

जाय। मैंने इस सम्बन्ध में अपनी एक प्रमेण्डमेन्ट भी दी है कि इस सम्बन्ध में सेंट्रल गवर्नमेन्ट की पूरी निगरानी होनी चाहिये। आपने इस में राष्ट्रपति को विजिटर बना दिया है, उन का इस से कोई मतलब नहीं है। इस में जवाब देही राष्ट्रपति के वजाय मिनिस्टर की होनी चाहिये ऐजुकेशन मिनिस्टर की होनी चाहिये, जो यूनिवर्सिटी के प्रशासन को देखे, उस के डिस्प्लिन के काम को देखे। यूनिवर्सिटी प्रशासन का काम देखे और डिस्प्लिन का काम देखे।

दूसरी बात यह है कि जो वाइस चांसलर हो वह लोकल आदमी होना चाहिए। जो लोग बाहर से आते हैं वह हिन्दी समझते नहीं हैं।

सभापति महोदय : आप कल कन्टीन्यू कीजियेगा।

श्री विभूति मिश्र : मैं खत्म कर रहा हूँ। तो मैं यह कह रहा था कि वाइस चांसलर वहाँ का स्थानीय आदमी होना चाहिए जैसे कि श्री मदन मोहन मालवीय और आचार्य नरेन्द्र देव रह चुके हैं जो कि हिन्दी एरिया के थे। नान-हिन्दी एरिया से जो आते हैं वे हिन्दी जानते नहीं, वे विद्यार्थियों से मिलते जुलते नहीं हैं।

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION AND YOUTH SERVICES (DR. V. K. R. V. Rao): Was Dr. Radhakrishnan a bad Vice-Chancellor?

सभापति महोदय : आप कल कन्टीन्यू कीजियेगा।

स.पति महोदय : आचार्य नरेन्द्र देव एक कमरे में रहते थे। तो सरकार इन बातों पर ध्यान दे।

सभापति महोदय : आप कल जारी रखियेगा।

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

FIFTY-THIRD REPORT

SHRI BHALJIBHAI PARMAR: (Dohad): I beg to move:

"That this House do agree with the Fifty-third Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 26th August, 1969."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That this House do agree with the Fifty-third Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 26th August, 1969."

The motion was adopted.

13 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: NATIONALISATION OF FOREIGN TRADE (GENERAL INSURANCE, ETC.—Contd.

सभापति महोदय : अब श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा का जो प्रस्ताव है उसको लिया जायेगा। लेकिन इस सम्बन्ध में मुझे एक बात कहनी है कि इसके लिए दो घंटा समय था. . . .

श्री मधु लिमये: (मुंगेर) : यह बहुत महत्वपूर्ण है।

सभापति महोदय : इसके लिए दो घंटा समय था लेकिन इस पर दो घंटे 49 मिनट आलरेडी हो चुके हैं। अभी एस०एस० पी० और पी० एस० पी० दलों की ओर से इस पर कोई नहीं बोला है।

श्री मधु लिमये : इस पर पार्टीज को नहीं बल्कि सभी को मौका दीजिए।

सभापति महोदय : श्री मधु लिमये

श्री महन्त दिग्विजय नाथ (गोरखपुर)

सभापति महोदय : अनेडमेन्ट भी लिखे जायेंगे। जब आपका अनेडमेन्ट आयेगा तब आप बोलियेगा।

श्री मधु लिखडे : मैं सब से पहले श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा का अभिनन्दन करना चाहता हूँ कि उन्होंने एक बढ़िया प्रस्ताव सदन के सामने पेश किया और हम लोगों को मौका दिया कि देश को हम लोग आगे ले जायें। इनके प्रस्ताव में मुख्य बातें क्या हैं। इन का कहना है कि इस पार्लियामेंट ने समाजवादी समाज का उद्देश्य कबूल किया है और उस उद्देश्य की ओर बढ़ने के लिये कुछ भी काम करना चाहिए। उन्होंने अनेड प्रस्ताव में सुझाव दिया है कि विदेश व्यापार का राष्ट्रीयकरण किया जाये। उसी तरह इन का कहना है कि इंडियोरैस का राष्ट्रीयकरण किया जाये। इस्पात के उद्योग का राष्ट्रीयकरण किया जाये। उसी प्रकार इन का कहना है कि विदेशी पूंजी का भी राष्ट्रीयकरण किया जाये और साथ साथ ही शहरी जायदाद है उस के ऊपर भी कोई रोक और सीमा लगे। और जो काले बाजार का पैसा है उस को भी निकालना चाहिए और उस के लिये जो वर्तमान करेंसी नोट्स हैं उन को वापिस ले लिया जाये। एक सवाल मेरे मन में जरूर उरस्थित होता है कि जब वे इस तरह का प्रस्ताव पास करवाना चाहती हैं तो क्या वजह है कि कल जब हमने यहां पर अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव रखा था, उसमें भी इसी किस्म की बातें थीं तो इन्होंने हमारे प्रस्तावका समर्थन नहीं किया। (व्यवधान) लेकिन अगर इन्होंने समर्थन नहीं किया तो कोई बात नहीं, हम इन के प्रस्ताव को सी प्रतिशत समर्थन करने के लिये तैयार हैं। लेकिन इन प्रस्ताव में मैं एक कमी देख रहा हूँ। यह प्रस्ताव तो अच्छा है लेकिन इसमें दो कमियां हैं। इस कार्यक्रम को इन्होंने कालवद्ध बनाने का प्रयास नहीं किया है। जब तक किसी भी कार्यक्रम के लिए काल की सीमा नहीं होगी तब तक प्रधानमंत्री का मंत्रिमन्त्रि-समजवाद की चर्चा तो करनी लेकिन (व्यवधान)

तो मैं यह कह रहा था कि अगर इसमें काल की सीमा नहीं रहेगी तो हमें एक खतरा बना रहेगा कि प्रधानमंत्री समाजवाद की बात तो करेगी लेकिन मनाजवादी कार्यक्रम को कार्यान्वित करने के लिए कोई कदम नहीं उठायेगा। बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण हुआ लेकिन बैंकों के राष्ट्रीयकरण का मतलब यह नहीं है कि उन से समाज में बुनियादी परिवर्तन आया। क्या वजह है कि विदेशी बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण नहीं किया गया? इसलिए श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा जी ने जो बात कही है कि विदेशी बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण होना चाहिए, उनका मैं समर्थन करता हूँ। लेकिन इस की शुरुआत होनी चाहिए विदेशी बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण से। इन्होंने इस्पात उद्योग के राष्ट्रीयकरण और विदेशी व्यापार के राष्ट्रीयकरण की बात की है, मैं दोनों का समर्थन करता हूँ क्योंकि हमारी पार्टी को राय है कि जितने भी बड़े उद्योग हैं (लघु उद्योग नहीं) उन सभी का तत्काल राष्ट्रीयकरण होना चाहिए। जहां तक तत्काल का सम्बन्ध है उन के लिए भी कोई समर्थक कार्यक्रम बनाना चाहिए। विदेशी व्यापार के राष्ट्रीयकरण की जो बात है उस के सम्बन्ध में मैं चाहूंगा कि सब ने पहले नेपाल और कम्प्युनिस्ट देशों के साथ जो हमारा व्यापार है उन का तत्काल राष्ट्रीयकरण हो। कम्प्युनिस्ट देशों का व्यापार सरकारी क्षेत्र में होता है फिर क्या वजह है कि कम्प्युनिस्ट देशों के साथ हम लोग निजी व्यापार रखते हैं? क्या कम्प्युनिस्ट देशों ने कहा है कि हम पूंजीपतियों से व्यापार करेंगे, सरकार से नहीं करेंगे? . . . (व्यवधान) . . . मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आने वाले 6 महीनों में कम्प्युनिस्ट देशों के साथ और नेपाल के साथ जो हमारा व्यापार निर्गत का व्यापार है उस का राष्ट्रीयकरण होना चाहिए। और उन के बाद आगे 6 महीने में अन्य देशों के साथ भी जो हमारा व्यापार चल रहा है उन का भी राष्ट्रीयकरण हो जाना चाहिए। लेकिन कम्प्युनिस्ट देशों के साथ सबसे पहले होना चाहिए, यह मैं इतिहास कह रहा हूँ कि कम्प्युनिस्ट देशों का जो अग्रता

व्यापार है वह सरकारी क्षेत्र में है इसलिए हमारे लिए बहुत आसान है कि जो हमारा व्यापार है वह भी सरकारी क्षेत्र में हो इसपात आदि के बारे में जो इनके सुझाव हैं उन की मैं तार्किक करता हूँ लेकिन उममें समय की सीमा लगनी चाहिए ।

