

the action of Shri Marwah in behaving rudely, and (ii) into the delay in taking Shri George Fernandes to the Hospital.

7. (a) It is not proved that the police unreasonably prevented any member of the Parliament from proceeding to the Parliament House ;
- (b) Shri Arjun Singh Badhuria's identity card was torn by a policeman, but there is no sufficient evidence to prove the identity of the policeman who tore it ; there is no evidence also as to who kicked Shri Arjun Singh Badhuria in the stomach.
- (8) There is no sufficient evidence that Shri Behari was injured at the cane-charge effected at Patel-Chowk and died as a result of such injury.
- (9) The evidence is not sufficient to show that Shri Babu Lal was injured as a result of arrow shot by one of the demonstrators at Patel Chowk.
- (10) There is nothing to comment adversely on the incident relating to Smt. Shanti Naik.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Bogusarai) : Regarding the statement made on the incidents that had taken place in Delhi on 6th April last year in connection with the procession taken out by the SSP, it may be made available to Members. We are all interested in that and we want to study it.

MR. SPEAKER : Yes.

श्री राम देव सिंह (महाराजगंज) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, जो प्रतिवेदन हाउस में प्रस्तुत किया गया है उस पर बहस की आवश्यकता है। क्या आपकी प्रीर से इस पर विचार करने के लिए कोई समय निर्दिष्ट किया जायेगा ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं देखूंगा।

12.33 hrs.

MOTION OF THANKS ON PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS—Contd.

MR. SPEAKER : The Prime Minister will now reply to the debate on the President's Address.

THE PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY, MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS, MINISTER OF PLANNING AND MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, the President's Address has been debated for three days. Many hon. Members have spoken and I am grateful to those who have supported the Motion and to those who have offered useful suggestions.

I am glad that several Members saw in the Address the beginning of a great renewal. With the accession of strength and faith from a fresh mandate given by a new generation, we are on the threshold of a new beginning. Our people have proved that the dark forebodings of pessimists at home and abroad were the mumblings of false prophets.

I must hasten to add that I look upon the massive support of the electorate not as an achievement but as an opportunity. The President's Address has indicated some of the steps which the Government propose to take to make use of this opportunity. These steps and many others will have to be translated into operational programmes. In the meanwhile, Government welcomes constructive criticism which will help to improve our programmes.

In my election speeches which, unfortunately, Shri Vajpayee does not seem to have read—I repeat—in every single speech I have said that the road ahead is long and full of hardships and those who supported us should be prepared for hard work, for difficulties and perhaps even for danger.

I have carefully followed the speeches of the hon. Members. I was touched by the great solicitude shown by Shri Fatehsingh Rao Gaskwad for the plight of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes and Shrimati Gayatri Devi's concern for the poor. It seems easier to shed tears than privy purses. I assure them and the House that these vestiges of feudalism cannot last long. (Interruptions),

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

I welcome the endorsement of the need to prevent pollution of air, water and soil and the imbalances of nature around us. I myself have been deeply interested in ecology since long before that word became fashionable in the western world.

The complaint of some Members that AIR and TV were used by the Government for Party ends need not be taken seriously. The only time I had broadcast was to announce the dissolution of the Lok Sabha.

Complaints against the Election Commission have already been dealt with by my colleague, the Minister of Law and Justice.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Gwalior) : Not satisfactorily.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : It was natural that in a debate of this kind much should be said about poverty. Our poverty is long standing. I have not been awakened to it to-day as some Members of the Opposition are apt to say from time to time. If I may say with some hesitation and deep humility, it was because of this awakening and concern that my family decided to give up most of its property and to change its entire mode of life in 1920-21.

Much has been achieved since Independence. There is no doubt that to-day a large number of people are better dressed and better fed than before. How do we judge the poverty of any area? We should judge it against the conditions which existed in that particular area earlier on. Is it the claim of any hon. Member that less has been done, for example, in Rajasthan or in Madhya Pradesh or in Orissa in the last few years than was done, say, in a century of princely rule? Yet the fact of poverty remains and vast numbers do lack their basic requirements. Also the needs of our people are increasing and will continue to increase as our development plans go ahead.

