

The opposition is trying to give an impression to the whole nation by bringing this no-confidence motion that they are united and committed to voice the aspirations of the people....

(Interruptions)

And they want to show the outside world and say that "we are united and committed to voice the aspirations of the people". Quite interestingly, the people outside this House know pretty well that there are the new political alignments taking place among strange bed-fellows, even here if they have forgotten what they did against each other and also what they said against each other people have not forgotten about them. The people know everything about the new political alignment now with those leaders coming closer and closer and also people know pretty well, how long this political alignment lasts. The opposition wanted to say to the word or to the country at large that they are united and committed to voice the aspirations of the people but the people know that they are not united and they are not committed to any ideology at all at any stage.

Many issues have been raised about poverty against which everything has been clearly clarified by those who spoke from our side.

One important thing that Government has done is containing inflation. When compared to other nations, our performance is quite remarkable. When compared to 21.4 per cent inflation in 1979-80 and when it was brought to 2.1 per cent in 1982 it was a remarkable achievement. In this respect, I would like my friends to understand one important aspect. With a country of our size which has more than 711 million population with different languages, different religions, castes and communities, is it not fortunate that we have a unifying force in the person of Mrs. Gandhi who can command respect and faith of South India as well as North India equally and can any leaders understand the special problems of South India or at least can they recognise the differences among the Southern languages? Therefore, these leaders are only regional leaders and can never claim to be national leaders.

Before concluding, I would like to say one more thing. No less a person than the Prime Minister of Japan — he is not a Congress-I man — has paid a glowing tribute to the leadership of Mrs. Gandhi saying that she is not only the leader of India and Asia but of the world. Is it not a pride to our country and to her party and to her Government?

With these words, I strongly oppose the no-confidence motion which has been brought here out of frustration.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI): Mr. Speaker, Sir, many people from our side have rightly said that this question of bringing a no-confidence motion has become a routine matter, but they have failed to follow it up by saying that every time it is we who come up on top, not because of numbers because of the effectiveness of the replies given to the points made by the opposition. No new point has been raised in today's debate that has not been discussed in this very Session and which has not been replied to during question hour and on other occasions time and again. Therefore, what was the point of raising them all over again. That point was answered by the last speaker from the Opposition Benches. It is personal animosity. He brought personal animosity into the debate, he tried to bring my family into it, even my small grand-children. Is this Parliamentary democracy? (Interruptions) Does it show decency? This was his major and most-loudly-made point. This shows what his interest lies in. Earlier and before that, as my hon. colleague, Mr. Venkataraman aptly pointed out, when very serious matters were being debated in the House, the hon. Opposition leaders and Members did not consider it worth their while, did not consider those matter important enough for them to be present in the House, and now suddenly they see them as important enough to censure the Government on. We can withstand their censure, we have faced their censure, we have stood the censure of the world on many important matters. We have stood, as I said in America and everywhere. I have gone and as I shall continue to state, we have stood upright in spite of our opponents or what Opposition Members say.

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

It would have been more appropriate if the hon. Members had moved a vote of no-confidence in themselves. (*Interruptions*) For once at least they would have got the credit of recognising the realities of the situation.

I do not think that the facts of their criticism about one another are hidden from us on this side or the opposite side or from the world at large. The last Member who spoke belongs to the real, *asli* Lok Dal, the other are *nakali* ones; and yet here they have got together! Those who have been the very perpetrators of such emotions accuse us of casteism and communalism, not just from today but since before independence. Then there are those who consider themselves progressive. What are they doing? They are very proudly saying, "We do not associate ourselves with such people." What are you doing on this occasion? What have you done in the elections, I ask you? You have not stood alone. You have supported reactionary elements outside and inside the House on every possible occasion. (*Interruptions*)

A respected and a known Marxist leader has said, we shall support the BJP, "we shall accept the support of the BJP, if this defeats Indira Gandhi". This was printed in all the newspapers. (*Interruptions*) Do not make a noise here.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY (Calcutta South): It was against authoritarianism and we shall fight it (*Interruptions*)

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: You have their version here also. Therefore, they consider the BJP and the RSS as good allies. It is not only I who am saying this. Your member himself has just admitted it—the CPM member... (*Interruptions*) I am not yielding to you. Please sit down.