इनके प्रस्ताव में एक और बड़ी कमी है कि जिस के लिए हम ने तरमीम रखी है । इन्हो ने शहरी जायदाद पर तो रोक लगाने की बात की है लेकिन आमदनी और खर्चा (उपभोग) इन दोनों में जमीन आसमान का अन्तर है । नौकरशाही कम्युनिज्म और ब्राह्मणवाद, दोनों में एक समानता है । समानता यह है कि जायदाद और उपभोग को अलग किया जाता है । ब्राह्मणवाद का सिद्धांत यह है कि सम्पत्ति अर्जित नहीं करेंगे लेकिन सम्पत्ति जितने उपभोग मिलते हैं उन उपभोगों को लेने ? करीब करीब यही हमने नौकरशाही कम्युनिज्म में देखा है कि मिलिक्यत तो समाज की हो गई लेकिन उस मिलिक्यत से जो फायदा होता है, जो उपभोग है उसको नौकरशाही लेती है । इसीलिये हम ने सुझाव दिया है कि जब तक व्यक्तिगत उपभोग पर सीमा नहीं लगाई जायेगी तब तक कुछ होने वाला नहीं है । हमने तरमीम में कहा है कि 1500 की सीमा लगाई जाये । मैं यह मुद्रा रखना चाहता हूँ कि जब तक उपभोग पर सीमा नहीं लगेगी, जब तक जो नौकरशाही है, हम सदन के सदस्य हैं, मंत्री लोग हैं या जो सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र में जो बड़े बड़े अधिकारी हैं उन के खर्चों पर कोई रोक नहीं लगेगी जैसे कि हिन्दुस्तान स्टील के चेयरमैन का अपना निजी विमान है, हम लोग कहते हैं कि सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र में इसपात का कारखाना है लेकिन मैं श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी जी से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आज तीन कारखाने सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र में हैं, जायदाद का निर्माण हो रहा है लेकिन क्या आप चाहती हैं कि जिस तरह से इसपात के निजी क्षेत्र में टाटा साहब का अपना प्लान है बिरला साहब का

अपना प्लेन है, उमी प्रकार से सरकारी क्षेत्र में में भी जो बड़े बड़े अधिकारी मनेजर या चेयरमैन हैं, उन की अड़्याशो और फिन्लखर्ची भी उपभोग की चरम सीमा पर पहुँचे । अगर वह इस तरह काम नहीं चाहती हैं तो हम उन से विनती करेंगे कि हमारे संशोधन को वह स्वीकार करें ।

यहां इधर एक महीने से बड़ा हल्ला हो रहा है कि समाजवाद की तरफ हम बढ़ रहे हैं । एक और समाजवाद का नारा और दूसरी ओर शान्ति प्रसाद जैन के साथ टाइम्स आफ इंडिया के बारे में समझौता । आज अगर वह समझौता खत्म हो गया तो वह हम लोगों की वजह से, इस सदन की वजह से ।

15.11.1981.

SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR in the Chair.

मैं कह रहा हूँ कि कैबिनेट का फैसला था कि टाइम्स आफ इंडिया शान्ति प्रसाद जैन को दिया जाय । अशोक जैन को चेयरमैन बना दिया जाय । लेकिन हम लोगों ने हल्ला किया, नतीजा यह हुआ कि वह मामला उंडा पड़ा । पी० के० राय जैसे ध्रष्ट अधिकारी के बारे में, मुझे खुशी है अदालत ने फैसला किया है कि पी० के० राय को निकाल दिया जाय । अगर यह सदन जागरूक रहेगा तो इस सरकार की हिम्मत नहीं होगी कि पूंजीपतियों के साथ वह गठबन्धन करे ।

एशियन कैबिन्स का मामला उठा । यह भी के० पी० गोयका की कम्पनियां हैं, इन कम्पनियों के बारे में हम लोगों ने यहां पर आरोप लगाये हैं । मैं उस पत्र के बारे में कुछ नहीं कहना चाहता, हो सकता है कि वह जाली हो, लेकिन मेरे पास ऐसा प्रकाट्य सबूत है कि के०पी० गोयका कम्पनियों ने सारे कानूनों का उल्लंघन किया है और जो आयातित कच्चा माल है जिसके लिये विदेशी मुद्रा बरबाद हो गयी, उस माल को काले बाजार में बेच कर,

[श्री मधु लिमये]

तिगुना, चौगुना मुनाफा गैर कानूनी ढंग से कमाया। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि अगर कोई जीपति श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी को समर्थन देता है तो क्या वह अच्छा हो जाता है ? क्या फखरुद्दीन अली अहमद साहब ने मोदी साहब को पद्म विभूषण देने का काम नहीं किया ? क्यों उन को दिलाया ?

श्री इन्द्रजीत दादव : (आजमगढ़) : एस०वी०डी० की सरकार ने जिस के मुख्य मंत्री चौधरी चरण सिंह में, उन को उपाधि देने के लिए सिफारिश की थी।

श्री मधु लिमये : चौधरी चरण सिंह ने किया वह भी गलत है और माननीय फखरुद्दीन अली अहमद साहब ने जो किया वह भी गलत है। के० पी० गोरनका के साथ गठबन्धन, बिड़ला कम्पनियों के बारे में चिल्ला चिल्ला कर हमारा गला बँठ गया तब जा कर अब सरकार की सूझी है। और अब भी टर्म्स आफ रेफरेंस के बारे में सदन को विश्वास में लेने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं। हमें संदेह है कि टर्म्स आफ रेफरेंस क्या होंगे।

एक अंतिम बात कहकर मैं वत खत्म करता हूँ। जिस तरह पूंजीपतियों के विशेषाधिकार और मुनाफे, उन के द्वारा जो शोषण चल रहा है वह शोषण, नौकरशाही का शोषण, इस के खिलाफ जिस तरह का हम आवाज उठाते हैं, और राजा, महाराजाओं के जो निजी क्रोध हैं उन के बारे में पहल क्यों नहीं हो रही है। ढाई साल हो गया आश्वासन दिया गया था। लेकिन ढाई साल के बाद भी अभी तक प्रिवी पर्मिज के बारे में पिछली बार भी कोई आश्वासन नहीं मिला। हमारे जो तुर्क लोग हैं, अफगानी लोग हैं, ईरानी लोग हैं, इन लोगों से मैं कहूंगा कि हम लोगों का साथ दीजिए। भारतीय बनिये और समाजवाद को केवल निर्गण, निराकार नहीं, बल्कि अमलो जामा पहनाने का काम करिये। एक एक काम

सभा के अन्दर किया जाए। जैसे तारकेश्वरी जी ने कहा है। मैं उन के प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करता हूँ और अन्त में उन आप की मार्फत उन से प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि श्री एस० के० पाटिल और श्री निर्जलिग पा के साथ छोड़ दीजिये, इन पुराने दकियानूसी लोगों के साथ जा कर क्या फायदा है। अगर हिम्मत है तो हम समाजवादियों के साथ, वाम-पंथियों के साथ प्रगतिशील लोगों के साथ आइये। बूढ़ों के साथ जाने से क्या फायदा है। इन के दकियानूसी दिमाग हैं, यह आज साबित हो गया। श्री एस० के० पाटिल, जिन के लिये आप 15 दिन मेहनत करने के लिये गुजरात में गयी थीं, वह पेपर टाइगर साबित हो गये हैं। आप सोचिये, और कांग्रेस के अन्दर जितने नौजवान भाई हैं, उन सभी लोगों से अपील करता हूँ कि जागिये, समय है, और हम लोगों का साथ दीजिये। कांग्रेस के अन्दर जो प्रगतिशील कहलाने वाले लोग हैं वे कांग्रेस को छोड़ दें और हम लोगों के साथ आये और मिलजुल कर निर्गण, निराकार ब्रह्म की जगह पर एक निश्चित, ठोस और प्रगतिशील समाजवाद लायेंगे।

SHRI S. R. DAMANI (Sholapur):
Mr. Chairman: Sir, I oppose the resolution moved by the hon. lady Member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please.
There is too much noise in the House. Let us listen to the hon. Member who is speaking.

SHRI S. R. DAMANI: Sir, the hon. lady Member herself is an economist. She has also experience of working in the Economic Ministry and as such she should have given the reasons how the country, how the common man, how the public are going to be benefited by the nationalisation of so many items, I have very carefully read the resolution and I could not find any reasonable ground to think that it is going to benefit the country. On the contrary, according to me, it is going

(Res.)

to damage the country. It is not going to benefit the common man or the public or any person concerned in that.

SHRI SHEO NARAIN: You are in the Socialist Forum.

SHRI S. R. DAMANI: Our Government has accepted mixed economy after careful consideration and in the last few years we see that that policy has paid rich dividends. Our government and our people are thinking more and more in the interests of increasing the national productivity. But merely by nationalisation, the purpose is not going to be served and as such I think that this is a very serious matter and I do not agree with the hon. lady Member who has moved this resolution.

Secondly our country is a developing country. We have developed to a great extent but we have yet to develop more. Still we require 30 many items. Our imports are higher and our exports are lower. We have to increase our exports so that our revenue and our finances may improve. These are the problems which should be looked after.

As far as imports are concerned, I think Government is channelising more and more items of imports through STC, MMTC and other agencies. More and more items are being imported through governmental agencies and there are very few items which are imported by private parties.

So far as imports are concerned, Government is gradually channelising them through governmental agencies. Recently they have decided to import industrial raw material through governmental agencies. They have laid down a policy in this regard.

Regarding exports, would say that exports is a very difficult thing; it is not an easy thing. We are exporting hundreds and thousands of items to

different countries. But how can exports be handled by a few persons through nationalisation. It requires knowledge and experience in every respect. It is a specialised subject and requires more specialised knowledge and experience for that.

The country has now become after so many years surplus in the matter of foreign trade and the adverse balance of trade has been wiped out and reduced considerably. In April 1969 we had small surplus of trade balance of 760 crores against the deficit of 91 crores in 1968 and 194 crores in 1967. In the first half of the year there is a small deficit of 79 crores against last year's figure of 440 crores and 560 crores in 1967. Our exports are developing and it should be appreciated that should not be disturbed. We will become self-sufficient soon and we should continue the present system for developing the country and increasing our exports.

Lastly I will say one word about the steel industry. This is very important. As I said earlier the country is following a mixed economy. There are both public sector and private sector steel mills. Steel mills in the private sector are doing much better and their results are much better. We should keep a competition between them and they should work complementary and supplementary to each other. So far the policy adopted by the Government is in the interest of the country and it should be followed.