The hon. Member, Shri Vajpayee, spoke tauntingly of what he called our "war on poverty." But, actually, this was the title of his manifesto. Compared to the glitter of the Jana Sangh manifesto, our own was matter-of-fact and down-to-earth.

It was remarkable how our people showed their keen sense of discrimination when they refused to be attracted by the stalking golden

deer, the *Swarna Mrig*, of the Jana Sangh or to be led astray by the outworn economic theories of the Swatantra Party, dressed up in elegant phrases.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : They were most attracted by the cow and calf.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I would remind the hon. Member that we had a number of Elections before this General Election. Some of our candidates had the bicycle as their symbol, some had the coconut tree or other emblems and yet all these or most of them won in the elections. And I should like to say also that something rather good happened because we took the cow and the calf as our symbol. It was proved that it was not a religious symbol, that it was a symbol of the prosperity of village and town people. It is after seeing the manifestoes and the performances of the various parties that the people have taken their decision.

The hon. Member who sits opposite me, Shri Gopalan, in his long indictment of Governmental policies, referred to some central projects. There was not, and there cannot be any discrimination or deliberate neglect of Kerala which is one of the most beautiful parts of our country and one which has had many problems. It is true that the Precision Instruments Plant and the Phyto Chemicals Plant, which we had proposed to set up there were not taken up for implementation. But this is because, on re-assessment, demands for the products of these Plants were not found to be good.

Government have to make a constant reappraisal of industrial and other programmes, and have to adapt them to the needs of the situation.

However, in regard to the Cochin Shipyard, Shri Gopalan has failed to keep up with recent developments. An agreement has already been signed with Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, covering the preparation of designs for the Shipyard and for Consultancy Services for its construction. The project will be completed in five years and is estimated to cost Rs. 45.40 crores. Rs. 3 crores have been provided in the 1971-72 interim Budget.

Shri Indrajit Gupta referred to Monopoly Houses and the issue of new licences to some of them, which also has been agitating some of our own Members on this side. Neither the Monopolies and the Restrictive Trade Practices Act nor the Industrial Licensing Policy rules out the grant of new licences to Business Houses. They only define the limits and conditions, subject to which these Houses would be allowed to expand further.

The decisions taken in individual cases do not involve any deviation from the policies which have been clearly spelt out. These policies seek to reconcile a number of objectives—the promotion of industrial growth and employment opportunities, accelerated development of backward regions, expeditious development of core industries and the attainment of economic self-reliance.

It would not be fair to view the grant of licences to the larger industrial houses in isolation from other decisions of the Government, for instance, the reservation of larger fields for small-scale industries, the exclusion of larger industrial houses from the middle sector and the expansion of the public sector as well as other policies designed to broaden the base of entrepreneurship.

A young Member from our side, Shri A. C. George made several concrete suggestions, in particular, regarding Housing in Urban areas. We have already made a beginning in this direction with the setting up of the Housing and Urban Development Finance Corporation. We shall endeavour to expand the role of the Corporation in the next two to three years.

There is also need for a new look at rural housing. I am sorry Shri Piloo Mody, our Architect Member, is not present, because I think that it would be very useful if our architects would give thought to new and inexpensive designs for rural housing, which would make the best use of locally available materials.

I was looking forward to hearing Shri Shyamnandan Mishra and was indeed disappointed that he surrendered his time to another Member of his party. I know that planning has lost much of its lustre...

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusaraj): I am very glad. Let her kindly recommend me next time to speak on the general budget.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I know that planning has lost its lustre since his connection with it has ceased.

I now come to the amendments of which there is a large crop. Some of these refer to rising prices and the need to stabilise them. The House knows how deeply concerned I am, and indeed all my colleagues in Government are, about this matter, and that we are deeply aware of the consequences which would follow if price stability is seriously impaired. Much of the increase in prices during the past year is because of the failure to raise the production of commercial crops.

Foodgrain prices have, on the other hand, been generally quiet, reflecting our success in raising production in that area. Hon. Members know that because of the drought, we have had to bend all our energies to increase the production of foodgrains. There is no doubt that during this period the other crops did not get the kind of boost or help which they should have.