They are slinging mud against one another. The various groups, the BJP, the various segments of the LDs, the CPI-M, and the DSP, all these have throughout been indulging in mudslinging. This does not prevent them from joining hands to try

to weaken the Government—not that they can replace it. They have no positive programme. They have no positive policy. What is the use of speaking of ideology? If one Opposition party has a programme, the other has a diametrically opposed one and the third persons goes in yet another direction. That is not called a programme. It just means destruction of the solidarity of our people. It means the destruction of the unity of our country. That is what you are out to do. You may refute it until you are blue in the face, but you cannot convince anybody. This fact the world has recognised. I happen to be in touch with world leaders, with the leaders of the countries which some Members oppose support and the country's which the rest of them support. I happen to know what they think of India... (*Interruptions*)

Today every country in the world is impressed by our basic policies and the manner in which we are implementing them. Every country, I repeat, from the developing world, the developed world, the Communist world and the capitalist world. There must be something good in what we are doing, that such very diverse elements have come to praise us, personally by talking or writing to me but speaking at public places, in their own news—Janata Party or Lok Dal Government...

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Diplomacy demands it.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Why have they not done it to you? Why have they not done it to other people? You have only to hear what was said in the non-aligned movement during the Janata Party or Lok Dal Government...

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: They have given us the same.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: You have now the temerity to suggest and alleged that we are compromising ourselves on self-reliance. You have the temerity to say this to Indira Gandhi?... when I have stood for the honour of the country— (*Interruptions*) yes, what is the use of saying 'Oh?'—Yes, I am... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI HARIKESH BAHADUR: You are destroying.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I am destroying it? (*Interruptions*) The world knows when India's strength has been built, the world knows when India's honour has been upheld. It is not a question of shouting in this House, whether our side does it or your side does it. The world knows it and the world has acknowledged it. The fact is that they have acknowledged some Members who accuse me, are those who have strongly opposed the policies of the Congress and of Jawarlal Nehru to build up our own economic strength, to have economic planning and to improve our industry and agriculture.

There are many who have constantly propagated that it is better for us to belong to en bloc or another. Today they seem to have changed. I am sorry to say I find it most difficult to believe in them when I know how long they have held other views.

Self-reliance has been, is and will always remain our basic objective. Especially this month of August brings back heroic memories of the Quit India Movement. There were some even then who did not want the country to stand for Independence but were serving the cause of the colonial masters. There are some who are sitting opposite who even when we become independent, said that we were stooges of the British. Don't make me repeat all this because it is all down in black and white.

Today, our technology has gained immense strength. For its own good, we have to go in for more advanced technology in some fields. Otherwise, we shall be struck with obsolete methods in a world that is fast changing and fast moving. We are not throwing open our entire economy to the foreign investment but only those segments which will increase our expertise and bring the sophisticated knowhow of which we are in need.

A great deal has been said about Tarapur. Now, I think an adequate reply was given. However, I should like to clarify once more that during the discussion with the U.S. Delegation in India and in U.S.A. between our officials, we made our position amply clear and also in other forums

regarding—(a) the right to reprocess without further consultation and (b) on the expiry of the agreement, and all rights and obligations arising out of this in 1993. Both sides agreed that, in spite of the differences of opinion on these two issues, arrangements for continued supply of enriched uranium to India within the framework of the 1963 agreement could be made and, therefore, it was decided to accept the offer of supplies through France. Because, earlier there was uncertainty in the supply of fuel by the U.S.A., we had to think of some alternative method. Development work was carried out and the use of MOX as an alternative fuel was found feasible. The work on this technological achievement will be continued. I have stated this in this House on an earlier occasion also. I could read a much longer note but I do not want to take the time of the House. But, I repeat that the use of MOX in the future for the Tarapur Atomic Power Station is not precluded.

Sir, much has been said about the Bihar Press Bill. I am not going into the matter except to reiterate that we stand committed to a free press. But, as the Press Commission has deserved, the Press has to be not only free but responsible — responsible not to the Government but to the consequences of whatever they write or publish. As has been said, in fact, somebody has sent me a quotation, "nobody is entitled to use his freedom of speech and expression to injure another's reputation" (*Interruptions*) I have no doubt that the senior professionals in the Press itself will not approve of the untruth or obscenity that are sometimes indulged in by the less responsible sections of the Press. How should this be dealt with is a matter which can be discussed and which can be gone into. But, as has been pointed out, this is not a new idea. A very similar act was passed earlier by two States. So far as I remember, I did not hear much noise about it, either here or outside, from those who were in power then.

