

[Sri P. C. Sethi]

(v) G. S. R. 574 published in Gazette of India dated the 4th April, 1970 together with an explanatory memorandum.

(vi) G. S. R. 575 published in Gazette of India dated the 4th April, 1970 together with an explanatory memorandum.

(vii) G. S. R. 583-84 published in Gazette of India dated the 1st April, 1970 together with an explanatory memorandum.

[Placed in Library. See No.LT—3232/70.]

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU (Diamond Harbour): Sir, I have given notice.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

श्री भोगेन्द्र झा (जयनगर): अध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे एक दूसरे मंसले पर सबमिशन करने का मौका दिया जाये। आप जानते हैं कि बिहार में अद्वार आयोग ने 6 पुराने मिनिस्ट्रों के बारे में टिप्पणी की थी। मुख्य मंत्री ने कहा है कि दो मिनिस्ट्रों पर मामला चलाया जाय, बाकी को छोड़ दिया जाये। यह बड़ा गम्भीर मामला है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय: आप इस तरह से एग्जेंटली न उठ खड़े हुआ करें।

श्री भोगेन्द्र झा: सुप्रीम कोर्ट जज की जांच को अपने हाथ में लेकर वह पूरी करने जा रहे हैं। गृह मंत्री से कहा जाय कि वह इस पर बयान दें। उन्होंने चार मंत्रियों को रिहा करने के लिये कहा है।

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE

HUNDRED AND SIXTEENTH REPORT

SHRI THIRUMAL RAO (Kakinada): I beg to present the Hundred and Sixteenth Report of the Estimates Committee

on the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment)—Employees' Provident Fund Organisation.

I may add with your permission that the report has also been translated into Hindi and copies thereof are available and such of those members who may want Hindi versions may get it.

12.49 hrs.

MATTER UNDER RULE 377

PUBLICATION OF A DEFAMATORY LETTER IN THE *Hindustan Times* RE. SHRI MADHU LIMAYE, ETC.

श्री रवि राय (पुरी): अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपका इजाजत से आपके सामने इस तरह का एक मुद्दा प्रस्तुत कर रहा हूँ जिसके सिलसिले में सारे देश में, सारे राष्ट्र में, सारे सदन में एक गुस्सा अथवा रोष व्याप्त है। मैं आपके सामने एक मिनट में एक चिट्ठी पढ़ कर सुनाऊंगा जो 18 तारीख के "हिन्दुस्तान टाइम्स" में प्रकाशित हुई थी। एक टेम्पल जोन्स ने 18 तारीख को एक चिट्ठी में लिखा है कि:

"Sir, I was more than astounded to read Mr. Madhu Limaye's some what ridiculous reply to your editorial which was more than commendable.

Any independent eye witness to the puerile demonstration by the S. S. P. in Parliament Street will verify the fact that the blame for the debacle lies squarely on the shoulders of your irresponsible politicians.

And because of this a man died needlessly.

Mr. Limaye has demonstrated once again how he and your other politicians have systematically destroyed a perfectly good system of parliamentary democracy which we left you 23 years ago.

If anything, the police acted with great restraint and Mr. Limaye should be horsewhipped in public."

आपके सामने यह मुद्दा मैं इसलिए उठा रहा हूँ कि यह सदन जो अस्तित्व में आया है यह हमारे राष्ट्रीय आन्दोलन का नतीजा है। इस सदन में बहुत से साथी हमारे ऐसे हैं जिन्होंने राष्ट्रीय आन्दोलन में भाग लिया था।

टम्पल जॉज को मैं व्यक्तिगत रूप से नहीं जानता। लेकिन मालूम ऐसा होता है कि वह ब्रिटिश सिटिजन है और हमारे देश में महमान के तौर पर है। एक महमान के नाते जिस रेस्ट्रेंट का उनको परिचय देना चाहिये और जिस रेस्ट्रेंट के साथ लिखना चाहिये उसका न तो उन्होंने परिचय दिया है और न ही लिखा है।