I think the Minister of Food has already told the House that we intend to adopt a range of measures to raise the productivity of such crops. We also intend to curb speculation.

In an inter-dependent economy, a price rise in one sector soon spreads to other sectors. For example, the rise in the prices of industrial raw materials pushes up the prices of manufactures which in turn leads to the demand for higher prices for farm products. The wage cost also tends to rise. Thus, what is called for today is a certain restraint and willingness on the part of the community not to press for short-term compensations.

We intend to protect the interests of the weaker sections who suffer most when prices go up. The public distribution system is aimed to serve this purpose.

I am sure hon. Members will appreciate that a part of the price increase in recent years was due to our anxiety to assure the farmers a reasonable price for their products. However, it is important that in this process, the interests of the small farmers, the landless labourers and the other poor people who live on the land and who do not have surplus products to sell are not harmed. It is for the Government to reconcile the interests of consumers and those of

[*Shrimati Indira Gandhi*]

producers. Only in this way, can a price policy be successful. We must work for the genuine welfare of farmers, and at the same time we must also ensure that certain sections do not unreasonably exploit the rest of the community. The welfare of the nation as a whole must at all times take precedence over that of an individual segment. We should remember that other countries including many developed countries are also experiencing rising prices in varying degrees. Of course, there are greater difficulties for us because of the lower standard of living of so many of our people. But some pressure on prices is almost inescapable in a growing economy.

We have to recognise and accept the fact that in a developing country such as ours, which must increase the pace of investment, we cannot afford to adopt a deflationary policy of budgetary surpluses coupled with measures for keeping the level of investments low.

So while implementing a plan which is large in relation to our resources but not large enough for the needs of our people, some upward pressure on prices is inevitable. I would, therefore, request hon. members not to politicise this issue excessively.

Another matter which came up for criticism was the grant of industrial licences in the period immediately preceding the general election. My colleague, the Minister of Industrial Development has already answered a specific question on this subject. Nothing was done in a hurry or outside normal procedure, and it does not seem strange to me that we should be accused of not holding up licences which had been cleared in the normal course, and at the same time be blamed for delaying them.

Even during the election, when I was in Bombay, the complaint was made that the country's economy was suffering because Government was not granting licences fast enough. So obviously, this complaint is part of the smear campaign of the so-called grand alliance before, during and after the poll.

There was an increase in the number of applications for industrial licences in the calendar year, 1970, reflecting an improvement in the industrial climate. This is as it should be. After June, 1970, when the *Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices*

Act came into force, Government had to evolve policies and procedures to harmonise the objectives of industrial licensing with those of the MRTPA Act. After Government had laid down the guidelines for the disposal of applications attracting the provisions of the MRTPA Act, applications falling within that category were considered for further processing. The formalities and procedures followed by the Government for the grant of licences during the period preceding the poll were exactly the same as those that were being followed earlier, and, as I just said, there was no relaxation of any accepted policy or normal standards of scrutiny in regard to these licences.

The other amendments seek to emphasise the need for the nationalisation of the remaining banks, of foreign trade, of major and basic industries and so on. Last year, I had explained Government's general approach to these and similar demands for nationalisation. Government are not afraid of nationalisation. At the same time, they do not consider nationalisation to be an independent objective by itself. Decisions on nationalisation must fit into the general scheme of priorities of our economic programme.

The direction in which the Government want to proceed is quite clear. We visualise a growing and dominant role for the public sector. We want the public sector to be able to influence and control the pace and direction of investment. Our available resources should be deployed in the best possible manner. Any proposal for the nationalisation of an industry or activity must be subjected to two tests: firstly, is it necessary from the point of view of enabling the public sector to attain a dominant role and to occupy a key position in the economy; and secondly, does it further our social objectives? The nationalisation of banks satisfied both these tests.