Sir, a lot of people have made much about the elections. I have not got all the figures about the last elections. But,

[Smt. Indira Gandhi]

I can say that in Haryana, in 1977, we had 17.15 per cent of the votes; in the Lok Sabha elections in 1980, we had 35 per cent and, in the Assembly Elections in 1982, we had 38 per cent.

If the weaker sections which are the vast majority of the population did not support us, how is it that we were able to get such a majority? Was it by the support of the big houses that we are two-thirds of us here? (*Interruptions*) Such a remark, Sir, is an insult not to me or to any of us, but it is an insult to the electorate of India and the many millions of people who voted.

Chaudhary Charan Singhji....

एक शीतनीय संवत्सः वे चले गये ।

श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी : वे चले भी गए हैं, लेकिन उन्होंने पवर्टी की बात की थी ।

Our differences with him are of long standing; they are basic. I do not want to bring them out in the open. But one of the questions which he used to raise with me during my earlier regime, when I was Prime Minister and he the Chief Minister of UP, was that we should close down the mills, specially the textile mills. It is for the House to consider whether that policy is viable in any modern country. I myself put the question to him: "What are we going to do with all the industrial workers, who will be dislodged?" He said, "You will have to get them to make handloom material." Hon'ble members can also consider if that is a possibility? Will that supply enough cloth at reasonable prices and in time to the huge population of India? I am mentioning only one item to show the trend of Chaudhuri Sahib's thinking on many such matters.

He also gave certain statistics. I do not blame him for using them very selectively, meant only to serve his own thesis. He said nothing at all about the overall increase in grain output, increase in sugar and milk products. I

can give figures of the record food production; in 1981-82, it was 132 million tonnes, oilseeds in 1981-82—115 lakh tonnes; sugarcane 180 million tonnes, milk production—33 million tonnes as against 17 million tonnes in 1951. I could have given many other statistics, I am cutting short the list. There are other items with which the smaller man is concerned, that is, the production of eggs, fish etc. In all these production has augmented tremendously. And obviously, the gain will go to private persons, these are not State ventures; but of small farmers, and sometimes even the landless people.

There was also talk about poverty line. I should like to make clear that I have never said that we have conquered poverty or eliminated poverty. On the contrary, I have said that there is poverty, and that in my generation, we shall not be able to remove it. I have made that very clear, as long back as when I came to power in 1966. It is an enormously big problem. What I have said is that the face of poverty is changing. What I have said is, and it is true, that many millions of people have been raised above what was considered the poverty line earlier on. And that line is a shifting line. At that time what was considered luxuries by the people, are today necessities. we do not blame them; we agree with them.

At the same time, the question of population increase must also be taken into consideration. Life expectancy has gone up. I am sorry, I do not agree with Shri Chavan's theory although I know that the Congress itself has used the phrase. The rich are richer, I agree but the poor are not poorer. They are poorer by contrast, they are poorer because they are more conscious of poverty, but they are not poorer in the sense that I with my own eyes have seen at the time of independence, that I with my own eyes have seen, even when I became Prime Minister in 1966. I do not live in a village; I do not know whether Chaudhuri Charan Singh himself lives in one. However, since I was a small child, villagers have been

coming to my home not in hundreds, but in thousands and in lakhs. Whether in Anand Bhawan, Allahabad, in Teen Murti House, 1, Safdarjung Road or in 12, Willingdon Crescent, the house and the compound have been full of villagers from all parts of the country not always from my part, not always those who sympathise with me. Perhaps the Hon. Members would be interested to know that at the time when Choudhury Charan Singh had his Kisan Rally in Delhi a large number of farmers turned up at my house. They told me: 'We have come for the Kisan Rally' and one of the inducements given to some of them was that 'you will have Indira Gandhi's darshan, when you come to Delhi'.

(Interruptions)

While we are on this subject and because Shri and Shrimati Dandavate are both present, I can bring to the notice of this House an incident which took place only a few days ago. Prof. Madhu Dandavate was a Minister in the Janata Party Government, but at that time he was not bothered about the people of Belgaum or about the border issue. Now, he and Mrs. Dandavate brought quite a crowd said to be from Belgaum. What was he doing when he was a Minister for two and a half years? "हमको तो आप ही में श्रद्धा है, आपको इस प्रश्न का सुझावोंगी." they said, not behind Prof. Dandavate's back but in front of them. He also used similar words!