पहला मुद्दा तो मैं यह रखना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान टाइम्स के जो वर्तमान सम्पादक हैं श्री बी० जी० बर्षीस वह प्रधान मंत्री के भूत-पूर्व प्रेस सेक्रेटरी थे। उन्होंने इस पत्र को छपा है।

दूसरा मुद्दा यह है कि अखबार घनश्याम दास बिड़ला का है।

फिर यह सवाल भी पैदा होता है कि जो सम्पादक है वह किस तरह के पत्रों को छापे। पत्र में इन्होंने कहा है कि 23 साल पहले जो आजादी हम दे कर गए थे उसको ये लोग तहस नहस कर रहे हैं। क्या वह यह कहना चाहते हैं कि आजादी इन्होंने हमें दान में दी है या हम कोई भिखमंगे थे ?

उन्होंने यह भी लिखा है कि लिमये जैसे लोगों को हासं व्हिप किया जाना चाहिये। अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह श्री लिमये का सवाल नहीं है, पार्टी का सवाल नहीं है। यह सारे राष्ट्र के सम्मान का सवाल है। जॉज साहब हमारी

सार्वभौमिकता को और लोक सभा को चुनौती दे रहे हैं। वह इस तरह जब वह कहते हैं कि इस तरह के लोगों का पब्लिकली हासं व्हिपिंग होना चाहिये।

मेरा निवेदन है कि सारे सदन को इस पर गुस्सा व्यक्त करना चाहिये। आप निर्देश दें ब्रिटिश हाई कमिशन को कि वह अपने नागरिक के लिए माफी मागें सारे देश के सामने, सारे राष्ट्र के सामने, आपके सामने। आप होम मिनिस्टर साहब को भी निर्देश दें कि वह पता लगायें कि ये जॉज साहब कौन हैं और उन्होंने इस तरह का पत्र कैसे लिखा। साथ ही बर्षीस साहब जोकि सम्पादक हैं और जो प्रधान मंत्री के भूतपूर्व प्रेस सेक्रेटरी थे उन्होंने इस पत्र को कैसे छपा ?

इस मामले को मैं आपके सामने रखता हूँ और मैं चाहता हूँ कि सारा सदन और सारा राष्ट्र और सभी सदस्य इसकी निन्दा करें, इसकी भर्त्सना करें।

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA (Barh): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I had also written a letter to you to raise this matter. Sir, the question is, not only that some letter has appeared in Hindustan Times, written by some foreigner. The point is this, that the Member of Parliament mentioned in this letter (Shri Madhu Limaye) was coming to Parliament House to present a Petition to this Parliament and therefore he was performing a Parliamentary duty of carrying the petition to Parliament House and therefore this matter is a fit matter to be referred to the Committee of Privileges. The paper which has published this letter and the gentleman who has written this letter—all these matters should be referred to the Committee of Privileges.

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त (दिल्ली सदर) : पार्लिमेंट से सम्बन्धित कैसे हुआ ?

श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा : वह आ रहे थे पंटीशन पार्लिमेंट को देने के लिए।

[श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा]

श्री लिमये और उनके साथियों ने स्टेटमेंट दिया है—

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : मैं पूछना चाहना है—

SHRIMATI TARKESHWARI SINHA : It has been stated by leaders of parties and by hon. Members that the lathi charge was made at a time when they were coming to Parliament for presenting a Petition. Presentation of Petition is a part of their Parliamentary duty and therefore reference that has been made to Shri Madhu Limaye, that he should be horse-whipped is a derogatory remark while he was performing his duty as a Member of Parliament. Therefore, this is a fit case for reference to the Privileges Committee. I hope you will agree with the Privilege Motion.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur) : Sir, I have already written a letter to move my Privilege Motion about the same subject. I have also quoted the portions of the letter written by Mr. Tumble-Jones, C/o. The Pines, Faridabad. I am not quoting everything quoted by Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha and Shri Rabi Ray. I shall only quote the relevant portion from that letter of Mr. Tumble-Jones. It says "The police acted with great restraint. Mr. Madhu Limaye should be horse-whipped in public."

This is for your information. There is another intemperate language with which the Hindustan Times has published it. Another letter is issued by Shri A. C. Sen of New Delhi who has condemned the whole letter. He writes as follows :

"I was surprised to find that the Hindustan Times should have published the intemperate letter of Mr. Tumble-Jones (April 18) on the incidents in Parliament Street when the S. S. P. leaders were beaten up by the police. I least expected this of a nationalist paper like yours.

"It is apparent from Mr. Tumble-Jone's

letter that there are people still living in the hey-day of the British Raj. When General Dyer massacred people in Julianwallah Bagh, there were British people who applauded him. Mr. Tumble-Jones has resurrected that spirit and the ghost of the General....."

After this letter, in condemning that particular letter of Mr. Tumble-Jones, the Editor has stated as follows :

"We certainly do not share Mr. Tumble-Jone's views on the present state of parliamentary democracy in India on the legacy left by Britain. Indeed the style as well as the content of the letter reveal the writer's old-fashioned outlook, to which laughter would seem a more appropriate reaction than anger.

"Nevertheless, Mr. Tumble-Jones is as much entitled as any one else in a democracy to express his views on public affairs, and it is 'the function of a newspaper to publish all points of view. We do not agree with his suggestion concerning Mr. Madhu Limaye and interpreted it in metaphorical' rather than literal terms. But we express our regrets if publication has hurt Mr. Limaye's feelings, or those of his associates."

After reading this particular remark of the Editor and after he published a letter, he really brought the House into contempt. Of course we want the freedom of the newspapers. And I also agree that Members of Parliament should not have more privileges than the ordinary people of this country. But this is a sort of a campaign going on in our country, I request that this matter may be referred to the Privileges Committee. I am sure, Sir, that this foreigner must be a C.I.A. agent. Otherwise he would not have written such a letter. I feel that some action should be taken against him. He should be asked to explain first and if you deem fit then you may refer this matter to the Privileges Committee.

I fully support Shrimati Tarkeshwari Sinha's motion.

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : उन्होंने कहा है कि प्रिविलेज मोशन की आप आज्ञा दे सकते हैं। आपको दूसरा पक्ष भी सुनना चाहिये।

MR. SPEAKER : Let me exhaust the names of the Members in this list.

श्री अर्जुन सिंह मबौरिया (इटावा) : यह प्रश्न केवल लिमये जी या किसी व्यक्ति विशेष का नहीं है। मैं आपके माध्यम से गृह मंत्री जी का ध्यान इस ओर आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर एक पक्ष पर जब कभी भी विदेशियों की ओर से आक्रमण होगा और उस समय यदि शासक पक्ष स्वामोक्ष हो जाएगा तो देश में गलत परम्परायें पड़ेंगी। हमारे सामने उदाहरण हैं, परम्परायें हैं। भारत में ऐसा हुआ है कि कौरवों के एक व्यक्ति को छीन कर जब नभ मार्ग से ले जाया जा रहा था, उस समय आपस की शत्रुता होते हुए भी पांडवों ने कौरव भाई को छीन कर अपने बीच में लाये थे। अगर इस तरह की भावना नहीं रहेगी तो हिन्दुस्तान की एकता नहीं बनी रह सकेगी, हम अपने देश को मजबूत नहीं बना सकेंगे। शायद कुछ लोगों को श्री वर्गीज के नाम से कुछ चिन्ता हुई हो। उनके नाम को हम नहीं जोड़ना चाहते हैं। हमको गुस्सा इस लिए है कि श्री वर्गीज जिसके सचिव या सलाहकार रहे हैं, अगर उनके पिता ने जेल काटी है, तो हम भी राष्ट्रीय आन्दोलन में 42, 42 साल के लिये सख्त रूप में दण्डित किये गये हैं।

13 hrs.

हमें उस अंग्रेज के खिलाफ गुस्सा है, क्यों कि अंग्रेजों ने हमको आजादी खुशी से नहीं दी हमने उनको धक्के देकर निकाला था। जो आजादी हमें मिली है, उसकी रखवाली के लिए जो कुछ भी करना होगा, वह हम करेंगे। हम अपने गुस्से को रोकते हुए, बहुत ही शान्त भाव से, अपना यह ख्याल गृह मंत्री महोदय को

बताना चाहते हैं कि वह ब्रिटिश हाई कमिश्नर को कहें कि वह माफी मांगें ; अगर वह माफी नहीं मांगता है, तो हमको हाई कमिश्नर के दफ्तर की ईंट से ईंट बजाने के लिए मजबूर होना पड़ेगा।

MR. SPEAKER : Is Shri Jyotirmoy Basu's motion on the same or the other ?

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU : On the same and the other.

MR. SPEAKER : Under the rules, there can be only one privilege motion in one sitting.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU : Then I will stick to the other one.

MR. SPEAKER : So he is not taking up the one on this ?

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU : I would have liked to, but since you are preventing me from doing so, I stick to the other one.

MR. SPEAKER : By accepting this, the other cannot have any chance.

DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH (Buxar) : The letter in question is very objectionable. As has been pointed out, the attack on Shri Madhu Limaye was made at a time when he was coming to Parliament. I do not know the nationality of Mr. Jones. It has been said that he is a British national. His correct nationality should be ascertained, also whose guest he was. It is written that he wrote the letter from Faridabad. All these things should be found out by you.

I am raising this point because the comment made by the editor in today's issue of the *Hindustan Times* is much more serious. He should not have made this comment while publishing the letter from Shri Sen.

Therefore, I suggest that these two letters plus the comment of the editor must be referred to the Privileges Committee with authority to find out all the details and take such steps as it may deem proper.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU : My notice is under rule 377, on the appointment of adviser to the Governor of West Bengal which is unconstitutional and outside his jurisdiction.

MR. SPEAKER : Without being concerned about the seriousness of the motion already in hand, he is pushing in his own. Let this be disposed of first.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU : You asked me whether I wished to speak on this or the other one. I said I would like to speak on both. It is my right to prefer and move both motions.

MR. SPEAKER : No, that is against the rules.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU : I have given notice under Rule 377. It does not restrict a member in any way.

MR. SPEAKER : Then he should have said that.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU : I have not given any notice of privilege but I have given notices under Rule 377.

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : अध्यक्ष महोदय, माननीय सदस्य, श्री मधु लिमये, और एस० एस० पी० के लोगों के साथ जो व्यवहार किया गया है, उसको सारा सदन, सारा देश कनडेम करता है और हम लोग भी उसको कनडेम करते हैं। जो कुछ इस लैटर में लिखा गया है, वह फैंक्चुअली गलत तो है ही, वह बैड टेस्ट में भी है। लेकिन मैं इस बारे में एक मौलिक सवाल उठाना चाहता हूँ कि सदन को यह तय करना है कि क्या किसी व्यक्ति को पार्लियामेंट के किसी मेम्बर के बारे में कुछ लिखने का अधिकार है या नहीं। यह ठीक है कि पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर प्रिविलेज्ड हैं, लेकिन अगर उसके बारे में किसी अखबार में कुछ भी लिखा जायेगा, चाहे वे अपशब्द हों और चाहे कोई गलत बात हो, तो क्या यह सदन उसका नोटिस लेगा। अगर पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर के

रूप में फंक्शन करने में कोई बाधा डाले, तब तो प्रिविलेज का सवाल उठेगा। लेकिन इस सदन को इस देश के हर एक सिटिजेन और अखबार के जो फंडामेंटल राइट्स हैं, चाहे वह हिन्दुस्तान टाइम्स हो और चाहे प्राइम मिनिस्टर का सेक्रेटरी हो—यह बात भी ठीक होगी कि वे लोग इस बारे में एक कैंपेयन कर रहे हैं—, उनको इग्नोर नहीं करना चाहिए।

इस लिए क्या ऐसी हर एक बात को लेकर प्रिविलेज का सवाल उठाना मुनासिब होगा ? मेरे बारे में पेट्रियट रोज इस तरह की बातें लिखता है। कोई अखबार किसी और मेम्बर के खिलाफ कुछ लिखता है। इस सदन को उन सब मामलों को लेना होगा। सवाल यह है कि क्या इस सूरत में अखबारों की आजादी सुरक्षित रहेगी या नहीं। मेरा ख्याल है कि हम यह तो कह सकते हैं कि यह गलत बात लिखी गई है, यह बैड टेस्ट में है और हम उसको बाहर निजी तौर पर कनडेम करें, लेकिन यह सदन ऐसी कोई कार्यवाही न करे, जिससे कांस्टीट्यूशन द्वारा दिये गये आर्डिनरी सिटिजेन के अधिकारों, किसी फारेनर के अधिकारों या अखबारों की स्वाधीनता पर किसी प्रकार की पाबन्दी लगे। मैं श्री मधु लिमये से सोलह आने सहमत हूँ कि जो कुछ उनके साथ या एस० एस० पी० के लोगों के साथ हुआ है, वह सरकार ने उनके साथ ज्यादाती की है और हम उसको पूरी तरह कनडेम करना चाहते हैं, जैसा कि हमने पहले भी कनडेम किया है।

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंगेर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय मैं इस बात का विरोध करता हूँ कि यह मामला विशेषाधिकार समिति के पास जाये, लेकिन साथ-साथ मैं आपका और सदन का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि आज इस तरह के लेख और पत्र कई अखबारों में आ रहे हैं, जिनमें, पुलिस द्वारा जो अत्याचार और हिंसा की जा रही है, उसकी खुलना-खुलना प्रशंसा

की जा रही है। श्री नन्दन कागल मेरे मित्र हैं, लेकिन दो-द्विन पहले उन्होंने 'इंडियन एक्सप्रेस' में एक लेख में लिखा है कि पुलिस वालों ने प्रदर्शनकारियों के खिलाफ केवल अपना डिल प्रैक्टिस किया। वह मेरे मित्र हैं, लेकिन मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि पुलिस को हमारा खून करने में सफलता नहीं मिली, इसके लिए उनके मन में अफसोस है। मैं आप से जानना चाहता हूँ कि यह देश किस ओर जा रहा है।

मेरे जैसे व्यक्ति अभी भी अहिंसा में विश्वास करते हैं, लेकिन मैं सदन को चेतावनी देना चाहता हूँ कि कभी कभी मेरे मन में आता है कि अगर इसी तरह की बातें चलें, तो इस देश में खून की नदियाँ बहेंगी। इस देश में अभी भी ऐसे नौजवान हैं, जो इस तरह की बातों को बर्दाश्त नहीं करेंगे। मैं यह गम्भीर चेतावनी देना चाहता हूँ कि अभी भी इस देश में खुदीराम बोस और भगतसिंह पैदा हो सकते हैं। मैं नहीं चाहता हूँ कि यह मामला विशेषाधिकार समिति के सामने जाये, लेकिन अगर पुलिस द्वारा किये गये हिंसात्मक अत्याचार की खुल्लम-खुल्ला प्रशंसा की जायेगी, तो फिर जनता और युवकों के द्वारा भी हिंसा और अत्याचार होगा। आज मैं यह गम्भीर चेतावनी देना चाहता हूँ।

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND SOCIAL WELFARE (SHRI GOVINDA MENON) : The letter which appeared in the paper of the 18th is a very intemperate and defamatory attack against not only Mr. Madhu Limaye but every Member of this House. It is an accident that his name came there, because if you read the letter as a whole you would understand and see that this is against "your politicians". Look at the words "your politicians" in which term are included all of us here including myself and the Home Minister and the Prime Minister, and the Speaker also, as the representative of Parliament, comes in for attack. This is a very serious matter and I do

not think there is any body in the House who does not feel indignant over the way in which this letter to the Editor was published on the 18th. Something has appeared today also but that does not take away the seriousness of what was written earlier. Therefore I submit that the House should unanimously take note of the temper of that letter, the lack of taste in that letter. I find it difficult to believe that an Englishman as the name indicates....

SHRI HEM BARUA (Mangaldai) : Is that an Englishman or an Anglo-Indian ?

SHRI GOVINDA MENON : I do not know.... can say like that, because he says that he left this country in 1947 with a very good parliamentary system which is being destroyed by your politicians today ; the very language, and the reference he has made are such and I find it difficult to believe that an Englishman would have written in this strain. I have grave doubts over the matter. I do not know whether it is a fictitious name or a real name. I am sure the Home Minister would enquire into the whole matter. But I want to tell you, Sir, that every Member of this House feels that this is an intemperate attack on all of us including you.... (Interruptions.)

MR. SPEAKER : There need be no debate now ; we are not taking it up for discussion. All these motions have come under rule 377.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : I have given under rule 222.

MR. SPEAKER : It is quite serious, especially when it comes from a foreigner and an Englishman out of all foreigners. Before I give my ruling I should like the Home Minister to enquire about this gentleman, who he is, where is he from.

श्री रवि राय : अखबार के बारे में भी।

MR. SPEAKER : That is not difficult.

SHRI HEM BARUA : Should the Indian Parliament take note of an individual writing a letter in a column of a newspaper ?

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra) : Is there no sense of proportion? I wish you allowed somebody else to express an opinion which does not necessarily form part of the sanctimonious sermon which we have heard so far. I hope you would allow me one minute. I do not use too many words to express an idea.

I quite agree with many of my colleagues here that it would be demeaning this House if we were to take any notice of this letter. There is no difference of opinion on what the Law Minister says about the letter; it is in extreme poor taste and it is not even factually correct and Mr. Madhu Limaye is certainly to be sympathised with for being involved in this sort of scurrilous letter. However, we shall be doing ourselves great injustice—including the Speaker, including the Home Minister as well as the Law Minister—if we started taking notice of letters that appear in the columns of newspapers. There are other correspondents who for the next two or three weeks will go on opposing and writing letters against Mr. Tumble Jones. I do not think that the Parliament of India should be the body to take notice of this sort of thing. Whether it is written by an Englishman or a Javaneese or an Indian. I do not think it makes any difference whatsoever. It is somebody's point of view with which we do not agree. We are all very concerned about it, but nonetheless, it is a point of view which should be treated with the contempt that it deserves.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA : Let there be an enquiry.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BASU : This is a calculated attempt to undermine this democratic set-up and also the freedom struggle which this country had carried on for years. The question is, whether their over-energetic police officers belonging to Mr. Chavan who wanted to shift their attention and make a judicial enquiry and all that in another region, will now go into this? May I ask the hon. Minister to submit a thorough report of this man's profession, what his reasons are for his stay in this country, and whether this letter is fictitious and so on? At the same time, the Editor of this

paper must be asked to explain why he has taken this step to publish this sort of silly and damaging letter. (Interruption)

MR. SPEAKER : Everything will be taken up later. I must have some information from the Home Minister. I think he will be in a position to supply it.

SHRI HEM BARUA : This matter should be sent to the Privileges Committee. Otherwise, it will be a bad taste on our part. (Interruption)

MR. SPEAKER : I am not going to say anything now. (Interruption)

श्री भोगेन्द्र झा : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यहां केवल मधु जी का सवाल नहीं है। मधु जी को करोड़पतियों के अखबारों के लिये कुछ कमजोरी है, यह हम जानते हैं। सवाल इस बात का नहीं है, सवाल इस बात का है... (व्यवधान)... मैं जानता हूँ इनकी कमजोरी है टाटा बिरला के अखबारों के लिए... (व्यवधान)...

MR. SPEAKER : Some views were given. Mrs. Tarakeshwari Sinha—(Interruption) Order, please;—put it like this : that when Mr. Madhu Limaye and his friends were coming, they were taking a petition to the Parliament House. Mr. Banerjee has in a very able manner put his own case. (Interruption)

SHRI HEM BARUA : Why not a judicial Committee enquire into these incidents? (Interruption)

MR. SPEAKER : There are other sides to the question.

SHRI BALRAJ MADHOK (South Delhi) : The House would like to leave it in your hands; you have known the sense of the House, and you should take a decision.

MR. SPEAKER : Let it be examined. We are very conscious of our own rights. We are also conscious of the rights of the citizens also. As to who this citizen is, why he should say that "you politicians; when we left the country in 1947, we left it like "this and all that,—so

many foolish things have been said by him—let us know the facts. He may be justified to exercise his right which is given to the citizens, in writing to the papers. But one thing we should not forget : that his whole attention, that his whole attack is on ourselves : as to how far we should stand it or ignore it is the question. (*Interruption*)

SHRI HEM BARUA : He has used dirty language.

MR. SPEAKER : There are a number of Englishmen I have met, living even at this time in England, who still think they are carrying the White man's burden even now.

SHRI PILOO MODY : We leave the matter entirely in your hands.

MR. SPEAKER : Thank you. Are you satisfied? We now adjourn for lunch and meet again at 2.30.

13.19 hrs.

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

The Lok Sabha re-assembled after lunch at Thirty-five minutes past Fourteen of the Clock

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

*DEMANDS FOR GRANTS, 1970-71—Contd.

MINISTRY OF STEEL AND HEAVY
ENGINEERING—Contd.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Shri Damani ; absent. Shri K. K. Nayar.

SHRI K. K. NAYAR : (Bahraich) Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to make a few critical observations on the policies which we have been following and on the results. It is not my purpose to belittle the magnificent effort which is being made, and which has been made, to make this country self-sufficient in steel ; nor is it my intention to disparage

the achievements which have been made so far, but I wish to pin-point some of the failures and also to caution the Ministry against certain pitfalls in the policy which this Ministry pursues at present.

Of all the steel procedures in the country Hindustan Steel Limited in the public sector is pre-eminently the biggest. It produces in the finished steel slightly more than half the total production in the country. In the private sector are Tata Iron and Steel and Indian Iron and Steel. The Hindustan Steel is a triptych or three-fold organisation consisting of three units which have reached this country from different sources—Rourkela Unit from the Germans, Bhilai from the Russians and Durgapur from the British. These units were handed over to us as Turnkey projects, complete in shape. We were not associated with the creation of the project. We have been merely handed over the projects, as it were. Any defects in our functioning must naturally be reflected in the results of our performance. It is a sad commentary on our performance that at the moment our production is only 65 per cent of the installed capacity. Shri Chandi, who took over recently—not quite recently but two years ago—the Hindustan Steel said that if we could increase our production to 75 per cent of the installed capacity we may be able to break even. I do trust that hope would be fulfilled. But I cannot understand why 17 years after the Rourkela Project was installed—it was installed in 1953-54—we are still running so much behind the installed capacity. I cannot see why we should not achieve 75 per cent the economy target, or even the hundred per cent target, or even excel it. The conditions are favourable ; we have all the material required, manpower, everything.

According to the assessment of Shri Chandy, the failure has been largely due to the inadequate stocking of spare parts. In one of his statements he said that he would not like to exhume old graves. He would not like to disinter the corpses from the graves. At the time when they were installed the persons concerned did not think of stocking enough

*Moved with the recommendation of the President.