Similarly, when we find any industry or unit operating in a manner which is detrimental to our national interests, we shall certainly not hesitate to take it over. But we should not be deflected from our priorities. Our priorities, which are known to the House—but I would like to reiterate them—are at present the acceleration of development and the augmentation of employment. Whatever resources we can mobilise,

should be canalised as far as possible into further investment in new, productive activities in the public sector. In the next few years, we shall be engaged in a relentless battle against poverty. We should not dissipate our energies and our resources in diversionary battles which can only make a marginal contribution to victory on the main front.

The subject which was mentioned by almost every speaker, one which has caused deeper and more widespread concern than any other problem facing our economy today is the question of unemployment. This problem is not unique to India. The U.K., U.S.A., and other developed countries are all facing similar situations. It is not difficult to understand why unemployment has assumed such large dimensions in India. Firm figures are available only in respect of the organised sector, and in this sector the rate of growth of employment opportunities was somewhat satisfactory in the first half of the "sixties", being 6.8 per cent in the Third Plan period. But this rate stated declining in 1964-65 and by 1966-67 has slumped to 0.8 per cent. During 1967-68 it was almost negligible. The slow growth of the economy particularly in the industrial sector was responsible for the sharp decline in employment opportunities.

In his speech, Hon'ble Mr. Krishna Menon quoted statistics of unemployment. In India the most serious part of the problem is not open and wholtime unemployment, but under employment, and this is why it is difficult to quantify the problem. Hon. Members know that sometime ago the report of an expert committee, presided over by Prof. Dantwala, pointed out this fact. In the absence of reliable figures, we should not allow ourselves to be intimidated by uncertain statistics.

I entirely share the concern voiced in this House and outside about this problem. To keep human beings idle is to waste a rich national resource, and I am particularly conscious of the serious hardships which our educated young people are suffering. Many of them come to see me.

We have mentioned the word "alienation" in the President's Address. Perhaps the most dangerous of all alienations is the feeling of disenchantment among able-bodied youngmen and women who are deprived of productive employment. The

is an economic tragedy and also a human tragedy. We cannot preach about our concern for our fellow-men, as I believe a young friend pointed out yesterday, if our social arrangements have no place for them.

People get alienated if they do not feel wanted. But there are other kinds of alienated individuals also—the Nexalite type for whom patriotism is a bourgeois enthusiasm, the superficial cosmopolitans who are too cynical to appreciate the qualities of our people and our country. There are also some of our highly trained specialists and others who would rather opt for better opportunities and higher salaries abroad than face hardship and frustration in creating better conditions for their own descendants. I sincerely hope that in the end India will win back to its fold all those who are feeling frustrated or alienated.

Hon'ble Members have referred to the need for allowances for those who are unemployed. I do not think that subsistence allowance to the unemployed is an answer to the travails of our youth. Let us not make these young people pensioners. Let us not accustom them to doles or subsidies. Let us try to provide them with opportunities in which they can find fulfilment. For this we should mobilise all the resources we can and raise the level of investment in the public as well as the private sector. The reappraisal of the Plan should give our development programmes an employment bias. A climb back to the ascending path of economic growth and vigorous implementation of the Plan will contribute to a significant expansion of productive employment on a durable basis.

But I am not one of those who subscribe fully to the view that if we take care of the Plan, employment will take care of itself. I am fully aware that when unemployment is acute and widespread, we must have special measures to deal with it. Programmes with high employment potential have to be identified and given a special push. Quite a few schemes of this nature have been incorporated in the Fourth Plan as recast and presented to this House in last May. The House is aware of the details of the schemes relating to small farmers, sub-marginal farmers, landless labourers and rural works in areas prone to drought. These schemes have already been taken up for implementation in large tracts distributed all over the country, although they may take

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

sometime to gather momentum. A provision of Rs. 235 crores is envisaged for these special programmes during the Plan period. Additionally, projects for small farmers and agricultural labour will receive support from financial institutions to the extent of about Rs. 300 crores. Similarly the total financial support for dryland farming programmes is expected to be about Rs. 150 crores. In the Budget presented last week the Finance Minister has indicated a provision of Rs. 50 crores for a crash scheme for rural employment.

13.00 hrs.