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Sir, I told her that when we were in power we convened a meeting, but unfortunately the Parliament was dissolved. I told this to her and I repeat it here.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Sir, so far as the poverty line is concerned, in absolute terms the number of people below the poverty line has increased because there has been 90 per cent increase in population. However, in percentage terms the number has come down. It has declined from 51.49 per cent in 1972-73 to 48.13 per cent in 1977, and it is

constantly declining. I am told that by the completion of the Sixth Five-Year Plan, we will be able to take some millions of people, over 10 crores perhaps above the poverty line.

So far as drinking water is concerned, the target under the 20-point programme is to cover all problem villages by 1985. 6,266 problem villages have been covered in the first quarter of 1982. This represents 20.2 per cent of the annual target. We hope to achieve the target by 1985.

Sombody also accused us of not dealing with this problem seriously. It is a sad commentary, but in many villages, in fact, in most villages, people seem to prefer to have a big unit or project rather than something which is so essential as drinking water or a primary school. I myself have had discussions sometimes with villagers trying to persuade them about urgent priority items, but they seem to prefer to have a prestigious project. So, we have to fight for this also.

Then there are land reforms. I don't want to go into the figures, but perhaps you know—this is as true of West Bengal as of other places—how many stay orders there are and cases that are stuck in the courts. This is true not only of land reforms, but of many other programmes which concern the poorest and the weaker sections. In this we are helpless. Unless we can all sit together and find some way, we cannot do anything.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why don't you bring it under the Ninth Schedule?

AN HON. MEMBER. They are under the Ninth Schedule. You don't know.

(Interruptions)

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I do not have the full figures here of the conviction of the accused but so far as the atrocities on the Scheduled Castes are concerned,—I speak subject to correction because I am not sure whether all these towns are in Bihar, Belchi, Pipra and Bishempur, in six places—there have been two death sentences and 135 life

[Smt. Indira Gandhi]

sentences and in other States also there have been some. I do not have all the figures with me.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: What about Meenakshipuram and Arab money?

AN HON. MEMBER: You have taken charge of it.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Now, with regard to employment, I have spoken on this matter earlier also. The figures that are on our registers are not always accurate. Many people who are unemployed do not register, many who are employed do register either to get a better job or to get a job in another part of the country. I have myself seen some of these figures. In spite of this, the rate of increase has declined from 16 per cent in 1978 to 13 per cent in 1979 and 1980 and has further declined to 10 per cent in 1981. By and large, about 50 per cent of the job seekers belong to the educated category. But even here, the rate of increase of unemployment has shown a downward trend. I should like to point out, as I had done before, that a lasting solution to the problem of unemployment can only depend on the level and rate of growth of the economy and that is why we lay so much stress on increasing production and on development programmes. That is the only way in which a long term solution can be found. We have got short term schemes; some of them are successful, some, I am sorry to say, are not succeeding. But the only way is really to get on with development and for hon. Members opposite not to try to obstruct us in that important task.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: We are insignificant.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: The other point to which my attention has been drawn is that the proper index of our effort is the rate at which the total national income at constant prices has increased. India's GNP at constant prices has nearly trebled in the 30 years since we have started our economic

planning; our domestic product grew up by an average of 3.7 per cent year during the years 1970 to 1978 and this performance was better than the majority of the advanced countries even.

Sir, we believe in and are fully committed to the democratic system. However, I must confess that I have some reservations about the present functioning of Parliament. Choudhary Charan Singh himself has spoken of the lengthening of the 'Zero Hour' and earlier I quoted my honourable colleagues, as to how little interest is shown in serious subjects and how much time goes on other subjects repeated over and over again. They may be important subjects; but when they have been replied to and you reiterate them, that does not lead to any solution. (Interruptions)

Mention also was made about blindings in Bhagalpur. That has been very barbarous and inhuman. I can hardly find words to describe the horror of it. But I should like to remind you that it started in the Janata Party period and it also took place in the Marxists' time in West Bengal, which by the way, was loudly denied from the opposite side when the fact was first made known, although later it was admitted by the West Bengal Government.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Do not blind them with retrospective effect!

