से ही आप ने 200 गाड़ियां क्यों बन्द कर दीं। यानी हड़ताल खुद जनता पर थोपे जाँधी। श्रीर रेडियो कितना गलत प्रचार करता है, जरा देखें। एक वकील साहब ने मुझे बम्बई में बताया कि मैंने रेडियो पर सुना कि फरनान्डीज 2 तारीख को घाने वाले थे, लेकिन वह नहीं आये।

He absented himself from the meeting.

इस लिए टाक्स नहीं हो पायी। एक वकील पढ़ा लिखा है वह किस पर विश्वास करता है? रेडियो पर ही तो करता है। रेडियो झूठ बोलता है। फरनान्डीस साहब को दो तारीख को सुबह पकड़ा जाता है। लेकिन आठ बजे सुबह रेडियो इस के बारे में कुछ नहीं बताता है अखबारों में यह चीज आती नहीं है। पार्लियामेंट में क्वेश्चन प्रावर होने नहीं दिया। आप अपने व्यवहार को मु धारे। सुधारने का समय गुजर नहीं गया है। अभी भी आप सुधार सकते हैं अपने व्यवहार को। विक्टिमाइजेशन के कारण आज भी हजारों लोग बाहर हैं, स्थायी और अस्थायी दोनों। लगभग तीन सौ जेल में हैं। इस तरह से विक्टिमाइजेशन करके क्या आप समझते हैं कि वायुमंडल ठीक रह सकता है? आप कहते हैं कि गाड़िया चलती हैं। मुझे काशी से पत्र आया है कल। मुझे उसमें बताया गया है कि वाराणसी दादर एक्सप्रेस हडताल के पहले भी बन्द थी और अब भी बन्द है। इस कारण से वाराणसी का सूती वस्त्र उद्योग जरी उद्योग ठप्प पड़ा है। इसका यातायात पर प्रतिकूल प्रभाव पड़ा है। काशी में जो यात्री आते वे आ नहीं सकते हैं। कहते हैं गाड़िया बन्द नहीं है।

For all practical purposes it is printed in the time-table that the train is running, but running where God alone knows.

ऐसी स्थिति में आपने कहा कि देश भर में वातावरण पीसफुल है तो वह कहाँ है? मुझे नहीं लगता है कि पीसफुल वातावरण है। आप ठीक ढग से, व्यवस्थित ढग से, जनता के हित में रेलों को चलाएँ और अपने

कर्मचारियों के साथ दुस्मनों का व्यवहार न करें। जिन लोगों के खिलाफ आपने डिसेमिनल के नोटिस दिए हैं, कुछ लोगों को आपने विक्टिमाइजेशन के रूप में हस्तक्षेप स्थापनों में ट्रांसफर कर दिया है, उन नोटिसिस को आप वापिस लें। उन बेचारों का गुनाह इतना सा ही तो था, अपराध इतना सा ही तो था कि वे इस्ट्राइक में शामिल हुए। इस्ट्राइक करना उनका अधिकार था, इसके बारे में बैकफ़ लिया गया था, इस्ट्राइक का नोटिस आप को दिया हुआ था, और तब स्ट्राइक उन्होंने की। ऐसी स्थिति में आपने रेल कर्मचारियों के साथ जो दुर्व्यवहार किया उसको देखकर क्या रेल कर्मचारियों का आप पर विश्वास होगा? नहीं होगा। इस स्ट्राइक का राजनैतिक लाभ उठाया जाए, इस दृष्टि से इस स्ट्राइक का हमने कभी समर्थन नहीं किया। उनकी मांगें उचित मांगें थी। क्या थी उनकी मांगें। अगर उन्होंने कहा कि उनको इस्ट्रीयल वर्कर माना जाए तो इस में कौन सी गलत बात थी। उन्होंने अगर कहा कि हमारे काम का पुनर्वर्गीकरण हो, ठीक ढग से हो, वैज्ञानिक तरीके से हमारे काम का मूल्यांकन हो, और पब्लिक अडरटेकिंग में जो न्यूनतम वेतन मिलता है वह हमारे यहाँ भी क्लास फोर एम्पलाइज को मिले तो कौन सी अनुचित बात थी इस में राजनैतिक कुछ नहीं थी।

मैं मम झता हूँ कि कि अब भी समय गुजर नहीं गया है। मंत्री महोदय में मैं विनम्र प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ कि उन लोगों के साथ शत्रु या दुश्मन जैसा व्यवहार वे न करें। स्ट्राइक पर गये वे भी इतने ही निष्ठावान हैं जितने वे लोग हैं, जो स्ट्राइक के समय काम पर आये। चूँकि वे काम पर नहीं गए इसलिए उनकी निष्ठा भंग नहीं हो गई है। वे अब भी निष्ठावान हैं। इसी दृष्टि से आप को उनके केसिस पर विचार करना चाहिए।

साथ साथ भाप आर्थिक अनुशासन भाप जाएं। वइ अध्यादेश जारी करके ही नहीं हो जायगा। भाप गम्भीरता से इस पर विचार करें और आर्थिक अनुशासन लाने की कोशिश करें ताकि भागे चल कर देश का भला हो। चूंकि मुझे विश्वास है कि भाप ऐसा करेगे नहीं, इस लिए मैं इस अविश्वास के प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करता हूँ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have been requested by the Whip of the Congress Party, to allow each speaker from the Congress Party 15 minutes. I hope they will keep that in mind. I shall co-operate by ringing the bell....

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA (Serampore): How many speakers are there from the Congress Party?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Why does he not allow me even to finish my sentence? I shall co-operate by ringing. (*Interruptions*). When men are troubled, certainly it is trouble enough, and when women are, I do not know what to say. I shall co-operate by ringing the bell at the right time.

श्री चन्द्रजीत दास (आजमगढ़) : आज जब हम अविश्वास के प्रस्ताव पर बहस कर रहे हैं तो हमें इस बात का पूरा एहसास है कि देश एक गम्भीर आर्थिक और राजनीतिक स्थिति में से हो कर गुजर रहा है। देश में जो अभाव की स्थिति है उसकी चर्चा यहां की गई है, जनता की परेशानियों की चर्चा की गई है। कोई भी इस देश का व्यक्ति इन बातों से असहमत नहीं हो सकता है कि देश में गम्भीर अभाव की स्थिति है, महंगाई बढ़ी हुई है, मुद्रा-स्फीति है। लेकिन मैं यह बात विश्वास के साथ कह सकता हूँ और देश भी इस बात को जानता है कि अगर आज इन सब चीजों का सब से ज्यादा अहसास किसी को है, देश के सामने उपस्थित चुनौतियों का एहसास किसी को है तो हमारी

प्रधान मंत्री श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी को है और वह इसके उपाय भी कर रही है।

मुझे अप्पत्तों के साथ कहना पड़ रहा है कि हमारे विरोधी दलों ने अविश्वास प्रस्ताव रखने का एक फैसला सा बना लिया है। किन बातों की चर्चा यहां की गई है? रेल हड़ताल की चर्चा की गई है। इस पर सदन बहुत विस्तार से चर्चा कर चुका है। अध्यादेश जो जारी किए गए हैं, उनकी चर्चा की गई है। वे अध्यादेश सदन के सामने आएं, उनकी पुष्टि सदन को करनी होगी और तब सदन उन पर विस्तार से चर्चा कर सकता था। इस वास्ते कोई जरूरत नहीं थी कि इस चर्चा को हम अविश्वास के प्रस्ताव के जगह करते। लेकिन हमारे विरोधी दलों के मित्रों ने इस बात को चुना कि अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव वे लाएं। यह उनका संसदीय अधिकार है। लेकिन अगर इस की गुफता को, इसकी महत्ता को कम करना चाहते हैं तो यह भी उनका अधिकार है। इस संसदीय हथियार का वे कब और कंस इस्तेमाल करने हैं, इसके बारे में मुझे कुछ नहीं कहना है और मुझे इस पर कोई एतराज भी नहीं है और यही कारण है कि सदन में इस पर हम चर्चा कर रहे हैं।

हम जानते हैं कि आज अगर देश की जनता और सरकार जो गम्भीर आर्थिक सकट एक राष्ट्रीय चुनौती के रूप में हमारे सामने खड़े हैं उनको उस दृष्टि से नहीं देखेगी और उनका मुकाबला भी उमी तरीके से नहीं करेगी तो हमारे देश को बहुत बड़े सकट का सामना करना पडगा। आज मुद्रा स्फीति बहुत बड़े पमाने पर है। महंगाई बढ़ी हुई है। चीजों का अभाव है। जोशी जी ने बिजली और पानी तथा दूसरी चीजों की कमी की चर्चा की है। कोई इन्कार नहीं करता कि हमारे विकसित देश में लोगों की मांग बढ़ रही है, जरूरतें बढ़ रही हैं। साधन उत्तने

नहीं है जितने होने चाहिए। यही सब से बड़ा भ्राज सवाल है। हम कहते हैं कि अगर इस सकट का मुकाबला करना है तो सारे राष्ट्र को तथा सभी वर्गों को इसे एक चुनौती के रूप में स्वीकार करना पड़ेगा, मिल कर और एकता बनाए रख कर चलना पड़ेगा और जिस रास्ते पर चल कर इसका हल निकल सकता है उस रास्ते पर चलना पड़ेगा। पिछले कई महीनों से इस बात की मांग की जा रही थी कि सरकार कुछ कठिन निर्णय करे मुस्तैद, में कदम उठाए। यह कहा जाता था कि सरकार ढीली है, कोई कदम नहीं उठा रही है, जो जरूरी बातें हैं नहीं की जा रही हैं। लेकिन मैं एक बात कहता हूँ। आप प्रधान मंत्री का माने न माने, यह आपकी इच्छा पर निर्भर करता है। लेकिन आप उपहास तो न करें। यह मैंने देखा है। श्री ज्योतिर्मय बसु जो एक सदन के मेंबर हैं, उन से मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि सदन की कोई गरिमा होती है और ससदीय व्यवस्था में इसका अपना महत्व होता है। उसके अनुकूल ही हम को आचरण करना चाहिए। सदन के अन्दर आप और हम में मतभेद हो सकते हैं, रास्ते आपके और हमारे अलग-अलग हो सकते हैं, सोचने के तरीके अलग हो सकते हैं, श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी या श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी से हो सकता है कि हम कई बातों में सहमत न हो लेकिन इसका अर्थ यह नहीं है कि उनके व्यक्तित्व पर हमला करना हम शुरू कर दें। कल श्री ज्योतिर्मय बसु ने अमर्गल, बेबुनियाद और गर जिम्मेदार के आरोप लगाये हैं। मैं जानता हूँ कि यह मदन ही नहीं मारा राष्ट्र इनसे इन्कार करेगा और इसको मानेगा नहीं। वैसे श्री ज्योतिर्मय बसु में मैं बहुत ऊँचे स्तर की आशा भी नहीं करता। लेकिन कम से कम इतनी आशा तो करता था कि इस सदन में प्रधान मंत्री के बारे में, सदन के नेता के बारे में अगर वह कोई बात कहे तो उसका कुछ तो आधार होना चाहिए। वह कुछ मन्त्रियों को भी चुन लेते हैं और अमर्गल प्रचार उनके खिलाफ करते हैं, बिना तथ्यों के करते हैं, जो मन में आता है

कह देते हैं। मैं सदन में भ्राज यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि भारत की जनता और सब कुछ बरबोस्त कर सकती है,—पिछले 27 बरस में इस देश पर बड़े सकट आए हैं, इस देश की जनता कम पड़ी लिखी हो सकती है, कम लोग हो सकते हैं, जिन्होंने कालेजों और यूनिवर्सिटियों में शिक्षा प्राप्त की है, लेकिन वह अपने हक को पहचानती है, राष्ट्र हित को जानती है और उसके अनुरूप काम भी करती है। देश की जनता ने पिछले 27 बरस में अगर सब से बड़ा कोई काम किया है तो यह किया है जिसको सारी दुनिया भ्राज भी मानती है कि उसके इस देश में शान्ति और व्यवस्था को कायम रखा है, जनतंत्र को सुरक्षित रखा है, उसकी जड़ों को मजबूत किया है। चाहे जितनी अमर्गल बातें, बेबुनियाद बातें और जिम्मेदारी की बात यहाँ कही जाय वह उन पर विश्वास नहीं कर सकती है। मैं नम्रतापूर्वक एक निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हम सब इस सदन में एक दूसरे के साथ बैठते हैं, मिलकर काम करते हैं। हमको सदन की मर्यादा को भी बनाए रखना चाहिए, शान्ति व्यवस्था को बनाए रखना चाहिए। ऐसी बातें नहीं कहनी चाहिए जो तर्कहीन हों, जो तथ्यों से परे हैं। भ्राज देश में प्रचार हो रहा है, ऐसी ताकतें काम कर रही हैं, जो सकट से फायदा उठाना चाहती हैं, देश के अन्दर चरित्रहूनन का समूहित प्रचार किया जा रहा है, देश की फासिस्ट और अर्द्ध फासिस्ट ताकतें इन देश की जनता को गुमराह करने की कोशिश कर रही हैं, हमने भी आप आखें न मूदे। श्री ज्योतिर्मय बसु अपने को बड़ा समाजवादी नेता कहते हैं, एक दल का नेता अपने आपको वह समझते हैं, उनसे मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस देश की प्रतिक्रियावादी ताकतों से साम्प्रदायिक ताकतों से अपने को अलग रखे, ऐसी ताकतों से अपने को अलग रखें जो विकास और प्रगति को नहीं देखना चाहती और तरह तरह के षडयंत्र मुक्त में रच रही हैं, साजिशें किये बैठी हैं।

माननीय सदस्य मेहरबानी करके उस साजिश के शिकार न बनें और चरित्रहूनन के आँध में

में न फड़े। वे अपने विचारों को तथ्यों के साथ रखें। मुझे आशा है कि माननीय सदस्य इस बात को ध्यान में रखेंगे।

इस चर्चा में रेलवे कर्मचारियों की बात कही गई है। मैं उन लोगों में से नहीं हूँ, जो कहते हैं कि हमारे रेलवे कर्मचारी गद्दार हैं। यह बिल्कुल गलत बात है, नामाकूल बात है। (अध्वघान) मैंने, या श्री मिश्र, ने यह कभी नहीं कहा है कि रेलवे कर्मचारी गद्दार हैं। हमारे रेलवे कर्मचारियों को हड़ताल करने का अधिकार है, और उन्होंने हड़ताल की। लेकिन हम समझते थे कि उनकी हड़ताल असामयिक थी, दुर्भाग्यपूर्ण थी। जब देश एक गहरे संकट में से गुजर रहा था, उस समय वह हड़ताल नहीं करनी चाहिए थी। उससे हमारी आर्थिक स्थिति बिगड़ती और आवश्यक वस्तुओं के अभाव में वृद्धि होती। इसलिये हमने उस हड़ताल का विरोध किया।

उस समय हमारे रेलवे कर्मचारियों और देश के श्रमिक वर्ग से बार बार यह कहा गया कि पिछले सताइस वर्षों में उनको विभिन्न सुविधाएं दी गई हैं। और उनके हित में कानून बनाए गये हैं। रेलवे कर्मचारियों की संख्या 17, 20 या 25 लाख हो सकती है। लेकिन इस देश में 56 करोड़ जनता रहती है। इस देशके गांवों में रहने वाले करोड़ों लोगों के पास कोई साधन नहीं है। हमारे लाखों नौजवान बेकार हैं, रेलवे कर्मचारियों की कुछ बातें हमने स्वीकार कर लीं, लेकिन कुछ बातें ऐसी थी, जो नहीं हो सकती थी, जो हम नहीं कर सकते थे। बोनस की मांग ऐसी थी, जो स्वीकार नहीं की जा सकती थी। उसको स्वीकार करने के गंभीर परिणाम होते। उससे देश की अर्थ-व्यवस्था बिगड़ती। इस स्थिति में जिम्मेदारी के नाते हमें कुछ कदम उठाने पड़े।

रेल मंत्री से मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जिन कर्मचारियों ने हड़ताल में भाग लिया, वह उनके मामलों की सावधानी के

साथ जांच कराये। जो कर्मचारी निर्दोष हों, जो स्थिति को समझ नहीं पाये। और हड़ताल में शामिल हो गये, कहीं ऐसा न हो कि वे भी सरकार की अनुसंधानात्मक कार्यवाही के शिकार हो जायें। जिन कर्मचारियों पर तोड़-फोड़ आदि के गंभीर आरोप हैं, उनकी अलग से जांच की जाये। लेकिन कहीं रेलवे अधिकारी निर्दोष कर्मचारियों की भी उस श्रेणी में न डाल दें। इस लिए रेल मंत्री पूरी हमदर्दी के साथ रेलवे कर्मचारियों के केसिज की जांच करायें। यह विषय ऐसा नहीं है, जिस पर कोई विवाद हो।

हम समझते हैं कि हमारे देश के रेलवे कर्मचारियों के विशाल बहुमत ने हड़ताल के निर्णय को गलत समझा और उस हड़ताल को असामयिक समझा। उन्होंने महसूस किया कि देश की परिस्थिति का तकाजा वह नहीं था। इसलिए कर्मचारियों का बहुमत उस हड़ताल में शामिल नहीं हुआ और उसने सरकार को सहयोग दिया। क्या उनके प्रति हमारी इज्जत न बढ़ती ?

जहां तक इन अध्यादेशों का सम्बंध है मैंने शुरू में कहा है कि अगर हम ने अपने देश को बनाना है तो उसके लिए हमें कठोर निर्णय लेने पड़ेंगे। वे निर्णय लिये गये। इस देश में साधन इकट्ठी करने के लिए, कल का हिन्दुस्तान बनाने के लिए, वे निर्णय लिये गये। प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा है कि ये निर्णय केवल इन दो, तीन अध्यादेशों तक सीमित नहीं हैं। इन अध्यादेशों को आइसोलेट करके नहीं देखना चाहिए। यह निर्णय लिया गया है कि जिन बगों ने पिछले सताइस वर्षों में अपनी आमदनी बढ़ाई है उन पर टैक्स लगाया जाय। जिन लोगों ने अपनी आमदनी बढ़ाई है, और जो टैक्स इवेजन कर रहे हैं, उनके खिलाफ कार्यवाही करने का निर्णय किया गया है। पिछले चार सालों में ऐसे तीस हजार व्यक्ति पकड़े गये, और उनके खिलाफ कार्यवाही की गई, जिन्होंने टैक्स की चोरी की। उन पर करीब बीस करोड़ रुपया जुर्माना किया गया। ऐसे दो

हजार श्रावणियों के खिलाफ कार्यवाही की गई है, जिन्होंने अपनी सही श्रावणी नहीं दिखाई थी। मैं समझता हूँ कि आज जखीराबाजी, तस्करी और टैक्सेशन इनकम को छिपाना देश के प्रति गंभीर अपराध है। मुझ खुशी है कि सरकार ने यह निर्णय किया है जखीराबाजी, चोर-बाजारी, मिलावट और टैक्स इवोजन करने वालों के खिलाफ सख्त से सख्त कार्यवाही की जाये, और मैं समझता हूँ कि सरकार को करनी चाहिए। सरकार उसके लिए तैयार है, और वह कार्यवाही की जायेगी।

एक माननीय सदस्य : नहीं होती है।

श्री चन्द्रशेखर बाबब . बहुत सा काम नहीं हुआ है। लेकिन अगर कुछ करने का इरादा किया जाता है, अगर कुछ कदम उठाए जा रहे हैं, तो माननीय सदस्य उन कदमों का तो बागत क।

आज हमारे सामने सबसे बड़ा प्रश्न है हमारे पास साधनों का अभाव। श्री जोशी ने कहा है कि बिजली की कमी है। मैं मानता हूँ कि बिजली की कमी है। अगर बिजली नहीं होगी, तो खेतों की पैदावार नहीं बढ़ेगी, कारखाने नहीं चलेंगे। हमने अपनी पार्टी में यह निर्णय किया है—और हमें खुशी है कि सरकार ने उस निर्णय को माना है कि चूंकि हमारा देश मुख्य रूप से एक कृषि प्रधान देश है, खाद्य पदार्थ हमारी पूरी अर्थ-व्यवस्था में सबसे महत्वपूर्ण स्थान रखते हैं और अगर यहाँ खाने की चीजों का अभाव होगा, तो हमारी अर्थ-व्यवस्था टूट जायेगी, इसलिए कृषि उत्पादन बढ़ाने के लिए प्रधान मंत्री की अध्यक्षता में वरिष्ठ मंत्रियों और विशेषज्ञों की एक समिति बनाई जाये। हमें खुशी है कि प्रधान मंत्री ने इस जिम्मेदारी को अपने ऊपर लिया है। उन्होंने तीन सूबों का दौरा किया, बहा मीटिंग्स की और कहा कि टारगेट फिक्स किये जाये और उत्पादन बढ़ाया जाये।

माननीय सदस्य कम से कम इस का स्वागत करते। इतना बड़ा कदम उठाया गया है।

लेकिन जो भी कदम उठाया जाये, उस के प्रति उपहास का वातावरण बनाने से प्रजातंत्र मजबूत नहीं होगा। ऐसा कर के प्रजातंत्र को कमजोर किया जा रहा है।

हम समझते हैं कि अगर देश को इस मौजूदा संकट का मुकाबला करना है, तो उत्पादन बढ़ाने के लिए सारे साधन इकट्ठे करने पड़ेंगे, तेजी और मुस्ती से कदम उठाए पड़ेंगे। हम यह भी समझते हैं कि उत्पादन करना ही काफ़ी नहीं है, अगर देश की अभावग्रस्त जनता को उत्पादन का हिस्सा न मिल सके। इस लिए देश में वितरण व्यवस्था को मजबूत करना है। हमने प्राधान्य दिया है कि वितरण व्यवस्था को मजबूत करने के लिए देश की जनता हमारा साथ दे। सरकार और जनता दोनों मिल कर उस को मजबूत करे। मैं स्वागत करूँगा अगर विरोधी दल के लोग वितरण व्यवस्था को मजबूत करने के लिए और जनता का सहयोग प्राप्त करने के लिए सरकार को सुझाव दे।

मैं विरोधी दलों के लोगों से नम्रतापूर्वक कहूँगा कि आज देश के मामले जो संकट है, उस को हमें किसी पार्टी का मवाल नहीं बनाना चाहिए। इस संकट का मुकाबला करना एक पार्टी के बस की बात नहीं है। संकट के समय देश की जनता सरकार के साथ मिल कर काम करती है, और उस ने किया है। हमने देखा है कि जब भी इस देश पर बाहरी संकट आये है, तो देश की जनता ने मिल कर काम किया है। देश का निर्माण कैसे होगा ? देश कैसे बनेगा ? देश में अन्धकनी निर्माण के लिए भी यह आवश्यक है कि हम सब, कम से कम ऐसे लोग, जिन के विचार और दृष्टिकोण मिलते हैं, उस नीतियों को कार्यान्वित करे, जिन में वे विश्वास रखते हैं। आपस में मतभेद हो सकते हैं, लेकिन उन को हम बैठ कर विचार विमर्श के द्वारा हल कर सकते हैं।

हम एक ऐसी वैदेशिक नीति पर चल रहे हैं, जिस के धनुष्धार हम ने दुनिया के बड़े के बड़े मसलों को दूसरे देशों के साथ बातचीत के द्वारा हल करने की कोशिश की है। क्या वह पद्धति और वह तरीका हम अपने देश में नहीं अपना सकते हैं कि हम बैठ कर बातचीत से अपनी समस्याओं के बारे में कोई रास्ता निकालें? लेकिन वह तरीका छोड़ना पड़ेगा, जिस में केवल विधायकों की बातें हों, केवल मूककारणों को देखने की कोशिश की जाये और रोमान पक्ष पर पर्दा डालने की कोशिश की जाये। पोलिटिकल स्टेट करने के जमाने चले गये। श्री ज्योतिर्भय बसु का कल का साधु भाषण एक पोलिटिकल स्टेट था, एक रैजिस्ट्रार की बात थी, एक स्लीडरस प्रैक्टिस था, जिस को देश की जनता बर्दाश्त नहीं कर सकती है।

हमारे इन मित्रों के डबल स्टैंडर्ड है। अगर वे चुन कर पार्लियामेंट में आ गये, तो उन का चुनाव निष्पक्ष था। लेकिन अगर बंगाल की जनता ने उन के कारणों के कारण चुनाव में उन का सफाया कर दिया, तो वे चुनाव निष्पक्ष नहीं थे।

पिछले दो सालों में इन के सदस्यों ने शपथ तक नहीं ली। यह क्या है? इन का दो स्टैंडर्ड है। अगर आप चुन कर चले आए तो आप का चुनाव निष्पक्ष हुआ और बड़ा विधान सभा में हार गए तो चुनाव निष्पक्ष नहीं हुआ? तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस तरह की एक माजिस्ट, एक कोशिश हो रहा है, एक राजनैतिक कांसपिरेसी इस देश में चल रही है। 1969 के बाद और खास कर के 1971 के बाद इस देश में प्रयास हुआ रीएक्शनरी फोर्स का एक ग्रेड एलायंस के रूप में जो नाकामयाब हुआ। आज उसी तरह से रीएक्शनरी फोर्स की ताकतों रीएक्शन की ताकतें शक्त खंडल कर के अपने प्रगतिशील नारे देकर के, जनता के हित की बातें कह कर के जनता को धुंधला कर के सामने खाना चाहती हैं। लेकिन

इन का मकसद क्या है? जो गुजरात के अंदर हुआ विधान सभा नहीं चलने दी गई, विधान सभा भंग हुई, वहां के सदस्यों के साथ किस तरह का व्यवहार हुआ और आज फिर विधायकों का आह्वान किया जा रहा है कि वे कालेज छोड़ दें, यह पूरी एक साधिका चल रही है। देश के अन्दर कुछ ऐसे लोग हैं जो अपने को गांधीवादी कहते हैं, जिन्होंने कहा था कि हमें राजनीति से कोई मतलब नहीं है, लेकिन सकट के जमाने में राजनीति करने की लालसा उन के मन में पैदा हो गई और वे जानी बूझी इस देश की प्रतिक्रियावादी और निहित स्वार्थी वाली ताकतों के साथ हाथ मिला रहे हैं। ऐसी ताकतें इस देश के अंदर और बाहर की जो हिन्दुस्तान को आगे बढ़ा हुआ नहीं देखना चाहती हैं, जो एक मजबूत हिन्दुस्तान को नहीं देखना चाहती हैं, जो एक खूबहाल हिन्दुस्तान को नहीं देखना चाहती हैं, जो ऐसे हिन्दुस्तान को नहीं देखना चाहती हैं जिस का गौरव बढ रहा हो, आज ये ताकतें एक साजिस रच रही हैं। मुझे इस बात का पूरा यकीन है कि हमारे देश की करोड़ों जनता जिसन इस देश की आजादी अर्जित की थी, दुनिया का बेहतरीन त्याग किया था, जिस ने 27 साल के सर्वाधिक सकट के जमाने में भी इस देश में कुछ आदसों, कुछ कदर और कीमतों को सुरक्षित बना कर के रखा है वह इस प्रकार की अनर्गल, गंर-जिम्मेदार और बेबुनियाद बातों पर नहीं जायगी और यह सबन इस अविश्वास के प्रस्ताव को तो अस्वीकार करेगा ही। लेकिन देश की जनता विरोधी दलों के प्रति अविश्वास प्रकट करेगी।

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (SHRI L N MISHRA) Mr Deputy-Speaker, Sir, first of all, I owe a word of apology to the House As you know, the question of railway strike was discussed during the last session both in this House and in the other House I was looking into the debate this morning and I could calculate that

the Lok Sabha discussed it for 17½ hours and the Rajya Sabha discussed it for 6½ hours, that is, for 24 hours the Parliament discussed the same subject. Naturally, I cannot escape repetition and it is just possible that I might have to repeat the some of the old points that have been mentioned in the House.

There is a fundamental difference in thinking and in approach between the Opposition and ourselves. They call it a labour strike. I do not call it a labour strike. It was not a trade union dispute. I say, it was a political adventure planned by political adventurers who wanted to cripple the economy of this country and to paralyse this Government. According to their calculations, they thought that the industries would get closed, that there would be no movement of food-grains, that there would be no movement of coal and that there would be closure of power houses. All these things were behind their move. Therefore, we should not treat this problem as a trade union problem.

Earlier, we thought that it was a trade union problem. We set up a Committee. I myself joined the Committee's deliberations. Out of eight demands, six demands were conceded. In the past, I had something to do with the trade union working and industrial relations. Any union which wins six points out of eight points will be happy enough and it would be a great victory for them. But this was not acceptable to them. Mr. George Fernandes thought that he must win all the eight points. Only two points were left. As Mr. Chandrajit Yadav said, one was the question of bonus and the other was the question of parity of wages with the public sector. These two points were obviously, with the present economic crisis, impossible to be met. It is not that we said, we were not going to have any discussion. But there were difficulties. We said that these could not be implemented at that stage be-

cause there were already many complications and we had already the problems arising out of the Pay Commission's recommendations. It was not possible for us to accept. This was the situation when the strike took place. And what happened during the strike? This strengthens my argument when I say that it was not a trade union dispute. Large scale violence took place. Officers were beaten up, workers were intimidated, fires were dropped, the dedicated workers were thrown on the streets, their children were beaten up and their families were terrorised. In no trade union strike such things take place. We have known of many trade union strikes. Only yesterday Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu was talking of the coalmen's strike in Great Britain and the result that followed, i.e., the fall of Mr. Heath's Government. Here it was, a much bigger struggle. Perhaps as I was told this morning by my senior officers, nowhere in the world labour agitation had taken such a big dimension. This kind of struggle was really difficult for the Government to handle. But I must compliment the administration, the State Governments, the policemen and all my senior and junior officers and the railwaymen who stood firm to their post. Out of 17 lakh workers that we have on the railways—14 lakh permanent and three lakh casual—5½ lakh workers did not go to work. This happened on the 8th. By the 27th, 3 lakh people came and joined the work. Therefore, only two and a half lakh workers out of 17 lakh workers remained outside and did not come to join duty till the strike was called off on the 27th.

I would like to narrate some of the incidents that took place. This is only to prove how these organisations have behaved themselves during this period. It is very easy to throw mud on Mr. A. P. Sharma or Mr. Stephen, but I must say that their organisations stuck to work. They realised the gravity of the situation. The food-grain specials, the coal specials and other essential commodities were kept

moving much because of the cooperation that we got from these Unions.

I may tell you what happened on the 16th April. The strike had not taken place at that time. On the 16th April, in Western Railway, Bombay, in Car Shed two motormen were beaten up, tarred and strung up with chappals. On 17th April, 1974, South Eastern Railway, in Kharagpur, the District Mechanical Engineer (Power), Kharagpur Division, when out on inspection of the loco shed was gheraoed and assaulted and he had to be on medical leave. On 22nd April, in the Western Railway, the Chief Electrical Engineer went to inspect the Car Shed, Bombay. As he walked in, he was surrounded and pushed and he fell down; suffering from such an assault, he registered a police case. On 25th April, in the Eastern Railway, the District Mechanical Engineer, Danapur Division, while on inspection of the Carriage and Wagon Depot and sicklines at Kiul was beaten up by a fitter and two others. On 3rd May, in Madras, a procession of the Southern Railway Mazdoor Union, affiliated to AIRF, entered the office of the Metropolitan Transport Project and man-handled some of the officers and staff and under threat of assault forced some officers to join the procession.

Then again on 4th May, 1974, on the Central Railway a loco foreman in (VT) was assaulted and had to be removed to hospital.

Then, again on the 5th May, on the Eastern Railway, a driver of Sealdah Division, while working a train sustained serious injuries to his nose and eyes due to stones throwing.

7th May, 1974: Eastern Railway—Two electrical engineers were assaulted at Jamalpur Workshops. They suffered minor injuries.

8th May, 1974: On the Eastern Railway, at Meghalsarai, a large mob went in batches to important locations like loco-sheds, diesel-shed, electrical

shed, yard, station superintendent's office and the Asstt. Station Master's office etc. and pulled out the loyal staff and beat the dedicated staff indiscriminately.

On 10th May, 1974: On the Central Railway, between Banda and Jhansi section, a gangman while on duty was not dead... (Interruptions) Shastriji, I will come to Jamalpur also. Please do not worry.

Then on 13th May 1974, on the Central Railway, the Asstt. Station Master (Suburban) Bombay V.T. was stabbed while on duty.

On 15th May 1974, on the Central Railway, at Agra, one Movement Transportation Inspector was assaulted at about 23.00 hours, with sticks and fists leading to fracture of his right arm.

On 19th May 1974, on the Southern Railway, a tinker at Avadi, sustained burns on his face, chest and knee-joint due to miscreants pouring kerosene oil and setting his clothes on fire.

This is how they have behaved. I will ask these people to tell you whether it is permissible under the trade union law. Is it a trade union dispute? Some of the workers... (Interruptions) I will later on come to sabotage cases. I am only trying to prove that it was not a trade union dispute. It was an illegal strike. It is a mild expression to call it only an illegal strike. It is much more than that—a conspiracy or whatever you call it, but it was never a labour dispute and to meet that, we had to take very firm and severe measures and I will say that if such a situation again arises, we will have to act stronger still... (Interruptions).

The strikers and their followers did not stop with violence... (Interruptions). They attacked willing workers and resorted to extensive sabotage, without the least concern for the safety of the traveling public. There were 53 cases of sabotage on the

railways and many other attempted ones. That is why they did not get the support of the public. I again tell my trade union friends that because of these activities you lost the public support. If you had conducted the strike on trade union lines, you would not have lost the public support.

Then, Sir, I come to the question of victimisation. Shri Indrajit Gupta was very very vociferous about victimisation. He was telling that there were large-scale victimisations. Before I come to that, he said that there were a large number of evictions. The actual number of staff who have been evicted from their quarters is only 34 and of them 32 were employees who have been removed from service for various offences but they were given the quarters and they came back.

Then, with regard to disconnection of electricity and water supply, no disconnection has taken place and if this is the information that Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu has received from somebody, it is not correct. No disconnection has taken place.

Then, about the question of break in service, I said 'No work, no pay'. The only thing I said in Calcutta as also in Delhi was this that the railwaymen are like members of my family and what I did say was that if they have not worked and if they were absent, they could not get the salary. There will be break in service. This cannot be helped. On these points there cannot be any question of compromise at all. The opposite only creates confusion and they take the time of the House unnecessarily. Those of the people who have not done their work will not get the salary for the period of their absence. Let me make it clear. For that absence they will not get salary and that will be treated as break in service. On this point we will not compromise. We do not want to hide anything; the law is very clear. If they want they can go to the Library and see for themselves what break in service means.

So, we cannot compromise on those points at all.

They said that lakhs of workers have been arrested. I am coming to the figure. I want to tell you how many railway workers have been released also. The total arrests were 19,883. The numbers who were released were 19,205 upto the 17th of July. That is to say 678 people are in prison today, and, not more than 400 to 500 persons under MISA are in prison. Number of staff who have been taken back to work is 15,000 against 19,000. The number of railway staff convicted is 1,005. In respect of number of railway employees who have been terminated, their number is 16,749. The number out of this which has been reinstated is 4,923. Regarding the number of casual labour—don't confuse this with the regular workers,—the casual labour who are discharged is 18,500 approximately. Those who have been taken back subsequently comes to about 7,000. The number of staff who will have break in service will come to 25 lakhs. Break in service does not mean losing the job. They will get the other benefits etc apart from break in service. They will not lose their jobs, as I have already pointed out. Their number is 25 lakhs.

The other day I was asked about the loss to the railways. In terms of revenue loss to the railways. In terms of revenue loss to railways this would come to Rs 60 crores. But the loss to the nation would be in the neighbourhood of Rs 600 crores. It means ten times loss to the nation at large. So, I said, this would be loss to the nation to the tune of about Rs. 600 crores.

There is no question of victimisation at all. Except those who have been convicted all others will be taken back and they have been taken back. When they say large-scale victimisation, I would submit, there have been no victimisation at all; this is only the sort of propaganda which they are carrying on and I will give any num-

by quotations of their own leaders in this regard.

I must pay my tributes to the dedicated workers who have stood by us in difficult times. In respect of them we have done the following. We have given them advance increments. The number comes to 94,551.

But, there were 2 lakhs of workers who had been given advance increments. We have also given cash award to the extent of Rs. 30 lakhs. We have given employment to the wards of the dedicated workers. About 2,000 people have been given employment. As regards reinstatement, their number is 4,902. It is a continuous process. This will go on. Those who stood by us would get due appreciation at the hands of the Government and the Railway Administration will ever remain grateful to those who have stood by us in difficult times.

About the casual labour, I do not want to say in detail. If the hon. Members want, they may refer about them in the Library. There was a question regarding police excess. I would like them to give a specific instance where there had been police excesses. Our reports say that there has been no police excess. I would like them to give a specific instance of police excess if there is any and I would look into it. I have no such information *(Interruptions)*

What is the situation to-day? The situation to-day is that there is normal functioning of the railways going on. But, the trade union leaders are going round to create problems; they are moving about and addressing meetings and trying to rouse the feelings of the workers. I would appeal to the leaders not to exploit them any more because it would be the railway workers themselves who would suffer; they should see the reason.

So far as we are concerned, as I have already stated, out of so many demands six demands have been conceded. The Prime Minister was gracious enough to order the release of all the trade union leaders unconditionally. All these trade union leaders were released unconditionally without putting in any condition.

Now, I would say something about of what Mr. George is doing. Shri Indrajit Gupta might not be knowing that. I would like to read the text of his speeches that he made. This is what Mr. George is doing. He was addressing a rally at Bombay on 30th May, 1974. He asked them to be prepared for another struggle. This is number one. Mr. Fernandes told the press men at Bombay the same day that the railway strike was called to give a respite to the striking people for launching another struggle.

Subsequently, addressing the workers at the Kanchrapara Railway workshop on June 5, 1974. Mr. George Fernandes advised the railway men to resort to local agitations under which the employees in the workshops would observe pen-down and tool down strikes if their colleagues were victimised. On June 17, at Poona, he called upon the railwaymen to be prepared for another show-down with Government within six months and warned the Government that normalcy could not be restored completely... *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI S M BANERJEE (Kanpur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I now rise on a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: He is quoting here—not from the statements which Shri Fernandes made. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI D. K. PANDA (Bhaujanagar): Why don't you have patience? (*Interruptions*).

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order, please. I am here to hear his point of order. Why don't you allow me even to hear him?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Let me know whether the hon. Minister has quoted it from the press statement.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: My point of order is this. Is the Intelligence report made available only to the Minister and not to the Members? (*Interruptions*) Kindly hear me. If he really thinks that he can quote. I have also got a secret report from which I can also quote. (*Interruptions*).

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Banerjee, you are now making a speech. This is not a point of order.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: That report should also go on record.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: What is his point of order?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: My point of order is this. Quotations from books and quotations from various reports including press reports can be given, but in this case, the hon. Minister is quoting something which he knows or Mr. Bery knows but nobody else. If he is quoting it, let him lay it on the Table of the House, and we shall verify it if necessary from Shri George Fernandes who is outside the House. Kindly give your ruling on this. Otherwise, I have got a secret report from which also I can read out.

SHRI SEZHIYAN (Kumbakonam): The hon. Minister is quoting from the speech of a person who is not a Member of this House. The House is entitled to know the source of the

speech or quotation; in fact, we should have not only that but the full text of the speech should be made available to us.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Under what rule?

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Mr. Fernandes is not here to defend himself.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He has made his point already.

SHRI SEZHIYAN: My point is that not only the source should be disclosed but the entire speech should be made available to us because it is quite possible that he may be quoting him out of context.

SHRI PILOO MODY: There is one more point, Sir. He should also tell us when and where he fabricated it.

श्री मधु लिमये (बाँरा) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय मैं अपना व्यवस्था का प्रश्न रख इसके पहले यह जरूरी है कि इन से पूछा जाय कि क्या

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Is he speaking on the same point of order or is he raising another one?

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: I am raising a point of order under rule 368.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Let him kindly sit down. If it relates to the point of order already raised by Shri Banerjee, I am prepared to hear him before I give my ruling. But if it is a different point of order, I cannot hear him at this stage.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं अपना व्यवस्था का प्रश्न उठाऊँ यह जरूरी है मंत्री महोदय से जानना कि अगर वह अखबारों से कोट कर रहे हैं तो मुझे कुछ नहीं कहना है। लेकिन अगर सी० आई० डी० रिपोर्ट से कर रहे हैं तो नियम 368 के तहत मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। आप उस नियम को देखें :

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have seen it.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: The rule says:

"If a Minister quotes in the House a despatch or other State paper which has not been presented to the House, he shall lay the relevant paper on the Table;"

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Let him read the proviso also. The proviso says:

"Provided further that where a Minister gives in his own words...

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: Let him not teach the Minister. Let me formulate my point of order...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Let us understand this very clearly that when a point of order is raised, it is the duty of the Chair to hear and to give a ruling on it. So, let hon. Members allow me to hear him fully before I give my ruling.

श्री मधु लिमये : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इसलिये सत्र में पहले आप मिनिस्टर से पूछें कि वह कहाँ पे उद्धृत कर रहे हैं ? समाचार-पत्रों से या किसी सरकारी रिपोर्ट से या कागज़ से ? अगर सरकारी रिपोर्ट से है तो हमारे सामने भी वह आना चाहिये । वरना इनको कोट नहीं करना चाहिये । उसका कार्यवाही से काट दिया जाय ।

AN HON. MEMBER: You should listen to us also.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There is no need for it. The point is very clear. I do not think the Minister ever said that he was quoting from a State paper. He never said that.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: Wherefrom is he quoting?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It is up to him now to say.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: If he is quoting from a newspaper, we have nothing to say.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I said this is the impression I had that the Minister was not quoting from any State paper. However, nothing prevents him from saying whether he is quoting from a State paper or not. It is up to him.

SHRI L. N. MISHRA: I will say like this (*Interruptions*). I am not quoting from any intelligence report. This much I can say; more than that, I cannot say (*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am only concerned with this limited point that if a Minister quotes from a State paper, he has to lay that paper on the Table of the House. I can understand it if he says that it is against the public interest to do so, but I do not think he made that point.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: With your permission I would quote the second proviso:

"Provided further that where a Minister gives in his own words a summary or gist of such despatch or State paper, it shall not be necessary to lay the relevant papers on the Table." (*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Do not get excited. Why don't you listen to me? This proviso does not arise in view of the fact that the Minister said very clearly that he was not quoting from any State paper. He has said that very clearly. Now members of this House are making references to so many other things...

SHRI A. P. SHARMA (Buxar): Shri Banerjee has said certain things which should be expunged.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: I want to say that Shri Sharma was conspiring against the Railway Minister. He is always doing it.

SHRI A. P. SHARMA: Nonsense.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Why don't you allow me even to give a ruling on this point of order? In this House, members come forward; either they quote from newspapers or they mention things that have come to their knowledge. It is up to other members to repudiate them and say that it is not correct. There is no point of order in this. Please go on.

AN HON. MEMBER: But he should indicate the source.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I think it is a well-established practice that if members do not reveal the source of their information, nobody can compel them to reveal the source.

SHRI SEZHIYAN: Let him say that he is not willing to give the source.

SHRI K MANOHARAN (Madras North): It is between the Minister and the members.

SHRI PILOO MODY: He is not a member; he is a Minister.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): In the first place, you should be pleased to consider whether it is only an intelligence report which constitutes a State paper or there are other papers which may be included under the head 'State paper'. The hon. Minister has said that it is not from an intelligence report. We agree with him; we grant that to that extent it is not a State paper. But that is not a limited thing to which a State paper can be considered because there are other papers which can be included under the head 'State paper'. He has not made it clear.

Secondly, if the hon. Minister is quoting even from a newspaper, he has to give the reference so that we are able to put it in proper perspective and understand the full import of the statement he is making. Otherwise, how are you going to do justice to the person? I may submit at the same time that whatever the hon.

Minister is trying to convey is nothing objectionable. The right to strike is a legitimate activity. After all, what is he stretching before the House? He has only asked the workers to be ready for this. Is there anything objectionable about it? It is a legitimate activity. I do not think he really understands the import of his statement.

So would you kindly make observations on these two points. First, whether a State paper is limited to any intelligence report or there are other papers in that category. The Minister must state categorically whether it is from a State paper or not. Secondly, if he has produced the statement from a newspaper, he has to refer to the newspaper so that we are in a position to judge whether it is the right kind of statement or not.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE. This is a very serious matter. In future, this is going to decide as to what is going to be the procedure because a member challenges.

SHRI C M. STEPHEN: Are we on the same point of order? Are they going to challenge your ruling which has been given?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This is not the way to proceed.

SHRI S M. BANERJEE. Do not bother about Shri Stephen.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am just clarifying a doubt in the mind of Shri Stephen.

The Minister has said it is not a State paper.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: No; he has only said it is not an intelligence report.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have heard him clearly saying it. He may repeat it, if you have any doubt about it.

SHRI L. N. MISHRA: It is difficult to say what is a State paper. I have many sources to know the facts—newspapers and other sources. I only said I am not quoting from an intelligence report.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I had given my ruling earlier that if it is not a State paper, the question of laying it on the Table does not arise. I had also said that if members refer to certain things that have come to their knowledge, those things are before the House and other members can repudiate them. I have also said that members cannot be compelled and are not bound to reveal the sources of their information. If they make a statement with all responsibility, they are responsible for it and other members can repudiate it and it is for the House to come to a decision. But Mr. Mishra has raised rather a fine point. What is a State paper. I do not think we can define it here in a huff. The minister has said it is not a State paper. I think you also said it is not from any newspaper?

SHRI L. N. MISHRA: Most of it is based on newspaper reports. But he has also addressed press conferences, public meetings, etc. These are the reports from which I am quoting, not intelligence reports.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: When you address public meetings either the newspapers take that up and report it or even members of the audience can tell a person that such and such a thing has been said.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: He is trying to accuse a person who is not present in the House. In future, I may quote serious charges and I hope you will not expunge it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I think no other person has been done so much honour in this country. If the Minister has spent a lot of time on this gentleman, I think it is an honour to him. Why are you objecting to that? Let me finish this point of order, because Shri Mishra has raised a point

SHRI PILOO MODY: We are withdrawing it. Let us carry on.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It is not a State paper. So, that question does not arise. The Minister says that he is not bound to reveal the source. If the point is being withdrawn, the question does not arise.

SHRI L. N. MISHRA:

"George Fernandes told a press conference at Ahmedabad on 19th June that the railwaymen would prevent return to normalcy through localised actions.

Addressing meeting of railwaymen at Jodhpur on 8th July George Fernandes incited the workers by stating that 90 per cent of the wage earners would be forced to miss a meal everyday because of the curbs imposed by the Additional Emoluments Ordinance. George Fernandes exhorted the railway workers to oppose the Ordinance jointly with employees in other sectors of industries.

Addressing a meeting at Abu Road on 9th July, George Fernandes appealed to the employees, the youth and the masses to unite and launch, concentrated efforts to dislodge the present government which has failed to solve their problems.

On 13th July at Calcutta, George Fernandes called upon the railwaymen to start preparation for launching a massive movement if their demands were not conceded.

On 10th July, George Fernandes, addressing a meeting at Palanpur, appealed to employees to join hands with the youth in order to counter the anti-people measures being taken by the Government and quoted the example of the recent agitation launched by the students and youths of Gujarat . . .

At Mugalsarai Station, Shri George Fernandes exhorted the rail-

way workers to go on strike. He stated that it was impossible to get the demands fulfilled without going on strike. He also stated that the Government cannot suppress the strike with force. He also stated that if any worker would not participate in the strike, he would be finished before the fresh strike begins."

I will deal with one more point before I resume my seat. Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu said that there is one *golmal* in the distribution and allotment of coal wagons. Here I may state that the railway do not allot wagons to anybody directly. In order to keep the records straight, I will read out the procedure for the allotment of wagons for coal. The distribution of coal to different consumers is based on a programme sponsored by the different Ministries of the Central Government, State Governments and other authorised agencies. The railways allot wagons in accordance with these sponsored programmes received by them. For instance, the coal Controller programmes for the movement of coal to different steel plants as also for the hard coke. The Linkage Committee consisting of representatives of the Ministries of Mines, Railways, Irrigation and Power and Industrial Development make out programmes for movement of coal from different coalfields to power houses and industries. Movement of steam coal to industries and of soft coke etc. are sponsored by the State Governments and other bodies authorised for issuing such sanctions. State Governments also sponsor the rake programme for the movement of brick-burning coal to different areas in the States and determine the priority to be observed in the allotment of these rakes.

The actual daily allotment of wagons

for movement of coal against these approved programmes is done by the Joint Director, Coal, in the case of Bengal-Bihar coalfields and by other sub-allotment offices in respect of out-lying fields, observing the priority laid down by the State Governments. So, the railways do not allot wagons on its own, as I have said earlier. I am really surprised wherefrom Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu got this baseless information. I refute and deny the allegation. (Interruptions).

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I demand a probe into that. Why is he afraid of facing a Commission of Inquiry? I have heard a part of what he said. It is far from convincing. Let there be a Commission under the Commissions of Inquiry Act to find out Mr. L. N. Mishra's conduct starting from the Kosi project and Bharat Sewak Samaj till today. This allotment of wagons has become a nauseating thing. Everybody knows that Mr. L. N. Mishra goes round the country to collect money.

SHRI L. N. MISHRA: I have not yet finished.

In the case of Programme Traffic, such as, foodgrains, fertilisers, cement, raw materials to and finished products from steel plants and petroleum products, etc., advance monthly or quarterly programmes are drawn by the user Ministries or by the Food Corporation of India or State Governments or the Steel Plants, etc., as the case may be, in conjunction with the Railways. Day-to-day supply of wagon is done by the Zonal Railways according to these approved programmes. In view of the essentiality of this traffic in the overall public interest, it is accorded a higher priority in movements.

Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu again raised some point. I do not know what to say. During the last two to three years, Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu has been talking a lot of things. I have not come to public life by accident. I have come to public life as a result of my family traditions and historical reasons. I challenge Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu that if it is proved that I have added anything to my assets, to what I got from my father in the year 1951—I am prepared for any probe—I am prepared to retire from public life. This kind of slanderous campaign must end. If anything is proved, I am prepared to give up my public life.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: He must face an inquiry under the Commissions of Inquiry Act.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta-North-East): Let Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu say it outside so that the matter can be thrashed out. Let him not say only in the House. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I have said it umpteen number of times.

15.50 hrs.

[SHRI ISHAQUE SAMBHALI in the Chair]

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN (Wandiwash): Mr. Chairman, Sir, the recent railway strike—how it was betrayed by one of the constituents and how it was broken with brutal force by the Government—is going to be a blot in the history of the labour movement of this country. Government is supposed to be a model employer. But now Government has come to share vindictiveness and victimisation which is going to tell upon the labour efficiency in the long run.

More than 20,000 employees have been dismissed. According to the Minister's own statement, six lakh employees are suffering from break in service and thousands of cases are pending before the court against the employees. I want to know from the Government whether it is a dispute because the Government and the

employees or a war between the Government and the railway employees.

I strongly condemn the attitude of the mass media, AIR, television, films, newspapers and other mass media which were used against the labour, against the railway workers. I want to know from them who own all these mass media—AIR, television and other things. Are they the private property of Shri L. N. Mishra or Shri I. K. Gujral? They are owned by the country. I am sure all the members would have heard the All India Radio at the time of railway strike. For everything it was the railway employees who were blamed. If you did not get your newspapers, it was because of railwaymen; if there was price rise in milk it was because of railway employees. Not even at the time of Chinese aggression or Pakistani invasion did we hear the Radio speaking like this against foreign invaders. It was so much used against the railway employees. It is a shame on democracy. I want to know whether this should continue hereafter. Opposition also should have a say in running the All India Radio and the Television—DAVP or they should be made independent public corporations like the BBC. I demand from the Government that they should keep up their promise. They had assured this House that there would be no victimisation. But there are thousands of workers who have been dismissed, and lakhs of workers are suffering from break in service. Government have to keep up its promise and see that all those who have been dismissed are reinstated and in respect of those who suffer from break in service, the break in service is condoned—there should be continuity of service; they should not suffer from break in service.

Now I will take up another issue where our Prime Minister has generously surrendered a part of our

territory. Kachchativu, to the Government of Sri Lanka. Yesterday Mr. Swaran Singh, Minister of External Affairs, made a statement and in that statement he has said:

"Exhaustive research of historical and other records was made by our experts on Kachchativu and every available piece of evidence collected from various record offices in India, such as in Tamil Nadu, Goa and Bombay as well as abroad in British and Dutch archives."

I want to know from the Government what were the records that were consulted and what was the evidence that was produced. A number of documents have been given to the Government of India by the Government of Tamil Nadu and nothing has come out of this. At least for 150 years we have got the records. The island was owned by the Raja of Ramnad it was a part of Ramanathapuram's zamin. There are records available. I have here a copy of some of those lease deeds registered in Ramanathapuram Sub-Registrar's office. From 1824 onwards we have got the records. In 1882 the East India Company entered into an agreement with the Raja of Ramnad under Isthimirar Sanad. We have a record of that. Again there is a lease deed of 1880; there is also a lease deed of 1885. I have a copy here. Till 1949, till the abolition of zamindari, there were lease deeds between private citizens and the Raja of Ramnad. It proves absolutely that we had our own sovereignty and suzerainty over the island. But what is the claim of Sri Lanka? Let the Minister tell the House. Sri Lanka has no claim on it. They had published a map in 1880, authorised by the Government of Ceylon. Kachchativu is not a part of it. All the small islands are mentioned in it including the Delft island which is the closest to Kachchativu but Kachchativu is not a part of that map. Not only that, a former Secretary of the Cabinet of Ceylon, Mr. B. P. Pieris says:

"I remember coming across this problem when I was Assistant Legal Draftsman. I had to deal with the file for the purpose of verifying some of the boundaries of the northern districts. In the process of revising the draft Proclamation issued probably in the time of Queen Victoria, indeed the islands of Kachchativu is excluded from the Northern Districts as it belonged to the Raja of Ramnad."

Sir, this is the statement of a former Secretary of Sri Lanka Cabinet....

श्री सरजू पांडव (गाजीपुर) ने मुन
नहीं रहे हैं आपसे मे चर्चा कर रहे हैं।

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: This is the statement made by a former Secretary of Ceylon and ultimately what did happen?

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN (Badagara). You are not from Ramnad, you are from North Arcot.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: Kachchativu is of strategic importance. It has oil potential as also rich in fishes. They say, 'It is a barren island' If it is a barren island, why should Mrs Sirimavo Bandaranaike be interested in it? Why are they insisting on that small island? We are worried about Diego Garcia, thousands of miles away from the Indian territory but we are not worried about this small island. When we speak of it, the Prime Minister is said to have remarked in the AICC meeting that it is a little rock. I am reminded of those days when Pandit Nehru called about our northern boundary as a place where not a blade of grass grew. I would like to remind the Prime Minister that after this historic statement of the Prime Minister, Pandit Nehru never regained the confidence of this country. This is going to happen to the Prime Minister when she says that this is only a little rock and there is nothing to worry about the territories of our country. If you are going to call

it a barren island or uninhabited, what will happen to a number of islands in the Andamans and Nicobar which are very close to Indonesia? Are you going to surrender them to Indonesia along with Shri K. R. Ganesh? I would like to know from the Government..

SHRI PILOO MODY: I say, that may be a good deal!

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: Neither the State Government was consulted nor was the Parliament taken into confidence before surrendering this island. I, therefore, appeal to the House to reject this agreement between the Government of India and the Government of Shri Lanka.

Sir, the country is confronted with a number of burning problems, the topmost of which is the problem of unemployment. It is increasing by leaps and bounds and what has the Government done about it? During the period 1960—1971 unemployment increased in this country by 20 per cent. But what has happened after 2-3 years? Now, it is going up by 42.85 per cent. According to Mr. B. K. Nehru, every 24 hours, 6000 people are added to the list of unemployed. I will give you some statistics to show how this problem is growing in our country. The New Delhi Bank of Baroda advertised for 2,000 posts and there were 1,25,000 applicants. In Haryana, the State Electricity Board which is famous—Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu talked about it—advertised for 3,000 posts and the applications received were 60,000. In the Punjab, a bank advertised for 5 posts and there were 4,000 applicants and last but not the least, in West Bengal, the State Government advertised for 17 rural posts and there were a lakh applications. This is how the problem of unemployment is growing in this country and the Government has not done anything to solve this problem.

We are supposed to live in a Socialist State ruled by a socialist Government. Very strangely, Cong-

ressmen have changed the very definition of socialism. What is this kind of socialism which is available in this country? You can call it 'bastard socialism'. Dr. Mihas said:

"Indian socialism in practical terms turned out to be a pernicious programme for the distribution of public largesse to the not so poor."

This is the sort of socialism which we are having in this country. This country is one of the most mis-managed economies of the world. With the abject poverty, increasing unemployment, stagnation in production, flourishing black money, galloping inflation, ever-increasing prices and more and more printing of currency, this Government has led this country to economic decay, disorder and chaos. This wonderful congress government has led the country to this sort of economic chaos, disorder and decay. Everything is increasing except the value of the rupee which alone is going down day by day and I am told now it stands at the rate of 29 naya paise. Who is the sufferer ultimately because of all these things?

16 hrs.

It is always the poor and the fixed income group who suffer; others somehow always escape. This is what happens. A rampant inflation in a stagnant economy is the most regressive form of taxation that I can think of. That is what the economists are telling us also. What efforts have been taken to relieve the sufferings of the poor whom Gandhiji used to call the Daridra-narayanans? When there was the United Congress the Prime Minister told us that there were road blocks like Nijalingappa, Kamaraj, Atulya Ghosh. S. K. Patil, Sanjiva Reddy and others; all those have been removed. Such road blocks were removed in 1969. Then she told the nation that she did not have a majority in Parliament. In 1971 after the gribi hatso programme

the massive mandate came to her: she was given absolute majority in parliament. Then she said we have no majority, we want majority in the States and during the 1972 elections almost in all the States except one or two congress was returned to power in absolute majority. She has won political victories and military victories but she has been badly defeated on the economic front. In 1974 they started consulting the economists, about the evil effects of inflation, I want to know this from the Prime Minister. She need not go outside. There is Prof. V. K. R. V. Rao who is sitting here; she could have consulted him; he could have suggested a few measures to tackle the evil effects of inflation. But he has not been consulted.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA. Now she has visited his Institute of Social and Economic Change.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: What is the net result now? Even after four five year plans, what has happened? Even now nearly 60 per cent of the population of the country live below the poverty line and the per capita income has gone down year after year. This is the present position. This was Rs. 348 in 1970-71 and this came down to Rs. 346 in 1971-72 and Rs. 333 in 1972-73. Money supply is increasing month by month. Government only resorts to printing money in Nasik printing press with the imported paper. According to the Reserve Bank bulletin, the present increase is on the top of the rise of Rs. 424 crores during April 1974 and this has pushed up the total money supply with the Government to Rs. 11,294 crores and in May 1974 the money supply with the Government increased by Rs. 112 crores. This is being done in April to May. Due to mostly unproductive expenditure Government is resorting to deficit financing. And this is to the tune of Rs. 700 to 850 crores during the last three years and this is particularly added to the inflationary trend in the country.

After Wanchoo Committee reports all of us expected that some drastic action would be taken to unearth black money but no action has been taken, nothing has been done in this regard. Government brings stringent laws; we pass stringent laws; but what happens after that? Nothing is implemented. Take for example the case of the Adulteration laws. Now the Planning Minister comes forward and says 'Inflation will be curbed in 6 months'. This is what Mr. D. P. Dhar has said. Already one month is over. Now, within the remaining 5 months what are you going to do about it? Now they say, we have come up with these ordinances; this will solve the problem. You have brought one ordinance to amend another ordinance, I say this is sheer non-sense; on the eve of the Parliament session they are bringing out ordinances which action is, to say the least, undemocratic and deserves universal condemnation.

An Ordinance on wage freeze was promulgated which was misconceived. Of course it was diametrically opposed to the interests of the working class and the poor people. The Government has no right to freeze the wages so long as they cannot freeze the prices. If you go on producing ordinances, it is only a fiscal squeeze applied in the wrong direction and will cause excess suffering to the people who are already affected by the inflation and the rising prices. There is another ordinance on dividend. No doubt this is a step in the right direction. But, it is not going to solve the problems. It will apply only to 200 firms in this country. It is not going to touch even the fringe of the problem. There is another ordinance on compulsory deposits. It also covers only those who are already paying income-tax and whose income and expenditure are accountable. But, what about those whose income and expenditure which is not accountable? What have you done in that direction? How is the money going to be used even if the monies are deposited with the banks? How is

the Finance Minister going to justify the anti-inflationary measures? There is an ambiguity about this ordinance. (*Interruptions*)... If Mr Salve is going to sit in the Treasury Benches and if he is going to give a reply, I shall accept it. Government is afraid to take drastic measures against the vested interests—tax-evaders, hoarders and black-marketeers. Government is willing to strike but afraid to wound. Unless comprehensive steps are taken to cut down the deficit financing which is going on year by year and unearth the black money and to increase the production, this country cannot be saved. The Government has forgotten for many years the agricultural sector and now they feel the importance of this. At least now I hope they give to top priority to agriculture and increase the agricultural production so that we need not go to country after country with a begging bowl to get from milk powder to wheat.

Now, some of the economists led by Prof Rao have submitted proposals to contain inflation or to curb inflation. There is another set of economists led by Shri Vakil who have given a formula called 'Semibomba'. I do not know why Government has not considered all these proposals seriously. They all wanted partial demonetisation. I think this was what Prof. Vakil and other economists have suggested. In this country, from food-grains to baby food, steel, cement, sugar and paper and everything is scarce. People give this Government and the Prime Minister full support. But, you have let them down. They could not be fooled for ever with your slogans. They cannot be fed with slogans. This great country should be freed from Congress misrule.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhagat.

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT (East-Delhi): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I was listening just now to the speech of my hon. friend from the DMK....

SHRI K. MANOHARAN (Madras North): Can you tell me, Mr. Chairman, at what O' clock I shall be called.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I shall call you after 5 O' clock.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN: After five it would be an empty House.

MR CHAIRMAN: After the Finance Minister's intervention I can call you. After Shri Bhagat, Shri Piloo Mody will speak.

Now, let him carry on.

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT: My hon. friend from the DMK was just now talking about Kachchathivu, the island. It appears to me that the DMK thinks that probably they can desperately cling to this issue and survive in Tamil Nadu. The Jan Sangh at one time thought that they could survive by clinging on to Kutch, but they failed. The DMK is also bound to fail because the people of India and the people of Tamil Nadu are mature enough to see that it is in the interests of India, a big and great country, to keep her neighbours, particularly her small neighbours, satisfied. Therefore, the people of India and the people of Tamil Nadu also welcome this agreement, and I am sure they will not be carried away by the narrow approach of the DMK in this connection.

I was really surprised when I heard my hon friend Mr. Viswanathan quoting figures relating to unemployment from Delhi, Haryana and one or two more States, as if unemployment has ceased to be a problem in Tamil Nadu. I wish he had known his home State better and he had come out with some figures in regard to Tamil Nadu and how they have solved the problem there. Anyway, I do not want to join issue with him or enter into arguments on these two points, but I just wanted to mention these two points.

My friend, the preacher of the RSS, Shri Jagannathrao Joshi was preach-

ing us morals and he was asking whether Congressmen disclosed their income to their organisation. I would ask this preacher friend of mine to go and preach and advise the RSS and tell them to disclose their properties and to disclose the huge amounts of money which they had collected during the last several years without issuing any receipts in the name of *gurudakshina*. The Income-tax Department is looking into this matter, and I expect that Mr. Joshi will tell his organisation to be straightforward and disclose what has been asked for.

With regard to this no-confidence motion, the concentration has been on two issues. One is the railway strike and the various problems attendant on it, and the other is about the ordinances which have been described by speakers from the Opposition as ordinances which mean a wage freeze.

The railway strike has been very much discussed in this House and repeatedly. Today also, a good many things have been said by Members from the Congress benches, which I would not like to repeat.

The burden and tenor of the speeches made by the Opposition leaders on this no-confidence motion has once again shown that even in a situation of very grave economic crisis, which they describe as grave, they are not prepared to adopt a practical and constructive attitude to help in the solution of the crisis. It seems pretty obvious that they wish to deepen this crisis more and make the difficult situation more difficult, hoping—and I believe their hopes will go in vain—that they can serve their pretty party ends by that attitude. If they do not mind, I am not being harsh when I say this, but to my mind, it looks, when I hear their speeches in such a grave situation, at least some of them are not trying to grapple with the problems as leaders of the nation, but it looks to me as if there are some professional old breast-beaters and mourners; probably that

breast-beating and mourning is also fake; that is how it looks to me.

As regards the railway strike, could there be a greater insult to the railway employees than to say, as most of my friends in the Opposition are saying, that lakhs of employees have surrendered to the repression by the Government? How can anyone repress lakhs of people? Obviously, the railway workers realised that the strike was not in their interest and in the interests of the country and they understood the game of the conspirators and political adventurers. They do not mind my telling them: Who wanted to paralyse the national economy? Who wanted to paralyse the whole country, to create a situation in which they might be able to flourish? I think the end of the railway strike is a victory of the good sense and good conscience of railwaymen and the people of India, above all, who did not appreciate the strike at this moment. The railway strike has been the defeat of certain conspirators and political adventurers—I am repeating the phrase—who tried to paralyse the country. I can understand their frustration. Their frustration is obvious. The railway employees and posterity will never excuse those leaders of the Opposition who at a crucial moment at the stage of negotiations did not have the guts and courage to command to the railway workers the acceptance of the three-point formula. They said the formula is good, we like it, we want it to be accepted. But they had no guts to tell the people concerned. Ultimately, they failed to control the demon they had created. Ultimately, the railway workers themselves met the situation and brought an end to the strike and brought about normalcy.

Shri Indrajit Gupta said yesterday that some of the assurances given by Government in this connection had not been followed or implemented. Shri Mishra, our Railway Minister, gave a reply today. Still I would request

the Railway Minister—I would also request the Prime Minister to go into this question—to see that if any assurances which were given have not been implemented, they should be implemented to the letter and spirit. We are not the enemies or opponents of the railway workers. We do not wish to cause any trouble to them because trouble to them means trouble to this country.

Now, a good deal has been said about these Ordinances. My friends have described it as a wage freeze. Obviously, they are free to use whatever expression they like. But it is a simple enough case. The Ordinance provides for some kind of deferred payment for some time on a good rate of interests. It is not a wage freeze. It does not stop increase in wages; it only defers payment on a good payment of interest of certain wages which the workers have earned. I can quite see that it can really be hard for poor people if it is postponed for some time. But in a situation like this which we have today in the country, some kind of sacrifice by all sections of people in the national interest becomes necessary.

My friends have asked: why ask the poor people to make a sacrifice? Ultimately, in this great country, who has met the challenges and faced trials and tribulations? It is not the rich man; it is the poor man of India who has done so and he is going to do it again. In him lies the strength to meet it. That does not mean that the rich should be spared. No. Government has taken other steps. Indications have been given that more taxes are likely. It is being said that this will not help to fight inflation. Nobody has said that this alone will do that. But if a thousand or at least five hundred crores of rupees are not put in circulation, to that extent inflation is bound to be curbed. Therefore, to say that this is a measure which will encourage inflation is, with due respect to those who have said it, absurd.

I have heard a number of other things said. Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu said that there has been an extraordinary increase in indirect taxes and indications are that more such taxes are going to be imposed; it looks more taxes are coming and he said it would be a burden on the poor man. Firstly, he is anticipating things and trying to act as a prophet. I would not say that the burden of taxes has not fallen on the common man. It has fallen, but it has to be compared with the tremendous stress and burden the country had to bear during the last three years and the kind of challenges we had to face from within and from without.

Mr Bosu made a long speech. He has only played his characteristic role—the sword and dagger role—which we see in the movies, a role full of deceits, distortions, misrepresentations, assassinations—here character assassination.

श्री सरजू पांडे (शाजीपुर) : सभापति महोदय, मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। पार्लिमेंट में यह पद्धति है कि ग्राम तौर से लिखी हुई स्पीचिज नहीं पढ़ी जाती हैं। माननीय सदस्य ने श्री ज्योतिर्मय बसु का नाम लेकर जो कुछ बह लिख कर लाए हैं उसको पढ़ दिया है। मेरा अनुरोध है कि चूंकि यह पार्लिमेंटरी पद्धति के खिलाफ है, इसलिए उनको ऐसा नहीं करना चाहिये।

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT: Mr. Bosu read his whole speech. I need not learn the art of speech-making from my friend. We see in the movies how tragic and grim is the end of the man who plays such a role. Mr. Bosu and his tribe are bound to meet with the same end. His party does not have the courage to contest elections in West Bengal now. Yesterday he mentioned Mrs. Indira Gandhi's name 35 times. A visitor in the gallery made a comment later: "It seems he suffers from Indira phobia. Can't you send him to a hospital?" He also said "A good name on a bad tongue remains

a good name all the same" I want to tell Mr Bosu, Mrs Indira Gandhi is not the product of black money, she is the child of that great revolution about which Mr Bosu does not know anything. Probably then, as a political personality, he was either unborn or still born. He made allegations against her and against our party without a shred of evidence. He said Rs 2 crores have been taken from 50-and-so, Rs 5 crores from 40-and-so etc. He made a mistake. He could have said Rs 20 crore, were taken. He has made wild allegations without the least regard for our rules which require that such kind of personal allegations cannot be made unless there is some evidence to support it. But Shri Jyotirmoy Bose made all kinds of false, wild, baseless and fabricated allegation. I very strongly and categorically repudiate them. The people are not influenced by his allegations. He thinks he has made a very impressive speech. Maybe he has got a few headlines in the papers but that will not carry him very far.

The situation in the country today is fairly grim.

AN HON MEMBER **Fairly grim?**
SRI H K L BHAGAT Very firm in your language, I accept it. In that grave situation, there can be two approaches. One approach is to grapple with the problem, face the difficulties, continue the fight unflinchingly against the problem. The other approach is to incite violence. Shri Jyotirmoy Bose and his party and others some Gandhians also they are taking to violence, encouraging violence in the name of non-violence. They are violating the Constitution in the name of the Constitution and butchering democracy in the name of democracy.

AN HON MEMBER **Who?**

SRI H K L BHAGAT If you want to know the names, it is Shri Jayaprakash and his supporters Shri Jyotirmoy Bose and his party always

believed in the philosophy of violence, violence against the Constitution, against democracy, against morality, decency and other good values. That is his attitude, and that attitude is reflected in this House. He was talking of the condition of women under the woman Prime Minister of India. The Prime Minister of India never said that because she is a woman, therefore, no injustice was being done to the women in this country. I want to ask Shri Bosu what happened to women when their party was ruling in Bengal. Were women not molested during that regime? I wish to ask Shri Jyoti Bose, the then Home Minister of Bengal and not Shri Jyotirmoy Bose what happened in the Kumbhadasaovar Gardens. What was his reaction to it? Why did he try to hush it up?

All these show that you are not interested in helping women, you are not interested in eliminating corruption, you are not interested in curbing inflation, you are not interested in preserving democracy, you are interested only in chaos, confusion, conflict, attempt at vilification, character assassination and all kinds of falsehoods. This is your negative approach on account of which you have never earned conviction with the people and you will never earn conviction with the people in the future.

SRI PILOO MODY (Godhra) Mr Chairman Sir, now that Shri Bhagat has solved all the problems of this country, it is perhaps a good idea to stop the debate at this point and disagree with the Prime Minister's reply. Because I have been hearing the ding-dong battle going on the question of the railway strike and the fidelity of one group or the other of the railway workers. Of course, the railway employees had a legitimate case which they put forward very adequately. They asked that when you have all wedged this to others, why not grant it to them also. Everybody says that their demands were legitimate. But the employer was bankrupt and could not

pay them. What is the attitude of a bankrupt employer when it comes to paying wages which he thinks are adequate? It is one of supplication. He goes to the employees and says "sorry; I agree with you that your demands are justified; but I cannot pay because I am bankrupt; please help me. We will work it out together and over a period of time, I will do justice by you." Everybody has admitted that these demands were legitimate.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Then, kindly go back to the Khadilkar formula. Is Khadilkar legitimate? I hear no reply, Sir. I do not see why for the sake of truth his parenthood should be questioned. Is Khadilkar legitimate or not? You have accepted the Khadilkar formula. In spite of the fact that we told you it was a bastardisation of labour relations, you accepted it because it meant a few cheap votes for you. You go on collecting cheap votes. But it is not going to solve the problems of the country.

Now, when the railwaymen say, adopt the Khadilkar formula, you say, no. Khadilkar becomes illegitimate. What sort of Government is this? Then, the railway strike begins. What happened during the strike is unbelievable. We treated prisoners of war better than we treated railwaymen who went on strike. This point has not been properly brought out. Repression was carried out on the families of those railwaymen who did not go to work. In spite of what Mr. L. N. Mishra says, many Congress Members have come to me and asked me, "Can it really be true? Is what we hear true? Is what they did to the railway employees' families, their women and children, true?" And yet Mr. Stephen—where is he? He has disappeared—gets up and says: Since when has Mr. Piloo Mody started worrying about workmen, as if workmen were his own private preserve, as if the whole of humanity in this country was inherited by him and by

all these people who have been playing to the gallery for generations for a vote—murder for a vote, rape for a vote, cheat for a vote, hunger for a vote, anything for a vote! Sometimes at least, you must say the truth. Mr. H. K. L. Bhagat just now talked about democracy, talked about violence on democracy. What about violence on truth? It is violence on truth which is being committed day after day.

Any sort of demonstration against the Government becomes an offence. Any sort of strike becomes unpatriotic. Who the hell owns this country? I begin to ask: Is it only the Congress Government or is it all the people of this country? As for what they have done, I do not think even God can forgive them. Every conceivable sort of opportunity they have taken to do what they have done. What is it that this country lacks except a Government with good intentions and goodwill, except an honest Government, a clean Government? Is there anything else that is lacking in this country? They only get up and make speeches.

They have turned this country into a police State. Everybody is swooped upon and spied upon. It is all very well for you over here to earn a few kudos or a part on the back from the powers that be. But when you go outside, what do you say? You are afraid of talking in your own houses. You are afraid of hobnobbing. You are afraid of visiting each other's houses. This is what you have done to the country. Every activity has been politicalised.

Recently, the Congress party nominated its Presidential candidate . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Please don't bring in that.

SHRI PILOO MODY: I am not bringing in the name of the President, now. What you did at the time of the last Presidential election? I am only saying what is going to be done. There is every chance that he

will not be the President. Recently, the Congress party nominated its Presidential candidate. I ask you: In a country of 56 crores, with a massive majority here, at the Centre, and in the States, couldn't you have done better?

AN. HON. MEMBER: What does he mean by it?

SHRI PILOO MODY: The very fact that you have to ask this is sufficient.

You recently had the General Secretary of the Indian National Congress—his name is Mr. Chandrajeet Yadav—bemoaning the fact that a few of our parties had got together and that we were right reactionaries and we were going to destroy his Party and all that. He loves to see the opposition as it is constituted today. He thinks that democracy can remain without opposition. I do not deny that at all because this is the sort of training that he has received since childhood; he has been taught about one-party democracy, democracy without opposition, democracy without decent, and democracy without people. If he had been literate enough to read the Constitution, he would know that democracy requires opposition. And when some of us get together to form that opposition, our dear General Secretary of the Congress Party is becoming that fact. As for what the Prime Minister did yesterday at the Oberoi Inter-Continental Hotel through the good offices of Mr. Yashpal Kapur in trying, in a feeble attempt, to get the BKD split—one of the parties that are getting together—is, I think, too funny for comment. It is sort of pantomime that goes on in this country, a sort of pleasure that one derives in doing these little things. Well, it is alright, you may destroy a little opposition. But that will not solve the problems that you have inherited or which you have made yourself. The problems are economic problems. And when it comes to economic problems,

all I see in front of me is only ciphers—ciphers of every kind.

To control inflation they have come out with a few Ordinances—some secret weapons that are going to control the monetary excesses of the last 20 years! All these Ordinances, if you were to read them, are economically illiterate. The persons or people or the economists who suggested them understand neither economy nor finance nor monetary arrangements..

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please try to conclude.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Why did you call me then?

सनापति महोदय : आप ने अपने टाइम से दो मिनट ज्यादा ले लिये हैं । क्या करें आपकी पार्टी इतनी छोटी है ।

श्री पीलू मोदी : अगर मेरी पार्टी छोटी है, तो मैं तो छोटा नहीं हूँ ।

Are you suggesting that your mathematics is better than your eyes?

As for as these Ordinances are concerned, to talk in terms of freezing workers' wages, even temporarily, is, I suppose, a proposition which can be accepted from Government at the end of a long series of measures. After you have made the basic changes in the structure of your economy, after you have exercised the necessary discipline upon yourself, if you come along ultimately to passing an Ordinance like this saying 'Come on, chaps, we have done everything else; now you also chip in' then I would have understood that there was some meaning in this Ordinance. What you have said about dividend control is even more illiterate. You do not understand what you are doing. An efficient company is penalised while the inefficient one is rewarded. People who have contributed to efficiency are penalised and the people who have contributed to inefficiency are rewarded.. What has happened? The capital markets of the country have

collapsed. Now, to-day, this is the new slogan....

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon Member's time is up.

SHRI PILOO MODY: If you are going to disturb me like that there is no point in my speaking.

Mr. Chairman: Please conclude.

SHRI PILOO MODY: I cannot conclude. I have not come here just to show my face. I have a point of view to put forward.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): We have discussed the arrangement with the Speaker that on a matter of no-confidence motion one cannot finish in five or ten minutes.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Let me ask you a question as to how long Shri Chandrajit Yadav spoke.

SHRI SAT PAL KAPUR (Patiala): It is Party's time and not individual's time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please conclude now. आगे 8 मिनट थे अब 15 मिनट के चुके हैं

SHRI PILOO MODY: You can either look after Parliament or you can look after your clock. You cannot do both.

Sir, the latest fashionable slogans is that there is need for production. All these years it was socialism. Now it is being converted into production. We want production. Well, there are certain things that are necessary for production and one of the things that is necessary for production is the capital market. I have no love for the capital market, but it is necessary. Under the system that you operate it is necessary and without it, you cannot have the increased production that you want.

Instead of doing something and analysing the disease, if you want inflation to go down, you have to start with yourself.

Administrative expenditure: The Finance Minister and all the Ministers over here must promise that every year compounded they will reduce their ministerial and other expenses concerned with their Ministry by 20 per cent year after year after year after year. I do not care how you do it.

The Prime Minister should call the Ministers one by one and say, 'You reduce your ministerial expenditure by 20 per cent or out you go.'

Believe me you will get rid of your inflation. Believe me that you will get rid of it in no time and no Minister will ever complain to you that you have done him in or you have been harsh on him.

Believe me, they will be able to do it. All you have to do it to call them and tell them that out they go if they do not do it and you would not have to impose taxes and you would not have to pass these illiterate ordinances and you would not have to go on record and say all the fabricated and compounded lies that go on. It will be done overnight.

Cut down on the free jaunts abroad. Cut down on the surplus staff that you employ. Cut down on all manner of meaningless controls which have ceased to have any meaning but which still continue because they are a matter of habit....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Piloo Mody, you should finish now

SHRI PILOO MODY: I am convinced that you are determined to ruin my speech. I am not yielding.

SHRI P. K. DEO (Kalahandi): Kindly give him five minutes more.

SHRI PILOO MODY: I do not need five minutes more I need ten minutes

more. It is for you to tell him, Mr. Raghu Ramaiah. What is the use of your looking at me? Please do not come here, go there. Either Parliament continues as a Parliament or it continues as a clock. It cannot continue both ways. Now the main problem with production is your own self-defeating ordinances. Suppose it manages to control your money supply for a few months or for one year, all right what are you going to do about it next year? Are you going to make inroads into your system of expenditure, into your quantum of expenditure? How are you going to do all these things? We have the problem of fertiliser where a million tons of fertiliser is short. You say, this distribution system is bad, that distribution system is bad, and all that. What are you distributing after all? I have not heard anywhere, any single programme, of how you are going to increase food production. I have not heard a word about how you are going to increase fertiliser production, how you are going to increase the acreage under minor irrigation, how you are going to increase rural electrification, or how the power shortage going to be met so that you can work your pumpsets. At present you are not able to work your pumpsets which are already installed. Instead of attending to all these things what we find is that this sort of debate is going on the question of distribution.

Now, may I ask: What about wage goods? What about common goods that are consumed by the common man? Have you got any programme for the increase of these production items? When you talk about increase of production what exactly are you really talking about, let me ask: Is it an abstract concept or is it something which requires some effort on your part in order to bring about increase of production of goods which are in short supply, food articles and wage goods.

In the background of all this, you had three days of debate in the All India Congress Committee Listening to these debates one wonders whether you were seized of the problem let alone concerned about what is happening in the country. You discussed about what Jayaprakash Narain has said. You discussed whether khadi should be certified or uncertified. You discussed about drinking, about womanising. These are the sort of things that we heard. Is this the sort of thing on which we should bestow our attention just now when we are in the midst of such a serious economic crisis such as we are facing today? We have heard all sorts of statements to the effect that the opposition must give up its opposition and start cooperation with the Government. You meant the fact that students were being asked to leave their colleges in Bihar and come out of their colleges and that colleges were being forcibly closed down and all that. But what about Uttar Pradesh? Why have the colleges been closed in Uttar Pradesh? There is no Jayaprakash Narain in Uttar Pradesh and if you are so much concerned about Education how is it that colleges in Uttar Pradesh are closed? The fact of the matter is that you are afraid of students and you have very good reason to be afraid of students.

The students have shown you what all of us have not been able to show. I regretfully have to confess. To-day I hate to leave by making only non-constructive observations. I always like to end my speech by making some constructive suggestions. I am glad that the Prime Minister has come back, because it is primarily for her. The first thing that I would like to suggest to the Prime Minister is the dispersal of power. Learn to share your power with your other colleagues in the Cabinet. In other words, let the power more from the Cabinet Secretariat to the Cabinet itself so

that we may have a more effective leadership in this country—a collective leadership in this country. Instead of Mrs. Gandhi and this puppet show of 56 dummies that she runs, let it be meaningful Cabinet where their individual performance helps her. There is little enough talent that she can draw upon but let her make use of the talent that is available in her party to the maximum extent possible. Therefore, the prime need of the hour is a Cabinet re-shuffle. That Cabinet re-shuffle should not be postponed for some political reasons or for some political motives to some other future date. Let her do it now while Parliament is in session and before the Presidential election. In the face of this crisis, I have a few suggestions to make.

The first thing is there should be a Deputy Prime Minister in this country. I have been looking around. Mr. Chavan is sitting here. A little while ago I saw Babu Jagjivan Ram. I think there should be a Deputy Prime Minister once again. I saw Mr. Chavan smiling away in animated conversation with the P.M. a while ago, but, he is not happy with his portfolio. And therefore, I suggest that you restore to him the Home Portfolio where he performed some distinguished services to the country and relieve him of this unfortunate Finance portfolio which he has been entrusted with.

This has several advantages. If Mr. Chavan moves to Home, the present incumbent can be conveniently made the Congress President. And that would kill two birds with one stone. Then, I suggest that for Finance, get somebody who knows a little about finance—maybe Mr. Subramaniam or maybe, Mr. Pai—I do not know whom. I leave the choice to you. But, get somebody who knows a little about finance to run the finance portfolio. I also suggest that you in-

duct this young man, Mr. Salve, into the Finance Ministry. I strongly recommend him. I strongly recommend also that the Prime Minister keeps a watch over him because there is a tendency for him to swollen beaded a little faster than he ought to* I would not like her to move Shri Swaran Singh out of the External Affairs Ministry. I think he is outstanding; he is excellent, who can talk for hours together and, at the end, tell you precisely nothing. This is the sort of man, I think, that we need in the External Affairs Ministry— I can go on like this, but, I think that you would get a little irritated again.

As for the Prime Minister herself, I suggest that she should stick to Atomic Energy because nobody understands it and nobody is expected to understand it, and she should keep all the intelligence powers in her own hands which she has been doing for the last so many years, because it will help her gossip and also to keep a tight control by black-mailing her fellow-colleagues as soon as they step out of line. There is plenty of talent outside. As I look around I find Mr. Hanumanthaiah, an eminent man. Also I see Shri Dmesh Singh sitting here who is trying to look very small. There is Mr. Jagannath Rao over there who also has been waiting. In the other House there is Mr. Chandrasekhar whose beard is growing longer and longer. He has been waiting so long. Then, there is Mr. Gadgil also in the other House. Then, there is my friend Mr. Daga, a first class man; you cannot get a better man than him in the entire Congress Party; he should be entrusted with agriculture. Then, I see Shrimati Maya Ray over there. I think that the Treasury Benches could stand a little bit of ornamentation. Then, there are several people who need to be promoted. There is, for instance, Mr. Gujral who has done excellent work. Then, I see Mr. Shafi Qureshi over here, and he should have been made to intervene instead of his senior colleague. Then,

of course, there are a lot of young people....

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: What about the Parliamentary Affairs Minister?

SHRI PILOO MODY: He should be left there. There is no bigger crook in the whole House.

Then, where is Mr Stephen? He should definitely not be included in the Cabinet. I leave these thoughts with the Prime Minister. I hope she will sleep on them tonight and announce the new Cabinet tomorrow.

I suggest the if she did have a better team and if she did share power with them and if she did made them perform and entrusted them with the task of cutting down their expenditure by 20 per cent every year and if not 'out', I think this country could be saved quite easily.

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN): I have been listening to the discussion on the no-confidence motion for the last four or five hours. When I was asked to speak at five O'clock I was wondering about what points I was going to reply to, because most of the important speeches have been made on this side of the House. Now, I find that Shri Indrajit Gupta's speech has been added to by that of Shri Piloo Mody. I thought that they were going to make a proposal for the unmaking of the Ministry. But here is a speech which has made some suggestion for making the Ministry. That shows their confidence and that shows their own attitude about it.

Sir, I have been in parliamentary life for a pretty long time, for nearly 28 years, and I have been brought up in a tradition where no-confidence motion is considered as a very serious proposition. I have never seen a no-confidence motion being treated so lightheartedly by those who move it. I thought that the Communist Party (Marxist) was a very serious political party in India. At least I take it

very seriously. I do not know whether the leaders of that party would really take the speech that Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu had made as a representative speech from their party. It is a very tragic situation that in our country in a Parliament of this stature, one of the Members representing a political party—certainly he has every right to criticise us, and I do not deny that right—has spoken in that fashion.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Your certificate is really impressive.

17 hrs.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: But the way abusive epithets were flung and allegations were made did not become the party. This is one thing I wanted to point out that if at all you have to make criticisms, certainly they are welcome and we are here to answer them, we are here to explain them. May be perhaps we may succeed in convincing you; may be we may not. That is a different matter altogether. But I would certainly at least make an appeal to the other political leaders who are very distinguished politicians in this country and leading their own parties whether they are doing any service to democracy, particularly parliamentary democracy, in associating themselves with a no-confidence motion of this type of motivation. This is a serious question I want to pose before both Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu and also the other political leaders before I come to actually what has been said in the debate on this no-confidence motion.

Two or three main grounds have been raised in this debate on the no confidence motion. One is about the railway strike, of which notice has been taken by the Railway Minister himself. He has participated in the debate and has replied to most of the points. The other was about the

issue of Ordinances and then the question of prices and the present economic situation, particularly the inflationary situation. Naturally, I am speaking briefly to intervene to explain government policies about the latter parts namely the present economic situation, particularly the inflationary situation, and why is it that in that context, the Ordinance have become necessary.

The House will pardon me if I repeat some of the things I have already said either here or outside because when you are talking about the realities of the economic situation, you cannot invent arguments or situations. You have to deal with the realities as they are. It is a truism to say that the present economic situation is something very serious of which we have to take note. As a matter of fact, we are in a serious grip of inflation which is threatening to be a runaway inflation and therefore, we have to think very seriously about this matter. We are thinking seriously about this matter and, therefore, we are taking certainly some serious steps in this matter.

But it is not enough merely to describe a situation. Merely describing a situation does not lead to any solution. We will have to find out why it is so. We will have to diagnose the situation. According to us, the inflationary situation has been gradually accentuating in the last couple of years. The basic reason for that of course—again to repeat the same theme—is that there is that imbalance between the aggregate demand in this country and the availability of essential goods and services that are needed to meet that demand. This is, really speaking, the basic reason for the present inflation.

Now we have to deal with this problem. How do we deal with this problem? If we have to deal with this problem, then naturally people ask: how are you going to deal with this question of demand? May I say

to that that it has been said not by Government only but it has been said for the last two years by a number of economists in this country, by a number of parliamentarians and politicians in this country, that this is because there is a rather unusually large money supply in the country? It has its many facets—money supply. There are many eminent economists here who possibly may speak about it more authoritatively. Of course, the reasons for that may be different. I admit Government's deficit financing was also one of the very important contributory factors to this. I do not deny it; it is there. There was certainly despite our efforts at credit controls, selective credit controls, a certain money expansion which came from that side. There is certainly the usual rise in incomes; it is not merely wages but general rise in incomes unrelated to the availability of goods. That has certainly created an imbalance and we have to deal with this problem.

It is not enough merely to deal with the problem of money supply. We have also to deal with the other side. That is, the side of production in the industrial and agricultural fields. There we have to deal with many other facts of the problem. There is another field of money supply coming from unaccountable, illegitimate, illegal sources, which is the result of evasion of taxes, both direct and indirect. If direct taxes are evaded, it becomes the nucleus of black money. In the case of indirect taxes, it is evaded by producing more and showing less in terms of commodities and those commodities become the mother of more black money. We have to deal with this entire problem.

Let me first explain what we are not doing. I heard Mr. Indrajit Gupta's speech very carefully. Possibly that was the one serious speech I heard in this entire debate.

AN HON. MEMBER: You mean from that side.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN:
Of course I began by saying that I heard some very good speeches from this side

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA:
During none of your interventions have you failed to say this

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN:
Possibly I would have heard some more serious speeches if I had delayed my intervention for some time I do not deny that *(Interruptions)*

Mr Indrajit Gupta made two points while criticising the ordinances. He said that we are saying something which exactly we are not doing. He made a reference to his famous Professor in Cambridge, Prof John Keynes. I quote him

"The basic determinant of prices in our society is not the wages of the workers but the capitalists held on the big sectors of the industry where they determine the prices for the sake of their profits and super-profits by creating artificial scarcity, by restricting production. Inflation is the thing which helps the capitalists the most. This theory was inspired by John M. Keynes' the old Professor of my old college in Cambridge. I thought we had given up this long ago. John M. Keynes' old theory is being resurrected again—he means by this Government—that the safety valve against economic depression and against the danger of economic explosion is to create deficit financing and inflation so that by creating paper money which has no value you can boost up the demand for goods, inflate the prices and allow the capitalists to make higher profits. It is a bogus theory, it has never worked in any capitalist country and it is not going to work here also."

He says as if we have issued these ordinances to create more money. Is that what he means? It is precisely the opposite that we are trying to do. I would like to emphasise that we

have never believed that the inflation in this country is basically the result of action on the part of the working classes. I do not want to dwell on the causes of inflation which are basically rooted in the slackness of agricultural and industrial production. We have issued these ordinances not because we believe that wages are going to increase the prices. We have done this to prevent possible inflationary pressures on the run away prices. I really do not know what could have been the size of the inflationary pressure if we had allowed things to go as they are and not taken any steps to prevent them.

So, the steps that we have taken so far are in the nature of preventive action. We never claimed that by the issue of these Ordinances, immediately there is going to be some fall in prices. We never claimed that. Then, these are not the only steps which ultimately will give us that result. We will have to take a series of steps. This is the first package we have given in the form of three Ordinances. I will explain later why the three Ordinances were considered necessary. So the main point is that Shri Indrajit Gupta was trying to attribute things which we never said. Really speaking this is part of our policy, the policy that has been implemented and the policy that has been explained recently in the ten-point programme by the Prime Minister, namely to reduce deficit financing, to reduce Governmental expenditure on the non-plan items. And the steps that we took last year and the steps that we propose to take this year also to economise shows our faith in the programme of minimising unnecessary expenditure on non-Plan items.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: We will show you all this by your own figures tomorrow.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN:
This he should have done in the beginning. What is the use of men-

tioning them at the end? If he had devoted his speech to that, I would have welcomed it.

This is exactly what we are trying to do, and that is why the Ordinances have become necessary. This was the time to act. If this is not the time to act, may I ask him what was the time to act?

Some hon. Members very legitimately raised the question why the Ordinances were necessary. I certainly owe an explanation to this House, and possibly we will discuss this in more detail when we discuss the Bill to replace the Ordinance. Then I will be hearing more about this from the opposition side. But I would like to explain in the beginning why we thought the Ordinances were necessary. If we take the Ordinances individually, one by one, that is a different matter. Certainly, it was a package. The Ordinance limiting the dividend, the Ordinance compelling the deposit of 50 per cent of the additional dearness allowance and the Ordinance compelling income-tax payers above a certain level to deposit a percentage of their income, it is really speaking a package in order to reduce the monetary supply and reduce the inflationary pressure on demand. It was thought that these are the important sections which can make this contribution. When I say "contribution", it is not a gift; it is not in that sense that I am using the word "contribution". Then, we are not taking away the present wages of the employees. It is only 50 per cent of the additional wages and dearness allowance that is covered by this measure. This increment is meant for the purchase of consumer goods....

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Food.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: Yes, food, clothing and many other items also. The idea is not to deprive them of their necessities. I would

like my friends to consider seriously this problem. We adopted the policy of dearness allowance with a view to solving the problem of the wage earners. But we found that it is not solving the problem of inflationary forces. I quite agree that it is a rather extraordinary step that we have taken. But when we face an unequal situation we have to take unusual steps.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): Is it not a fact that the package was not comprehensive enough and that is why your colleague like Shri Dharia opposed this Ordinance?

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: You better ask that question of Shri Dharia. Please listen to me now. The package can certainly be more comprehensive. But the package that we have produced is, in a way, a linked package. It is an inter-linked package. It is a deposit operation which the Government of India can through its own legislation bring into existence. This is the most important thing.

About dividend distribution, may I ask: Was not the Ordinance necessary? Could we have brought this proposition or this proposal merely in the form of a normal law? It had to be done by an Ordinance. In a package, when one item has to be enacted through an Ordinance, the others become inevitably linked up with that. Mr. Indrajit Gupta gave an argument that in the case of persons who were supposed to deposit money sometime in the month of December, why was it necessary to issue an Ordinance? It is not in that mechanical sense that you could judge these issues. These are very important issues.

There is something like psychological aspect of inflation also. When an approach has been accepted, it is necessary to put the entire approach in a package before the country in a comprehensive form. Therefore, when one Ordinance becomes necessary, it

is absolutely inevitable that all the other proposition organically linked with it be brought in the form of Ordinances. Nobody likes Ordinances. Don't we know that if we come with Ordinances, the House does not like it? We also know it. But we had to do it. We had no other option. We thought that there were compelling reasons for us to go in for Ordinances. Therefore, I would request this House to appreciate the compelling reasons and the reasons why we thought that this was going to help the economy of the country. As far as the Ordinances are concerned, I have tried to explain my own reasons for the issue of Ordinances. Ultimately, the Ordinances on their merits will be considered by the House.

The other issue of administrative problems, their implementation, is also an important one. I do not deny that administrative problems are very many; I do not minimise the difficulties in implementation. But some of the difficulties have to be accepted knowingly. You cannot merely push away a task only because it is difficult. It is difficult and it is necessary and, therefore, it has to be performed. We have undertaken this difficult task because we believe that it is ultimately going to help the economy of this country.

Now, the question comes up as to what are the other things that we want to do about black money. Everybody asks a question, a legitimate question, as to what we propose to do about it. I would like to say that for the last two years, we have been consistently taking steps to control the problem of black money. Some people just stick to one thing and try to find out what we are doing and what we are not doing. The hon. Member, Mr. Indrajit Gupta, made a reference to the memoranda submitted by the economists and asked as to what we are going to do about those memoranda. He, particularly, made a reference to this popular name "SEMIBOMBLA" and asked what we are going to do about it. Let me take this opportunity to

express our deep appreciation of the cooperation that the economists of this country are giving to the Government. We are really grateful to them that in the present difficult economic conditions, they are applying their mind individually and collectively and giving us very important constructive suggestions which we are also considering from time to time.

They are also giving us suggestions in a package. It is not only one suggestion or two suggestions. The Memorandum which they have submitted to the Prime Minister is a very important document. There is no doubt about it. I would like to say that a number of their suggestions are very useful and constructive. We have already accepted some of them. I can mention some of the suggestions that we are implementing. A number of suggestions listed by economists in their Memorandum, such as, rationalisation of Government expenditure, involvement in the working of public sector undertakings, reduction of governmental subsidies, increased in the rate of interest—only recently, the Reserve Bank of India increased the bank rate—the use of fiscal instruments to reduce consumption improvement in foreign exchange reserves, building up of adequate buffer stocks of foodgrains, reduction in non-developmental expenditure and increase in production are already under implementation. Most of those suggestions we have certainly accepted. But at the same time I must humbly point out that their main suggestion is reducing, by 30 per cent, through stamping by designated authorities the face value of currency notes of the denomination of Rs. 100 and above held by the public and the issue of Special Government of India Certificates equal to the reduction, i.e. of 30 per cent, in the face value of the currency notes; the Special Certificates will have a maximum maturity period of ten years and they will bear an annual rate of interest of ten per cent. etc. Also their idea is to reduce the value

of deposits in banks. We in the Finance Ministry have examined very carefully this suggestion. The Reserve Bank of India has also applied its mind to it. And I must frankly State that we have given all the weight to the suggestion but we do not favour this because it is not likely to help the economy as we understand it. If you reduce the value of the deposits in banks, you are really speaking, undermining the faith of the people in the banking system itself. Therefore, we do not favour this suggestion. I only want to tell the hon. Member, Shri Indrajit Gupta, that we have given a very serious thought to the suggestions made by the economists. As I said, we are very grateful to them for their suggestions. Some of the suggestions which are acceptable we are implementing, but some of the suggestions which are not acceptable we are not implementing.

I was coming to black money. As I said, some members really go by some slogan here and there. But I have repeatedly said that through legislative action we have taken a number of steps. Ultimately, as I said, black money is generated by evasion of taxes and also in certain monopoly in commodity distribution like steel....

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Why did you suppress the interim report of Wanchoo Commission?

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: Again you are talking about demotisation. We have made our position very clear, many times, about this, we have said that we have not accepted this. What is the use of publishing the report about it? There is no use doing it.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: You appoint a Commission and then you suppress it report.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: At the present moment also there is a very important Bill before a Select Committee. A large number of members of this House are members of that Select Committee. I hope the

Select Committee will submit its report seem for the consideration of the House so that it becomes a statute. A number of steps have been taken there. The most important part of that recommendation is that we want to treat the economic offences very seriously. According to me, that is the most important part of it and I wish that it becomes a law.

Another outlet for black money was investment of money in urban properties or other properties in an undervalued manner. You know about that Act. That Act has already been implemented and more than 4,000 notices have been issued. I learn that, in respect of nearly 38 properties, final orders have already been issued. May be, they may go on appeal to tribunal, etc. But my main point is this. This number '38' or '4,000' is not important. What is important is that a new process has started about economic offences in 1973-74. Nearly a hundred prosecutions have been launched. As I said, it is not the number of prosecutions that is important. The main point is that a new way of dealing with this problem has started. A large number of raids have been organized. It is a question of creating a fear in the minds of these people for using black money, for their anti-social activities, not to resort to these things. It is again this atmosphere. (*Interruptions*) Merely crying hoarse about black money does not help either you or me or anybody. We ought to change that atmosphere in the country. Let us do that. Merely trying to accuse one Party or one individual or one section of people does not help us or the party. These are some of the steps we are taking in the case of black money as well.

I tried to point out the measures we have taken in the case of production also. I have taken a series of measures even last year in the case of agriculture as you very rightly know. As we said in our AICC meeting, we think that the production of the last year was certainly bad enough for us. Unfortunately, we have not been successful to effectively bring the necessary produce into the distribu-

tion system. . . (Interruptions) That is the effort we have to do this year also. . . (Interruptions) Why we are not successful, we are certainly thinking about it. You also give some co-operation in this matter. This is a national problem. Let us think about it. If you want to think about the economic problems in a co-operative manner, you are welcome. But when we are considering the national problem in its national perspective, what is your contribution? Strike, more strikes and more strikes. That is the way you are talking about. This is the way you are talking about a serious matter of a no-confidence motion in the country. The most important and serious problem before the country to-day is this economic problem. What is your offer of co-operation to solve this problem instead of merely criticising us? (Interruptions)

AN HON MEMBER: It is your own certain.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: That would not absolve you from your responsibility as leaders of this country if you are leaders of this country. Merely saying that this is your creation or his creation would certainly help you make a speech, but certainly it would not help you to go back to the people.

Therefore, I make an appeal to the hon. Members here, both on this side and on that side, that if at all we are serious about the problems of this country, let us not think in negative terms. Let us not think in terms of anti-this and anti-that. Fortunately we have got a very effective leadership of Madam Gandhi as the Prime Minister of this country. I think it is our duty in this difficult time of the history of the nation that we give our best co-operation to her and through her to the nation.

SHRI PILOO MODY: His last sentence is the real contribution to the economic problems of this country.

श्री जनैश्वर मिश्र (इलाहाबाद) : सभापति महोदय, श्री ज्योतिर्मय बसु ने जो

अविश्वास-प्रस्ताव श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी की सरकार के खिलाफ रखा है, मैं पूरी ताकत के साथ उसका समर्थन करता हूँ

जहां तक रेल कर्मचारियों का सम्बन्ध है, मैं वे आंकड़े नहीं दूंगा कि कितनों को सरकार ने निकाला और कितनों की नोकरी भंग की। मैं केवल इतना ही कहूंगा कि जब उन लोगों ने रोटी की मांग की थी, तो माननीय श्री ललित नारायण मिश्र ने पल्टन और पुलिस बुलवा कर उनको मिटवाया था और उनके घरों को उड़वाया था।

इस बहस के दौरान ही नहीं, इस से पहले भी, बाहर भी, यह चर्चा चलती रही है कि रेल कर्मचारी देश के दुश्मन हैं। रेल कर्मचारी हड़ताल करने के बाद भी, बहुत ज्यादा उग्र हो जाने के बाद भी, कञ्चातिवू किसी दूसरे देश को नहीं दे सकते हैं। असल में, देश का कौन दुश्मन है, इस बात का फ़ैसला इस देश में होना चाहिये। जो अपनी रोटी की मांग करेगा, वह देश का दुश्मन है या जो अपने देश की जमीन किसी परदेशी को दे देगा, वह देश का दुश्मन है ?

कल मैंने प्रधान मंत्री का वह भाषण देखा, जो उन्होंने कांग्रेस पार्टी के अपने लोगों के बीच में दिया था। उन्होंने कञ्चातिवू के बारे में कहा कि वह पथरीली जमीन है। ऐसे ही रड्डिज जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने, जब चीन का हमला हुआ था, कहा था कि देश की सरहद पर स्थित अक्साई चिन एक पथरीली कंकड़ीली जमीन है।

मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि गांधी जी के जमाने से, और उससे पहले से, हिन्दुस्तान की धरती को हम भारत माता कहते रहे हैं। हिन्दुस्तान की प्रधान मंत्री इस धरती को रखवाली और चौकीदारी करते हैं। भारत माता ही सब से जिम्मेदार लड़की भारत माता की उंगली, नाक और दान के बारे में कहे कि उस से बढ़कर आती है, वह सड़ गया है, यह बहुत गौरजिम्मेदारी की बात है। बहुत ही गंदे लोगों के बयान हुआ करते हैं

इस तरह के। यह मैं धारोप लगाऊंगा और अन्त में कहूंगा कि अगर निकलवाना था किसी को तो रेलवे कर्मचारियों के बाल बच्चों को उनके क्वार्टरों में नहीं निकलवाना चाहिये था बल्कि ललित नारायण मिश्र को और उनके परिवार को उनके घरों से निकलवाना चाहिये था। श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी को और उनके परिवार वालों को उनके घरों में निकलवाना था। इनके खिलाफ अविश्वास प्रस्ताव नहीं, गण्टू-द्रोह का मुद्दा चरना चाहिये था। इन लोगों ने बहुत ही गद्दारी की है देश के साथ।

एक और बहस चल रही है कि आजकल महंगाई बढ़ी हुई है। इसका दोष। कौन है? उनकी तरफ से अगर कुछ विरोधियों की तरफ से भी कहा जाता है कि इसके दोषी जमाखोर, जखीरेबाज, और विरोधी पार्टी के लोग हैं क्योंकि ये उम में अड़गा लगाया करते हैं। जिन दिनों उत्तर प्रदेश में चुनाव चल रहा था और श्रीमति इंदिरा गांधी देश भर में दौरे कर रही थी जबकि उन्हें जगह जगह काले झड़े दिखाए जा रहे थे तो वह लोगो में कह रही थी इन का एकब्यान मझे याद है कि महंगाई से घबराना मत क्योंकि रबी की फसल बढ़िया होने वाली है। लगता है कि डान्डा रबी के खेत में पैदा होता है, मिटटी का तेल रबी के खेत में पैदा होता है। लोगों का खाना नहीं मिल रहा है और ये कहते हैं कि केवल विरोधी दल और जमाखोर यही लोग इसके दोषी हैं। हो सकता है हम दोषी हो सरकार दोषी न हो लेकिन मैं इस की एक ही मिसाल दूंगा कि आज में तीन महीने पहले खाद की एक बोरी 53 रुपये में मिल सकती थी, आज वह 105 रुपये बोरी मिल रही है। एक बोरी में 50 किलो खाद हुआ करती है और यह सरकार किसान से 105 रुपये क्विंटल गेहूँ लेती है। एक क्विंटल खाद हुई 210 रुपये की और एक क्विंटल गेहूँ हुआ 105 रुपये का यह सरकार कारखानेदारों की सरकार है या किसानों की सरकार है, खलिहान वालों की, सरकार है या कारखानेदारों की सरकार है? इस पर बहस होना चाहिए। इन की नितिया

दोषपूर्ण है। और यह केवल खाद वाली बात ही नहीं है, इस तरह में इन्होंने लगानार कारखानेदारों के द्वारा किसानों का शोषण करवाया है, उनकी फार्मों का शोषण करवाया है, खलियान का शोषण करवाया है, मैं यह आरोप लगाना चाहता हूँ इस के ऊपर। जब किसान का गल्ला खलियान में तैया है तब सस्ता कर दिया और जैसे ही वह गल्ला मंडी में चला जाएगा तीन महीने के बाद यही गेहूँ जो आज दो रूपये किलो या 1 रूपये 5 पैसे किलो बिक रहा है वह तीन रूपये, साढ़े तीन रूपये किलो बिकेगा और यह वे कहेंगे कि मैं क्या करूँ? मेरा इस में कोई दोष नहीं है?

चव्हाण साहब का बड़ा मामूला शोषण हुआ। शोषण से लग रहा था कि कोई डिबेटिंग सोमाइटी की अध्यक्षता कर रहे थे और इनाम बांट रहे थे कि कौन बढ़िया बोला है कौन बढ़िया नहीं बोला है। उन का इनाम लेने के लिए हम लोग यहाँ मजदूर में नहीं आए हैं। देश की जनता को खाने के लिए नहीं मिल रहा है। उम का पेट जल रहा है और पिछले 6 महीने, 8 महीने में उम के पीर के नीचे की जमीन भी जलने लगी है। हम इन का उनाम मागते नहीं आए हैं। इस तरह के मटिफिकेट लेने नहीं आए हैं। देश की जनता इस समय इन का जबाब दे रही है। इन में बात नहीं करना चाहती है। ये मंडको पर निकलने की हिम्मत नहीं करते। किसानों का शोषण कराने वाली सरकार है यह।

आज कल यह सीना नान कर कहा करते हैं ये लोग, इन की प्रधान मंत्री कहा करनी है कि हम ने ऐंटेम बम बनवाया है। माबुन की टिकिया तो आप बनवा नहीं सके, आय का ऐंटेम बम नहाने समय शरीर में चलाएंगे क्या? तब पर रोटी पकाने का काम करेगा क्या ऐंटेम बम? ऐंटेम बम का घमंड आपने किया है जब मुल्क के लोगों को आप माबुन की टिकिया नहीं दे सके हैं और माबुन की टिकिया ही नहीं, आज उत्तर प्रदेश के स्कूला और कालेज बन्द है। केवल इसलिए बहुगुणा साहब ने कह कर बन्द किया है कि उत्तर प्रदेश में किसानों नहीं है,

कागज नहीं है, कापियां नहीं है, इस लिए बन्द है। लड़के पैकेज नहीं क्यों कि कागज नहीं है। यह बयान है सरकार का, हमारा नहीं है। जिस रफ्तार से पढ़ने वाले रिडकोंकी तादाद बढ़ी है, तालीम बढ़ी है, उस रफ्तार से कागज का उत्पादन नहीं बढ़ा है। स्कूल और कालेज बन्द नहीं होंगे तो और क्या होगा। और अब स्कूल और कालेज खुलेंगे, लड़के किताब और कापी मांगेंगे, बाजार में नहीं मिलेगा तो आप की सरकार को घेरेंगे जो आप कहेंगे कि विरोधी दल के लोग भड़का रहे हैं, जयप्रकाश नारायण करवा रहे हैं। अपनी करनी पर, अपनी असफलता पर और अपने निकम्मेपन पर आप जरा भी शर्म नहीं करेंगे। हर बार विरोधी दलों के लोगों को कह देंगे कि ये लोग भड़का रहे हैं। कैसी है यह सरकार ?

प्रधान मंत्री जी यहां से चली गई। मैं चाहता था कि वह रहती और अपनी बात सुनती। लेकिन नहीं रहीं। एक चर्चा चली है अध्यक्षता की। एक साहब ने कहा दो साल। मैं चाहता हूँ कि यह दो साल का टाइम नहीं रहता और जितनी गर्मी के साथ यह अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव पेश किया गया है, एक क्षण के अंदर यह पास होता और मैं कांग्रेस पार्टी के लोगों से कहूंगा कि वे आत्मा की आवाज को इस्तेमाल करें। अगर उस का इस्तेमाल वे करेंगे तो अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव पास हो जाएगा।

अप्टाचार की चर्चा चली है। अध्यादेश जारी हुआ और उसके जारी होने हुए जिस बढ़िया पैकेज की बात चर्चा साहब कर रहे थे उस पैकेज में लीकेंज बना हुआ था। टाटा साहब को करोड़ों की आमदनी हो गई, विरला साहब को और बड़े-बड़े सरमायेदारों को आप का अध्यादेश जारी होने ही आमदनी हो गई। क्या था आप का अध्यादेश ? यही था न कि छोटे से मजदूर का महंगाई भत्ता और न बढ़ने दिया जाए, उस पर रोक लगाई जाए। कहें हैं इसने देश की दौलत बढ़ेगी। कल हम को भागवत सा आजाद ने कहा था कि इस से देश को दौलत बढ़ेगी, कमाई बढ़ेगी। प्रधान मंत्री का दौरा होता है। एक

दौरे में इन के तीन लाख रुपये खर्च हुआ करते हैं। दस हजार पुलिस का सिपाही जाता है। हर सिपाही अगर तीन रुपये रोज भत्ता लेता है, दो दिन पहले जात है, दो दिन बाद में भत्ता है, पांच दिन का भत्ता तीन रुपये रोज के हिसाब से दस हजार सिपाहियों का जोड़ें, लाख से ऊपर चला जाएगा। हवाई जहाज का, अफसरों का, बांस बल्ली का या फाटक का खर्चा में नहीं जोड़ रहा हूँ। एक दिन का खर्चा में अपने घर में बैठी रहे तो 25 हजार, 30 हजार, 35 हजार जाएगा। अपनी फिजूल खर्चों पर ये लोग बहस नहीं करेंगे, अपने ठाट वाट पर ये लोग बहस नहीं करेंगे। ये लोग बहस करेंगे कि कमजोर मजदूर और गरीब किसान का बेटा अगर कहीं चौकीदारी करता है तो उस की तनख्वाह उमरका महंगाई भत्ता न बढ़े। कहां है बास्पाल जी ? वह यहां पर बिल लाने वाले हैं कि पालियामेंट के मेम्बरों का महंगाई भत्ता बढ़ा दिया जाए। सड़कों पर निकटेंगे यह कानून पास करने के बाद तो जनता जिसको आप ने बेज फ्रीज का अडिमेंस पास किया है वह आप को पीटेगी, यह याद रखना। थोड़ी शर्म और हया आप लोगों को रखनी चाहिए। जनता के बीच में हम लोगों ने कहा था कि हम बहुत दड़े त्यागी हैं और यहां आने के बाद अपनी महंगाई भत्ता बढ़ाने के लिए बिल पेश करने आ रहे हैं... (व्यवधान)... इस से भी बड़े शर्मनाक बात कोई और क्या हो सकती है ? (व्यवधान).....

यह मेरे टाइम में मत जोड़िएगा। अब मैं जल्दी जल्दी अपनी बात खत्म करना चाहता हूँ।

अक्सर एक चर्चा चला करती है साल भर पर, डेढ़ साल पर, दो साल पर कि सी रुपये के नोट की कीमत घटा दी जायगी। यह चर्चा बम्बई का खेल है। जब वहां के तस्कर व्यापारी सोना बाहर से ज्यादा लाते हैं और उनके सोने की कीमत ठीक नहीं मिलती तो सरकार से साठ-गांठ कर के चर्चा चलवा दिया करते हैं कि सी रुपये के नोट की कीमत घट जायगी। लोग अपने अपने नोट ले कर

भाग करते हैं कि जल्दी सोना खरीद लें। जब सोना महंगा होने लगता है तब सरकार की तरफ से और सरकारी प्रवक्ताओं की तरफ से बयान आ जाता है कि कोई कीमत नहीं घटेगी। तीन हफ्ते, चार हफ्ते यह चर्चा चलती रहती है। मैं चव्हाण साहब पर आरोप लगाऊंगा, वे भी बम्बई के हैं, बम्बई के तस्कर सोना व्यापारियों के साथ साठ गांठ करके इनका मंत्रालय यह चर्चा चलवाता है और फिर इस पर सफाई दे देता है कि यह चर्चा गलत है।

अभी अभी इलाहाबाद में स्टेट बैंक के अन्दर सौ रूपये के नोट का नाटक देख कर मैं हैरत में रह गया। सौ सौ रूपये के नोट वस बारह पकड़े गये, पुलिस वे छापे मारा। वहां के एजेंट ने कहा कि सरकार की तरफ से आदेश आया है कि ये नोट बैंक में जमा कर लिये जायें और दूसरे नोट दे दिये जायें। वह जाली नोट थे। आप को याद होगा आज से चार महीना पहले आचार्य कृपालानी ने बयान दिया था कि देश में इस समय 25 करोड़ रूपये के नोट छापे गये हैं, चुनाव होने वाला है, उसका मुकाबिला करने के लिए। वे जाली नोट आज बाजार में फैले हुए हैं। उनकी कोई सफाई नहीं है। इसके लिए क्या कहा जाय ?

असल में अष्टाचार के मामले में मैं केवल इतना ही कह सकता हूँ कि इस समय मुल्क की गंगात्री ही गन्दी हो गई है और गंगोत्री सियाम्त में प्रधान मंत्री की कुर्सी है। छोटे छोटे नदी नानं, बाबू जगजीवन राम, चव्हाण साहब, नरलिन नारायण मिश्र या बहुगुणा या बंशी लाल की मैं क्या चर्चा करता ? असल चीज तो है इस गंगोत्री की सफाई। जब तक हम गंगोत्री की सफाई नहीं होती इस मुल्क से अष्टाचार जा नहीं सकता है।

आखीर में केवल दो बात कह कर खत्म करूंगा। एक तो खत्म करूंगा यह कह कर कि यह इतफाक ही है कि दो बार आप के सदन में मैं आया। पहली बार आया तो पंडित

जवाहर लाल नेहरू के इलाके से, वह प्रधान मंत्री थे। दूसरी बार आया तो बाबू लाल बहादुर शास्त्री के इलाके से, वह भी प्रधान मंत्री थे। फूलपुर और इलाहाबाद तो मैंने निबटा दिया, अब रायबरेली की तमन्ना है। आप अविश्वास के प्रस्ताव को पास कराइये, नहीं तो प्रधान मंत्री जी इस्तीफा दें, अगर उनकी नीतियां सही हैं तो इस्तीफा दें और फिर से चुनाव लड़ें, हमारी भी हसरत पूरी हो जायगी। चले रायबरेली, इस बात का फैसला करने (व्यवधान) यह चुनौती मैं आप को अपनी तरफ से फेंकता हूँ—अगर ये बेचारे चुनाव की जहमत में नहीं फंसना चाहते तो वे अकेले इस्तीफा दे दें। मैं उनको कहना चाहता हूँ कि वे जनता के बीच में आयें। आज लोगों के लिये खाना नहीं है, बिजली नहीं है, जनता तकलीफ में है . . .

श्री कृष्ण चंद्र पाण्डेय (खलीलाबाद) : ये दो बार इलाहाबाद से चुनाव लड़ चुके हैं और जीत चुके हैं, अब मेरी इनको चुनौती है कि जहां से जीत कर आये हैं, इस्तीफा दें और मैं भी इस्तीफा देता हूँ—हम दोनों दोबारा चुनाव लड़ लें। मैं इस सदन में घोषणा करता हूँ कि प्रधान मंत्री जी के इस्तीफा देने की जरूरत नहीं है, मैं इस्तीफा देता हूँ और ये भी इस्तीफा देकर चुनाव लड़ लें। . . . (व्यवधान)

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र : इस समय जैसी देश की हालत बिगड़ी है और जिस तरह से लोगों को तबाह किया जा रहा है—बहुत निन्दनीय है। आज सवेरे दूध मेरे पास टेलीफोन आया है—श्री कर्पूरी ठाकुर के बेटे ने मुझे टेलीफोन किया—श्री कर्पूरी ठाकुर को भागलपुर जेल में रखा गया है, लेकिन उनको बिछाने के लिये बिस्तर नहीं दिया गया, खाने के लिये बर्तन नहीं दिया गया। वे बिहार के मुख्य मंत्री रह चुके हैं लेकिन इस तरह का व्यवहार उनके साथ किया जा रहा है। सभापति जी, अगर किसी भी इतिहास से विरोधियों की सरकार बन जाती है और प्रधान मंत्री जी को और इन

लोगों को उस हासत में रख दिया जाय तब आप लोग इस तरह से हल्ला नहीं मचायेंगे। इस लिये चिल्लाइये नहीं, चुपचाप बैठे रहिये। श्री कर्पूरी ठाकुर आधी घौती पहनते हैं और आधी बिछाते हैं। मैं गृह मंत्री जी से कहूंगा, मैंने अभी उनको देखा नहीं है लेकिन वे मेरे चुनाव में काम करने गये थे। वहाँ उन्होंने यही कहा था—प्रधान मंत्री जी के नाम से—कि इनको हरा दीजिये, ये ससद में जा कर हल्ला मचायेंगे, घसीटे जायेंगे—इस तरह की बात इन्होंने वहाँ कही थी, इनके बोलने का यह स्टैंडर्ड रह गया है (व्यवधान)। मैं चाहता हूँ कि होम मिनिस्टर इसको नोट करते कि किस तरह का व्यवहार वहाँ श्री कर्पूरी ठाकुर के साथ हो रहा है।

इस के अलावा आज हम को एक चिट्ठी पढ़ने को मिला है, मैं उस को सुनाउगा नहीं, मेरे पास रखा है। यह चिट्ठी यहाँ पर विरोधी दलों के नेताओं के पास आई है, उमाशंकर दीक्षित जी के पास आई है और कार। हम लोगों के पास आई है। उस में लिखा गया है कि मुख्य मंत्री ने हरियाणा, हरियाणा कांग्रेस के जनरल सैक्रेटरी के सामने यह कहा है कि जयप्रकाश नारायणको खत्म करने का इन्तजाम हो चुका है। नाथुराम गोडसे (व्यवधान)

अगर यह बात सही है तो मैं चाहता हूँ कि जयप्रकाश नारायण जी की जिन्दगी के साथ खिलवाड़ मत बरना, कांग्रेसियो। अगर इस जिन्दगी से तुमने खिलवाड़ किया तो वह खिलवाड़ बिना जवाब के नहीं जाने दिया जायगा। अगर इस तरह की कोई भी बात हुई तो देश की जनता तुम्हें सड़क पर निकलने नहीं देगी। जयप्रकाश नारायण जी की जिन्दगी कीमती जिन्दगी है, तुम्हारी इस तरह की साजिश को जनता बरदाशत नहीं करेगी। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि कांग्रेस पार्टी को एक क्षण भी यहाँ रहने का हक नहीं है। जो लोग

श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी के भक्त हैं मैं उन से कहूंगा—ठीक है आप लोग इस अविश्वास प्रस्ताव के खिलाफ वोट देंगे, लेकिन जिन लोगों के दिल जले हुए हैं—मैं जानता हूँ बाबू जगजीवन राम जी का दिल कम नहीं जला है, मैं जानता हूँ, महापाति जी, भागवत शा आजाद का दिल कम नहीं जला है, मैं जानता हूँ, कांग्रेस पार्टी के जिन लोगों के दिल जले हैं

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Chirayinkil) On a point of order I did not want to interrupt the maiden speech of the hon. member. But he has made a very serious allegation against the Chief Minister of a neighbouring State. It has serious implications. It has gone on record. He said in Hindi—I will repeat it—that Mr. Bansilal has told the Secretary of the Congress Committee that he is thinking of murdering Jayaprakash Narayan. It is a very serious allegation. It has gone on record. It is the responsibility of the hon. member making it to prove it. It is a baseless allegation without any foundation. Since it has gone on record it has to be substantiated. Otherwise, it should be expunged.

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM (Srinagar): He did not say that he was present at that meeting. He said 'I have received a letter to this effect'.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Mr. Charan Singh is conspiring against Jayaprakash Narayan. There is a report that Charan Singh is trying to do it.

श्री राम सहाय पाण्डेय (राजमद गांव) : सदरे मुहतरिम, मैं आप से दम्नबस्ता गुजारिश करता हूँ कि जो इन्जाम हरियाणा के चीफ मिनिस्टर को तस्वूर करने हुए लगाया गया है कि कार्टेरी कास्पिरेसी या लडयन्ड या कोई ऐसी साजिश बन चुकी है जिन में आदरणीय माननीय, श्रीदास्पद बाबू जी

प्रकाश नारायण जी को खत्म करने की बात कहीं नहीं है और ऐसे किसी खत या खतूत का बटवारा हुआ है जो मिश्र जी के पास आया है—इस बात को रिकार्ड से हटा दिया जाय, यह गलत है लगे है, झूठ है, बबुनियाद है ।

श्री मनु बबुइयते (राजापुर) : मिश्र जी अपनी तकरीर में बयान देते हुए यह कहा है कि वे जो इल्जाम लगा रहे हैं उस का आधार एक खत है जो उन के पास आया है । अगर आप चाहें तो मैं उन से यह कहूंगा वे उस खत को आपके सामने और इस सदन के सामने पढ़ कर बतलायें . . (व्यवधान) . .

श्री श्री० आर० शुक्ल (बहराइच) : सभापति जी, कायदा यह है कि जो व्यक्ति इस सदन में उपस्थित नहीं हो—मेम्बर की हैसियत से या मंत्री की हैसियत से, उस के खिलाफ कोई इल्जाम लगाना या उसके खिलाफ को बात कहना जो उसकी बदनामी का बाइस हो, उस को नहीं कहा जा सकता है । इस किये मैं आपसे अनुरोध करता हूँ कि आप उस पोस्मन को एक्सपोज कराने का आदेश दें ।

श्री नरसिंह नारायण पाण्डेय (गोरखपुर) : मेरा निवेदन है—श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र जी कहते हैं कि वह पत्र उन्हें प्राप्त हुआ है और वह यह भी कहते हैं कि वह पत्र दूसरे अधिकांशियों के पास, गृहमंत्री जी तक भी गया है—इस बात की पुष्टि वे करते हैं । अब अगर यह पत्र फेक है तो इस की जिम्मेदारी उन को लेनी पड़ेगी, क्योंकि वे एक ऐसे व्यक्ति के बारे में इस सदन में सीरियस एलीमेशन लगा रहे हैं तो इस सदन में मौजूद नहीं है

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: I can say that Charan Singh has written this letter. It is a conspiracy of these fellows.

श्री नरसिंह नारायण पाण्डेय : वह व्यक्ति इस सदन के बाहर है, एक प्रवेश का मुख्य मंत्री है । ऐसी स्थिति में अगर यह पत्र फेक है, बेसजेस है तो इसकी जिम्मेदारी

इन को लेनी चाहिये उस के बाद उस पत्र को प्रमाणित कराकर जांच की जाय और अगर वह गलत पाया जाय तो इन के खिलाफ कार्यवाही होनी चाहिये । इस तरह से इस सदन में अपने प्रिविलेज का इस्तेमाल करते हुए कोई सदस्य ऐसा आरोप लगाता है जिससे देश में ऐसी स्थिति पैदा हो सकती है, तो इस की जिम्मेदारी उस को अपने ऊपर लेनी चाहिये . . . (व्यवधान)

श्री हकूम खन्ड कछवया (मुरैना) : हम आधे दिन यहां किसी न किसी व्यक्ति के बारे में चर्चा करते हैं । आज ही आप ने देखा जब रेल मंत्री भ्राना वक्तव्य दे रहे थे तो उन्होंने श्री जाजं फरनांडिज का नाम अपनेकों बार लिया जब कि श्री फरनांडिज इस सदन के मेम्बर नहीं हैं । दोनों ओर से इस तरह के आरोप लगाये जाते हैं । जिस पत्र में मिश्रा जी ने उल्लेख किया है वह और लोगों को भी मिला है । मैं चाहता हूँ कि उस को समा-पटल पर रखा जाय और देखा जाय कि जो कुछ उन्होंने कहा है वह सही है या नहीं, इस की एन्क्वायरी होनी चाहिये (व्यवधान)

17.50 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): The point of order relates to a letter which is said to have been written by some person in Haryana stating that there is a conspiracy to kill Shri Jayaprakash Narayan. It is has been alleged that the Chief Minister of Haryana said to the General Secretary of his party that he is hatching some such conspiracy and it would not be difficult to kill a person like Shri Jayaprakash Narayan. Shri Janeswar Misra made this remark during the course of his speech to which objection has been taken. If any hon. member receives a letter of that kind, what is his duty in the matter? If unfortunately it comes about and Shri Jayaprakash Narayan is killed, the person who had received the letter will be hauled up

before an enquiry. We had seen that during the course of the trial of persons who had killed Mahatma Gandhi, so many things had been brought in, the letter to Mr. Jain and things like that. I think it is the bounden duty of any hon. member to bring it before the House. I should have thought that the Government benches would have welcomed this information. They could have contradicted it the next day. The Government benches should solemnly consider it. I think nobody can prevent us from bringing such letters to the notice of the House. We receive so many letters from so many constituents and we are bound to bring them to the notice of the House. So, if what the hon. member has said is expunged, it would be a grave injustice to parliamentary procedure and also to the hon. Member who has to discharge certain duties.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am not totally ignorant of what happened. I was listening to the debate in my room. I think it was Mr. Ravi who raised the point of order. What exactly he wanted to be done, he did not make it quite clear. Later on a submission was made that these remarks should be expunged. We should not make this point into a mini debate. If we start making too many submissions, it becomes a debate within a debate. I am prepared to hear three or four more persons and after that I shall give my ruling. Let us do it in an orderly way. I am prepared to hear you all. Why are you excited? I will not hear those who have already made submissions. Let us clarify the issue. Let us not throw mud at each other. The main point is whether all these things that have been said should be on record or not. That is the only point.

DR. HENRY AUSTIN (Frnaku lam). When an hon. Member receives information alleging a conspiracy of the type that was mentioned here, involving persons of the stature of Shri Jaiprakash Narayan or the Chief Minister of Haryana, has

not the hon. Member a responsibility to enquire into it and authenticate the records before bringing that matter here and character is assassinating several persons and creating so much of tension? When such information is available, if it is not authenticated, it should be expunged from the proceedings.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Muvattupuzhe): I take my stand strictly under the rule and I insist that the rule must be enforced. Rule 353 says:

"No allegation of a defamatory or incriminatory nature shall be made by a member against any person unless the member has given previous intimation to the Speaker and also to the Minister concerned so that the Minister may be able to make an investigation into the matter for the purpose of a reply:

Provided that the Speaker may at any time prohibit any member from making any such allegation if he is of opinion that such allegation is derogatory to the dignity of the House or that no public interest is served by making such allegation."

My submission is that whatever Shri Mishra has said will not invalidate the point raised by us. You will have to decide firstly whether what was said here would amount to an allegation of an incriminatory nature; secondly, whether the plea that he received a letter is enough of an excuse or a cover to put forth this allegation on the floor of the House and, thirdly, if an incriminatory or defamatory statement which is not in conformity with the rules of the House has been made what exactly is the relief to be given. I suppose that to make a statement that the Chief Minister of Haryana is hatching a conspiracy for assassinating a particular person is certainly incriminatory. That he received an anonymous letter from somebody will not make it the less incriminatory. There are so many sources whereby you can get information. To say that he could

not get the source would not give him the right to air it on the floor of the House, except in conformity with the procedure that is specifically stipulated in the rule. He made a statement in violation of that. Therefore, that should not be allowed to remain in the records of this House under the rules. The expunction is not merely of what he has stated but the entire statement where this allegation is directly or indirectly put forth so that the records of the House would not carry a single word which may indicate that an allegation has been made on the floor of the House. I want a ruling on that point of order.

18 hrs.

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT (East Delhi): Sir, Mr. Stephen has quoted me relevant rule. This is not an ordinary matter; this is a very serious matter. The most serious charge has been made by the hon. Member, Shri Janeshwar Misra. He was saying that he had received a letter and, therefore, it was his duty to bring it to the notice of the House. It is amazing for me to hear that any letter which is absolutely without any basis should be read out in the House without verifying it. It was the first duty of Mr. Misra, if he has received the letter of the kind, to satisfy himself and then hand it over to the police. In this House, if a Member makes a defamatory and incriminatory allegation—this House is open to the press—the damage is done. What happens to the person affected? If you allow this House to develop into what it is developing, any person can get up and say anything.

There are certain rules and restrictions on the Members' right to speak in the House. We receive hundreds of anonymous letters. If we try to do what he has done, there will be no end to it. I would say that the alleged letter has been written, obviously, with a political motive. It is a conspiracy to create a fabricated allegation

Therefore, in the interest of proper functioning of Parliament, this sort of a thing should not be allowed.

This is a very serious matter. I would request you to see that the rules of procedure of the House are properly followed and that these things are not allowed, and the person affected is protected.

श्री एस० एम० बनर्जी (बानपुर): इनके कहने का मतलब यह है कि इनके पास एक पत्र आया है जिसमें यह है कि हियाणा के मुख्य मंत्री ने कहा है कि श्री जय प्रकाश नारायण को लिक्विडेट करने का पूरा इतजाम हो चुका है। यह एक चिट्ठी के आधार पर उन्होंने पढा है। इसी तरीके की एक चिट्ठी मैंने भी इसी हाउस में पढी थी जिसमें माननीय श्री झारखंडे राय के बारे में हम लोगों को सूचना दी गई थी (इन्टररूप्शंस)

It is just to revive their memory. This is what happened in the House. I read out a letter which was written by someone. He wrote that he will be killed because he did not support anti-go-katia movement. The Speaker allowed me. I read out the letter. (Interruptions).

The Speaker, in his wisdom referred the entire matter to the Home Minister and he was given protection. There are several instances like this. Here he has read out a letter. I do not agree with the politics of Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan. But the point is this. The statement which has been made by the hon. Member on the basis of some information may be right or wrong. It should not be expunged now. It should come on record. An

investigation should be made and if the letter is false or fabricated or is meant for political purposes, then he will face the consequences. If it is true, it will stand. I would request you not to expunge this in the larger interest of Parliamentary democracy.

I would also like to point out that often names are mentioned in this House by Ministers or members of those outside, of those who are not here to defend themselves. I would request them not to mention such names since this is a consequence of that.

SHRI HARI KISHORE SINGH (Pupri): Sir, I want to make a submission....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We have heard enough. There is no more fresh point. Please sit down. I think, all the points that are to be submitted have been made. If you want to convert this into a mini-debate, it is left to the pleasure of the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Two more from here

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Two more from here, two more from there, if it goes on like this, it becomes a mini-debate (Interruptions) Order, please. Whenever Pandeji speaks, I am attracted by him, more particularly by his beautiful moustache. Will you kindly keep quiet for some time?

The limited question is whether what Mr. Janeshwar Mishra had said and everything that the members have said after that relating to this should form part of the record or not. That is the point. Now I will first go by the rules. Mr. Stephen has drawn my attention to two rules; one is 353 and the other is 380. I will first go to rule 353 which reads like this:

"No allegation of a defamatory or incriminatory nature shall be made by a member against any person unless the member has

given previous intimation to the Speaker and also to the Minister concerned so that the Minister may be able to make an investigation into the matter for the purpose of a reply."

Then there is a provision.

"Provided that the Speaker may at any time prohibit any member from making any such allegation if he is of opinion that such allegation is derogatory to the dignity of the House."

"...or that no public interest is served by making such allegation." Now, there are two aspects of it here. The first is prohibition that this kind of a defamatory statement should not be made. But despite everything,—I am not saying defamatory or not—despite everything the statement has been made by Mr. Mishra and it has been strongly refuted, strongly contradicted from this side—both sides are there. Now the only thing that is open to the Speaker is that if a Member makes a statement and he continues after he has prohibited him, then only he comes in and can say now that I have prohibited you, you cannot continue and from that point onwards whatever is said will not form part of the record. But whatever has been said before in spite of efforts, once it has been said, it forms part of the record. This is the interpretation of this Rule. And, I think Mr. Stephen, if you read this rule very carefully you will see that the scope of the Speaker is limited only after he has prohibited. That is about this rule....

SHRI A. P. SHARMA (Buxar): Not from that point of view. (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order please. Why are you getting excited? I know that the Chairman has not prohibited and, therefore, whatever

has been said under this Rule cannot be expunged. . . (Interruptions).

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: The point of order raised was. . .

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am giving the interpretation of the rules. Now, I come to Rule 380. . . .

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: If you permit me, before you go to Rule 380, the point of order raised is that he has violated this rule. I want a ruling on that point of order whether he has violated the rule or not. Then, we come to relief. . . (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, I come to Rule 380. It says:

"If the Speaker is of opinion that words have been used in debate which are defamatory or indecent or unparliamentary or undignified, he may, in his discretion, order that such words be expunged from the proceedings of the House."

Let us come there. . . .

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA (Tumkur): You use your discretion and expunge it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I will take the first of the first part, to use my discretion but my discretion also will be the discretion of all of us.

We have to consider. . . .

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Also the discretion of the earlier Chairman.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, the question is: if the Chair, in its discretion, thinks that these words are defamatory, indecent, unparliamentary and undignified, he may expunge.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: It is not 'and', it is 'or'. 'or'.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Perhaps you are right, it is "or". Not all of them together, any one of them.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: The term 'Khaneka Bacha' is defamatory and derogatory. . . (Interruptions).

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: : They say that the entire speech should be expunged.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, I would like to refresh the memory of the Members of what happened only yesterday. I read in the papers and records—correct me if I am wrong—and it was published in the papers this morning. One of the speakers in the debate—I need not name him—had made very strong statements relating to the Prime Minister herself yesterday. Allegation was made that Rs. One crore was brought to her residence because of the consent. . .

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Don't mention it, Sir, it will again come on record. . .

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It is already in the papers. It came out in all the national papers.

SHRI G. VISHWANATHAN: No objection was taken. (Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Order please. He said, with the rise in the price of the cars—as a result of that—so much money has been brought and all that. Now, will the House not consider whether an uncorroborated statement like that—because, in any case it was a statement made, and no proof had been produced. (Interruptions) Why don't you listen to me? Order please. When I finish perhaps you will be the happiest person. Why do you get excited? Now, in respect of that kind of uncorroborated statement—I would put it to the House—whether it may be considered as defamatory or not. (Interruptions) Order please, please sit down.

SHRI G. VISHWANATHAN: Nobody objected from that side.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD (Bhagalpur): That thing is not before

the House. That was what happened yesterday. You can give your ruling about what happened today. But please do not put that statement of Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu which happened yesterday. You need not do that.

Dr. HENRY AUSTIN: It was some other issue; today it is not relevant.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I will hear you all again, but kindly hear me in peace. Please sit down. That statement yesterday was allowed to go on record.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: Nobody challenged it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Kindly sit down. Let me finish.

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD: We want to hear you only on this part which has arisen today. Yesterday you were not there. We have not asked for your decision on that statement of yesterday. We have asked you about what happened today only.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am coming to that. Please resume your seat. Order please.

Please sit down. And listen to me. I am going to hear you.

According to me, any unsubstantiated allegation of a serious nature against any person in high authority—there is nobody in higher authority than the Prime Minister—is of a defamatory character. . .

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: No, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Why don't you understand me?

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: On a substantive motion, that allegation was made. Under Rule 353, no allegation shall be made. (Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Stephen, will you kindly sit down?

SHRI C. H. MOHAMMED KOYA (Manjeri): Mr. Stephen is not the Speaker. Mr. Speaker should give his ruling. You see the pitiable condition of the Deputy-Speaker—he is still standing.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now you will please hear me. I had said that every Member of this House has to speak with a great sense of responsibility. And unless and until he has completely satisfied himself that any statement that he makes has a basis of truth, he should not make that statement and any unsubstantiated statement of whatever nature is of a defamatory character.

Now you will say 'yes' but, some time ago, you all shouted. Now, kindly sit down. When the Speaker, in his discretion, decides that a certain allegation is of a defamatory nature and when that decision is taken, we have also to bear in mind the kind of repercussion, whatever decision is taken here, that it has on the country, on the nation and on the minds of the people. That has to be taken into consideration.

Therefore, I think that this House should make own decision here with extreme seriousness. I would, therefore, appeal to you sincerely to listen to what I say; you may or may not agree. Now, here, an allegation has been made. A letter has been read by Mr. Janeshwar Mishra.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: Copy of the letter.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Or a copy of the letter has been read by him.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE: It is addressed to Government.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Whatever it is, he has read a letter.

AN HON. MEMBER: He did not read but he referred to it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It may be that he referred to it, I was not

here and so I am not sure. I do not know because I was not here. It may be that he read it or it may be that he read it or it may be that he referred to it. But the meaning of it was that a certain conspiracy was hatched in which the name of the Chief Minister of Haryana was mentioned.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Miserable fellow.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: that the respected leader Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan will be done away with. That is the meaning of what he said, and that has been strongly refuted.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: How can we refute? We cannot refute. We object to that. We do not refute. How can we?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I shall quote the words of Mr. H. K. L. Bhagat just now. He said 'This is a fabricated conspiracy'. Those are the words of Mr. Bhagat. They are on record and I am repeating it. Those are his words, Mr Bhagat has nodded his consent that he said this that this is a fabricated conspiracy.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN (Badagara): But the point of order is on something else.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: If that is not refutation, then I do not understand what refutation is. It has been strongly refuted by the Members of the ruling party with a big majority, and there have been strong protests against it that this is utterly false and that is a fabrication. They have said that.

Now, I would like hon. Members to consider the role of this House. I had said on more than one occasion that this House is not only a reflection of the country but it is also a barometer. It registers the moods in the country and it registers the kinds of tensions and other things that happen in the country and they find a reflection here

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I had said also that that is why the mercury goes up.

Mt. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is whether we would like this House to act really as an instrument of the nation which it should be, to reflect what is happening in this nation, right from the people who are some of the most intellectual in the world down to people who do not know how to read and write, whether we would like this House to be a sensitive instrument to measure the mood of the nation, and whether we would like this House to serve that purpose and to impress upon the people of this nation that whatever be their difficulties, whether their difficulties are solved or not, at least this House is sensitive to their problems? Or would we like the House to be used as a kind of sledge-hammer so that whatever happens in this country may be tamped down and must be suppressed? I would like hon. Members to consider what should be the real role of this House.

We are living in convulsive times. The times are changing in the country. The question is whether we should reflect that and whether we should measure that or not. Now, things are happening in this country. Shri Jaya Prakash Narayan is involved in a movement, rightly or wrongly. It is a matter of opinion; many people think that it is not right. These things are there and have been mentioned. Many kinds of things may happen or may not happen. A certain thing has been said and objection has been raised. I think even if we say that it will go out of the record, it means that only the papers cannot publish it, but people can talk about it that this thing has happened here, and this can be done by word of mouth.

Therefore, according to me, an allegation has been made, a wild

unsubstantiated allegation has been made, and it has been refuted very strongly.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA Not only allegation, but grave information has been given.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER. Yes—put it that way—information which has not been investigated.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Are you giving your ruling or giving your personal opinion?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am giving my ruling I will finish it now. Information which has not been substantiated has been given. Therefore, there is no difference between information and allegation.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA: For investigation by Government.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I feel that this House as a responsible body, should take note of all these things. These things have been alleged. This kind of information has been passed on. The House should take note of it. The Government should take note of it. Everything is on record. I do not think that anything should be expunged.

The House stands adjourned till 11 00 A.M. tomorrow.

18.33 hrs

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, July 25, 1974/Sravana 3, 1896 (Saka).