I know that almost every hon. Member has taken exception to the smallness of this sum. I should like to remind them that the programmes which come under this crash programme are only supplementary to other programmes to create additional employment. Employment opportunities are provided by the entire economic system and you cannot put the whole of the problem on one side and only one of the several measures evolved to solve it, on the other. I have announced in my public speeches that the programme would start soon. I should like to tell Shri Vajpayee, because he felt that the entire Rs. 50 crores would be spent on the mere planning of it, that all the planning and other preparations have been completed and the programme, if it has not already started, would do so in a few days. We want to make this programme the nucleus of a more comprehensive programme. These programmes are oriented to create more employment in the rural areas. But the works which are envisaged will also absorb the educated such as technicians, engineers and other educated unemployed.

But we are conscious that there is need to devise yet other programmes to absorb the educated unemployed in larger numbers. For this Plan outlays must be increased in sectors such as education and public health. Unfortunately most Members demand big prestigious projects for their areas instead of helping to strengthen these other services. A higher rate of industrial growth through the maximisation of investment in the public and private sectors is by far the most effective answer to the question of educated unemployment. The President's Address has indicated

that we propose to set up task forces to identify the various impediments to the expansion of industrial production and to propose suitable changes in policies and procedures.

This leads me to another related issue of national importance, and that is the question of higher levels of investment, whether in the public or the private sector. This can come about only as a result of an all-round improvement in efficiency and productivity. Concern for higher productivity should become almost an obsession with those engaged in productive processes, whether they are managers or workers, because only by augmenting productivity can we enlarge the surpluses available for investment. This is an obligation which the employed owe to those who are yet to be employed. The employed should not become an instrument for the exploitation of the unemployed. As my colleague, Shri Khadihar, has already told this house, Government propose to hold discussions with trade union leaders as well as representatives of management on these and other issues to seek their co-operation and support in ensuring increasingly higher levels of employment at rising levels of productivity.

Several hon. Members have spoken about the law and order problem in West Bengal. Our youngest Member, Shri P. R. Das Munshi, made a moving speech based on personal experience. It brought home to me once again and to us all the difficulties of young people and the awesome character of political violence in that State. The Government are determined to curb violence, whoever is responsible and whatever the motive behind it.

Shri Gopalan took umbrage at the use of the expression "politics of murder". But I am sure we will all agree that murder cannot be sanctioned or sanctified even though some have made it their political creed.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): Murders committed by Government itself.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: We have been taking all appropriate steps to stop this menace and will continue to do so. The situation in West Bengal cannot be dealt with by the police alone. We are

conscious of this and Members also have drawn our attention. Other measures are needed and they are not being neglected.

The greatest emphasis has been laid on the revival of Calcutta and its surroundings. The development of other parts of Bengal is equally important.

During President's rule, immediate steps were taken to bring land reform legislation more in tune with the aspirations of the people and the requirements of social justice. We are urging other State Governments to adopt similar legislation.

Some Hon. Members have referred in their speeches as well as in the amendments to the question of Centre-State relations, particularly the financial aspects of this relationship. But I was surprised that these issues should be raised by those who call themselves Marxists who, I thought, were the votaries of centralism. Is it because they are no longer an all-India party that their mental horizons have been scaled down to a provincial level? Or perhaps a weak centre fits in with their present strategy?

It is not for me to say what is good for them, but when votaries of Marx constrict their mental horizon, there does seem something wrong in their understanding of a universalist methodology. (*Interruption*)

MR. SPEAKER : Order, please. No interruptions.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : The issues pertaining to Centre-State relations have been debated at length on many occasions in this House ; also in the meetings of the National Development Council and in the meetings of State Chief Ministers and other Ministers. They have only recently been studied comprehensively by expert bodies such as the Finance Commission and the Administrative Reforms Commission.

I think our Constitution has visualised fruitful roles for the Centre and for the States in its scheme for distribution of powers. It embodies financial and other provisions to deal with problems as they arise. In particular, the Constitution provides for a periodical review of the financial relations between the Centre and the States through the Finance Commission, which is an autonomous statutory body. Under the aegis of the Commission, substantial

resources are being transferred from the Centre to the States.

Hon. Members are aware that a successful federation cannot exist merely on rules. It can be successfully only if there is full cooperation. A number of difficult financial issues do arise from time to time and from all States, regardless of the party or parties which happen to form the Government at that time. So, the problem is not one of unwillingness or discrimination on the part of the Centre but rather of how the Centre and the States can jointly endeavour to raise the maximum possible resources to meet at least the minimum needs of the people. I should like to emphasise that all those interested in national unity and welfare should look upon the relationship between the Centre and the States as one not of confrontation but of partnership and cooperation in the great task of nation-building.

The President has invited the members of the House to lend their support to the efforts which we have outlined. I repeat that invitation. Nobody says that the task is easy, but neither should anybody say that this Government and this House held back from this great endeavour. Common concern for the country is also a part of democracy. Let us certainly criticise one another in the House and outside, but let us also work together for a common purpose, for the all-round growth and prosperity of our country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS : *rose*—

MR. SPEAKER : I am not allowing anybody.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore) : She has made no reference to East Bengal, in spite of the fact that so many of us from all sides of the House referred to the conditions prevailing in East Bengal.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : We would like to hear from the Prime Minister about the latest situation in the East Bengal. We are adjourning today.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : We were expecting that at the end she would say something about it.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta-North East) : East Bengal is burning and

[Shri H. M. Mukerjee]

we are adjourning. The Prime Minister does not say a word about it. We, Members of Parliament are going back to wherever we are...*(Interruptions)*.

MR. SPEAKER : You cannot do it like this. Why are you shouting at the top of your voice ? *(Interruptions)*. She has replied to the points raised in the debate.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU : She wants to evade the issue.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I purposely did not refer to East Bengal in my speech. Hon. members know of our deep concern. I do not know what move I can say. These are matters which, as I have remarked on an earlier occasion, we can discuss with the leaders of the opposition... *(Interruptions)*. Well, as I said, it is a little difficult to discuss these matters in the House. Hon. Members have most of the information as it has appeared in the newspapers. Fighting is going on there; the people are suffering great hardship; we are aware of all these matters and we had expressed our sentiments firmly and in a dignified manner, in the Resolution which was passed unanimously in the House. If hon. Members would like any special information, I am willing to meet leaders of the opposition, as we did before, and answer any questions they would like to ask.

MR. SPEAKER : Two hundred and sixty-five amendments have been moved to the Motion of Thanks. I shall now put all these amendments to the vote of the House together.

All the amendments were put and negatived.

MR. SPEAKER : I now come to the main motion.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : Sir, I rise on a point of order. You should have asked the hon. Members which amendments they wish to move.

MR. SPEAKER : They have been moved already.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : I want amendment No. 12 to be put separately, I

want a voice vote on that. Why should I be deprived of my right.

MR. SPEAKER : It should have been brought to my notice when I was putting them to the vote. Now it is too late. I am sorry, I cannot revise my decision...*(Interruptions)*.

SHRI A. K. GOPALAN (Palghat) : Sir, this is very bad. It has never happened in the House... *(Interruptions)*. As a protest, we are walking out.

(Shri A. K. Gopalan and some other hon. Members left the House)

MR. SPEAKER : The question is :

"That an Address be presented to the President in the following terms :

"That the Members of Lok Sabha assembled in this Session are deeply grateful to the President for the Address which he has been pleased to deliver to both Houses of Parliament assembled together on the 23rd March, 1971."

The motion was adopted.

13.20 hrs.

(The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch till thirty minutes past Fourteen of the Clock)

The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at Thirty three minutes past Fourteen of the Clock.

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker in the Chair]

OBITUARY REFERENCE

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I have to inform the House that the Speaker has received intimation from Shri Samar Guha, M.P. that Shri Dharendra Nath Datta who was Member of the Constituent Assembly during the years 1946-47 has been killed by the Pakistan Army at Comilla in East Bengal.

It is a tragic death which we deeply mourn. Shri Datta played a prominent role in the freedom struggle before independence and later he was a prominent figure in the political life of East Bengal. I am sure the