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: It was raised, that is why, I am speaking of it. Otherwise, I would not have talked of the subject.

Since we were on the question of this raising of a hue and cry in the House I might say that the economic figures regarding West Bengal which we gave were loudly protested and denied by the Marxist Party during the elections. After the elections, they admitted that they had been misled and that the figures that we had quoted were correct.

20 hrs.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Which figures?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI:
Economic figures. (*Interruptions*)

It is refreshing but not really believable that the Bharatiya Janata Party, the Jansangh, the RSS—whatever name you want to give it I consider them to be one and the same—pretend to take a different stance. With all humility I say that these are just tactics. There is no reality in this difference of opinion between the BJP and the RSS. That they have suddenly come to believe in the concept of self-reliance or of economic planning or of non-alignment, I find it very difficult to believe. What did they do? What steps did they take towards self-reliance, towards socialism when they were in power? Most of the Members opposite—I am sorry to say—become pastmasters in destructive tactics for their own ends. At that time the destruction was not against us; it was only amongst themselves; but it was destruction nevertheless.

So far as prices in Delhi are concerned, I am not going into the whole question of prices here. But I do want to take this opportunity of saying that Government is taking special measures to ensure increased supplies of essential commodities in Delhi, in the Delhi market especially during the ASIAD, so as to prevent prices going up to a significant extent.

Now, my hon. friend Shri Sathe will excuse me if I say a word about him, because several people have quoted from his speech. His own thinking has been largely, if not entirely these days, confined to the question of colour TV. And it is true that he felt that we are not giving that issue he thought that it deserves. This is all that he meant by his long speech. I must confess that I am not against colour TV. The question is one of priority. My priority in radio and TV is to reach the largest number of villages possible. And we feel that we cannot do this with colour TV. We do not want to stop colour TV and we have begun it. But we feel that it is easier and cheaper to cover the country with black and white. If we

can do it cheaply with colour TV, certainly we shall do so. We do not want to lag behind other countries and especially our neighbours. At this moment, this poses a serious problem. In the border areas, people like to switch on to colour programmes from other countries rather than to see our own black and white. This is a very real problem which we have all to face.

Some people have said that the 20-Point Programme is not new. We never said that it was. We have called it the revised 20-Point Programme. It was revised because some of the points have been completed and because we wanted to direct our attention and energies to the gaps and the most urgent problems which remain.

Some hon. Members felt that any time anybody mentions the name of the Soviet Union, they have to rush to its defence. I think the Soviet Union is quite capable of defending itself. It can do without help from this quarter. (*Interruptions*) I do not think that Shri Gadgil meant in any way to denigrate the Soviet Union. He was referring to the news that has appeared in newspapers in many countries that the USSR is short of grain not only for cattle but wheat for human beings also. This is not a cause for blame because, so much depends on rain. Shri Gadgil just stated a fact which he had read. To interpret it as casting aspersions on a friendly country would be wrong, and even an unfriendly act towards that country.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: It is the habit of your people.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: It is your habit also. Why do you want to be so touchy on that account?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: You are more touchy.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I am not touchy, because I know they can defend themselves. (*Interruptions*) You sit down.

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

Some other members have made all kinds of insinuations. I do not wish to take the names of the hon. Members, but I can only say that it was the vilest possible insinuation to say that the Centre, or the Union Government, gives instructions for any or every Bill, or that all actions are referred to me or to anybody who is not directly concerned.

I am not concerned with what words were used in my Manipur case. But even if you say—I am not admitting it at all for I do not want to start a new argument; even if I were merely summoned there as a witness, is it not a ridiculous charge to summon a former Prime Minister, abetting the stealing of two chickens and six eggs? That is the question which I want to ask... (*Interruptions*)

Sir, the opposition cannot have it both ways. On the one hand, they say I am a dictator, I do not allow anybody to function, I do not allow anybody to speak; on the other hand, they say that people are doing things without asking me, things are happening in Bihar, things are happening in Delhi, without my being aware of them! You cannot have it both ways. You choose which you want and stick to that point of view... (*Interruptions*)

I should like to ask; which Communist country or which Fascist country has democracy? Perhaps you would like to answer that question... (*Interruptions*) I do not know if Mr. Vajpayee will agree with that.