Sir, I oppose this Resolution.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai): This Resolution of Mrs Tarkeshwari Sinha is almost a challenge to the new profession of socialism of those persons who voted for Mr. Giri with a free conscience. If this Resolution is not accepted by the Congress party it will amount to this that whatever professions or big ideological slo-

[Shri Samar Guha]

gans were raised during the Presidential elections were nothing but mere hoax. (*Interruption*). It was on the basis of this display of conscience on the part of many Congress members, it was because their conscience was rendered free, that it was supposed that they were going to stand by the great cause of socialism. If this is it we take it that these people who were guided by their free conscience were actuated by a sense or standard of ordinary political morality, in each and every step further, we should find a corresponding reaction on their part. But if it is just a case of filing nomination of one candidate, supporting nomination of that candidate and then doing many things which are just the reverse of that, it will be an instance political immorality. If they did that, what would be the reaction or impact in the country? It was thought that those people who led the revolt, Shrimati Indira Gandhi and her supporters, those free voters, were in revolt against status-quoism, against conservatism, against capitalism. Those who are not in the Congress, those who stand for socialism and for the liberation of our suffering humanity looked upon this as a conflict from which would emerge a new force representing the urges and aspirations of the people force which would become revolutionary and which would identify itself with the ideal of socialism. The revolt of the Prime Minister and her followers during Presidential elections was identified with this urge.

Now it is challenge to the Prime Minister, it is a challenge to those Congressmen who acted with a free conscience to show whether they actually and really meant it or it was only a political hoax? Whether it is powerism or whether it was really meant as a pursuit of the path of a social revolution? That is the challenge facing them in their attitude to this Resolution.

Either the Prime Minister and her supporters inside the Congress should pursue the socialist programme and demonstrate it by their action or they should plead guilty to political immorality and powerism. This morning there was a lot of talk about the Naxalite activities. What is the root cause of the activities of these adventurists, antinational people who have got hold of the grievances of people and can rouse them, the innocent agriculturists and our younger generation? The root cause is the poverty and frustration and economic discontent of the people. They take advantage of the poverty, frustration and discontent of these people and exploit them. Although the Congress in our freedom struggle roused the aspiration of the people, although they created the hope that a new India will emerge out of our struggle, we now see what a big hoax it has proved to be. These Naxalite activities cannot be curbed by penal measures, nor by shooting but only by a comprehensive socialist programme and a socialist revolution ushered in without delay. This alone can meet the challenge of the Naxalite, Pekingites or Muskovites. This is a challenge to all those who believe in the concept of Indian socialism.

The proof of the pudding is in the eating. This Resolution is a test of the socialist pretensions of the free voters, the socialist conscience of those who rose in revolt. They will be judged by whether they accept this Resolution or not. On this will depend whether they really believe in and want to act in pursuance of socialism or are just propagandists of a free conscience for the sake of power politics.

A new force has emerged in our policy. It is in spite of Mrs. Gandhi, it is in spite of the Syndicate. It is the product of an inner conflict within the Congress. This new force, is a tremendous force, a force like a tidal bore, which has been released in the

whole of India. Unless you move ahead with the speed of the tidal bore, the tidal bore will consume you and drown you into oblivion.

I warn the House that the time has come for a real polarisation. I warn those inside the Congress that, if they really believe in socialism, let those who have been dubbed as the Syndicate people—I do not know what they mean by Syndicate—the liberal capitalists, the conservatives, the status quoists from within the Congress or without the Congress, unite and form one Conservative Party. The socialists within and without the Congress should unite and form one single consolidation of a Socialist Party for effecting early social revolution in India. The time has also come for those who profess the Peking ideology or the Moscow ideology or the ideology of Communist totalitarianism in general to unite. The time has come when there should be polarisation in India. The Conservative Party, the Socialist Party and the Communist Party will compete with each other and ask the people to follow the path of real social revolution in the way the people of India want.

Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose in his book "*Indian Struggle*," in the last chapter, "Glimpses of the Future", wrote that the weakness inside the Congress was that it always compromised with the interests of the peasants and the landlords, of the workers and the capitalists, of the upper class and the lower class. This conflict and contradiction inside the Congress has now exploded. And it has now been temporarily patched up. Those who feel that by patching up they will be able to ride over powerism are mistaken. This explosion has started a process of chain reactions, one after the other. More explosive shots will be fired. This patching up is just a temporary passing phase. Unless and until they know the tremendous force of socialist urge which they have released and

unless they can fulfil its aspiration the doomsday is for them; the Nemesis will not spare them.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI P. C. SETHI): Sir, it is well-known to the House that it is the broad objective of the Government to achieve a socialist society in the country. That, in fact, is one of the accepted principles and in the past, Government have taken several measures; in this direction. Public ownership and control of the commanding heights of national economy are some of the aspects of the new social order which we are trying to build up in this country. Already through the various industrial policy resolutions and other concrete policies, we have built up in the country a commendable infrastructure which can take us on the path to socialism. Not only that. We have built in this country a very formidable infrastructure, which has given us confidence as far as defence and defence production are concerned. We have also taken steps to see that not only in the mining sector but in the industrial sector also, wherever private capital cannot flow to build up new and bigger projects, Government has taken upon itself the responsibility of building such projects. It is in view of this policy that we have embarked upon a programme of launching all new steel plants in the public sector. Our Industrial Policy Resolution clearly stated that any new steel factory would come only in the public sector and TISCO and ISCO would be allowed only nominal expansion, if they wished to do so. Yet, even though they were allowed nominal expansion, on account of many factors we have seen that they have not been able to do so and it has fallen on government to build steel plants in the public sector alone. Bokaro, one of the giant steel projects in the public sector, is coming up.

From this point of view, we have marched even ahead of the ten-

[Shri P. C. Sethi]

point programme. In the ten-point programme mentioned by the hon. lady Member, one is the social control of banking institutions. We have now marched much ahead and we have taken steps which have left behind social control completely out of date. It is in this view that after the nationalisation of banks the Prime Minister stated:

"Financial institutions are among the most important institutions that any society has at its command for the achievement of social and economic objectives. It is in recognition of this fact that we nationalised life insurance business and the then Imperial Bank of India over a decade ago. We have also set up in the public sector other institutions for the provision of medium and longterm finance to industry and agriculture. Nationalisation of major banks is a significant step in the process of public control over the principal institutions for the mobilisation of peoples' savings and canalising them towards productive purposes."

I would like to restrain myself from the various controversies. But I would like to say that when this House was passing the Bank Nationalisation Act and almost the whole House was with us, at that time the hon. Member, who should have been the first to vote for it, was unfortunately not present in the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: She was not well then.

SHRI P. C. SETHI: I never wanted to comment, but this is a fact..

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA (Barh): I wish the hon. Minister should really make some responsible remarks. So many times, questions are asked here why his Minister is not present here. Now when members of his own Treasury Benches are not present here why

should he indulge in those remarks which may not be applicable so much to me as to members of his own Treasury Benches?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member can say all these things when she gets the chance.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: While receiving to the debate on the resolution, by indulging in such remarks, I think he is taking away the importance and seriousness of the resolution. Now the members of his own treasury benches are not present here. Is he going to clarify why they are not present here before he asks me why I was not present then?

SHRI P. C. SETHI: As I said in the very beginning, I am speaking with restraint. I am not going into all those personal questions. When really radical and progressive steps are being taken, when we are ushering in the dawn of the day, then trying to steal the show by putting up a more radical approach to the whole question, about that I was only trying to explain that if one is sincere to the objectives and professions which one proclaims, one should also act according to them. It is only from this point of view that I mentioned that incident. I never wanted to offend the hon. Lady Member. I only wanted to show that one of the points of the ten-point programme, namely, social control of banks, we have left that behind and marched forward. But, at the same time, I would like to say that the Prime Minister also remarked that this is not an attempt to transfer resources which are already employed productively to other sectors.

Having said this, I would like to examine the various points put forth by the hon. lady Member through this Resolution. She has asked for nationalisation of foreign trade, nationalisation of general insurance, nationalisation of the steel industry, taking over of all foreign investments in India, fixing of ceiling on urban

property and eradication of black money through demonetisation.

As far as the question of nationalisation of foreign trade is concerned, it is practical to see how things are moving in that direction. The Prime Minister in this connection had said:—

“While it may not be practical to nationalise all import and export, can we not consider the nationalisation of the import of raw materials? This would make collective bargaining possible and might get us better prices.”

Now, as far as imports are concerned recently the Ministry of Foreign Trade has taken the decision that most of the raw materials which were being imported even by private parties would be channelised through the STC or the MMTC, whatever the case may be. That has already been announced. But besides this I would also like to say that as far as commodity-wise State trading in imports and exports is concerned, exports by the STC or the MMTC and other manufacturing undertakings of the Central Government were of the order of Rs. 114.98 crores in 1966-67, Rs. 139.02 crores in 1967-68 and Rs. 199.21 crores in 1968-69. Therefore, even in the case of exports the amount is amounting up and from Rs. 114 crores in the year 1966-67 we have almost reached the figure of more than Rs. 200 crores now.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU: (Diamond Harbour): What percentage does it represent of the total exports?

SHRI P. C. SETHI: I will come to it.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU: Not more than 5 per cent.

SHRI P. C. SETHI: As far as the export trade is concerned, we would also have to appreciate that export

trade is a trade where we are not in a position to lose any foreign exchange. It would not be in the interest of the country.

Therefore, as far as export trade is concerned, while having our objectives in view, we will have to move with caution and with a sense so that the extremely difficult situation of foreign exchange is not further aggravated. Keeping this point in view, certainly we are moving in a direction whereby the public sector companies are exporting more and more and we would like it to be stepped up further. But, at the same time, we would not lose sight of the fact that we cannot take a position or a situation where our foreign exchange resources and earning are depleted.

In the case of imports, I would like to point out that imports of STC and MMTC were Rs. 93.43 crores in 1966-67, Rs. 144.63 crores in 1967-68 and Rs. 137.34 crores in 1968-69. Apart from this, I would like to mention that about 20 per cent of the total imports are in the form of foodgrains which are completely done by the Government itself. And, including other Government imports about 60 per cent of the total imports is already in the public sector. By the recent decision which has been taken by the Ministry of Foreign Trade this percentage is bound to go up.

As far as export is concerned, I do not have the real break-up and the percentage with me, but I would only like to point out that even in the case of export, our export figures through public sector companies are going up and it would definitely be our objective to increase the exports also more through public sector companies. We have already taken steps; for example, apart from the STC and the MMTC, steel, which is being exported from Hindustan Steel, is being directly exported by

[Shri P. C. Sethi]

Hindustan Steel itself and we are not allowing it to be done more through the private sector. Therefore we are taking steps in this direction.

Therefore keeping the broad national good in view, we shall move in this direction so that as far as imports are concerned, gradually we may completely take them over. We have already started in the direction of raw materials import. But as far as exports are concerned, I would beg of the House to consider that we are already facing a difficult foreign exchange situation and we would not like to embark upon this programme as a result of which we may completely be in a more depleted position.

As far as the nationalisation of the steel industry is concerned, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Member to the Industrial Policy Resolution of 1948 and 1956. Apart from this, I have gone through the 10-point programme of which a mention has been made by the hon. Member. Nowhere in the 10 point programme a mention has been made about the nationalisation of steel industry.

श्री लखन लाल कपूर (किशनगंज) :
वह नो हाथी के दांत दिखाने को हैं, खाने को नहीं ।

श्री प्र० च० सेठी : हाथी के दांत का सवाल नहीं है । जो दांत उन्हीं ने दिखाये हैं उस की बात मैं कर रहा हूँ ।

As far as the steel industry is concerned, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. House to this fact that the Industrial Policy Resolution of 1956 clearly stipulates that our general policy is to expand the public sector in strategic and key areas by setting up new capacities and not to fritter away our resources in nationalising all these old private companies where heavy compensation is involved and where the profits are dwindling.

I would like to point out, as far as the profits are concerned, the Indian Iron & Steel Co. was having a profit of Rs. 5.50 crores in 1965-66 and it came down to 0.81 crores in 1967-68 and, last year, they were in a position where dividend had almost come down to a negligible extent. As far as the Tata Iron & Steel Co. is concerned, they were having a profit of Rs. 10.45 crores in 1965-66 and it came down to Rs. 5.8 crores in 1967-68. Therefore, instead of frittering away our resources in nationalising these two old companies, I would only beg of the House to consider whether it would not be more useful and beneficial to invest money in the setting up of new units in the public sector.

We have already started our programme of building up Bokaro Steel Plant. There are already more demands in the country. There are other areas which are demanding the establishment of the steel industry. Dispersal of the steel industry is absolutely necessary. The entire steel industry is at present, situated in one particular zone and, therefore, dispersal of the steel industry in certain areas, for example, in Goa, in Mysore, in Bastar and in other areas, is absolutely necessary. Therefore, instead of frittering away our resources in paying compensation to these old units, it will be more useful and beneficial to have more new units in the public sector for which there is more demand. There is a demand from almost every State. For example, in Tamil Nadu, there is a demand from the Salem district that they should have a steel factory, it may be a small alloy steel factory to start with. But there is a demand. There is a demand from Andhra Pradesh; there is a demand from Mysore; there is a demand from Goa and all that. Considering all these things, it would not be a prudent policy to fritter away the resources in the nationalising of these two old units which are showing dwindling profits. Therefore, I

would request the hon. Member to consider her proposal in the light of the position I have explained.

As far as the fixing of ceiling on urban property is concerned, I would like to say that we have already said both in this House and in the other House that it is under active consideration of the Government. It is difficult for me to say how much time it will take. We would certainly try to expedite this programme. This has very many facts. For example, I would like to say that in the rural areas, we have got a ceiling only on the holdings of the land. Now, coming to the urban areas, we will have to take into consideration whether it should be a ceiling only on the household property or on the acquisition of new lands which are coming round the cities, which are being acquired by the persons who can afford to buy them and who are making huge money out of that. Shall we also take into consideration the holdings in the form of jewellery or in the form of other things? Because the moment we decide that there should be a limit on the possession of houses, it is likely that the entire property in the form of houses may be transferred to some other type of property. Therefore, it is not such an easy matter and it is not as if a ceiling on the holdings in the rural area is being considered. This will have to be examined from all its aspects and from all points of view so that the ceiling on urban property comes in such a manner that the object of the Government is fulfilled.

Then, there is another aspect in imposing a ceiling on the urban property. For example, by telling that this man can be allowed to hold only this amount of property, how shall we take away the remaining property? Will it be the same process we followed in the case of nationalisation of banks? We are going into an arena where it will be difficult to fulfil the objectives. Therefore, we will have to devise methods where the evaluation of the

property is done properly, valuers are appointed and they do their work correctly and we will have to devise measures so that whatever extra is left, that can be mopped up through taxation measures. Various legal points will be mopped forth when we impose a tax. It may be of any percentage. Then whether legally it will be a constitutional tax or whether it will be declared invalid—all these aspects of imposing a ceiling on urban property will have to be taken into consideration.

We have already said both in this House as well as in the other House that it is the declared policy of the Government that a ceiling on urban property is being considered and we shall come forward before the House when it is finalised.

Then there is the question of nationalisation of general insurance. Now I would certainly like to say that as far as nationalisation of general insurance is concerned, it is one of the points in the ten-point programme and to that extent there is no denying this point. I would request the House to consider whether this measure requires a top priority as compared to other things. For example, we will have to see that as far as funds available for investment in the general insurance is concerned, it is about Rs. 50 crores apart from Rs. 10 crores which are already invested in government securities. This is in contrast with Life Insurance which was nationalised with an investment of Rs. 1000 crores and with an annual increase of Rs. 100 crores while the annual increase in general insurance is only Rs. 5 crores and the profits in the general insurance after taxation are only in the range of Rs. 3-4 crores. Therefore, the Government brought a legislation before the House and it was passed in 1968 and it has come into force from 1st June 1969. This policy measure was adopted by this very House. This policy measure with regard to the control of general insurance has come into force from 1st

[Shri P. C. Sethi]

June 1969. Therefore, I would only request the hon. House let us look into this object of social control over general insurance. There are other questions also as far as general insurance is concerned. I am not at the moment trying to say that we are against the question of nationalisation of general insurance. What I am trying to say is that compared to the nationalisation of life insurance, the problem of general insurance is that its profits are also low comparatively and that it involves a lot of litigation. I would like to give it comparatively a lower priority. I am not at the moment trying to say that we are against the question of nationalisation of general insurance. I am only trying to say that the measures which we have recently adopted have come into force from 1st June 1969. Let us wait and after some time if we feel that they are not coming up to our expectations, certainly it is one of our points of the ten-point programme and it is one of our policy decisions.

Therefore, I am only trying to say that as far as this question is concerned this is comparatively at a low priority.

About the nationalisation of foreign trade, I have already dealt with that question.

As far as taking over of foreign investment in India is concerned, the taking over of foreign investment would involve a huge compensation. The present figure of foreign investment might be Rs. 1,000 crores. Some of these investments are very valuable to our economy and they develop our economy in various schemes in our engineering, metallurgical and other industries. There are certain industries where we require plant and equipments and machinery from foreign countries and the know-how is not available within the country. There are certain investments which took place before independence which may not be in consonance with the

policy declared now. That is why the policy of the Government is to restrict the inflow of foreign capital. We are moving in that direction, in respect of import of technical know-how, machinery and other things. It is now the declared policy of Government that to the extent possible we should develop even technical know-how within the country. We should not depend for technical know-how on foreign countries especially in certain projects where there is a possibility of repetition. Of course technical know-how is not a thing where we can close the door of the country for all time to come. If there are new inventions, certain inventions outside the country, and if we can't develop them, to that extent we shall have to keep the door open so that we can march along with the progress of the other countries and to the extent possible we shall try to develop not only know-how in our country, not only technical know-how but other capacities in the engineering sector, in the industrial sector, etc. So, as far as foreign investment policy is concerned it is the declared policy of the Government that we do not allow inflow of foreign capital for any projects which are not of national importance or which are not in priority sector, or for which know-how is available within the country.

Therefore, as far as our policy with regard to taking over of foreign investment in India is concerned, I have just now said that this is a thing which requires huge investment.

Regarding the nationalisation of oil companies, I wish to say this. We had negotiations with these oil companies. On account of that the terms are already reduced very considerably. This is a question which is constantly being kept in view.

We will have to take into consideration whatever is more beneficial

to the country and we will have to review or revise the same and take whatever action is necessary when the situation demands, and we shall move in that direction; but for the time being I would only plead that it would not be a prudent policy to fritter away resources in acquisition of properties where we will have to pay very huge compensation—more than Rs. 1,000 crores. Therefore, this is the position with regard to that matter.

16 hrs.

As far as eradication of black money through demonetisation is concerned, many a time during the current session in this House and in the other, questions have been asked. We have explained it very clearly that demonetisation is not going to solve the problem. Our experience is to the contrary. Even in 1966 when demonetisation took place, out of Rs. 138.0 crores of currency, Rs. 136.8 crores were exchanged and only Rs. 1.2 crores did not come for exchange. This time the problem is quite huge. For example, if we demonetise 100-rupee notes, it is 45 per cent of the total currency in circulation, and from that point of view, it is not going to help.

It is also not necessary that black money should be with people in the form of currency notes. It might have been transformed into house property, it is likely to have been transformed into jewellery or agricultural investments. Therefore, black money is not going to be taken away only by demonetisation.

We have already taken measures to see that black money is eradicated. That is why we have been amending our taxation laws, that is why we are bringing in more heavy penalties, for avoidance of tax and for evasion of tax. It is not only the amount of tax avoided due to which a penalty is imposed but the quantum of wealth not declared is taken into account and there is even 100 per cent and 200

per cent penalty imposed. Even in the case of income-tax, it is not only the tax avoided on which there is a penalty, but the amount of money on which tax had been evaded draws a penalty—100 per cent. These penalties are being made more stringent. Not only that. Orders have been issued that where there are infringements of the rules, wherever evasion takes place and wherever prosecution are possible, all such cases should be prosecuted. Therefore, we are trying to have more stringent measures even in this direction so that black money is not created. We are moving in that direction. Hence demonetisation is not the solution.

श्री प्रकाशवीर शास्त्री (हापुड़) :

ये जो चीन के छपे हुए करोड़ों रुपये के नोट आ रहे हैं और हमारे सीमावर्ती क्षेत्रों में चल रहे हैं उन को रोकने के लिये आप क्या सोच रहे हैं ?

SHRI P. C. SETHI: If currency which is not legal currency is found anywhere, we have got our vigilance units. We have created a special unit in the police also and the State Governments are to help us. To the extent possible, we try to catch it. If the hon. member could pass on any definite information he has, we would certainly take action with promptness.

In conclusion, I would say these are certainly measures which the hon. lady Member has suggested. I have explained Government's policy with regard to them. I have not tried to show that we are against them. But it is not possible to undertake all these measures together as worded in a comprehensive Resolution. These are measures which are already part of the accepted policies and programmes of Government. Of course, there are certain difficulties which I have explained, in regard to the time and the manner of taking a decision. For example, I cannot tomorrow announce demonetisation because Shrimati Tar-keshwari Sinha's Resolution says so. That is not possible.

[Shri P. C. Sethi:]

All these are good and laudable objectives. We are thankful to her for drawing Government's and the House's attention to them. These are already under active consideration of Government; not only that, we have taken far-reaching decisions with regard to many of them.

Therefore, it would not be proper for the hon. lady Member to pursue the Resolution. She has drawn our attention to it and she has highlighted the subject. That is quite enough. I would urge upon her to withdraw the Resolution.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA (Barh): I have listened very carefully to the speech of the hon. Minister. If these objectives had come before the House or before the Government only recently, I would have taken the words of the hon. Minister. Then I would have understood that these things cannot be done immediately and accepted his advice. I would remind him that as early as 1931, in the Karachi Congress, the Congress itself decided to fix a ceiling not only on urban property but on individual incomes. That resolution said in black and white that individual income is to be lowered by stages to 20 times the nation's minimum. It was also said that the State should control key industries and services—mark the words—key industries and services. The spirit of this resolution was reiterated, as the hon. minister himself said, in 1948 and again in 1956. Then came the famous 10 point programme of the Congress Working Committee which was endorsed by the AICC with the additional item of privy purse abolition. Since a discussion on privy purse abolition has taken place. I would like to read a letter which I wrote to the Prime Minister and her reply to it. I think the hon. minister's words do not show the same urgency reflected in the Prime Minister's letter and in her expressions day in and day out inside the Parliament and

outside. I wrote to the Prime Minister:

"I received your letter dated 26th July about the implementation of the AICC Resolution on the abolition of Privy Purses. You have mentioned about priorities and timings. Should one presume that 2 year old resolution of the AICC will have to wait though more than 100 members of the party had asked for immediate implementation.

118 mebers of the party had asked for immediate implementation.

SHRI P. C. SETHI: I have not touched that subject because it is not part of your resolution.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: I am talking about the 10 point resolution. I wrote to the Prime Minister:

"Should one presume that 2 year old resolution of the AICC will have to wait though more than 100 members of the party had asked for immediate implementation? Now I would like to know what exactly you wish us to do...."

because on that day a resolution on abolition of privy purses was put on the agenda for discussion in this House.

The Prime Minister replied thus:

"There is no question of delaying the implementation of our decision to abolish privy purses. As you perhaps know, Morarjibhai had undertaken to hold talks with representatives of the Princes in an effort to persuade them to voluntarily accept the Home Ministry's scheme for the termination of privy purses. We have now to consider urgent steps not only to implement this decision but all such policy decisions of the Party."

(Res.)

May I ask the hon. minister and the Prime Minister are the decisions taken by the Congress in 1951 new decisions? Are the decisions taken in 1956 new decisions? Are the decisions contained in the 10 point programme adopted two years ago new decisions? What kind of new decisions is the minister referring to? What is the part of the resolution which I have put in this programme? I would like to read them for the benefit of this House. One is rationalisation of foreign trade, general insurance and steel industry. Nationalisation of foreign trade is a part of the ten-point programme. It has been clearly mentioned that as a phased programme the State taking over of the foreign trade has to be brought out. I would have expected of the Minister to come out with a clear-cut categorical announcement that the principle of this Resolution is accepted and that a phased programme of taking over of the foreign trade would be followed. It has been reiterated even by the Prime Minister by saying that we would start taking over of the raw material. Does the Minister's statement indicate that any positive steps have been taken to take over even the import of the raw materials? What is the use of talking of platitudes? After you have raised the hopes of the country to that extent, the country is not going to accept this talk of platitude.

Coming to general insurance, I had been in the Ministry of Finance for a long time to understand the intricacies of general insurance.... (Interruptions) Let me give my own understanding of it. Regarding the nationalisation of general insurance, it is a fact that general insurance has been having so many abuses, and that is why after seven days of deliberations of the Working Committee they clearly stated that it should be done. They were not all fools. Do we consider that the Prime Minister, who was sitting there in the Working Committee, could not have come out and said that this could not be done?

Since that was not done, it is a commitment of the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister, Shri Morarji Desai. I think Shri Morarji Desai was in the Government when this commitment was made. This was a decision made by the Prime Minister and the Deputy Prime Minister who were sitting in the Working Committee. Do we take it that at that time they did not understand all the intricacies? The hon. Minister, instead of trying to explain this to the House in this way, must go and ask them why they accepted the proposition of taking over of general insurance companies? Now, why is it that this kind of different analysis is given?

Not only that. Who is going to explain to the hon. Minister, who is himself in the Finance Ministry, that nationalisation of banks, as an isolated feature, has no relevancy? Here I would like to quote what Dr. Hazare has said: "if the objective of nationalisation has to be fulfilled, immediately a new budget has to be brought forward" Here is a sensible man, who understands economics, who knows what he is talking about, suggesting that a new budget has to be brought forward. Why has he mentioned that? Because he knows that the banks provide only the working capital. Suppose the Eirlas have an industry worth Rs. 50 crores. They have to take a licence under the licensing policy. Then structural finance is provided by agencies like IFC or ICICI. Then government allows foreign collaboration and the structural finance is provided by the foreign collaborators and government stand guarantee to those companies. Sometimes, government advances money, government allows import licence, government allows import of machinery, government provides interest-free loans for the running of the structural finance of the industry, for plant and machinery and for the import of raw material. When they are all ready, then these industries go to the banks for arranging for working capital. Who

[Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha]
does not know that the banks provide only working capital?

If you do not change all these things, if you do not re-arrange the priorities, how is your nationalisation of banks going to succeed? They are taking money only for working capital from the banks. Nobody is taking money from the banks for the structural financing of the industry. For that they go to either IFC or ICICI.

Then, who is buying the blue ships of Birlas, Singhanias and Tatas? Their shares are called blue ships in the stock market. Who buys them? They are bought mostly by LIC and similar organisations. But if I float a company, will the LIC buy shares of my company? They will never buy them. Will they under-write my shares? No, they will never do that. So, it is the big companies which get facilities of under-writing; not small companies.

I hope the hon. Minister now knows that I know a little bit of my subject. That is why Dr. Hazare has pointed out that in order to make the nationalisation of banks really effective, an immediate budget has to be brought forward. Here I would like to refer to the remarks made by the Chief Minister of Madras, Shri Karunanidhi that immediately a meeting of the National Development Council must be constituted because this is a fundamental change of the economic structure and, therefore, their counsel and their consultation must be available to you.

Then, the Planning Commission has to reorient the entire Plan. The Plan has to be recast. You have earmarked the financial resources but where are the financial resources available to divert from this resource to that resource? Suppose, you have created Rs. 200 crores worth of synthetic fibre industry. It may be with the Birlas, the Tatas and the Singhanias but the total productive capacity of synthetic fibre—I am giving one

example—has been created of Rs. 200 crores. Is it possible for you to keep that starved? The industry has been created; the production programme has to go on. If you disturb the production programme of these industries the entire length of the economic structure will be disturbed, the production programme will be affected creating further recession, unemployment, disturbances in the economic horizon and the economic structure.

Therefore do not talk of bank nationalisation in isolation. When you talk of bank nationalisation in isolation, there is no sense of urgency of what exactly you are going to do even to make bank nationalisation successful. It is all right to talk of these things to school children but do not talk of these things to persons in the country who understand this.

About ceiling on urban property, Planning Commission had suggested that first of all you announce the decision and, secondly, you have to create a valuation machinery for which you have to take certain steps. What are the steps that are being taken? May I know whether Government has taken even one step or whether the Planning Commission has suggested even one step asking you to create some machinery?

It is a fact that ceiling on urban property is a complicated problem. The valuation will take a very long time. But if this is the kind of platitudinous language that we use, the machinery will never come into existence, at least not before five years even if you announce the decision today because it is a very difficult problem. Hundred and one cases will go to the court and you will have to trash it out. It is not so easy.

Therefore do not feed us on lollypops, if you really want to be serious about the implementation of the

(Res.)

socialist programme. I have not gone beyond the ten-point programme. I want the Congress Members to realise that if they do not vote for this Resolution, they will not be able to stand before the country. . . (Interruption). These are all points in the ten-point programme.

Why have I taken up the nationalisation of foreign trade? It is because—it is not I but Dr. Myrdal and Professor Galbraith, both, who have said:—

“Unfortunately, the Government does not realise that *ad hoc* arrangements in all the three Plans have been made for expansion of the public sector and, therefore, the structural differences in the Indian economy are not decisive.”

These are not my words: these are the words of Dr. Myrdal, who is neither a Communist nor a Capitalist, and of Professor Galbraith who is supposed to be one of the leading economic thinkers in this world.

Why have I moved this Resolution for taking over foreign investments? It is because—it is not I but Professor Galbraith who says—one of the cause for the growth of the private sector is the foreign investment and the attitude of the foreign investor in regard to foreign investment *vis-a-vis* Indian industry, because when you enter into collaboration you have to be conditioned by the force of circumstances and the conditions which a foreign investor puts on your head which you have to accept.

Moreover, why have I asked for the State takeover of foreign investments? I would like to confine my remarks to the three basic industries—steel, oil and pharmaceutical. To start with I will insist that these three industries should be nationalised. You know, today the tea industry is facing a strike. Then hon. Member sitting on my right, Shri Basu, is an expert on

tea. He knows that the tea industry is incurring a loss of Rs. 30 lakhs a day. Who is going to compensate for that loss? If they had been running so efficiently, naturally, they would not have created this kind of a situation where the tea industry is facing a loss of Rs. 30 lakhs a day. This is apart from the fact that a hundred and one times the Home Minister and his deputy have come before the House and said that a lot of foreign interference is going on in Assam and other strategic areas. Now, many tea planters are involved in this kind of subversive activities. Therefore, this is another reason why you should nationalise the tea industry.

Then, about the oil industry, everyone knows that the oil is a very strategic material. Who does not know that? Thank God this country has not to face many adversaries. But supposing, tomorrow, our relationship with American cartels, oil companies, gets worsened and they start putting pressure on us, supposing our relationship with those companies becomes so bad that they are in a situation to put pressure on us, what are we going to do? It is a strategic industry. No Government would allow, conscious of the fact that we are situated in a very vulnerable part of the world, this kind of free foreign resourcefulness to operate at a strategic point of the economy. It is not realised that they can make your life immobile if they so desire. Even if they put pressure on you in the oil industry, they can paralyse your economy completely. After all, do we not know why the Chinese attacked India? Do we not know why the Pakistanis attacked India? For the last three years, the Prime Minister has been saying that because of the Pakistani war and because of the expenditure of Rs. 500 crores that we had to incur to meet the challenges of the Pakistani war our economy has not yet started projecting as it should have. Now, this is an industry which can

[Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha]

immobilise you completely and paralyse the economy. You are not thinking in terms of nationalisation of the oil industry.

Apart from that, I would like to tell the Government that there are lakhs and lakhs of petrol pumps in the country. Once you nationalise these petrol pumps, those could be used for providing service to villages. In the villages to day, if I have to get my tractor repaired, I have to go 50 miles to get it repaired. I want all these petrol pumps to be used as service centres for repair of tractors, for repair of pumps and for supply of oil. When the American companies were trying to take over marketing facilities for fertiliser, they had a plan that they would use petrol pumps as service centres. That is how they were thinking of spreading completely to the rural areas. If you do not utilise such an instrument which is available in your hands, it will be a tragedy of the first order. Therefore, I say, oil industry must be nationalised.

Then, coming to pharmaceutical industry, I do not have to say to the Minister that the entire patent system, the entire technique, the raw material in the pharmaceutical industry and the formulae of the pharmaceuticals are in the hands of the foreigners. Tomorrow, if they do not desire, they would not supply you even one drop of medicine, what is going to happen to so many lakhs and lakhs of patients in the country? I know when you started drafting the Patents Bill—I know it because I am very near to the levers of power—so much pressure was brought on you not to nationalise the patents system but to relax it. The pharmaceutical industry was the biggest culprit in this regard. Therefore, I demand that the pharmaceutical industry should also be nationalised.

I would not insist on total taking over of the foreign investments. But I would like to tell Mr. Damani who is away that I do not talk with my head off as he thinks to be. I have genuinely felt about these things. When you believe in a *status quo* you say, many things cannot be done. But the Prime Minister herself has insisted that we want to break the *status quo* and we want to catch the mood of the country and that we have to bring necessary changes for that. That means we have to make structural changes in the Indian economy to really make the Indian economy fulfil all its objectives.

Another point that I would like to make is about the urban property ceiling. I am always reminded that urban property ceiling is not the last word. I would like to say that this property ceiling should also be vigorously pursued in the rural areas so far as the land is concerned. The other day, I was reading an editorial in the *Statesman* and in the *Times of India*. When there was lot of agitation in Andhra Pradesh in Srikakulam district—it appeared in the *Statesman's* editorial as also in the *Times of India*—that of land has passed from tribals to non-tribals and from Harijans to non-Harijans. I would like that the Government should regulate by law, a complete legislation must be brought forward whereby no land from the tribal, passes into the hands of a non-tribal and no Harijan land is taken up by any private individual. The Government must appoint a permanent Commission to look after this problem of tribal lands going into the hands of non-tribals and Harijan lands going into the hands of non-Harijans. This Commission should have a rotating fund. If the tribal finds any financial limitations, he goes to the money-lender and that money lender fleeces him. Here the Commission must come out and protect his interests.

(Res.)

Sir, the Government should not only impose a ceiling on the urban property, but should ban the passing over the land from the tribals and Harijans to non-tribals and non-Harijans.

Lastly, I would say a word about the socialistic programmes and the new dimensions and the commanding heights and the hopes the commanding heights have created with the nationalisation of banks. I would say that workers' participation should have been there in our public sector industries. I want the Government to come out with a statement that to start with workers' participation will be in all the public sector industries. In the Board of Directors of every public sector industry, you must include a representative of the Union of workers.

Lastly, I would like to say about demonetisation. The Government has come out a number of times saying that there is Rs. 4000 crores of black money. The hon. Minister announced about the black money going into urban property and jewellery. Then the Gold Control Bill came here. The Gold Control Bill got completely diluted. The Gold Control Act as it exists in the country is in a diluted form. It is a fact that I moved a resolution in the AICC to abolish the Gold Control Act because the Act that existed was neither living nor dead. Therefore, I thought, let us consign the emaciated and truncated Gold Control Law to the Nigambodh Ghat. That is why I moved that resolution. If the Government was serious enough to control the black money, I would have insisted that they would have vigorously pursued the Gold Control Act in a much more vigorous manner than even when it was originally introduced. The hon. Minister has nothing to say about it. Even the hon. Minister says that black money goes into the urban property. That is why I say, let us control the urban property. Let us not really walk down with a sense of pragmatism.

You have given compensation of Rs. 60 or 70 crores. If I had been in

your place, I would have done this. 41 per cent of Government. (Interruptions). If I would have been there to implement this, I would have done (Interruptions). Please listen to what I have to say. You know that 41 per cent of the shares of the banks taken together belong to LIC and the Unit Trust. It is only the question of 10 per cent of the shares for which compensation may have to be given. It would not have amounted to more than Rs. 10 crores and 51 per cent of the shares would have come into the hands of the Government. Now you did not do it. You have to pay compensation of nearly Rs. 160 crores. If you are so much bothered about compensation, it is not a problem. You have abolished zamindari. We were zamindars in Bihar. Zamindari was abolished and you were not bothered about compensation. You could do the same thing on the urban property. Therefore, I said that in order to eradicate black money, the only possibility is this. (Interruptions).

SOME HON. MEMBERS—Rose Interruption).

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like the hon. Lady Member to conclude her speech. She has already taken more than 25 minutes. In a non-official resolution it is not possible to give so much time. But I know the unusual situation and that is why I had been a little indulgent.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: The only way to curb black money is to put ceiling on urban property and also to demonetise the currency. You have to demonetise the currency today or tomorrow or day after tomorrow. You will have to do it one day. You could have done it now. It would have given much more fruitful results now than if you do it tomorrow or day after.

About the steel industry I would like to say this. I am just winding up. In the Indian Iron Rs. 2 crores worth of shares have been taken over

[Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha]

by Mr. Goenka. The entire control of Indian Iron has passed on to Mr. Goenka from Mr. Biren Mukerjee. Is it the interest of the public that you serve? LIC was holding nearly Rs. 30 lakhs worth of shares and the LIC has let this thing happen. I raised this matter earlier with the Finance Minister. But nothing happened. By this indirect help. Mr. Coenka has cornered 3 crores worth of shares. A straight and honest way is to take over these industries in the public sector.

Then, one word I wish to say to my friends on my right the so-called right communist party Members. Their *bonafides* begins and ends with Mrs. Indira Gandhi, Prime Minister of India. I do not have to learn my political convictions from them. We have lived in public life through our own convictions.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU: Our party's resolution is very clear on the subject. I would request the hon. Lady Member to go through the resolution which has clearly clarified our stand. We have seen enough of phoney socialism the congress professes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the hon. Member goes into a debate across the benches, she should be prepared to receive back also. I am prepared for all that from the Chair. It is for the Members to decide. But my difficulty is, we are running short of time. In non-official resolution so much time is not taken. She has already taken 35 minutes.

I was very indulgent and considerate to the hon. lady Member. She has no reason to complain. But at least there should be a limit somewhere.

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA: I am very grateful for the opportunity you have given me because you have realised the urgency and importance

of this Resolution. But when some hon. Members say all the time when we move a resolution that we are phoney, and if something comes from Mrs. Gandhi they say that they will issue a mandate from their party to support it, I have not been able to understand this difference. If we are phoney, we are all phoney. I do not have to take the certificate of the hon. members to my right. We have survived in India's political life and we shall survive through our own convictions, not by the certificate issued by hon. members over there.

I am sorry to say that the hon. Minister's reply was not satisfactory. We stand by ten-point programme of my Party and I would ask the party members to support this Resolution I do not propose to withdraw it.

श्री मधू सिलव : सभापति महोदय, अब आप वोट लेने जा रहे हैं, तो मेरा एक पायंट आफ आर्डर है और साथ ही प्रार्थना और गुजारिश है। मेरी प्रार्थना है कि इस प्रस्ताव पर सत्तारूढ़ दल के सदस्य मेह्रग्वानी कर के अपनी अन्तरात्मा की पुकार सुन कर वोट दें। इस प्रस्ताव पर फ्री वोट हो।

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am not going to allow any further discussion

SHRI P. C. SETHI: I have replied to the points raised by the hon. lady Member. With regard to the point she raised about the ten-point programme, I never said that we are against it. She has tried to create confusion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall I put any amendment separately? Shri S. C. Jha.

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : (मधुबनी) : सभापति महोदय, मुझे अपनी अमेंडमेंट पर बीलने दीजिए।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not at this stage. Shall I put the amendment of Shri S. C. Jha separately?

SHRI SHIVA CHANDRA JHA: Yes.

SHRIMATI ILA PALCHOUDHURI (Krishnagar): On a point of order. The hon. lady member mentioned that tea planters are in collaboration with foreigners. I want to say that during the Chinese aggression, they had given their lives for the sake of the country . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order. She should resume her seat and listen to the Chair. She might make use of another opportunity to refute the allegation.

I will now put Amendment No. 1 of Mr. Shiv Chandra Jha to the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Please read the amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If members begin to ask like that, it is very difficult for the Chair. (Interruptions). It is no use getting angry with the Chair.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: I will quote precedents when amendments have been read out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May be, but there are more precedents of not reading it. You cannot compel the Chair to do it. The usual practice is, it is not read out.

श्री मधु लिमये : मैं कम्पेल नहीं कर रहा हूँ । मैं विनती कर रहा हूँ । आप नहीं पढ़ना चाहते तो मैं पढ़ूँगा । . . . (व्यवधान) . . . कई दफा पढ़ा गया है इसलिये मेरी प्रार्थना है कि पढ़ा जाय ।

MR. CHAIRMAN: If it is a request; it is a different matter. The only diffi-

culty is when I begin to read out one, I will have to read out everything else. If you are very particular I will read it out.

The question is:

"That in the resolution,—

for "socialistic pattern of society which is the declared policy of the Government, necessary steps such as (a) nationalisation of foreign trade, general insurance and steel industry; (b) taking over of all foreign investment in India; (c) fixing of ceiling on urban property; and (d) eradication of black money through demonetisation of the currency be taken by the Government without any further delay"

substitute—

"the goal of socialist society accepted by Parliament the Government should nationalise General Insurance and export-import trade with Nepal and Communist countries within six months and impose ceiling on personal consumption at Rs. 1500/- per month had ceiling on urban property at Rs. 10 lakhs and nationalise rest of the export-import trade within one year from now.

This House further resolves that the Government should also formulate a phased, time-bond programme for implementing other socialist measures."

The Lok Sabha divided.

Division No. 22].

AYES

[16.47 hrs.

Basu, Shri Jyotirmoy
Behera, Shri Baidhar
Bhagaban Das, Shri
Biswas, Shri J. M.
Chakrapani, Shri C. K.
Daschowdhury, Shri B. K.
Esthose, Shri P. P.
Gopalan, Shri P.

Jha, Shri Shiva Chandra
Limaye, Shri Madhu
Mandal, Shri B. P.
Menon, Shri Vishwanatha
Mishra, Shri Janeshwar
Modak, Shri B. K.
Molahu Prasad, Shri
Nihal Singh, Shri

AYES

Paswan, Shri Kedar
 Patil, Shri N. R.
 Ramji Ram, Shri
 Ray, Shri Rabi
 Roy, Shri Chittaranjan

AYES

Sezhiyan, Shri
 Shastri, Shri Prakash Vir
 Shastri, Shri Raghubir Singh
 Shastri, Shri Sheopujan
 Shastri, Shri Shiv Kumar

NOES

Amat, Shri D.
 Awadesh Chandra Singh, Shri
 Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha
 Babunath Singh, Shri
 Barua, Shri Bedabrata
 Barua, Shri R.
 Bhagat, Shri B. R.
 Bhanu Prakash Singh, Shri
 Bhargava, Shri B. N.
 Bhattacharyya, Shri C. K.
 Bholanath, Shri
 Bist, Shri J. B. S.
 Bohra, Shri Onkarlal
 Chanda, Shri Anil K.
 Chanda, Shrimati Jyotsna
 Chandrika Prasad, Shri
 Chaturvedi, Shri R. L.
 Chaudhary, Shri Nitiraj Singh
 Chavan, Shri D. R.
 Chavan, Shri Y. B.
 Choudhary, Shri Valmiki
 Damani, Shri S. R.
 Das, Shri N. T.
 Dass, Shri C.
 Deo, Shri K. P. Singh
 Deo, Shri R. R. Singh
 Deoghare, Shri N. R.
 Deshmukh, Shri B. D.
 Dinesh Singh, Shri
 Dixit, Shri G. C.
 Ering, Shri D.
 Gandhi, Shrimati Indira
 Ganesh, Shri K. R.
 Gautam, Shri C. D.
 Ghosh, Shri P. K.
 Gowder, Shri Nanja
 Gupta, Shri Lakhan Lal
 Gupta, Shri Ram Kishan
 Hanumanthaiya, Shri
 Heerji Bhai, Shri
 Hem Raj, Shri
 Iqbal Singh, Shri
 Jadhav, Shri Tulsidas
 Jadhav, Shri V. N.
 Jagjiwan Ram, Shri
 Jamir, Shri S. C.
 Jamna Lal, Shri

Jena, Shri D. D.
 Karan Singh, Dr.
 Kasture, Shri A. S.
 Katham, Shri B. N.
 Kesri, Shri Sitaram
 Khan, Shri Zulfiquar Ali
 Kikar Singh, Shri
 Kinder Lal, Shri
 Krishna, Shri M. R.
 Kureel, Shri B. N.
 Lakshmikanthamma, Shrimati
 Laskar, Shri N. R.
 Laxmi Bai, Shrimati
 Lobo Prabhu, Shri
 Lutfal Haque, Shri
 Mahadeva Prasad, Dr.
 Maharaj Singh, Shri
 Mahida, Shri Narendra Singh
 Majhi, Shri M.
 Malhotra, Shri Inderjit
 Mandal, Dr. P.
 Mandal, Shri Yamuna Prasad
 Mane, Shri Shankarrao
 Marandi, Shri
 Menon, Shri Govinda
 Minimata, Shrimati Agam Dass Guru
 Mishra, Shri Bibhuti
 Mrityunjay Prasad, Shri
 Mukerjee, Shrimati Sharda
 Mulla, Shri A. N.
 Naik, Shri G. C.
 Oraon, Shri Kartik
 Padmavati Devi, Shrimati
 Pahadia, Shri
 Palchoudhuri, Shrimati Ila
 Pandey, Shri Vishwa Nath
 Panigrahi, Shri Chintamani
 Pant, Shri K. C.
 Paokai Haokip, Shri
 Parmar, Shri Bhaljibhai
 Parmar, Shri D. R.
 Pratap Singh, Shri
 Parthasarathy, Shri
 Patil, Shri S. D.
 Poonacha, Shri C. M.
 Pramanik, Shri J. N.

Qureshi, Shri Shaffi
 Radhabai, Shrimati B.
 Raghu Ramaiah, Shri
 Raj Deo Singh, Shri
 Ram, Shri T.
 Ram Dhan, Shri
 Ram Sewak, Shri
 Ram Swarup, Shri
 Ramshekhar Prasad Singh, Shri
 Randhir Singh, Shri
 Rao, Shri Jaganath
 Rao, Shri Muthya
 Rao, Shri J. Ramapathi
 Rao, Dr. V. K. R. V.
 Rao, Shri V. Narasimha
 Reddi, Shri G. S.
 Reddy, Shrimati Sudha
 Roy, Shri Bishwanath
 Roy, Shrimati Uma
 Saleem, Shri M. Y.
 Salve, Shri N. K. P.
 Sankata Prasad, Dr.
 Sarma, Shri A. T.
 Savitri Shyam, Shrimati
 Sayeed, Shri P. M.
 Sayyad Ali, Shri

Sen, Shri Dwapayan
 Sen, Shri P. G.
 Sethi, Shri P. C.
 Sethuramae, Shri N.
 Shambhu Nath, Shri
 Sharma, Shri N. K.
 Shastri, Shri B. N.
 Sheo Narain, Shri
 Sher Singh, Shri
 Shiv Chandika Prasad, Shri
 Shukla, Shri S. N.
 Shukla, Shri Vidya Charan
 Siddeshwar Prasad, Shri
 Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan
 Snatak, Shri Nar Deo
 Sonavane, Shri
 Sursingh, Shri
 Swaran Singh, Shri
 Swell, Shri
 Tiwary, Shri D. N.
 Tiwary, Shri K. N.
 Uikey, Shri M. G.
 Ulaka, Shri Ramchandra
 Vyas, Shri Ramesh Chandra
 Yadav, Shri Chandrajit

MR. CHAIRMAN: The result* of the division is Ayes: 27; Noes: 145.

The motion was negatived

MR. CHAIRMAN: Should I put any other amendment separately?

SHRI B. P. MANDAL (Madhepura): I want amendment No. 4 to be put separately.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. I will now put amendment No. 4 to the vote of the House.

Amendment No. 4 was put and negatived

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will now put all other amendments to the vote of the House.

[Division No. 23]

Abraham, Shri K. M.
 Ahmed, Shri J.
 Behera, Shri Baidhar
 Biswas, Shri J. M.
 Chakrapani, Shri C. K.

Amendments Nos. 3, 5, 6, 8 and 9 were put and negatived

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will now put the original Resolution to the vote of the House.

"This House resolves that in order to achieve socialistic pattern of society which is the declared policy of the Government, necessary steps such as (a) nationalisation of foreign trade, general insurance and steel industry; (b) taking over of all foreign investment in India; (c) fixing of ceiling on urban property; and (d) eradication of black money through demonelisation of the currency be taken by the Government without any further delay."

The Lok Sabha divided:

AYES

[16.50 hrs.]

Daschowdhary, Shri B. K.
 Dwivedy, Shri Surendranath
 Esthose, Shri B. P.
 Gopalan, Shri P.
 Guha, Shri Samar

*Shri B. Shankaranand also recorded his vote for 'NOES.'

AYES

Jha, Shri Shiva Chandra
 Kachwai, Shri Hukam Chand
 Kapoor, Shri Lakhan Lal
 Limaye, Shri Madhu
 Mangalathumadam, Shri
 Mirza, Shri Bakar Ali
 Misra, Shri Janeshwar
 Modak, Shri B. K.
 Molahu Prasad, Shri
 Nihal Singh, Shri
 Patil, Shri N. R.
 Ram Charan, Shri
 Ramani, Shri K.

Ramji Ram, Shri
 Ray, Shri Rabi
 Roy, Shri Chittaranjan
 Sethuraman, Shri N.
 Sezhiyan, Shri
 Sharda Nand, Shri
 Shastri, Shri Parkash Vir
 Shastri, Shri Raghuvir Singh
 Shastri, Shri Sheopujan
 Shastri, Shri Shiv Kumar
 Sinha Shrimati Tarkeshwari
 Viswambharan, Shri P.
 Yadav, Shri Ram Sewak

NOES

Awadesh Chandra Singh, Shri
 Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha
 Babunath Singh, Shri
 Barua, Shri Bebabrata
 Barua, Shri R.
 Bhagat, Shri B. R.
 Bhanu Prakash Singh, Shri
 Bhattacharya, Shri C. K.
 Bist, Shri J. B. S.
 Bohra, Shri Onkarlal
 Chanda, Shri Anil K.
 Chanda, Shrimati Jyotsna
 Chandrika Prasad, Shri
 Chaturvedi, Shri R. L.
 Chaudhary, Shri Nitiraj Singh
 Chavan, Shri D. R.
 Chavan, Shri Y. B.
 Choudhary, Shri Valmiki
 Damani, Shri S. R.
 Das, Shri N. T.
 Dass, Shri C.
 Deo, Shri K. P. Singh
 Deo, Shri R. R. Singh
 Deoghare, Shri N. R.
 Deshmukh, Shri B. D.
 Dinesh Singh, Shri
 Dixit, Shri G. C.
 Ering, Shri D.
 Gandhi, Shrimati Indira
 Ganesh, Shri K. R.
 Gautam, Shri C. D.
 Ghosh, Shri P. K.
 Gowder, Shri Nanja
 Gupta, Shri Lakhan Lal
 Gupta, Shri Ram Kishan
 Hanumanthaiya, Shri
 Heerji Bhai, Shri
 Hem Raj, Shri
 Iqbal Singh, Shri

Jadhav, Shri Tulsidas
 Jadhav, Shri V. N.
 Jagjiwan Ram, Shri
 Jamir, Shri S. C.
 Jamna Lal, Shri
 Karan Singh, Dr.
 Kasturi, Shri A. S.
 Katham, Shri B. N.
 Kesri, Shri Sitaram
 Khan, Shri Zulfiqar Ali.
 Kikar Singh, Shri
 Kinder Lal, Shri
 Krishna, Shri M. R.
 Kureel, Shri B. N.
 Lakshmikanthamma, Shrimati
 Laskar, Shri N. R.
 Laxmi Bai, Shrimati
 Lobo Prabhu, Shri
 Lutfal Haque, Shri
 Mahadeva Prasad, Dr.
 Maharaj Singh, Shri
 Mahida, Shri Narendra Singh
 Malhotra, Shri Inder J.
 Mandal, Dr. P.
 Nanda, Shri Jamna Prasad
 Mane, Shri Shankarrad
 Marandi, Shri
 Master, Shri Bhola Nath
 Menon, Shri Govinda
 Minimata, Agam Das, Guru, Shrimati
 Mishra, Shri Bibhut
 Naik, Shri G. C.
 Oraon, Shri Kartik
 Padmavati Devi, Shrimati
 Pahadia, Shri Jagannath
 Palchoudhury, Shrimati Ila
 Pandey, Shri Vishwa Nath
 Panigrahi, Shri Chintamani
 Pant, Shri K. C.

NOES

Paokai Haokip, Shri
Parmar, Shri Bhaljibhai
Parmar, Shri D. R.
Partap Singh, Shri
Parthasarathy, Shri
Patil, Shri S. B.
Patil, Shri S. D.
Poonacha, Shri C. M.
Pramanik, Shri J. N.
Qureshi, Shri Mohd. Shafi
Radhabai, Shrimati B.
Raghu Ramaiah, Shri
Raj Deo Singh, Shri
Ram, Shri T.
Ram Sewak, Shri Chowdhary
Ram Swarup, Shri
Ramshekhar Prasad Singh, Shri
Randhri Singh, Shri
Rao, Shri Jaganath
Ranga, Shri
Rao, Shri Muthyal
Rao, Dr. V. K. R. V.
Rao, Shri V. Narasimha
Reddi, Shri G. S.
Reddy, Shrimati Sudha V.
Roy, Shri Bishwanath
Roy, Shrimati Uma
Sadhu Ram, Shri
Saleem, Shri M. Yunus
Salve, Shri N. K. P.
Sankata Prasad, Dr.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The result of the division is: Ayes: 36; Noes: 139.

The motion was negatived

16.50 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: UNEMPLOYMENT

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU (Diamond Harbour): Sir, I beg to move the following Resolution:—

"This House express its grave concern at the unprecedented increase in unemployment in the country and failure of the Plans to create adequate employment potential and recommends immediate for-

Sarma, Shri A. T.
Savitri Shyam, Shrimati
Sayeed, Shri P. M.
Sayyad Ali, Shri
Sen, Shri Dwaipayan
Sen, Shri P. G.
Sethi, Shri P. C.
Shambhu Nath, Shri
Shankaranand, Shri B.
Sharma, Shri Naval Kishore
Shashi Bhushan, Shri
Shastri, Shri Biswanarayan
Sheo Narain, Shri
Sher Singh, Shri
Shiv Chandika Prasad, Shri
Shukla, Shri S. N.
Shukla, Shri Vidya Charan
Siddheshwar Prasad, Shri
Sinha, Shri Satya Narayan
Snatak, Shri Nar Deo
Sonavane, Shri
Sursingh, Shri
Swaran Singh, Shri
Swell, Shri
Tiwary, Shri D. N.
Tiwary, Shri K. N.
Uikey, Shri M. G.
Ulaka, Shri Ramachandra
Vyas, Shri Ramesh Chandra
Yadav, Shri Chandra Jeet

mulation of a high power All Party Parliamentary Committee to tackle the problem immediately and frame rules for operating National Financial Assistance Scheme for the unemployed."

We in this country, all of us, are now sitting over a volcano of unemployment. Over the last 22 years the Government is noted for two things in particular: firstly, their utter failure to create employment and, secondly, their success to destroy the existing ones partly. Whatever plan they have drawn up during the last 17 years was more to feed the foreign monopolists and industrialists. The only target they succeeded in fulfilling

*The following Members also recorded their votes:

Ayes: Sarvashri B. P. Mandal, E. K. Nayanar, S. Kundu, Viswanatha Menon, Bhagban Das, and Kedar Paswan.

Noes: Sarvashri J. Ramapathi Rao, Ram Dhan. A. N. Mulla, Badrudduja, D. Amat, D. D. Jena and Mahendra Majhi.