I charge this opposition... (*Interruptions*) I am just finishing. I charge this opposition with irresponsibility; I charge this opposition with utter disregard for the norms of democracy; I charge this opposition with wasting the time of this hon. House; I charge them wasting the money of the exchequer; I charge them with lack of concern for important legislation. Just measure the time spent on actual legislation or discussion on important issues now facing us and the

world with the time spent on shouting, whether it is in 'zero hour' or on other occasions... (*Interruptions*)

In the beginning, not a voice used to be heard from our side. Only when we discovered that by keeping quiet the opposite would not allow us to function only then our people started shouting. If the opposition guarantees to keep quiet, I guarantee that not a word will come from our members. Are you prepared to listen to that? Are you going to control your motley crowd there? I charge this so-called Left of the country for so completely abandoning its principles and ideals and for selling out to the right reactionaries... (*Interruptions*)

A couple of speeches—(*Interruptions*). I am not yielding, I am not yielding.

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI (Patna): We are also not yielding.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: A couple of speeches or demonstrations make no difference, nor do they form a policy. Those who are concerned with progressive policies all over the world are aware of this betrayal by the Indian Left. (*Interruptions*).

Sir, I should like to remind the House of the early days of Hitler in Germany, when the West was content to encourage him because he was supposed to crush communism and in that process millions of people in Germany, in Austria, in Czechoslovakia, Poland and other countries were tortured and massacred in the most barbarous manner imaginable and the entire world was engulfed in World War II. Today, the so-called Left forces in India are supporting the BJP and RSS and strengthening them in the hope, they are giving it respect in the hope... (*Interruptions*). I shall keep on repeating till you sit.

AN HON. MEMBER: We are not yielding.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: You have had your say.

The left are giving the reactionaries respectability, they are strengthening them

in the hope that this will weaken and, if possible, destroy the Congress, the Party which brought Independence to India, the Party which brought honour and progress, which is trying against tremendous odds to retain, ... (Interruptions) the Party which is trying against tremendous odds to retain our culture and at the same time modernising the country and bringing a better life to millions of our people, specially the weaker and under-privileged sections.

Sir, I should like to ask: How many voices were raised in the Opposition when one of its Members openly and gleefully declared himself to be an agent of the CIA? How did the Opposition react when one of its Members gave information to a foreign embassy? Does this bring honour to the country? Whatever its faults, the Congress—and the Congress does have faults because we also are human, we are not super human, we do have faults, but the Congress always has risen and always will rise to the challenge.

Hon. Members of the Opposition have brought this Motion to empty their ammunition. They have been poor marksmen and their ammunition was drmp and stale. Little damage has been done except that the valuable time of the House has been spent on issues which have been discussed many times before.

I ask the hon. Member to withdraw his Motion and if he does not do so, I request you all to defeat it strongly.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Bahuguna.

(Interruptions)

SHRI ERA ANBARASU (Chagalpattu): I am on a point of order. While moving the Motion Shri Bahuguna said....

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI: Under what rule? (Interruptions)

SHRI ERA ANBARASU: I am on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: No point of order. Please sit down. I have over-ruled. Shri Bahuguna.

(Interruptions)

SHRI ERA ANBARASU: Please listen to me.

MR. SPEAKER: No, no. Please sit down. Not allowed. I am not allowing. Whatever he says will not go on record.

(Interruptions)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : बागडो जी, आप कहना क्या चाहते हैं ?

श्री मनोहराम बागडो : सदन का यह मालुम होना चाहिए कि माननीय सदस्य क्या रखने आये थे ।

MR. SPEAKER: I have not allowed. I have over-ruled everything. How can you do it?

(Interruptions)**

MR. SPEAKER I have not allowed. I have allowed Shri Bahuguna.

SHRI H.N. BAHUGUNA: The debate which we started this morning has ended with general type of enunciations by the Prime Minister. Her speech is couched in good language, high sounding phrases, but has no concrete content in it. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: It is all right. Well you keep silent.

SHRI H.N. BAHUGUNA: I was little surprised about the excitement that this debate caused her. She spoke more in anger than with reason. Therefore, I have nothing to say as far as she goes, for the Prime Minister did not answer a single question. (Interruptions) Nor did the Prime Minister while talking about Taraput answer my two specific questions: