

MR. SPEAKER: I am studying it. There is no Privileges Committee yet. It will be made known to the House. I have told you to please wait. Don't take any more time. Now we take up the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address. Mr. Indrajit Gupta.

SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV: What happened was: yesterday you were not there. I raised the matter that the time should be extended for this debate.

MR. SPEAKER: We have extended it by one hour to-day. There will be no lunch break to-day. Even yesterday. Mr. Yadav you were not here, I requested the House and appealed to the House that if they wanted more time, I would extend it. All the opposition members were agreeable. So I agreed. Otherwise I could have given two more hours yesterday.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: My submission is: why should J.R.D. Tata be protected like this.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Bosu, why do you want to waste the time of the House? I said it will be done before the 2nd.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: On the 2nd the House will adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: Doesn't matter... (Interruptions) I know the urgency of the matter. Now you have said it and I have heard it.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: It should be before the House adjourns. Let me exercise my right.

SHRI N. G. RANGA (Guntur): How can there be a dialogue between a Member and the Speaker on the floor of the House? Such dialogues should take place in the Chamber... (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: There is no question of any special treatment. Everybody is alike before the House. Nobody is high or low. Mr. Bosu, I have heard you. I have talked it over. If you are still persisting, all other members will object to it. Please don't try to monopolise. You are against the monopoly system.

12.44 hrs.

MOTION OF THANKS ON THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS—Contd.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Indrajit Gupta,

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat): The President's Address has tried to cover a very wide ground no doubt, but I regret to find that there is no mention whatsoever in this Address of two very important matters, crucial matters I should say, which have been affecting the political life of this country for a considerable time now. One is the question of defections and counter defections which have corroded the political life and political standards of this country. I should have thought that some mention would have been there in the President's Address of the early need for some anti-defection legislation which has been pending for a large number of years to be put through. But there is no mention whatsoever about it and the reasons are not far to seek, because it seems that whichever Party is in power at the centre likes to go slow on the question of bringing in any effective anti-defection legislation.

It may be that this time the Government may not yet be in a position whatever its inclination is, to dismiss out-right from the Centre those State Governments which are run by parties which are not the same as those of the Congress(I). Therefore, Mr. Yashpal Kapur and other people are on their peregrinations through-

out the country, trying to organise defections or counter-defections in order to bring about the downfall of some of the State Governments from within.

My friend, Shri Ghani Khan Chaudhuri is not so subtle; he is a very outspoken person. He openly declared twice that the left-front Government in West Bengal should be thrown into the Bay of Bengal. I think that any responsible Minister who makes a public statement like that owes an apology to this House. We are being told everyday by the Ministers that they are not prepared to follow in the footsteps of the previous Janata Government which, we also, at that time, opposed when they dismissed outright those State Governments which did not owe allegiance to them. Shri Ghani Khan Chaudhuri has openly called for throwing out the Government in West Bengal which has been returned with a huge majority. Mr. Yashpal Kapur is busy touring various States as an unofficial emissary and it is quite obvious for anybody that his only job and purpose is to organise defections and counter-defections.

I would like to point out with all modesty that today, in India, it is only the Leftist Parties—the C.P.I., C.P.M., R.S.P., Forward Bloc and other Leftist Parties—which cannot be accused of indulging in this game of defection and counter-defection. You will not be able to show me instances of M.Ps. and M.L.As. belonging to these parties who can be bought and sold in the market like the commodity. But, regrettably, other parties are all prone to this disease. And therefore I wish that the President had highlighted this matter and emphasised the necessity for an early Anti-Defection Bill. But, it is not there. The second issue which has not been mentioned at all is the need for restructuring the election system in this country.

Sir, in the 1977 Election,—I think the Congress Party had not split and

it had not divided into Congress(D) and Congress(U) at that time—they won 115 seats in this House having secured about 35 per cent of the total votes cast. This time, with an increase of only 8 per cent—approximately 8 per cent—of the votes which they have polled over 35 per cent they have registered an almost three hundred per cent increase in the number of seats. Do you consider this to be a fair system of voting? It does not apply only to one party. It applies to everybody; it applies to all the States also. It may go against a certain party in one place against another party in another place. Only the system of proportional representation which is there in so many other countries which are supposed to be democratic countries, is good which they follow. France follows the proportional representation system. Recently we have been hobnobbing with a very high level delegation led by the French President with which we want to collaborate on many technical, economic and commercial matters. Why not borrow something from them from their Parliamentary system also? They have got the system of proportional representation. Here, in any election, if two or three per cent of votes go this way or that way, it may mean a complete landslide in the number of seats which are won or lost. So, I plead for what my party has been agitating for many years that the system of proportional representation should be introduced into our electoral system to properly reflect all the different points of view of the different political parties in this House. There is no mention of that in the Address.

Then, Sir, I come to the question of the cold-war to which, my respected friend, Shri Jagjivan Ram has also referred. In his speech, the President has mentioned that the cold-war is coming near to our borders; the Prime Minister has also referred to it. I may also mention, Sir, the point raised just now about the detention at

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

the London Airport of Mr. Romesh Chandra who has been put in the next plane and sent back. This is what the *Guardian* of the 26th of January has to say about this incident. I quote:

"The Home Secretary signalled a return to cold-war stances yesterday by refusing to let the Leader of the Soviet-backed World Peace Council into Britain for a Conference. The decision is clearly a part of the current fist-shaking in the direction of the U.S.S.R...."

"Mr. Chandra was due to attend a two day Conference at the Conway Hall in London....aimed at trade unionists and designed to urge disarmament."

I think India is one of the foremost champions of disarmament in the world and here, a citizen of our country, a distinguished citizen, who happens to hold a high office of President of the World Peace Council with which many Members in this House are not only familiar but are also associated with the activities of that organisation including some Ministers whom I see sitting here, who have benefited from their association with that council. I am asking them whether it is not proper that if a matter like this can be protested against in the House of Commons in London should our Parliament not go on record protesting against this high-handed and humiliating behaviour which has been dealt to a distinguished citizen of this country simply because he is associated with a particular organisation?

Now, Sir, this cold war has come close to our borders. This is a matter in which we should rise above party interests and consider what should be done. The sole thing which we should be guided by is considerations of our own security, defence of the national sovereignty and the territorial integrity of our country. There should be no other criteria by which

we should take an attitude on this question.

Sir, it has become a fashion to attribute everything—I regret to say—to this formula of super-power rivalry. It is true that there is a super power rivalry in the world and one of these powers, though a super-power, is a socialist super-power. The other is an imperialist super-power, and I would like to ask this House whether it is not a fact that sometimes this so-called super-power rivalry has benefited us also in this country from the point of view of our own security. We should be very careful.

Sir, I agree completely with Babuji in this matter, that is, be very careful and circumspect in what we say keeping our own interests in view. Whenever the question of Kashmir was raised in the Security Council by one super-power when we were sought to be branded as aggressors because we had sent our forces to Goa to liberate Goa which is part of our motherland a resolution was moved in the Security Council asking that India should be branded as an aggressor for recovering its own territory. What might have happened had the other super-power not been there to defend our stand? Did we not benefit from that? I would ask the hon'ble Members and also the Prime Minister to consider this very carefully. Sir, what happened in 1965? Before the outbreak of hostilities with Pakistan, is it not a fact that for several days and weeks there was infiltration across the line of control or the ceasefire line not by regular units of the Pakistan Army but by so-called tribesmen—armed tribesmen—who had been sent in across the border into Kashmir, and was it not the beginning of an aggression? Does it mean only when people are dressed in regular military uniform, then only they can be treated as aggressors and not otherwise? What happened in 1965? Why today we are shouting only about the entry of Soviet troops into Afghanistan? What about these people, not dressed in military uniform, who, for three to four months

together were being trained, organised, armed, equipped and financed from Pakistani soil by another group of powers and were being sent across the border in order to attack the people inside Afghanistan, to carry out pillage, burning and killing of people? Is that no aggression? We should be very careful. We should not say things which may put us into difficult positions.

Sir, the Afghan Government says that it is their internal affair. They say that they asked for the Soviet help because they were in great difficulties and this was done under Article 4 of this Treaty, which exists between them and the Soviet Union.

Now, Sir, I want to remind the House that the Government which asked for the Soviet help in Afghanistan was at least located in Kabul. But, Sir, would we agree if somebody says to us: You went into Bangla Desh in 1971, on an appeal of a Provisional Government of Bangla Desh which at that time, was not even functioning from the soil of Bangla Desh? Everybody knows it. I don't want to labour the point. That Provisional Government was located in Mujibnagar—which was not located inside the territory of Bangla Desh. Are we now to counter this argument in another way then? Is it not a fact? Is it right for somebody to say that because in 1971 we entered into a long-term treaty of friendship and mutual assistance with the Soviet Union, therefore, that thing provoked President Nixon to send in his Seventh Fleet into the Indian Ocean because it is super-power rivalry? Is everything a super-power rivalry? We don't accept that argument, because, we were very much involved in that matter with our own security and our own defence.

Then, Sir, it is being argued in some quarters that these tribesmen,—these Afghani tribesmen,—who are operating from across the border and from Pakistan are after all nationals of that country. They have become refugees; they have been forced to leave that country; and therefore, if they carry

on a so-called war of liberation—operating from foreign bases—we should sympathise with them. Therefore, Sir, I beg of this House not to use an argument like this because these arguments will be used against us. Here in this country, you have citizens of this country—their number may not be large, but you have people from Nagaland, people from Mizoram, people from Manipur and now I read in the Press that there have been even some boys from Assam—they are citizens of this country. They are using the same argument. They are going out from this country to seek arms and training; we know where they are going across our borders. And they are being sent back in order to create trouble inside the country—the so-called insurgents on our borders. See what is going on in the North East border? Are we to accept the argument that because they are actually citizens of India therefore they should be sympathised with? Do you accept this argument? Then why do we prevaricate on matters which are the internal affair of Afghanistan? I should like to tell you that regarding the power which is now supporting Pakistan with new armaments we know in the past what they have done and how they regarded us. Therefore, Sir, I would beg of this House to remember who are the powers involved, whether some of them are traditionally, historically, hostile to us or some which are historically, traditionally, friendly to us. We cannot take up a so-called neutral attitude between them and say, oh, it is all super-power rivalry. We have also got a long term treaty with the Soviet Union. I don't say that under that treaty you are going to ask the Soviet people to come here. But I want to know if there is any treaty, suppose at any time, such a critical situation does arise when under the treaty you are forced to ask for foreign help, suppose your Government in this country, any Government in this country is forced to take such a step, then, will you term that as ag-

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

gression against this country? This is a delicate and tactful question and we should not join the general chorus which is being indulged in by those in the monopolist and capitalist press. This is all what I would like to say. In my time over, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: More than that.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Then, I will conclude by saying that there is not much, but a little, in this President's Address about rising prices and the need to control prices. I would just remind the House that we will probably debate it at some other time. But, Sir, it is not only a question of rising prices. There is the problem of rising prices in respect of commodities which you and I purchase, essential commodities or manufactured articles and so on. But nobody talks about the fall in prices which the farmers are suffering from, the unremunerative prices which growers of all commercial crops suffer from, in this country. The growers of raw jute have been suffering for the last so many years in my own State, irrespective of whatever regime may be in power at the Centre; they have never been paid their economic price and they have been defrauded to serve the interest of the big jute mill owners whose factories are situated in and around Calcutta. Therefore, Sir, we should look at all these questions in the proper economic perspective.

13.00 hrs:

SHRI MADHAV RAO SCINDIA (Guna): The election results to the Seventh Lok Sabha have demonstrated that the Indian electorate has blossomed forth from adolescence to full maturity

At one stroke, our electorate has ended a traumatic period of non-Government. In these 2½ years, we have witnessed a scramble for seats of power which has tarnished the very image of the politician and shaken the roots of democracy. In Delhi nothing

moved Ministers engaged in hectic in-fighting were too busy for anything else. What we were experiencing was not merely a crisis but a paralysis. Hypocrisy became official policy—morality only symbolic. Under the Janata Government, if you were lucky enough to be born a vegetarian and a teetotaler, 90 per cent of your morality was guaranteed. The other 10 per cent could then be devoted to amassing money and land, indulging in bribes and in extensive foreign travels. There was neither vision nor supervision—only division. The Presidential address has rightly highlighted the seriousness of the situation. To set things right, we will first have to attack the core sectors whose malfunction has paralysed the whole system. Coal is in short supply, power cuts are frequent and severe, wagons are not available and ports are congested. All these are having their downstream effect on agriculture, industry and exports. Each public sector undertaking blames the other. The coal industry points its finger at the electricity undertakings. No electricity, so no coal. The electricity undertakings say: no coal so no electricity! What came first the chicken or the egg? The hard truth is that coal production in the past 3 years has remained stagnant at 100 million tonnes, the gap between demand and supply of electricity continues to be 12 per cent, and traffic moved by railways does not go beyond 210 million tonnes. Then how is the economy to grow? To compound the zero growth in these core sectors is the spread of the tentacles of corruption. I am told there are industries in the Delhi area which due to power cuts, are officially restricted to 2 days working but are actually working the full week. Money is paid under the table to certain people and power is drawn directly, bypassing the meter-reading. What a shocking state of affairs? In the last 3 budgets the Government has made additional investments of 6112 crores in power generation, 1220 crores in coal and 1637 crores in railways but with-

out any additional production. These sectors often called India's topless wonders have proved to be bottomless pits. It is all a matter of management. For instance in power generation, only 45 per cent of installed capacity was utilised. In some plants it was as low as 25 per cent. The rest of national investment was wasted because of non-utilisation. Targets for performance must be set and those who do not measure upto the standards set should be immediately replaced.

These management bottlenecks, coupled with the large projected budgetary deficit of 2500 crores of rupees and a zero industrial growth rate have had a devastating effect on the price spiral, which rose in the 3 years period by 30 per cent. The common man and the farmer are being crushed under this burden. Stringent anti-inflationary measures have to be taken but taking care that massive and indiscriminate credit squeezes do not affect the production levels. This nation is a farmers nation and injustices to our farmers and poorer sections must be removed. Adivasis and most harijans live in a most backward economic condition. In fact the greatest victims of the deteriorating law and order situation have been the harijans. In Belchi 14 were burnt alive and harijan atrocities have occurred in countless villages. I therefore suggest the formation of a separate Ministry for Harijan and Advasi Welfare which can directly ensure their security and provide facilities for their progress.

The President in his address makes mention of another obstacle we face, that is, the massive petroleum bill of approximately 5000 crores, enough to wipe-out our foreign exchange reserves. Measures to conserve and tap alternative sources must be immediately undertaken.

An investment in solar energy R&D would not be out of place and could prove to be the lifeline of the nation. Other measures like the ban on private vehicles for one day in the week and the switching off of neon signs

after 9.00 p.m. can contribute greatly to the conservation of fuel and power. There must be a general tightening of the belt all around.

In the sphere of external affairs, the region faces a situation pregnant with explosive possibilities. At one stroke overnight, a whole area of the world became a tinderbox. The Soviet entry into Afghanistan touched off a seismic shift in Super Power relations. Control of Afghanistan has put the Russians within 350 miles of the Arabian Sea, the oil lifeline of the West and Japan. Soviet war-planes based in Afghanistan could cut the lifeline at will. And all that now stands in the way of Russia's historic, age-old, quest for entry into the warm waters is Baluchistan straddling the Iran-Pak border. Under the sagacious leadership of Shrimati Indira Gandhi, India can play a crucial role in defusing the issue.

Firstly, it is alleged that Pakistan was arming this rebels and creating a situation which the Afghan army, weakened by coups and counter coups, could not combat. This has ricocheted on Pakistan and it is in their interests that these activities cease immediately.

Secondly, Islamabad must be persuaded to understand that in the changed circumstances, a strong Pakistan is vital to India's interest so as to act as a buffer between Soviet controlled Afghanistan and India. It is indeed unfortunate that General Ghaousey chose to make a mention of Kashmir in the recent Islamic Conference because the only way to face this possible threat, is for Delhi and Islamabad to act in the Simla spirit and work in unison for peace in the region, but a pre-requisite for this is that Pakistan refuse American arms aid. If Pakistan keeps receiving massive arms aid from America and China, it is inevitable that India too will start arming itself and there is no knowing where this escalation of the arms race would end, causing a tremendous set-back to the economic progress of both the countries.

[Shri Madhav Rao Scindia]

Thirdly, Tehran must be made to realise that the 'hostages' issue may cause Washington to take drastic action against Iran. But the moment it does so, Soviet Russia may make it a pretext to commence their thrust Southwards making Iran the main cockpit of Super Power fighting. It is, therefore, in Iran's interest that they release the hostages and thereby eliminate the risk of the triggering of Super Power action and reaction in Iran.

Finally, the Russians must be persuaded to bow to world opinion and withdraw their forces at the earliest.

The din and dust of electoral battle has subsided. And at this juncture, the country is undoubtedly passing through a critical situation. In a crisis one faces grave danger, but also has unparralled opportunities. The expectations are great but the patience of the people is limited. To live up to the expectations, we will have to create a positive psychology in this country. Mrs. Gandhi has taken the lead in creating this psychology by rejecting the negative sentiment of vengeance. In my view, a politics of vengeance is not politics. Revenge is a racklessness towards the future, in a vain attempt to make the present abolish a suffering which is already past. We have entered a new age. The ghosts of the past should have long ceased to haunt us. Unfortunately, though political systems have changed, the underlying psychology remains the same. The princes are long dead and buried but feudalism still lives. Feudalism is not represented by coincidences of birth, but it exists as an attitude of mind. It exists in the action of the Janata Minister in Bhopal, who involved hundreds of Government servants, cars and paraphernalia in the pompous wedding of his children, it exists in the mind of a former Janata Minister in Delhi who claimed ministerial privilege from being searched by airport security; it exists in the mind of the another Janata Minister

in De'hi who on his return from South America refused to go into quarantine at the airport and travelled from Bombay to Delhi at great risk to all the passengers travelling in the aircraft. Let us break out of these as shackles shed the skin of hypocrisy and emerge into the sunlight to lead the nation into the new age. When I was at school, a passage of Tagore was painted on the wall at the top of the stairs we climbed every day. Those words are still imprinted in my memory. And when each sentence of his is reviewed in context to what exists to-day, the magnitude of the people's disappointment can be understood. I take the liberty of reading those words of Tagore; and I am sure you will give me just that little time extra to quote him. I read it now:

"Where the mind is without fear,
and the head is held high;

where knowledge is free;

where the world has not been
broken up into fragments by
narrow domestic walls;

where words come out from the
depth of truth;

where tireless striving stretches
its arms towards perfection;

where the clear stream of rea-
son has not last its way into
the dreary desert sand of dead
habit;

where the mind is led forward
by Thee into ever widening
thought and action.

Into that Heaven of freedom,
my father, let my country
awake.

When applied to the circumstances existing to-day, these words should be enough to stir anyone's conscience. Let us resolve to build the India of the dreams of Tagore, Vivekanand, Subhas Bose, Gandhi and Nehru. At this critical juncture, we the representatives of the people have a most difficult role to play. Let us attempt

to live up to that role. Otherwise, history will never forgive us.

SHRI KEDAR PANDEY (Bettiah): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I stand to support the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address. The Address is well-thought-out, and has touched all the important points concerning the nation.

Shri Jagjivan Ram had referred to the structure of the society. We are living in a capitalistic society and we wish to change it. Rather, we want to transform this capitalistic society into a socialist one. And the methods have already been chalked out. During the regime of Shri Jawarharial Nehru—when Shri Jagjivan Ram was one of the very important members of his Cabinet—we accepted certain principles viz. that we have to have secularism in this country, we have to have democracy in this country, that we have to have a socialist society and that our foreign policy should be one of non-alignment.

14.28 hrs.

[SHRI TRIDIB CHAUDHURY *in the Chair*]

At that time, there was a session at Bangalore, and the 10-point economic programme was there. Very important programmes were chalked out to transform the society. Banks were nationalized, land reforms were mentioned and so many institutions were nationalized. Because ours is a capitalistic society, there is exploitation in the society. There are high-ups, there are persons who live on the labour of others. So, the banks were nationalized, privy purse was abolished and there were land reforms. The Congress did it, and Shri Jagjivan Ram was also a partner to this. So, during the last 30 years of the Congress regime, much has been done. No doubt about it. But still much has to be implemented. We find to-day that there is disparity and discontent and acute unemployment. So, we have to deal with this

problem; and the methods have already been chalked out. What should we do? We find the 20-point programme mentioned in the President's Address.

The 20-point programme relates to the economic programme. It includes a minimum wage to the agricultural labour and Land Ceilings Acts. All these things are mentioned in the 20-point programme. Of course, that was there in the emergency period, but it does not mean that during the emergency period, this 20-point programme was not scientific and uniform. This was a scientific programme, but it was not cared by anybody.

Now in the capitalistic society, there are agricultural workers. They must be getting a minimum wage. They must get a fair wage. But there was much that had not been implemented during the Janata Party regime. What happened when they came to power? They did not care for the implementation of the 20-point programme. During the Congress regime, we had passed certain laws. I was the Chief Minister in Bihar in 1972. At that time, the Land Ceilings Act was passed. We got them implemented to a great extent. But when the Janata Party came into power, they did not care at all for the implementation of those programmes, and rather they became sympathisers with the capitalists, *rajās, maharajās* and a number of big landlords. They with the help of big politicians, formed the Janata Party. Whatever programmes we had formulated and were pursuing, they gave a goodbye to those programmes. At that time, Shri Jagjivan Ram who also a party to it. Why were they not implemented? That is the defect of the Janata Party, and Lok Dal. During their 2½ years' regime, they did not care to implement those programmes.

If you wish to change the society, this capitalistic society, transform this capitalistic society into a socialist

[Shri Kedar Pandey]

one, you have to follow those programmes in a democratic manner. You did not do it. Mrs. Gandhi was the Prime Minister for 11 years. She did whatever was started by Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in this country. You must accept this truth. But when you came into power, you never cared to implement all these economic and social programmes. You should have done it. So, you have committed that mistake and that is why, people have punished you. You have lost the grip. You are now in the Opposition and are in a minority.

So far as land reforms are concerned, we see that land-reforms constitute the crux of the burning problem plaguing the Indian economy. There are 35.7 million operational holdings. These constitute 50.6 per cent of the total operational holdings which number 70.5. Mere 35.7 million operational holdings have less than one acre each and cover 9 per cent of the total cultivable area. 2.7 million holdings which are 3.9 per cent of the total cultivable land cover 31 per cent of the total cultivable land. There is a growing inequality.

A series of ceiling laws is in force for the last ten years but still the work is not completed. Forty per cent of the total cultivable land still remains in the hands of 5-6 per cent of the land-holders. 60-70 per cent of the agricultural population possess only 5 per cent of the land. The Janata Party Government and Lok Dal have miserably failed on this front. The Planning Commission has made a cautious and conservative estimate of the surplus land and its figure is 21.5 million acres.

The Economic Survey of the Government points out that only 4.6 million acres have been declared surplus. Only 2.5 million acres have been brought under Government possession. Only 1.6 million acres have been distributed to the landless. In

fact these were distributed before the Janata rule came into being. There is no credit of yours—either of the Janata rule or the Lok Dal rule. Whatever the credit comes, that comes to the Indian National Congress regime under the prime ministership of Shrimati Indira Gandhi. That is the truth. We must face it. You have done nothing for land reforms during your 2½ years regime. You must feel this and you must accept this truth and you must say that you have done nothing for the uplift of the poor. Whatever has been done, this has been done by Smt. Gandhi when she was the Prime Minister of this country. That is the truth. You must realise it.

What about prices? In 1977-78, prices started spurting. The monthly average rise was 8 per cent above that of 1976-77. Prices to-day are all higher than they were at any time in the past. The index of the whole sale prices is not correct indicator of the prevailing price situation. The consumer price index should be regarded as the correct guide. There is a rise of at least 4.4 per cent between April 1978 and December, 1978. This rise has come on top of massive increase in previous years. If we take into account the Budget of Shri Charan Singh, we find that there is a deficit of Rs. 1071 crores. Two supplementary demands for grants shall increase the deficit to Rs. 1,400 crores. In the last three years it has increased to nearly 4,000 crores. This huge deficit is bound to have unhappy consequences. Fiscal prudence or caution has been thrown to the four winds. Between 1972-74, money supply increased by 42 per cent. It has already increased by 50 per cent during the last three years. This year money supply is expected to increase by 20 per cent. This shall be quite the inflationary fire which cannot be quenched and quelled by large stocks of food grains and maximum foreign exchange resources. It takes at least between 18 months to 24 months for the expanded money supply to have its

effect on prices. Hence price stability becomes very difficult. We know that in the developing economy, it is very difficult to have stability. Our country has got a developing economy. It is not a fully developed nation. Of course, it is natural that we may have some inflation, no doubt about it. But at the present moment we have the highest inflation in this country. This is what we see to-day. This is the legacy of the Janata rule. What is that? We may say that this is a bankrupt economy. Now how to revitalise it and how to revive it, it is a difficult question. There is acute unemployment and demoralised bureaucracy. What have you done? Have you done anything for the good of the nation? You must think on it. This is the position that you have achieved during the last 2-1/2 years.

What about energy? Only 48 per cent of the total capacity of the energy is utilised. The other 52 per cent of the capacity remains unutilised. What is the cause of it? Your bad management, your mismanagement. This is the position. You must realise it. So, you have got the defeat at the polls due to two important reasons. One is complete break-down of law and order during your regime.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): If you permit my intervention, I would just request the hon. Member to tell us what was the state of the economy of the country when the Janata Party took over the Government.

SHRI KEDAR PANDEY: That I have referred, for the years 1974-77 and 1972-74. That was much better, balance of trade and all these things. Now, I said that only on two important points you could not reply to the people and so you got the defeat. One is complete breakdown of law and order in this country during your regime, during the regime of Janata and Lok Dal. Second is high prices. And you could not reply to the people on these two points and so you got

the defeat. These are the two important factors which are responsible for your defeat and which are responsible for our success. You must realise it. This is the truth. You have failed in your administration. (Interruptions). Now we shall do it. With the better administration of law and order in this country we are confident of our success. Secondly, we must try to reduce the prices. Prices must be stabilised to some extent. These are the two important factors and we must now be in a position to reply to these questions.

There is one difficulty in this country. Now, the State Legislatures are there in different States. They are your creation, the creation of Janata Party or Lok Dal as the case may be. I do not know how far they will respond to the answer of these two questions. This is the difficulty at present. Because ours is a federal structure we must try to find some solutions as to how to get on and how to find out the solutions and how to maintain law and order in a perfect condition and how to minimise the prices, how to reduce the prices. These are the two questions. So, you must acknowledge your defeat. Don't calculate 43 per cent and 57 per cent. I completely agree with Shri Jagjivan Ram when he said: "Don't make this argument". The fact is that you are defeated, you must acknowledge your defeat. Don't try to minimise the thing and defend it, saying that 43 per cent of population gave us votes and you got so much. This is a faulty argument. In the present democratic set up this is the system which is prevalent in this country, in England also which you follow. So, you must know and realise your mistakes, you must apologise to the people and you must show respect to the Government and you must rather atone for it. That is the position, and I do feel that you are realising it. So, there must be a complete and radical change in your tone in your speech and all these things. This is what I have to say.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (Barasat): The President's Address which we are discussing now does not reflect in totality the major realities in the political scenario of our country. The Address to some extent is fragmented. There are certain omissions and distortions which have found a place in the Address which can hardly escape the notice of the hon. Members of this House and the nation outside.

The President has been very much pleased to refer to the massive mandate obtained by the ruling party. I would crave the indulgence of the House as other hon. Members have done already to explode that myth, because there is no massiveness in the so-called massive mandate. Facts will go to substantiate that the total votes polled were 57 per cent of the electorate, and out of that only 42.6 per cent was secured by the ruling party. This implies, you will agree with me, that by an approval of about one-fourth of the electorate, the ruling party has secured two-thirds majority, which means in the final analysis the rule of the minority over the majority of the people. This paradoxical situation is due to the fact that there are inherent defects in our electoral system which has once again underscored the urgency of electoral reforms. This paradoxical situation can be done away with if we adopt the widely accepted principle of proportional representation as the main basis of our electoral system.

The President has been pleased not to take any note of the significant defeat of the arch communal and casteist forces in the country. The election results have clearly demonstrated that our electorate has attained political maturity and has rejected the communal and casteist approach to the national problems of our country. The electorate has thoroughly rejected the pernicious theory of Hindu backlash and has given their verdict in a more pronounced manner in favour of the secular forces as against the communal and casteist forces.

The President has also taken no note of a new situation that has arisen in our country. Particularly he has ignored the emergence of the left and democratic forces in larger numbers in the Seventh Lok Sabha. These left and democratic forces constitute a bright promise for tomorrow, which is alone capable of being a national alternative to the bourgeois landlord parties, whether taken singly or together. The election results have also unerringly proved that the masses of this country are looking forward to a third alternative. Wherever such an alternative was made available to the people, they have deliberately, consciously and firmly opted for that alternative. The results of Tripura, West Bengal and Kerala unerringly demonstrate that fact.

The President has also been pleased to refer to the need of the spirit of conciliation instead of confrontation today, but the actual trends reveal that the ruling party has already taken resort to a spirit of confrontation and not conciliation. I would only mention three statements falling from three Cabinet Ministers very recently.

Mr. P. K. Mukherjee, the Union Commerce Minister is reported to have said:

"They (West Bengal) should forget the existence of a weak Government at the Centre. We in our area of competence know how to make a State Government implement legislation" (*National Herald*, January 27).

Again, says Mr. P. C. Sethi, another Union Cabinet Minister: "If the States do not implement the Central Acts, action would be taken against those State Governments." I have quoted this from *National Herald* of 27th January. Mr. A. B. A. Ghani Khan Chaudhuri has topped both these Ministers and he says that he has taken a solemn pledge to drown the Government of West Bengal into the waters of Bay of Bengal.

PROF. MADHU DANAVATE: The Bay of Bengal will become Red Sea.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: We will be glad if the Bay of Bengal becomes Red Sea. Does this reflect a spirit of reconciliation? It really shows nothing but throwing the gauntlet. I wish to remind them that 1980 is different from 1970. Eighties will be different from the Seventies. We shall fight tooth and nail against any kind of unilateral assault on any non-Cong. (I) State Governments, which are existing on their own rights because they have secured the mandate of the people. They are there not because of any gift of the ruling party at the centre, to be taken away at any suitable time at their convenience. While making this kind of pronouncements through the Cabinet Ministers, moves are on to resort to operations of toppling the State Governments. One so-called emissary of the Prime Minister is hopping round the country, engineering defections and counter-defections, engineering the so-called movements to bring down the existing State Governments. That shows the very strained relations between the Centre and the States. This is not only reprehensible but also contrary to the basic principle of federal polity. We are prepared to preserve the federal principles. It is they who have started an assault on the federal principle of our Constitution? People should be on vigil and they should resist any such move on the part of the ruling party.

All the events which are unfolding themselves in quick succession lead one to believe that the return of the days of parliamentary authoritarianism and if necessary, extra parliamentary authoritarianism is imminent and it is a great danger to democracy, to parliamentary democracy, the parliamentary democratic system in our country and all these efforts are to be fought back and resisted. Let there not be any illusions about it. We on this side will always be against parliamentary authoritarianism, extra-constitutional authoritarianism because that is a grave danger which is being posed to the democratic system.

The President has referred to the new challenges facing the nation. The challenges are undoubtedly gigantic. We are passing through a period of deep economic crisis. Our economy is really reeling under the impact of high costs instability on the price front, runaway inflation, mounting trade deficit, staggering deficit financing, incidence of heavy tax burdens; stagnation has followed and sometimes even declining production has followed. A radical socio-economic programme is needed to salvage the economy from this deep malaise. Structural and institutional changes alone can change the basic character of our economy. But instead of spelling out such radical economic programmes, the President has been pleased to refer to the much boasted 20-point programme. It is essentially a *status quo* programme; it represents nothing but palliatives and it does not represent any fundamental change of the institution and the structure of our economy. Therefore, I would say that this 20-point programme, even if it is honestly implemented, cannot lift the economy from deep morass. It would prove, as in the past, a great failure to lift our economy from morass.

Now, freedom of the press is also under attack today. Freedom of the press is very precious to us. In this connection, I would like to refer to certain pronouncements made by certain Cabinet Ministers. The Minister of Information and Broadcasting, Mr. Vasant Sathe, was pleased to say:

"If the press is really to be free, then it cannot be partisan."

What does it mean? It means categorically and clearly that if the press goes partisan, then freedom of the press will be curbed. Who is to take care of the partisan press? It is not you, the Government. It is the leadership which can take care of the partisan press.

Then, Mr. Sathe goes on to say:

"We shall now judge the press by its objectivity."

[Shri Chitta Basu]

The question arises, what is the benchmark of this objectivity? Is it sycophancy or fearlessness? The demand of the Government is sycophancy, not fearlessness.

Further, he goes on to say:

"If anyone purposely maligns the administration, the reciprocity between the Ministry and the press and media will be lost."

What does he mean by "reciprocity"? Does it not throw a challenge to the free press?

Before concluding, therefore, I would say that there are discernible trends, strong trends, towards authoritarianism. It is for the House to rise firmly against those trends of authoritarianism. It should be put down firmly.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR SINGH (Banka): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have been patiently listening to the speeches made by the hon. Members of the Opposition. I am sorry to note that I found hardly any evidence of the fact that the political scene has changed and that they have to play a different role in the present political context.

The hon. Members of the Opposition have talked of electoral reform. It is a question which requires a debate in depth. We will not be averse to any new arrangement which may result from it. But at the moment, it has been repeatedly pointed out amidst applause from the members of the Opposition that we represent 45 per cent of the people of this country while they represent 57 per cent of the people. I would most politely submit that politics is not governed by the rules of arithmetic and that in politics, two plus two do not always make four. Even the leader of the C.P.M. talked in those terms and was very assertive about his 57 per cent representative character. Whose views would he express here? Would he voice the opinion of the R.S.S. with all its communal manifestations? Would he be guid-

ed by the Janata Party power seekers? Or would he still team up with the Kulak lobby of the Lok Dal? I hope and wish the Left groups would save their soul and stop speaking for 57 per cent of the people. If the opposition groups still prefer to function as a rudderless conglomeration of parties, bereft of any ideological moorings, and bound together only by their blind wrath and frustration, their future is no doubt going to be worse than their present predicament. But if political parties have any ideological foundations and live by them, then the concept of 57 per cent representative capacity is a total myth. The Congress (I) represents the authentic national mainstream of Indian public opinion.

Even after this nerve-racking experience, if the Opposition does not realise that the old strategy of 'Grand Alliance' would not work, God alone can help them. They are busy today dividing seats for the pending by-elections and Mr. Fernandes has taken a brisk step forward to canvass for joint campaigning by all Parties. If basic beliefs and ideological postures do not mean anything to you, and you want to wear the halter of communalism and casteism round your neck like badges of glory, you are bound to be doomed. You cannot stop that rising tide of the people's faith in the leadership of Mrs. Gandhi in this manner.

Another phobia which plagues them is the image of Shri Sanjay Gandhi. He is an Hon. Member of this House and has come here with the sanction of the people. And at least the Lok Dal should be indebted to him that his strategy helped their leader achieve his life's ambition of becoming the Prime Minister of India. It is a wonder or wonders that he could make it without the necessary support in the Lok Sabha, without facing the House even for a day. (*Interruptions*).

I hope you realise I am stating real facts....

Now, what is the legacy which we have inherited from you? Law and order is shaken to the roots and there

is complete erosion of authority in all parts of the country. But the most outstanding feature of the 33-month old rule has been the resurgence of the R.S.S. menace and their accession to unbridled power. It was a sad day for our country when we saw all the Janata Party leaders, standing in a row, with bowed heads and garlands in their hands, to pay their respects to the R.S.S. Chief. The R.S.S. was then talking of capturing power within the next ten years.

The President's Address is proof of the fact that on all fronts, we mean to keep our promises to the people. It has been announced that the minority character of the Aligarh Muslim University would be soon restored. Our Government would do every thing to give the minorities their rightful place in every sphere of national life. It is really not a question of promises; it is a matter of faith to us. Ours is the only political party, I am proud to say here, which has always kept the RSS and the Jan Sangh at a distance and has never shared power with them even under the most adverse circumstances. Congressmen may differ on many issues, but where national interests and secularism are concerned, I can assure you and Members of the Opposition that we shall never falter.

The country is in safe hands today. We are confident that the Prime Minister would untangle the Assam situation and the explosive situation on our north-eastern borders and restore complete normalcy very soon. Events are fast developing into a hot war on our northern border in Afghanistan. The American response to the situation, to buttress Pakistan militarily, has created serious problems which concern our security; so also the present triangular relationship, the axis between the United States, Pakistan and China. The present situation, if not checked in time, is likely to completely upset our priorities even at home. We fully agree with our friend, who made a speech just now, that Soviet Russia is a dependable friend and has stood with

us in hours of crisis. The Prime Minister, even before her assumption to power, took the initiative and clearly stated the position that our national interests lie in making every effort to defuse the crisis and de-escalate the present tension.

On the economic front, the Janata Party's and the Lok Dal's legacy is most unenviable—a massive backlog of economic travails. The industrial growth has come down to zero. The GNP has been reduced to one per cent during the current financial year. The rate of inflation is nearly one and half per cent per month. It is really a case of stagnation, economic stagnation and inflation feeding upon each other. The trade deficit is to the tune of Rs. 2,000 crores. The oil bill is likely to come up to Rs. 5,000 crores which is 80 per cent of our export earnings. Power generation, as Mr. Pandey has just now mentioned, has reached the low level of 48 per cent of the installed capacity. Transport bottlenecks have further aggravated the situation. This year the man-day losses have been to the tune of 50 millions and labour unrest is getting acute every day. With the Janata Party's announcement of a ten-year countdown on ending unemployment, the number of jobless has shot up and the percentage of available jobs has gone down. Deficit financing was recklessly adopted and credit facilities were generously liberalised even for speculative activities. The planning process was rolled up and given a complete holiday. With shortages of industrial and consumer goods, there is complete chaos on the economic front.

The Address has clearly laid down and defined the immediate objectives of removing shortages of key factors, ensuring greater availability of mass consumption goods and price control. All efforts have to be directed towards full utilisation of unused capacities.

The public distribution system has not only to be enlarged but has to be given a completely new orientation so as to protect the proper interests of

[Shri Chandra Shekhar Singh]

the most vulnerable sections of the society.

The Minimum Needs Programme has been rightly revived and I hope, will be, pursued with all speed.

I have full confidence that the government will use its massive mandate to ensure political stability and also to usher in an era of socio-economic transformation, which would not just be a cosmetic change but which would be fundamental in character so as to maintain an automatic pro-people balance in our economy.

We are happy that the charismatic leadership of Mrs. Gandhi is once again on the saddle to guide the destinies of the nation. We also hope that the opposition groups would not continue to be counted under the anonymous anti-Congress label and that they would not barter their principles and identity for some immediate and illusory gains.

Our leader has proclaimed that she has forgotten the nightmarish experience of the thirty-three months and would not carry on any personal vendetta against any one. I hope the opposition too would not remain tied to the past but look towards the future. They should be able to overcome their present frustration and strengthen the national will to build up a self-reliant nation, to create an equitable and just order and ensure a better future for our people.

श्री सतीश प्रसाद सिंह (खगरिया) : समापति महोदय, मैं राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण का समर्थन करते हुए कुछ बातों की तरफ आप का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। वैसे तो 1952 से ही कांग्रेस के खिलाफ विभिन्न विचारधाराओं के लोग पार्टी के रूप में देश के सामने आये और उस समय से यह प्रयास रहा कि कांग्रेस को अपदस्थ कर के शासन में आवें। लेकिन 12 वर्ष के बाद इन लोगों ने यह अनुभव किया कि अलग-अलग विचारधारा रख कर हम लोग सरकार में नहीं आ सकते। ऐसी हालत में सारी पार्टियों ने मिल कर संविद की सरकार बनाने की कोशिश की लेकिन उस समय भी इस मुल्क के लोगों ने पूरे का पूरा शासन न लोगों के हाथ में नहीं दिया और दस राज्यों में आंदोलन की सरकारें बनीं, लेकिन केन्द्र में कांग्रेस की

सरकार ही रही। उन संविद की सरकारों का जो रवैया रहा उस से यह साफ़ जाहिर हो गया कि विभिन्न विचारधाराओं के लोग मिलजुल कर सरकार नहीं चला सकते, वे सरकारें बिखरी, टूट गई और फिर सारे मुल्क में यहाँ की जनता ने कांग्रेस के हाथों को मजबूत किया। उस के बाद जितने विरोधी दलों के नेता थे, उन सब ने जनता के बीच में यह बात रखी कि अगर हम लोगों को सेंटर में भी मौका मिलता तो हम द्रुत गति से जनता का फायदा कर सकते थे, जनता की समस्याओं को जो कांग्रेस धीरे-धीरे हल करना चाहती है, हम उस को द्रुत गति से हल कर सकते थे और कम समय में देश का नकशा बदल देते। इन बातों के लिए भी प्रयास करने में उन को 10 साल का वक्त लगा। उस के बाद 1977 में जनता के सामने इन लोगों ने सब पार्टियों को मिला कर कहा कि हम एक पार्टी हो जाते हैं हमें मौका दीजिए। और जनता पार्टी नाम रख दिया, जनता के हितों के लिए। इस से जनता के मन में यह बात उठी कि हो सकता है कि कांग्रेस धीरे-धीरे देश में प्रोप्रेस कर रही है और अगर इन लोगों के हाथों में सत्ता दी जाए, तो हो सकता है कि द्रुत गति से हम लोगों को कुछ फायदा मिले, हम आगे बढ़ें और हम लोगों में खुशहाली आए। इसलिए सन् 1977 में जनता ने इन लोगों को जिताया और स्टेट्स में भी और केन्द्र में भी सरकार बनाने का मौका दिया और बड़ी उम्मीदें ले कर यह मौका दिया था कि अब हम लोगों के लिए अच्छे दिन लौटने वाले हैं लेकिन जो कुछ हुआ, वह सब को मालूम है। इन लोगों ने शुरू शुरू में जब सरकार का काम संभाला, तो कुछ दिनों तक तो लोगों के मन में यह आशा जगी रही कि हम लोगों की प्रगति होगी लेकिन विभिन्न विचारों के इन लोगों ने एक नाम रख कर विभिन्न दिशाओं में खींचातानी शुरू कर दी। खींचातानी आपस में बढ़ने लगी और वह इतनी बढ़ी कि ढाई साल भी जनता पार्टी नहीं चल सकी और उस की सरकार बिखर गई, दो भागों में वह बंट गई और फिर सरकार टूट गई।

14 hrs.

एक बात में यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि एक बात जनता पार्टी की ओर से पिछले ग्राम चुनाव में बड़े जोरों से यह कही गई कि आप लोग जनता पार्टी को वोट देंगे, तो हम श्री जगजीवन राम जी को प्रधान मंत्री बना देंगे। जब जनता पार्टी बहुमत में चुनावों में आई थी, तो उस समय उन्होंने अपने यहां चुनाव नहीं करवाया। श्री जगजीवन राम जी को प्रधान मंत्री न बनाने के लिए कुछ लोगों ने चुनाव नहीं होने दिया और श्री मोरारजी भाई को प्रधान मंत्री बनाया। फिर भी जनता पार्टी ने इस बार-इस तरह का काम किया है जो कि मैं समझता हूँ कि दुनिया की किसी भी प्रजातन्त्रीय प्रणाली में नहीं होता है। उन्होंने अपने चुनाव घोषणा पत्र में प्रधान मंत्री का नाम पहले लिख दिया। दुनिया में इस किस्म की एक भी मिसाल देखने को नहीं मिलती है। यह सभी जानते हैं कि प्रजातन्त्रीय प्रणाली में जिसके ज्यादा लोग रहते हैं, उस का ही प्रधान मंत्री होता है लेकिन उन्होंने पहले ही डेक्लेयर कर दिया।

इसी लिए कि जनता पार्टी यह दिखाना चाहती थी कि जगजीवन राम जी आथेरीटोरियन हैं और वे यह चाहते हैं कि मेरा नाम पहले से ही मैनीफेस्टो में दे दिया जाए। इस के बाद आप यह देखिए कि चौधरी साहब जनता पार्टी से अलग हुए और उन्होंने लोक दल बनाया और बीच में जब उन को सरकार से श्री मोरारजी भाई ने निकाल दिया था, तो एक बड़ा प्रदर्शन भी किया दिल्ली में और उन को फिर से सरकार में रख लिया गया लेकिन उन की एक बहुत बड़ी मुराद थी कि जिन्दगी में प्राइम मिनिस्टर बनना है और अगर प्राइम मिनिस्टर नहीं बने तो यों ही मरना बेकार है। इसलिए उन्होंने अथक परिश्रम किया और बाद में प्रधान मंत्री बन गये लेकिन एक बात में यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि लोक दल के आदमियों को तो कम से कम इन्दिरा जी के खिलाफ नहीं बोलना चाहिए क्योंकि इन्दिरा जी ने ही चौधरी साहब का जीवन सुधारा है। इस बात को याद रखें कि अगर इन्दिरा जी उन का समर्थन नहीं करती, तो उन का नाम प्रधान मंत्री के लिए नहीं आता।

अब एक सवाल और उठता है। हमारे एक पुराने मित्र हैं, जिन्होंने कांग्रेस के साथ बहुत दिनों तक काम किया है और वे हैं सी० पी० आई० के मित्र। अब वे भी कांग्रेस के खिलाफ बोलते हैं। जब बीस सूत्री कार्यक्रम चलाया गया था, तो उस की ताईद करने वाले यही थे, इमर्जेन्सी की ताईद करने वाले सी० पी० आई० वाले ही थे लेकिन एक बात सभी लोगों को मालूम होनी चाहिए कि इन का रवैया शुरू से ही एक जैसा रहा है कि यह पार्टी हमेशा सरकार के पीछे रहूँ है। जिस समय अंग्रेज थे और यहां पर आजादी की लड़ाई लड़ी जा रही थी, उस समय भी सी० पी० आई० अंग्रेजों के साथ थी। जब इन्दिरा जी का 20-प्वाइण्ट प्रोग्राम आया और गरीबों के लिए भलाई की बात हुई तो इन्होंने कहा कि हम भी गरीबों का भला करना चाहते हैं। उस वक्त वे कांग्रेस के साथ थे और जब जनता पार्टी की सरकार बनी, तो फिर वे जनता पार्टी के साथ हो गये। और जब लोक दल की सरकार बनी तो वे लोक दल के साथ हो गये। इस से साफ जाहिर हो गया है कि वह पार्टी सत्तापरस्त है और सत्ता के साथ रह कर ही फायदा उठाना चाहती है। मैं उम्मीद करता हूँ कि फिर वे हमारे साथ आ जाएंगे और यह कह कर के आ जाएंगे कि आपके साथ रह कर गरीबों के लिए काम करेंगे।

सी० पी० एम० के लोग बहुत उतावले हो जाते हैं। वे कहते हैं कि गनी खां चौधरी साहब ने क्यों कहा कि इस पार्टी को बंगाल की खाड़ी में भेज देंगे। यह बात सभी जानते हैं कि बंगाल की खाड़ी के द्वारा ही इस पार्टी का जन्म हुआ और वहीं यह बनी है। इस पार्टी का प्रजातंत्र पर विश्वास नहीं है और न कभी था। न इस पार्टी की चुनावों में मान्यता थी और न अभी भी है। एक बात सभी सदस्यों को जान लेनी चाहिए कि जो रवैया इस पार्टी ने बंगाल और केरल में अख्तियार किया है वह कोई भी प्रजातंत्र

प्रेमी आदमी अख्तियार नहीं कर सकता है। चुनावों में इन्होंने गांव वालों के साथ जो व्यवहार किया वह मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूँ। उन लोगों को इन्होंने जबदस्ती वोट डालने के लिए जाने नहीं दिया और जबदस्ती वहां वृथ केपचरिंग किया गया। अगर गनी खां चौधरी साहब ने ऐसी बात कही तो कोई गलत बात नहीं कही है। ऐसी पार्टी यहाँ नहीं पनप सकती है और न उसे पनपने देना चाहिए जो देश के हित में नहीं है और समाज के हित में नहीं है।

आप यहां कहते हैं कि हम लोगों को चुनावों में कम परसेंट वोट मिले। लेकिन मैं आप से कहता हूँ कि आप अगर अलग अलग चुनाव न लड़े होते तो आप का परसेण्टेज बहुत कम होता और कांग्रेस का बहुत ज्यादा होता। क्योंकि बहुत से मतदाता किसी जातिविशेष पर वोट देते हैं, बहुत से लीडरशिप पर वोट देते हैं। इसलिए यह कहना सही नहीं है कि कांग्रेस को कम वोट मिले।

दूसरी बात सी० पी० एम० के सम्बन्ध में जो गनी खां चौधरी ने कही है उस पर हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर को भी ध्यान देना चाहिए। जो वहां चुनावों में हुआ उसके लिए वहां इक्वायरी होनी चाहिए। लोगों के साथ जो वहां व्यवहार किया गया, उन्हें वृथ पर नहीं जाने दिया गया, वोट नहीं डालने दिया गया, इस सब की इक्वायरी होनी चाहिए। इस पर यहां बहुत जोरों से यह कहा जाता है कि हम लोगों की केरल में जीत हुई, वेस्ट बंगाल में जीत हुई। वहां के सब लोगों को मालूम है और मेरा प्रांत चूँकि बगल में है, इसलिए हम लोगों को भी मालूम है कि किस प्रकार से इन लोगों की वहां जीत हुई है। कोई भी राज्य सरकार इस ढंग से चुनावों में नहीं कर सकती है जो वहां की राज्य सरकार ने किया है। मुझे इस सम्बन्ध में इतना ही कहना है कि इन बातों पर ध्यान देना चाहिए।

एक बात आपको और जान लेनी चाहिए। यह सब कुछ हुआ सो हुआ और उसके बाद भी कांग्रेस शासन में आयी। लेकिन विरासत में हम लोगों को जो कृषि व्यवस्था खराब मिली है, वह बड़ी दुखद स्थिति है। मैं आपको खास कर बिहार में कृषि की हालत के बारे में बताना चाहता हूँ। वहां हालत यह है कि रात को काशतकार अपने खेत में नहीं रह सकता है। उसकी खेती का सामान गायब हो जाता है, पम्पिंग सेट का सामान गायब हो जाता है। यह सामान उससे छीन लिया जाता है और उसे मारा जाता है। भले आदमी काम खत्म होते ही अपने घरों को चले जाते हैं। मैं एक ही क्षेत्र के दो प्रखण्डों में जो घटनाएं घटी हैं उन के बारे में सारे सदस्यों को जानकारी देना चाहता हूँ और उम्मीद करता हूँ कि अपोजिशन के सदस्य भी इन बातों पर और करेंगे और विचार करेंगे। मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी से भी निवेदन करता हूँ कि ये जो घटनाएं हैं, जिस ढंग से ये घटती

[श्री सतीश प्रसाद सिंह]

हैं, उनकी तरफ उनका ध्यान जाना चाहिए और जिस तरह से एक ही प्रान्त के किसी एक भाग में अगर वे इस तरह से घटती हैं तो उनकी तरफ तो विशेष ध्यान जाना ही चाहिए। कांग्रेस के शासन में पहले भी हत्याएँ हुई होंगी लेकिन इस तरह से नहीं। मैं दो ही प्रखण्डों की बात आप के सामने रखना चाहता हूँ और वे हैं नौगछिया और गोपालपुर प्रखण्ड, जो एक ही विधान सभा क्षेत्र में पड़ते हैं। वहाँ से जो रिपोर्टें मिली हैं उनके आधार पर ही मैं आपको ये सब डिटेल्स दे रहा हूँ। 1977 के इलैक्शन के बाद थाना नौगछिया के ए.एस. आई को 31 राजपथ पर शाम को गुंडों ने गोली मार दी। उसके कुछ दिन के बाद एस.डी.ओ. ट्युबवैल की पत्नी की हत्या नौगछिया बाजार में गुंडे तत्वों ने कर दी। जगतपुर ग्राम थाना नौगछिया के बासा पर तीन व्यक्तियों की हत्या कुल्हाड़ी से काट कर 1978 में कर दी गई एक सप्ताह के अन्दर बारह व्यक्तियों की हत्या असामाजिक तत्वों ने कर दी। इन सारे व्यक्तियों की लाशें बरामद हुईं। 7 अगस्त 1979 को महेन्द्र मंडल, मुखिया, ग्राम पंचायत मालपुर, थाना गोपालपुर की देडे बजे दिन में नौगछिया बाजार में गोली मार कर हत्या कर दी गई। इसके बाद चौदह अगस्त 1979 को राम लरा, गोपालपुर थाना, में तीन व्यक्तियों को कुल्हाड़ों से काट कर मार दिया गया। सात नवम्बर 1979 को पांच बजे संध्या हजारों लोगों के बीच नौगछिया बाजार में डাকা पड़ा जिस में ती व्यक्तियों को गोली मार दी गई। एक व्यक्ति की मृत्यु—पी.एस.सी. एच. पटना में हुई। फिर इसी साल 1979 में बैजू शरीफ के सिपाही, ग्राम इमलामपुर, थाना गोपालपुर में दिन दहाड़े हत्या कर दी गई। पंद्रह जनवरी 1980 को बारह बजे दिन में पूरन भगत और टैगर मंडल की हत्या लतीपाखर ग्राम में कर दी गई। पूरन भगत ग्राम अभिया, थाना गोपालपुर और टैगर मंडल, ग्राम परवत्ता, थाना नौगछिया के थे। पूरन भगत को गोली मार दी गई और टैगर मंडल को काट काट कर टुकड़ों में फेंक दिया गया। 23 जनवरी 1980 को लतीपाखर के लाला सिंह जो कांग्रेस (आई) के एक सक्रिय कार्यकर्ता तथा नौगछिया प्रखण्ड कांग्रेस कमेटी के कार्यालय मंत्री थे, की चार बजे दिन में सैकड़ों लोगों के बीच गोली मार कर हत्या कर दी गई।

1977 से अभी तक इस प्रकार की 34 निमंम हत्याएँ एक ही विधान सभा क्षेत्र में जिस में दो थाने पड़ते हैं—नौगछिया और गोपालपुर—की गई हैं। विधि व्यवस्था की जब यह हालत हो तो यह चिन्ता की बात हो जाती है। यह हाल वहाँ बिहार में हो रहा है। इन मुद्दों पर और इस सारे मामले पर आपको ध्यान देना चाहिए और सोचना चाहिए कि वहाँ की सरकार अगर कारगर नहीं तो यहाँ पर प्रधान मंत्री जी या गृह मंत्री जी या दोनों

मिल कर कुछ ऐसी व्यवस्था करें ताकि वहाँ के लोगों के जान और माल की रक्ष हो सके और शान्ति से लोग अपना जीवन बिता सकें। वहाँ पर लोग तबाह हो रहे हैं लोग कोई काम नहीं कर रहे हैं और परेशानी में पड़े हुए हैं। इस और आपका विशेष ध्यान जाना चाहिए।

SHRI BALANANDAN (Mukundapuram): I cannot say that I am happy like the other friend who spoke from the other side. Our President was speaking about the stability which has entered into the country. But stability for whom? For the big growers, for the monopolists and the high priests of the capitalist class? If the total policy so far followed, is not changed then stability cannot come. Stability could come only if the total policy is changed. And therefore I beg of the Government to spell out what the drastic changes in policy which they propose to take.

And secondly, Sir, somebody said here about the big majority which they have got in the Lok Sabha election. That is a fact. But I want to mention the other side of the picture also. You will find this situation in Tripura, in West Bengal and in Kerala. The Ruling Party—the Congress (I) Party—was rejected by the people. After the Lok Sabha election is over, there has been the election to the State Assembly of Kerala. Our Prime Minister came to Kerala and she told the people about the benefits of the Congress (I) Rule, if they came to power in Kerala. But what happened? I need not narrate the whole thing. She came to Kerala and she visited Padmanabhaswami Temple and Guruvayur Temple in order to catch the votes of Hindus. The President has been talking about the communal harmony and there should not be any reference to communalism during poll. In Kerala the Congress-I had entered into alliance with all the caste and communal parties. More so, they were in alliance with the Janata Party. Yesterday, the Prime Minister had said that the Congress-I Party had no understanding with other communal parties. I can tell you that Mr. Ra-

jagopal and Mr. Sukumaran Nayar are the R.S.S. leaders who were also supported by the Congress-I Party in Kerala. What was the result? The result was that only 17 seats they could win out of 140 seats. So, in Kerala the Congress-I were rejected by the people. But you claim a massive majority throughout the country. I have to remind those people who talk of big majority, that the other side should also be taken into account. The hon. Member who spoke just before a few minutes wanted that the C.P.I.(M) in West Bengal should be thrown into the Bay of Bengal. It is a wonderful suggestion. But you have to remember that our President has all along been saying about cordial relations between the Centre and the States. Whereas you have been talking the other way round. Many people are thinking that the CPI(M) in Kerala can be thrown into the Arabian Sea or the CPI(M) in West Bengal can be thrown into the Bay of Bengal. But I can tell you that you are in a day-dream. If you do not respect Centre-State relations, you will be thrown into the Indian Ocean.

Here I do not want to mention about the rising prices. Everyone was talking about that. It is because of black-marketeers and the hoarders that we are witnessing the price spiral. It is a fact that they are doing their mite. But the basic policy of the Government is that the Government year after year has been increasing tax rates, resorting to deficit financing and also other methods by which the prices are going sky-high. If you want to arrest the price-rise, you have to change the policy. Then only you can arrest the spiralling price.

In the President's address mention has been made about the environmental protection and solution of the pollution problem. But before considering all these things, one expects the government to work out a scheme by which more than 50 per cent of the country's population who are living below the poverty line could be ameliorated. Nobody is against protecting

scientifically flora and fauna in the country. Here I would like to refer to the National Environmental Protection Committee's report which had gone into the environmental conditions in the Western Ghats. They had submitted a report on three projects. One is Kudremukh, the second is the Silent Valley and the third is the Kodachadri project. For preparing this report 10,000 dollars were given by the International Wildlife Fund. I would like to know from the Government whether our Government was not in a position to provide funds for the preparation of such a report. The Committee report was amply rewarded by giving clearance to the Kudremukh Project in Karnataka which is a project completely against environmental and ecological protection. In Kudremukh project, they have also two dams which cover about 1000 hectares for coal washeries. This has been agreed to. Another project at Kodachadri in Mysore has also been agreed to. About Silent Valley project alone, this Committee has raised certain objections. These international agencies which pay money to others for such things are interested in one thing and that is that the developing countries should not get cheap energy and cheap food. Therefore, they resort to all kinds of tactics in the name of protection of wild life, special birds etc. and they try to get the forests under their control and indulge in all kinds of espionage. Did the Government go through this report? They did not. Somebody from Kerala had gone to the Kerala High Court; the High Court cleared this project, but somehow some objection has been raised by the Centre. I would strongly urge that that objection should be removed because by this project, Kerala State will get cheap energy and cheap food and for which clearance should be given.

There is another point. For supporting Congress(I) Party; the monopolists throughout the country are making very big demands. They want to go over to the core sector hitherto reserved for public sector. They want complete freedom in that respect. They

[Shri Balanandan]

want to enter the fields of electricity, coal and other core sectors. Then, the international monopolists also want that they should be given complete freedom in the matter of investment in the private sector or any sector whichever they want. I would like to say emphatically that if we want to get out of the present economic crisis, these monopolists must be dealt with properly and sternly. Our public sector has got to be kept intact, nobody should be allowed to go into the fields reserved for public sector.

Sir, the President has covered many subjects, but I have no time to express my views on them. I would like to make one point about Kerala's traditional industries. The Government should pay special attention to see that these industries not only survive but prosper. Millions of people are engaged in coir, cashew, bamboo and mat making industries in Kerala. I would, therefore, urge that Kerala needs special attention from the Government. Only if special attention is given to these aspects, the economic equilibrium in the country can be kept.

And finally, I would submit that the Central Government should not do anything which would estrange the Centre-State relations. On the other hand, every effort should be made to strengthen these. The States should be given more powers. The attitude shown by one of the Ministers here when he talked about the Government of West Bengal is not at all desirable. He should be asked to behave properly. We have to take the country forward and that can be done by changing the basic policies hitherto adopted.

श्री हरिकेश बहादुर (गोरखपुर) : सभापति महोदय, राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण पर जो धन्यवाद-प्रस्ताव प्रस्तुत हुआ है मैं उसका समर्थन करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ।

सब से पहले मैं सरकार का ध्यान इस देश में बिगड़ी हुई कानून और व्यवस्था की तरफ खींचना चाहता हूँ। सरकार ने घोषणा की है कि स्थिति को सुधारने के लिए पूरी ताकत के साथ कोशिश की जायेगी। लेकिन बहुत अफसोस की बात है कि तमाम राज्यों में जो सरकारें काम कर रही हैं वे केन्द्रीय सरकार के साथ सहयोग नहीं करना चाहती हैं। कुछ राज्यों की सरकारें तो अपराधी तत्वों के साथ मिल कर और अपनी पुलिस तथा पी० ए० सी० के जवानों को साथ ले कर जनता पर अत्याचार कर रही हैं। मैं इसका एक उदाहरण आप के सामने प्रस्तुत करना चाहता हूँ।

यह अखबार है जो पूर्वी उत्तर प्रदेश के गोरखपुर जिले से निकलता है। देवरिया जिले में लोकदल के एक विधायक, पुलिस और मैजिस्ट्रेसी के अपसरों ने मिल कर जितना भयंकर अत्याचार नारायणपुर गांव में किया है, सब से पहले मैं उसका रहस्योद्घाटन करना चाहता हूँ।”

इसमें लिखा हुआ है—

“देवरिया के नारायणपुर गांव में पुलिस व पी०ए०सी० का अमानुषिक अत्याचार :— लाखों की सम्पत्ति लूटी गई : ग्रामवासी पीटे गये : महिलाओं की असमत लूटी।”

समाचार में लिखा है—

“ग्रामीणों ने बताया कि यह लोपहर्षक कांड एक विधायक की उपस्थिति में हुआ।”

फिर आगे लिखा हुआ है—

“पुलिस ने बद्ध महिलाओं तथा दस ग्यारह वर्ष की मासूम बच्चियों तक के साथ मुंह काला किया।”

आगे लिखा हुआ है—

“ग्रामीणों ने बताया कि गांव के हिन्दुओं को मुसलमानों का मुत्र पीने और मुसलमानों को हिन्दुओं का मुत्र पीने के लिए बाध्य किया गया। पुलिस ने हिन्दुओं की चोटी और मूछ नोचने के लिए मुसलमानों तथा मुसलमानों की दाढ़ी नोचने के लिए हिन्दुओं को मजबूर किया।”

यह काम किया है उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार की पुलिस ने और उत्तर प्रदेश में जिस पार्टी की सरकार है उस पार्टी के विधायक ने। बहुत अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि उत्तर प्रदेश के मुख्य मंत्री ने पहले बड़ी बेशर्मी के साथ इस बात को कहा कि इस प्रकार की कोई भी घटना वहां पर नहीं घटी, लेकिन जब उनके मंत्रीमंडल के एक मंत्री ने यह एडमिट किया कि बाहर भी और सदन के भीतर भी कि इस

तरह की घटना हुई है तो मुख्य मंत्री आज अपनी जान बचाने के लिए तरह तरह की दोहाई दे रहे हैं। इस तरह की निकम्मी सरकारें तमाम राज्यों के अन्दर काम कर रही हैं। अगर इसी तरह की सरकारें राज्यों में काम करती रहीं तो केन्द्र सरकार देश के अन्दर कानून और व्यवस्था की रक्षा नहीं कर सकती। यह एक बहुत ही शर्मनाक घटना है कि जो वहां घटी है और मैं इसलिए केन्द्रीय सरकार से अनुरोध करना चाहूंगा कि इस घटना को ध्यान में रखते हुए उत्तर प्रदेश की इस प्रकार की भ्रष्ट और बेशर्मा सरकार को तत्काल बरखास्त किया जाय और वहां पर फिर से चुनाव कराया जाय। वहां के मुख्य मंत्री... (व्यवधान)... आप अपने काले कारनामों को सुनिए और देखिए। आज जिस बेशर्मा के साथ आप इन तमाम कामों को करा रहे हैं उनको भूलिए मत... (व्यवधान)...

यह अखबार है जिसमें कहा गया है कि हरिजनों और अल्पसंख्यकों के ऊपर इस प्रकार के अत्याचार उत्तर प्रदेश की सीमा में किए जा रहे हैं। अलीगढ़ के अन्दर अल्पसंख्यकों के ऊपर कितने अत्याचार किये गये। मैं इस बात का गवाह हूँ, उस समय भी मैंने जाकर वहां पर आवाज उठाई थी और उस मुख्य मंत्री से कहा था कि आप वहां के अपराधी अफसरों के खिलाफ कार्यवाही करें, लेकिन दुर्भाग्य की बात है कि मुख्य मंत्री ने जिन्होंने कि हमेशा ही अल्पसंख्यकों के विरुद्ध काम किया है, उन्होंने कोई भी कार्यवाही इस पर नहीं की और उन्होंने इसे नामंजूर कर दिया। मैं अनुरोध करना चाहूंगा कि इस प्रकार की निकम्मी सरकारों को तत्काल बरखास्त किया जाय।

कल चौधरी साहब जाति पांत की बात कर रहे थे। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस देश के अन्दर अगर जातिवाद का विष किसी ने फैलाया है, अगर जातिवाद के भयंकर विष से इस देश को कई टुकड़ों में तोड़ने की साजिश किसी ने की है तो वह चौधरी चरण सिंह जी हैं जिन्होंने यह कुकृत्य किया है। इस बात का उन्हें जवाब देना चाहिए और देश को आश्वस्त करना चाहिए की आगे आने वाले दिनों में इस तरह की कोई घटना नहीं होगी। आज देश में केवल कौम के आधार पर, वर्ग के आधार पर, जाति के आधार पर इस प्रकार के तमाम संघर्ष फैलाए जा रहे हैं और लोकदल के नेताओं ने खुले आम यह भाषण किया है कि अगर कोई ब्राह्मण है तो उसका तिलक जूते की नोक से पोछ देना चाहिए। यह लोक दल के लोगों ने कहा है। इस तरह से संघर्ष फैलाने का काम किया जा रहा है और आज जाति पांत को मिटाने की बात की जाती रहती है। शर्म की बात है। इस तरह की बातों को लेकर आप देश को नहीं चला सकते, यह मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ।

मैं सरकार को इस बात के लिए धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ कि राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने अभिभाषण में कहा है कि अलीगढ़ मुस्लिम विश्वविद्यालय के अल्पसंख्यक स्वरूप को आश्वस्त करने के लिए विधेयक अगले सत्र में लाया जायगा। यह एक बहुत ही अच्छी बात है। इसके साथ अल्पसंख्यकों की भावनाएं जड़ी हुई हैं। मुझे विश्वास है कि शीघ्र ही इस विश्वविद्यालय का माइनारटी कैरेक्टर रेस्टोर कर दिया जायेगा।

हमारे देश में साइंस और टेक्नालाजी की क्या स्थिति है इस पर भी मैं प्रकाश डालना चाहता हूँ। आज भाभा एटॉमिक रिसर्च सेंटर के वैज्ञानिकों का बहुत ही डिमारेलाइजेशन किया गया है। उनके साथ इतना अन्याय हुआ है कि वहां पर वैज्ञानिक सूसाइड कर रहे हैं। अभी तक ऐसी घटनाएं आइ० सी० ए० आर० में हुआ करती थीं लेकिन आज वी० ए० आर० सी० में भी यह घटना हो रही है। मुझे पूरी उम्मीद है कि नई सरकार इस दिशा में ऐसी कार्यवाही करेगी जिससे इस प्रकार का डिमारेलाइजेशन जो हमारे देश के वैज्ञानिकों का हुआ है उसकी समाप्ति हो सके।

मैं सरकार से एक अनुरोध भी करना चाहूंगा और वह यह कि डा० भीमराव अम्बेडकर का एक चित्र संसद् के केन्द्रीय कक्ष में लगाया जाये क्योंकि वह देश के एक महान नेता थे और उन्होंने देश की आजादी की लड़ाई में और देश के नव निर्माण में महत्वपूर्ण भूमिका निभाई थी।

मान्यवर, मैं एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ चुनाव के समय में कितनी रिंगिंग हुई है—सबको विदित है। इस काम को कराने में राज्य सरकारों ने अहम भूमिका निभाई है। इस बात की जांच कराई जानी चाहिये और जांच में जो राज्य सरकारें दोषी पाई जाएं उनको तत्काल बरखास्त किया जाना चाहिये। इनको बरखास्त करने के लिए यही एक मुद्दा काफी है आज देश में कानून और व्यवस्था बिगड़ रही है। किसी की इज्जत, किसी की सम्पत्ति की कोई सुरक्षा नहीं रह गई है। केवल यही एक ऐसी बात है कि जिस को लेकर इन सरकारों को बरखास्त किया जा सकता है। इसके लिये फिर से जनता के सामने, जनता की अदालत में जाने की जरूरत है और वहां से मेन्डेट लेकर हम उन असेम्बलीज में बैठ सकते हैं, जिस प्रकार हम संसद में आये हैं। इसलिये मैं अनुरोध करूंगा कि बिगड़ती हुई कानून और व्यवस्था की स्थिति को सुधारने के लिये, बढ़ती हुई महंगाई को दूर करने के लिये शीघ्र कदम उठाये।

अन्त में मैं यह कहना चाहूंगा—आज देश में दिन प्रति-दिन बेरोजगारी बढ़ती जा रही है। हमारे देश के नौजवान जो स्कूलों, कालिजों और

[श्री हरिकेश बहादुर]

विश्वविद्यालयों से पढ़कर निकलते हैं, निराशा के वातावरण में इधर-उधर भटकते रहते हैं। अगर इस निराशा को खत्म नहीं करेंगे तो देश में हिंसा भड़केगी। जनता पार्टी और लोक दल के शासनकाल में 6टी पंच वर्षीय योजना के प्रारूप पर बहस हुई थी और उसको पास किया गया था। लेकिन अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि उस पर अभी तक कोई भी कार्यवाही नहीं हुई। इस बात को कान खोलकर सुन लीजिये—अगर देश के नौजवानों में व्याप्त इस अशांति को दूर नहीं किया गया, देश के लोगों का शोषण करने का प्रयास किया गया, यह सत्ता की कुर्सियों पर बैठकर उनको गुमराह करने का प्रयास किया गया तो देश की जनता इसको बरदाश्त नहीं कर सकती है। इसलिये मैं कहना चाहूंगा—6टी पंचवर्षीय योजना जिसको लागू करने के लिये पिछली सरकार ने कोई काम नहीं किया, अगर यह सरकार उस पर प्रभावशाली तरीके से कार्यवाही करेगी तब ही हम इस देश की बेरोजगारी को दूर कर सकेंगे और इस देश के नौजवानों के जीवन में उजाला लाने का काम कर सकेंगे।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं फिर माननीय राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण पर जो धन्यवाद प्रस्ताव आया है, उसका समर्थन करता हूँ।

✓ PROF. K. K. TEWARY (Buxar): I rise to support the Address of the President to the Joint Session of Parliament. I take this opportunity to thank him for the Address and support the statement made by him regarding the task that we have to face in the future and also the reference made by him to the Janata regime. I agree with the statements and also the kind of problems that we have to face as a country, as a Government.

Sir, I would like to draw your attention to the rule of the Janata Party. The Janata Party is not a new baby. It was not born in 1974. In fact, the Janata Party was born in 1967. The Janata Party is wedded and was wedded to its role of destabilisation in the country. They started this game way back in 1967. It was a notable political monstrosity when political parties professing different ideologies came under one banner; and they were pitted not so much against the Congress programmes as

against Mrs. Gandhi as an individual. This fight started in 1967; and then they succeeded by hoodwinking people and by dishing out hapney tapney rhetoric and ideologies. They succeeded in destabilising Congress Governments in many States and they captured power and you know the consequences which followed. The whole country is aware of their disruptive role. They lowered the morale of the people, ruined the discipline in the country. Well, they were safely deposited into the dustbin of history. Then Mrs. Gandhi, as the leader of the Congress Party had to take some bold economic steps to refurbish the image of India abroad and to ameliorate the worsening economic conditions of the poor and as a consequence the 1969 famous split in the Congress followed. Many of them are now adorning the Opposition benches. They were with us then. They broke away from us on certain economic issues and joined hands with the people who are boasting of democracy and are raising third-rate slogans about democracy versus dictatorship.

Again the 1967 drama was played in 1971. This discredited alliance was formed which came to be known as a grand alliance. The point which I want to emphasise is that the whole movement was not directed against the programmes and policies. If they were against the programmes, then how could the Jan Sanghies, the supporters of capitalists who were playing in the hands of the foreign lobby and the communists come together. How did it happen? So, my point should go home that they were not against the Congress programmes but against Mrs. Gandhi individually. Again this was revived with the support of our erstwhile Congress

friends and the entire opposition. Now the difference is between them is that of dweedledum and dweedle-dee—Lok Dal people or Janata people or their friends communists, because there is hardly any difference between the communists and communalists. The difference is very thin and it gets obliterated in the heat of their argument as they have been doing.

In 1971 they again ganged up under a new banner. They had a new garb this time. But the people of India knew their Indira better. They again defeated them. They gave them a mortal blow and sent them into wilderness. They had to live on herbs and grasses for many years. But unfortunately, time was not very propitious for us. We will remember and the whole House will remember. During this time, what happened when Mrs. Gandhi took over as the Prime Minister? Bangla Desh war, a new catastrophe for the country was looming large on the horizon and Mrs. Gandhi won the Bangla Desh war and covered India with glory. The people on the Opposition benches who were applauding Smt. Indira Gandhi as a 'devi', Durga mata, 'the defender of India', the same people took advantage of the attendant troubles which come in the wake of all wars and then, unfortunately, a spate of drought and flood conditions in many parts of India occurred. Taking advantage of this, they launched a movement. Revival of 1967, 1971 was again seen in 1974 and excuse me for saying this—the hordes of Philistines who came in the field during 1967 and 1971, later came to be known as total revolutionaries. Petty saboteurs who were responsible for the blowing up of Railways, they became instant revolutionaries and in the garb of instant revolution again the process of destabilisation was launched in a very mighty way by the reactionaries who are sitting on the Opposition benches and by throwing tonnes of dust into the eyes

of the Indian people, by hoodwinking them, bambeezling them, these people succeeded in wresting power, from the Congress Party. What followed and what happened after that, you please open your ears and listen to me. (*Interruptions*)

You please listen to me. This will educate you, some of you. When you came to power, when Janata Party came to power, the known slogan was that you were fighting in the name of democracy. I would like Shri Shastri, who is perhaps the most vociferous, irrationally vociferous member on the Opposition benches to hear. What happened? You are talking of democracy. What was your role? I would take you back to 1942. You and your Jan Sanghi friends, it does not lie in the mouth of Jan Sanghis and Communists to talk of democracy. When we were fighting, the whole country was engaged in desperate fight for freedom. What you and my communist friends were doing is known to the whole world. I need not shout it from the house tops.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: You were not born in 1942.

PROF. K. K. TEWARY: If Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee is in the House, I would like to remind him what the Jan Sanghis were doing. Is it not a fact that not even half a dozen lathi wielding R. S. S. friends courted arrest in 1942? What were they doing? And they are now talking of democracy. They should thank their stars. (*Interruptions*). And when you took to the streets you unleashed a war, a slanderous war against Mrs. Gandhi in 1974. You disrupted the functioning of duly elected governments. This august House was subjected to all kinds of vilification. You got leaflets thrown from the galleries of this House. You are responsible for all this. Even then, Mrs. Gandhi gave a call for elections and after the election results were declared, the power was

[Prof. K. K. Tewary]

gracefully handed over to you. And what did you do? You are talking of democracy. You remember the slogan that you are wedded to the removal of corruption from India and I would like my friends to remember when your Janata Party was in power, when Morarjibhai was the Prime Minister, unprintable and unspeakable charges were levelled by no less a person than the Home Minister of India against the Prime Minister and his son. They should be known to you. These are the landmarks in the field of removal of corruption. You remember your great leader, Morarjibhai, your great leader Babu Jagjivan Ram, and your great leader, Chaudhury Charan Singh were overnight 'replaced' by their sons and sons-in-law. How? Because they had acquired name and fame all over the world in the field of corruption. Where are these charges? I would like this House to take up the charges, the charges submitted by Chaudhury Charan Singh against Kantibhai Desai. They must be taken up, they must be proved and you must agree to this scrutiny. Then, you talk of corruption? I will speak about Mr. Jagjivan Ram, the photographs circulated in the city of Delhi and hundreds of charges levelled against him. Who did it? Was it done by any Congressman? It was done by your Lok Dal leader, Mr. Raj Narain. He levelled charges against Mr. Jagjivan Ram. Mr. Charan Singh levelled charges against Morarjibhai. You were very alert, very vigilant in removing corruption. These are some of the landmarks achieved by you in the field of corruption. Do not forget these things and your role is well-known in history. You will go down in history as the perpetrators of corruption, as people who immortalised corruption. And then you talk of defections. (*Interruptions*). When your so-called revolution started, you wanted anti-defection laws to be enacted. Let me remind you as to who started this vile game of defection in

India. You have called Mr. Charan Singh by various names. You have called him the king of defectors. Who initiated him into this sordid, vile game of defection? Have you forgotten 1967? He was a Congressman, you lured him out of the Congress fold, you offered him Chiefministership. You installed him as the Chief Minister. You taught him defection. So, he was the first defector at the instance of Jan Sanghis, and therefore, I say the difference between Jan Sangh and Charan Singh is that between tweedledum and tweedledee. The people of India have deposited the flotsam and jetsam of the Janata group who are sitting on the Opposition benches into the gutters. You should not forget it. Then you talk of defections again. I will again remind you when defections started and the most prized defector was Mr. Jagjivan Ram. Jagjivan Ram had defected after the elections were announced. The most prized defector is Mr. Jagjivan Ram and you welcomed him with open arms and you say you have saved democracy, you say you have ended the defection in the country.

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI
(Patna): What about Mr. Bahuguna?

PROF. K. K. TEWARY: Listen to me. The time at my disposal is awfully short. Otherwise, I would have extended the privilege of naming each one of you. One of the biggest defectors on the front benches is Mr. Charanjeet Yadav. Not long ago he was the General Secretary of the All India Congress Party and I had the good fortune or misfortune of meeting him very often. He was the Convenor of the Socialist Forum within the Congress Party. Remember his role. He was bringing about socialism. And now he happily shares his seat with the once famous Mr. Charan Singh, who is now the incarnation of casteism, communalism and groupism of the worst type. I would request you to ponder over the formidable problems facing the country to which

the hon. President has drawn our attention. You broke, you got split up. How? Not because of Congressmen, but because of your inner contradictions. And I am reminded of many of your misdeeds during your regime, but all these things have sufficiently been dwelt upon by my friends on this side. I would just draw your attention to one or two more points.

While I speak from this bench, I am again reminded of the grim struggle that we had to launch against your misrule. For this struggle, as on all previous occasions, the credit has gone to Mrs. Gandhi, and this time also the credit went to her for launching a grim struggle when you were bringing ruin to the country, when you were disrupting the economy of the country, when you were earning the opprobrium of the world and you were reducing the country to a non-entity when you were doing all this. (*Interruptions*). You talk of the welfare of the people the backward people and Harijans. I regret to remind you of what happened during your own regime. Nearly 23 persons were burnt alive in Belchi. Then your Government was in power, and you had a Trojan Horse in Jagjivan Ram. You brought him to the fore and you wanted the gullible people of India to vote for you, and you wanted to make him the Prime Minister of India. Who went to Belchi? It was the Congress President, Mrs. Gandhi, who went to Belchi, riding on the back of an elephant. (*Interruptions*) Even in the face of such provocations and the total ruin that was brought, Mrs. Gandhi advised Congressmen to launch only a peaceful struggle. Fortunately for the country, you have been cut down to your proper size.

You talk of foreign policy. What was your foreign policy? The kind of confusion that prevailed in foreign policy during the Janata Party regime makes every self-respecting Indian hang his head in shame. You were

trying to mend your fences with China while China was trying to mend its fences with America. So, you were pawns in the hands of the international imperialist lobby. You, Communist friends, you have forgotten all your past and also your Marx, and you can safely shake hands of friendship with the communalists sitting by your side. Similarly, China, is shaking hands with America. You were playing to the gallery. That was your achievement in foreign policy.

Just now, my young friend was talking about some State Governments. I must say something about the achievements of the State Governments. They are well known to the Members of the House. You may be ashamed of admitting your drawbacks and the follies committed by your Government, but tell me if there is any Government in Bihar today. Bihar is characterised by sheer lack of government. There is no Government in Bihar. I can say this on oath. I was contesting from Buxar against one of your stalwarts, Mr. Ramanand Tiwary. The present Janata Chief Minister happens to be an old disciple of Mr. Ramanand Tiwary. He camped there for one whole week, then he had deputed six cabinet rank Ministers in the six segments of the constituency and they were distributing money, granting licences for rifles and pistols, they were passing orders for construction of roads. Hospitals were being constructed, of course, only on paper. But we fought with full determination and faith under one leadership, the one which can deliver goods, which has saved the country in the past and which will save this country in future too. (*Interruptions*) Your great leader, Fernandes, who is a petty saboteur, was pitch-forked into an instant revolutionary, Mr. Fernandes contested from Muzaffarpur—what did he do? These things have come out in the press. He spent Rs. 1 crore in Muzaffarpur constituency, he hired a number of criminals and these criminals descended on the

[Prof. K. K. Tewary]

constituency on the election day and about one hundred booths were captured and I have also information that Mr. Fernandes distributed motor cycles and cycles and....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, order. The hon. Member should not make accusations against another elected Member of the House in this fashion indiscriminately. I would ask him....

PROF. K. K. TEWARY: Let him come and defend himself: You form a House Committee to go into the charges I have levelled against him. I stand by the charges I have made. If my charges are not proved, I am prepared to suffer any penalty you impose upon me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would request him to maintain some restraint.

SHRI M. M. LAWRENCE (Idukki): We have also heard about bicycles and blankets being distributed by your party.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is such a thing as election petition. If you think that Mr. Fernandes had indulged in any corrupt practice, it is open to anybody to challenge it in a court. Let this House not be turned into a court and forum for trading mutual accusations.

PROF. K. K. TEWARY: I do not believe in the philosophy of re-
crimination.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would only request you to exercise some restraint.

SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV: I would just draw your kind attention to one thing. As you said, no member should level this kind of baseless allegation against another member...

PROF. K. K. TEWARY: In the last elections, which was to determine the fate and the destiny of India, the people of India in their wisdom have elected a Government which can lead

us well, which has led in the past also. I am sure that the sacrosanct nature of our socialist programmes and policies will be carried out and will be implemented and the Government will firmly deal with an iron hand with all kinds of disruptive elements, whether they are speaking in the name of democracy or socialism, who are out to impose a sort of regime on the people of India which would lead us to destruction, which will unleash, as they did unleash during the Janata and Lok Dal rule, a kind of civil war based on casteism, sectional and narrow interests. I wonder how my friends who belong to CPI and CPM the people who swear by the name of Marx, can—they boast that they have won hands down—sit with the Jansanghis? Mr. Ram Avtar Shastri is always on his legs... (Interruptions) Why do they feel sad? By doing this, they have brought the name of "Marxism" into disrepute. They are a party wedded to the worst kind of communalism. They are aligning with people who are against the integrity of India; they are aligning with people who outright believe in casteism. They are aligning with people who are replacing our socialist and economic programmes by an extended and sustained programme of casteism. They supported Chaudhuri Charan Singh. Do you forget that in the late '50s, you used to call him a kulak leader of India? The communists are now very friendly with him; they are chummy with him. You support all the virulent casteism that he has unleashed... (Interruptions) You are quibbling with words. I make an appeal to my hon. friends to listen to me peacefully because I am trying to develop my arguments on something which is part of history and which cannot be forgotten by more quibbling of words. I am not quibbling, I am stating solid facts. If you have any arguments, you bring them up. You will get an opportunity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please wind up now.

PROF. K. K. TEWARY: I am making a solemn appeal to my hon. friends, let them not forget that the people are watching the sordid performance of communalists on the one side and that of communists on the other side. The people of India will not forget that.

There is a Bill before the House against hoarders and profiteers. I was rather shocked when I saw the abullient Bombay lobby working here which includes my colleague, on the other side, as senior Professor of Physics—he was equally abullient forgetting his age—and also an eminent lawyer from Bombay. They were in unison and they were the most vociferous members in opposing the introduction of the Bill against hoarders and profiteers. The Bombay lobby may flourish; they may be profited. But the people at large in India will be put to a grievous loss. They will continue to suffer because of the scarcities of essential commodities all around.

I am making an appeal to the people of this country to take note of how they are conducting themselves and that, in future too, when they talk of democracy, how they are utterly hypocritical. They should not give any credence to these people when they utter the name of democracy. Day in and day out, they are throttling democracy.

I want to refer to Mrs. Indira Gandhi's election. She was elected hands down with a thumping majority despite all the hurdles created by the Janata Party and the Lok Dal people and the communists alike. She won from Chikmagalur. What happened? This is the kind of democracy they are preaching and practising. This House saw the most vile drama ever enacted in free India where a leader who had led India for 11 distinguished years and who had earned name and fame for her outstanding statesmanship was removed from the House just to please a handful of people. All of you were silent spectators. You aided and abetted in that sordid

drama, sometimes at the behest of some of your colleagues and sometimes at the behest of the foreign lobby. Don't try to hide it. This is the kind of democracy you practised. I again warn you—it is a warning, not a threat; it is in your own interest—don't try to be hypocritical. Try to follow the great standards set by Jawaharlal Nehru. When you talk of socialist programmes, don't forget Mahatma Gandhi. You got vile books published against Mahatma Gandhi. You got the wildest possible books published against Jawaharlal Nahru. You funded them; you financed them. Sometime, the Jana Sanghis financed them; sometimes your CPI friends financed them.

15 hrs.

So, this country will exist even if you remain divisive. Therefore, friends, the uppermost interest, the prime interest in our minds should be the well-being of the people—the teeming millions of India. And at the moment, we are the elected Party and we are proud to have Mrs. Gandhi as Leader of the Indian National Congress. The people have reposed their faith in her leadership and policies and programmes, and all your hapney tapney rhetoric, your attempt to deflect us from the path, will not succeed. Therefore, I again make an appeal to you to be a constructive Opposition. You always talk of British democracy; you talk of American democracy, but the way you behave in the House and outside is the opposite. Your Atal Bihari Vajpayee and some other friends, including Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu—who is conspicuously absent—were so much agitated about the Assam agitation. Mr. Vajpayee has said he will lend his whole-hearted support to the agitation in Assam. What are you doing? Are you not a party to the disruption of the basic unity of India? Remember it: you may play to the gallery but the people of India will not forgive you and once gain you will be deposited in the dust bin of history and forgotten for good.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI (Bombay North West): Mr. Chairman, it has been a tradition of this House to pay a suitable compliment when a maiden speech is made. Before Lunch my young friend Mr. Madhav Rao Scindia made a maiden speech in Parliament and I wish to record my sense of appreciation of the excellence of the speech. It is not out of respect for tradition that I am doing so: it is my genuine sense of admiration, of what my young feeling and wishing that some day his feeling and wishing that some day his reason, his conscience and his influences at home will put him in the right company.

Mr. Chairman, a Motion of Thanks on the President's Address is an occasion on which the Government indicates its legislative and administrative proposals and outlines its solutions for solving the country's problems. It is an occasion on which the Opposition points out, according to its own light and wisdom, the inadequacies and pitfalls in the Government's policies and makes constructive suggestions for the acceptance of the Government, if the Government so chooses. I shall therefore utilise this occasion for only those legitimate purposes for which this occasion is meant and I shall not succumb to the temptation of making misuse of this occasion. I shall at least refrain from indulging in accusations and counter accusations, from hurling abuse and counter abuse. I think my Party has been abused to the satisfaction of the distinguished leader of the House.

I have something to say about Shri Kedar Pandey. (Yes, he is present). He told us at least six times in his speech that the Janata Party must admit defeat. We admit defeat; we have admitted defeat and we are here on this side of the House because we have been defeated.

It reminds me of a small little story. Once upon a time the great Birbal was asked by his Emperor to

find out how many blind people there were in the city of Delhi. Birbal did the extraordinary thing of sitting on a public road and polishing the shoes of other people and every friend who saw him polish still came and asked the question 'Birbal, what are you doing?'. So Birbal reported that everybody in the city of Delhi was blind. If somebody were to ask me to make a report on the faculties of Shri Kedar Pandey, however distinguished he is, I am afraid I shall be compelled to make a very adverse report.

Mr. Chandra Shekhar Singh embarked upon the role of an astrologer and he made a prophecy....

SHRI RAJESH PILOT (Bharatpur): Sir, on a point of order under Rule 352. I invite the attention of the hon. Member through you, sir, to Rule 352 which clearly says that a Member, while speaking, shall not make a personal charge against a Member....

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is not a personal charge. Please sit down. There is no point of order. Mr. Jethmalani will continue.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I have one word to say about what my distinguished friend, Chandra Shekhar Singhji, has said. He made a prophecy about the future of the Janata Party and he said that, in course of time, the Party shall vanish. It shall be a sorry day for this country when this Party vanishes because this Party shall vanish when democracy will have vanished from this country and when dictatorship will have been re-established. So long as democracy survives, this party shall survive, and this party shall survive for the protection of yourselves; it shall survive for the protection of you from you who today talk ill about the Janata Party....

THE PRIME MINISTER (Shrimati Indira Gandhi): We have had ample evidence of protection, Sir

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I shall not go into the question of defections about which my friend, Mr. Tiwari, talked. He talked about the king of defectors too: I do not wish to go into this question because but as a believer in democracy, I believe that it is the right of everybody in a democracy to change his opinions, to leave a Party and go and join another Party. (*Interruptions*). But, Mr. Chairman, I have a condition to put, that he who changes his mind, who changes his policy, must give up the benefits which he has acquired and which he continues to hold as a result of his previous protestations and previous declarations. On that footing, Mr. Jagjiwan Ram was not a defector because Mr. Jagjiwan Ram left a Party on the eve of elections and he resigned his office as Minister and went to the people contested elections. Those people who talk about defection ought to know what defection means. I am afraid we are taking recourse to using a lot of unintelligible clics going round and flying in the air. Nobody seems to have mastered the democratic spirit or seems to understand the true spirit of any concept whatsoever. (*Interruptions*) I have no admiration or sympathy for the defection from Janata Party of Mr. George Fernandes who is a Member of this House; I have no sympathy or admiration for his current actions or recent actions in the past. But let me say this that he too has been returned by an overwhelming majority of the people of his constituency. He is a distinguished Member of this House, and we shall oppose every move to denigrate any Member of this House without evidence. If Mr. Tiwari is prepared to take an oath in this House which he did—it not a practice in the House for Members to take oath because we believe the word of our members—, if he wants to take an oath and if he is satisfied that his oath is credible, let him take an oath before an election court and have Mr. George's election set

aside and have him disqualified for the next six years. We shall be happy if he brings about that result. But we hope that the court shall accept his word and the oath for which he claims credence. (*Interruptions*)

Now, let me apply myself to the few problems which are upper most in my mind. The first problem on which I wish to speak is a problem on which I have a plaintive cry to make, on which I have a pathetic appeal to make, to the Government of the day. It is not a question of politics, it is not a question of votes, it is not a question of gaining popularity or popular slogans. I am talking of the unfortunate plight of a very unfortunate section of the people of this country, namely, those who dwell in what have come to be known as slums. In my own constituency I have 250,000 people living in the slums. I want the Government and I request the Government. (*Interruptions*) Will you please sit down and listen for a change?..

SHRI HARIKISHAN SHASTRI (Fatehpur): In 1977 you should have said it.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I want the government to accept three principles. The first principle which I want the Government to accept is that those slums which are situated throughout the country on land belonging to the Central Government—there are four departments—the Defence, the Railways, the Civil Aviation and the Communications—all those poor people who are living in slums constructed on this kind of lands must get the same facilities from the State Governments and the local corporations as slum dwellers on other land. (*Interruptions*) Have you not shouted enough? Your leader is impressed. Why are you shouting more?

I want this to be accepted.

The second principle I want you to accept is that no poor man should be displaced from the hut or cottage

whether it is legally constructed or illegally constructed. He shall not be removed until and unless some national emergency requires it and only when a national emergency requires it shall he be removed and even then and this is the third principle subject to the condition that suitable alternative arrangement shall be made before the man's possession of his small house is touched....(Interruptions) I have too little time to make a political issue out of the misfortune or misery of others. But if you are inclined to make a political issue of it, you have it. For thirty years or more these slums have existed. These are not slums which have come into existence during the Janata regime. They even existed at a time when the Congress Party after every five years fought the elections and in every election you got their votes and you betrayed them. It is true that during the 2 1/2 years the Janata Party did not fulfil its promises to the poor people of this country living in the slums. I plead guilty to the charge that in 2 1/2 years we were not able to do what we ought to have done. That is why we are here on this side today. We did not do it for 2 1/2 years but you had 30 years and yet you could not do it. We were trying to do it until the dishonest persons interrupted the process of improving the quality of the existence of these people.....(Interruptions)

श्री गिरधारी लाल व्यास (झीलवाड़ा) : इन्होंने यह किया कि जिन बड़े बड़े आर प ओ ने गरीबों के मुकदमे लड़े, उन को हटा दिया।

SHRI VIKRAM MAHAJAN (Kangra): In Delhi the Congress Party gave alternative sites when they were in power. But you never gave alternative sites.

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT (East Delhi): Shame on you. Jawaharlal Nehru's policy was negated.

श्री गिरधारी लाल व्यास : मगरमछ के आंसू कब तक बहाते रहेंगे।

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Mr. Chairman, it is your business to keep the House in order, not mine. I shall keep mum till the disorder dies out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please allow him to conclude. He has very little time.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: During the election campaign promises have been made to the gallant Christian community—though small, it is a gallant community—that legislation which is designed to interfere with their legitimate fundamental rights, particularly, the right to propagate their own faith will not be tolerated and will be annulled. I, therefore, request the government to remind itself of a speech which their present Prime Minister made during the course of the election campaign in which she said that she was opposed wholly to and she had fought against Mr. Tyagi's Bill. Mr. Tyagi is not in this House any longer but as a member of the Janata Party had introduced that measure but the whole Janata Party opposed it and ultimately the Party came to the conclusion that such measures ought not to be encouraged.

I hope the Government will live up to its election promises and repeal the legislation which has already come into force in the three States of Orissa, Madhya Pradesh and Arunachal. If the promises made during the elections are seriously meant, I hope this promise will soon be fulfilled (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jethmalani, you will please conclude now.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: What can I do, Mr. Chairman?

Then, Sir, I wish to congratulate the Government for having promised to create in this country an independent judiciary and to maintain its independence. The sole cause of my be-

ing in politics is because of this. I would not be in politics if there was no threat to the independence of the judiciary. I am glad that they have now promised. But the proof of the pudding is in the eating. (*Interruptions*).... I hope that in future, the appointments which are going to be made will be upon the basis of qualifications on merits and the hated thesis of committed judiciary propounded by the late Mohan Kumaramangalam will be abandoned; the doctrine of the committed judiciary will be renounced. And the people will be appointed to the Bench on the basis of merits. (*Interruptions*) Sir, the Janata Government did a breath taking thing. They ratified the U. N. Covenant on Human Rights of 1966. But, even they did not go the whole hog to the extent to which I wanted. I request this Government seriously to consider the question of making a declaration under Article 41 of the first Covenant which deals with Civil and Political Rights—and I appeal to this Government if it wants to enhance its own reputation to ratify the Optional Protocol and create a fresh complaint to the U. N. Human Rights that every citizen is free to make a complaint to the U.N. Human Rights Body if they are being violated in this country. (*Interruptions*)

Sir, there is talk today in the air that the State Assemblies are going to be dissolved and the precedence of 1977 is being used. I want to make it clear. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV: Will nobody be allowed to speak? Mr. Chairman, if rowdyism is going on like this in this House, if anybody wants to make his observations and if he is not allowed to make them, how can we function in this House? They should not be allowed. The person is not even allowed to express himself. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, Order. Everybody should sit down. Please sit down I am on my legs. Allow Mr. Jethmalani to conclude his speech. He is winding up.

SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV: Sir, if Mr. Jethmalani is not allowed to express his opinion then how this House is going to function. He simply said that it is in the air that the Government is thinking of dissolving the Assemblies. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Sir, I wish to remind the Government that the situation in 1980 is widely different from the situation in 1977. First of all in 1977 elections the conduct of the State Governments was directly an issue because the State governments had enforced the Emergency measures promulgated by the Centre. Therefore, the whole 1977 elections was fought on the principle of condemnation of the Emergency and in the enforcement of Emergency the State governments were equal partners as much as the Central government was. (*Interruptions*)

Moreover, out of the Assemblies dissolved all except two had outlived their normal legitimate tenure of five years. They were all relying on the 42nd amendment to the Constitution. The 42nd Amendment and its propriety were directly the issue in the 1977 elections. I would commend to the Law Minister that he must read the judgment of the Supreme Court, particularly of Justice Fazal Ali—The Government must carefully study the judgment—and they will know the ground on which dissolution was upheld. It was not on the ground of merely the voting pattern but it was upheld on the ground that the conduct of the State governments was directly an issue in the elections. The situation is not comparable today.

SHRI R. S. SPARROW (Jullunder): Hon'ble Mr. Chairman, Sir, I feel privileged to stand before you for my first speech in this august House today in support of the Motion on the President's Address.

Sir, the first point on which I would wish to congratulate the House and my countrymen is for the benefit of outside people who may wish to know

[Shri R. S. Sparrow]

how we move about in our country that constitutional democracy is functioning and functioning very well. We have our ups and downs but amidst all types of turmoil around Central Asia and other places the teeming millions—660 million people—of India do have constitutional democracy and I think we all ought to be very proud of it.

I want to just bring out a few important facets concerning the Presidential Address. Some of the opposition members had remarked that perhaps the Presidential Address is somewhat over-ambitious. I would like to point out most humbly to them that any aim or any objective settled or established, has to be kept achievingly high, optimistically viable, as also practically workable.

So, this particular document that has been prepared is of very important consequence to all of us. I fully support that myself, individually.

Then, we have to take up the various facets concerning the background points which have got to be brought into focus very clearly.

I would now touch upon some of these important points very briefly.

Sir, India was on its way to progress. I do personally think—looking around other countries—that we were progressing very, very satisfactorily. And in fact, we were nearly achieving or had achieved a very high stature.

And now I will touch upon a couple of historical land-marks.

Sir, foreign aggression had been forced on us many a time. It started with the Jammu and Kashmir Operations of 1947 till the 31st of January, 1949. Then, as you will recall, there were troubles about our borders many a time. I will try to bring back to your memory the aggression in the Rann of Kutch. Then there was the Goa Wrangle of the Year 1960. Then there was the Chinese aggression of 1962 and then there was the Indo-Pakistan war of 1965. And then you have the triangular turmoil involving Bangla Desh, Pakistan and

India culminating in the Indo-Pakistan war of 1971. How certain powers usually wanted to make pawns of the under-developed and developing countries can very well be understood by many of us. But these did happen. The very first historical mark through which stature of India went high, I will shortly explain. The 1971 Indo-Pak War started. Yahya Khan and his associates on the other side were threatening us in no uncertain terms. We did not inflict war on them from our side. It was their own wrong choice to aggress into our house. Pakistan kept on threatening us menacingly. Not only that. Some other powers also came in to join her at it. Someone has already mentioned about the coming in of the Seventh Fleet of the USA in the Bay of Bengal. They were supposed to have told the Pakistani regime that they were coming, with all the force. The Voice of America and so many other papers spoke about this in no uncertain terms. China for that matter also started sending messages to say that Pakistan should keep on fighting, and that all arms would be sent to them. This was the situation that I am just recapitulating. Friendships can change. That is one thing. But China backed up Yahya Khan's regime then and told him that he should continue the war and would find all types of armaments sent to him. India fought alone; we were all by ourselves to fight these battles. The idea of the two big powers then was this: They were trying to frighten the then Prime Minister.—Shrimati Indira Gandhi,—a woman. They thought that they could frighten her to submission easily. They thought that possibly with such brow-beating she will say: "All-right", and with that coaxing, and that type of frightening attitude she perhaps would accept to go to the Security Council or the UNO and say, well, we are brothers, let us make it up; and so on and so forth. But the point to note is this that she did not get frightened. She was not at all frightened. She was made of a tough metal, she kept clam, steady and went on unshaken with the

task that was to be handled by her as Prime Minister, and the result was somewhat sensational;—sensational from historical point of view. She had to be very resilient to all types of talks, because all types of frightening stories were built. She had to remain calm and quiet, strategically and tactically balanced. She had to handle the war situation in a determined and adroit manner. Ultimately what happened? The result was that the armed forces of Pakistan were defeated in detail. Our forces under the aegis of our Prime Minister at that time fought all battles successfully, winning a resounding victory and Pakistan was broken into two. General Yahya Khan was previously referring to the old glorious names like Mahmud. Gazni, Timur and Chenghiz Khan. He said:

मिस्मार कर देंगे, फनाफिल्लाह कर दगे ।
But no. It happened the other way.
In other words. Gen. Niazi had to put his arms down—
हथियार-बर-जमीन

which incidentally reminds me of something else historically. I will recall this incident for your information about Chandragupta Maurya who 2300 years back went all the way to demolish the great empire of Alexander the Great. He had to give a big battle at Madain (Ctesiphon), 27 Km. south-east of Bagdad. I had the opportunity to visit that place some years ago. He fought this great battle against famous General Nicator Salucas, successor of Alexander the Great. A pitched battle took place and Gen. Salucas was defeated, his forces were destroyed. Chandragupta Maurya told him at that time: 'Put your weapons down'. Here also a similar thing took place in the case of Gen. Niazi. The above historical fact has also been recorded by a famous Persian poet Khaqani. The hon'ble Speaker had asked yesterday if there were any Persian couplets, to quote. And, here is one, showing the destruction of MADAIN:

भावख कि मदायन बुद
बैतुलशक्र ई रा रा
कर दे खजल अफ्रगश
खुरशीदे दरखशा रा ।
बुद जे तिन मामुन
असकंदरो खाका रा ।
इमरुज बयो विगर
ई बुंगाए वीरा रा ।

Mr. Chairman, Sir, India for the first time, after a long lapse of time, stood on its own two strong legs under the aegis of the Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi. We showed our mettle in a cumulative fashion correctly to the world at large. Not only that. Another historical landmark must be kept in view revealing the magnanimity part of Mrs. Gandhi, the winner of the 1971 Indo-Pak War. She knew that the enemy had been beaten in detail. Gen. Yahya Khan also knew that he had been beaten in detail. Yet with a large and magnanimous mind, she decided unilaterally and declared to bring cease-fire within 48 hours from India's side. She declared that the very next day of victory at 8.00 P.M. The person who used to say that he would fight for a thousand years also declared within half-an-hour cease-fire from Pakistan side. For the first time, in the history of the world, every bit and every inch of the ground taken possession of was returned with honour to the vanquished country. For the first time in the history of the world, no reparations were taken by the victor. Just take, as an example, the case of Germany. From the cease fire time of World War II, in 1944 till today, in one form or the other, Germany keeps on paying indemnity to NATO forces or others who still are on their soil. There are also some other countries which are still holding on to other people's land and soil and are not parting with it. It was

[Shri R. S. Sparrow]

Shrimati Indira Gandhi, who set a fine pace of ultimate good will and friendship or call it what you like and behaved so well with the fallen enemy. Our great traditions of India, our civilization and our culture were pragmatically applied. This was one point which I wanted to bring to the notice of the hon. Members. With that, India's stature went high. Unless you have some kind of actual power and potential power, no one cares a fig for you. Here was the first moment when India started feeling that we are on our own, we are not anybody's tools, not under anybody's bonds, we are independent India worth something great.

Not only that, then we had the nuclear explosion at Pokhran. There was, of course, some furore all round; but the main point was that it was accepted by all that how good the technocrats and scientists of India were; without much help from outside they placed India among the first six nations of the world in progress in respect of technology and potential power. These are the things which I thought, I would mention as a little background.

Then, I come to the economic field. I had myself had the opportunity of producing grain for the Central pool in the capacity of Minister for Food and Agriculture in Panjab. And I know the position. I heard Shri Charan Singh giving certain statistics. I would like to point out that there are other people who have also some statistics. We used to worry about PL 480 when they used to give us some kind of an awful wheat and also wanted us to put our signatures on the "dotted lines" in return. They were trying to dictate their own terms to us. But during the eleven years of Prime-ministership of Shrimati Indira Gandhi, our stocks went high. I remember, at one time when we used to put six and a half lakh tonnes of wheat into

the Central pool. Then in a couple of years we went upto 20 lakh tonnes and then 25 lakh tonnes. I want to remind Shri Charan Singh who was at that time the Chief Minister of U.P. that he had in his own State a deficit of 27 lakh tonnes of grain. That is just one small example to show as to how we kept coming up economically, potentially and from every point of view under an able and big leader, Mrs. Indira Gandhi. Such things historically cannot be forgotten.

Then, I would like to come to the industrial output. I come from a place where we have also certain industries, most of these in small scale and possibly some in mini size and so so. Industrially, we had started churning out so much output all round all over the country and our goods started going to foreign markets right upto Canada and Alaska; it may be hand tools, sweaters or shoes or anything. There is one Basti Sheikhan, in my own place Jullundur where we had started exporting goods worth about five and a half crores of rupees. If it works this way then you know what happens economically. Your manufactured stuff goes out of your country and money and other credits come in and circulate round, which in turn brings up the living standards of the masses. That is how America and Europe were built and this process was going on with leaps and bounds forward to our countries advantage. You may, from one angle or the other, minimize this statement. But I am looking at it from a bigger and factual angle. The foreign exchange was built up in its tall shape and our give-and-take accelerated, economically to help keep the price level in order whilst finding our way on to raise our living standards.

We own our mistakes. Yes; certain mistakes can be made. But so long as the scales outweigh the silly slips, I think, one has to accept the same to keep the country's progress going.

And then, as chance, would have it suddenly the nation was taken on a vicissitudal set back. The wheel turned the other way, and the Janata Party came into power. I do not want to go into details as to how it happened. Yes, I know every bit of it. One of my ex-General Secretaries, i.e., of the Indian National Congress Mr. Chandrajeet Yadav is sitting here who then asked me when the election results came, as to how it all happened. I gave it to him in writing as to how the Congress defeat occurred. Anyway, the wheel of destiny had turned. And this is what happened. I will not hesitate to point out to this august House a few things that came to my notice in that context. The wheel turned with so much of gusto and with so many promises from the side of Janata Party leaders that all seemed so enticing. And nothing seemed wrong with that at that time. But the Janata Party had hardly started, when things started going away. And the first thing that happened was that their team work would just not click. In fact, one top leader started to get at the throat of the other.

I want to make just a simple comparison. You want to play a game of football or hockey, but then if you start hitting your own companions, the goal is not going to be scored by your team. Only the opponents would score the goal.

You are talking about administration. I know what happened to administration during these 2-1/2 years. The team mates who were expected to carry out this task concerning 66 crores of people had really not time outside their own quarrels to attend to administration in reality. (*Interruptions*)

They were not children, but the sagacity needed to handle vast problems was not there. The thought of having to dovetail their efforts was not there. The result was that they did everything wrong for India, and India cannot excuse them for that.

Facts have to be mentioned. I have got the highest regard for many of the friends there. Atal Ji and others were there. I have the highest regards for them; but it is a question of playing with the destiny of the people of our country.

I will tell you something personal. I have no right to be standing before you here ladies and gentlemen. I should have been a dead body in the presence of others—18 counted times. When I used to fight from the burning tanks, it was the image of Bharat Varsha which made me keep on fighting and thinking that I should continue to fight. This is my perspective. How can then we afford to let India down. And I am not going to excuse anybody who does it. And, my party is not going to excuse such a group of them.

May I give some examples of mis-handling of our affairs.

Kindly bear up with me now because previously we had wasted so much of the time not through you Sir, but through some of my friends. I first bring in just one example. You know all about gold. How it vanished? How it was thrown up to disappear amidst the four winds. 7.7 tonnes of the gold reserve was disposed of at such a huge loss. I do not know why that big old gentleman was against gold. Sometimes he would bring in gold control and then just put it on for auction. I could not understand it. Nobody understood it. I have done my Economics also. Others have done it much more eminently, better than myself. This action of the ex-Prime Minister is something unheard of. Gold reserve is one of your national guarantees. Every nation has it. Russia has it. England has it. America has it. This is the guarantee for give and take, for aids, for running your business, for running all types of give and take trades. And here you were just throwing it through the auction hammer for about Rs. 640 per ten grammes. It was auc-

[Shri R. S. Sparrow]

tioned in between Rs. 600 and Rs. 700 per ten grammes and the promises that were given went something like this. Let it go into the masses and it will become very cheap to buy. But that proved wrong within a period of three months, it was at Rs. 800, Rs. 900, Rs. 1000; and then it went up and up till it came to Rs. 1500; and lately, about a month ago, it went up to Rs. 2000. After this Government quitted, it started to slide down in price. Economically, one could say more on this, but I will not take up your time because time is not there. But I have something more to say, if you very kindly bear up with me for another minute or so.

Much has been said about law and order and the rule of law. But what I want to bring to your notice is that there had occurred so much of carnage and blood shed during 2½ years of the Janata Party rule. According to statistics, as Chairman, Statistical Compilation Committee, I would be able to tell any of my friends, if you come to me, as to exactly how many deaths took place by shooting and by communal disturbances and by turmoil that cause to be all over India in that period. To quote a few cases it may be Aligarh, it may be Agra; it may be Aurangabad; it may be Amritsar; it may be Belchi; it may be Jamshedpur; it may be so many other places. All that happened, but the Janata Party was only staring dumb at it as if nothing was happening. Is this your creation or somebody else's creation is not my worry. But the fact remains that even during the Englishmen's regime, all the period—I know they used to bring two communities against each other—they had some idea or controlling disturbances. Here there was no control. It may be Pant Nagar; it may be any other place for that matter. Here you (Janata Party) failed miserably. I am sorry to say this. Let us not anyway let repeat such a thing again. If you have to stamp

somebody down, stamp it with all your emphasis and strengthen quick enough, so that others live happily.

About our foreign policy, I have to say something about which Janata Government missed very badly; and on that, I want to bring to your kind notice that in collusion with China, Pakistan put up Damocles' sword on our head, India's head, that is, Karakoram Road. They put it up there starting from Havelian, Thakot, Jalkot-Chilas Gilgit-Baltit-Pasu-Misgar-Khunjarab Pass and so over to Kashgar right into Sinkiang Province of China. I know to what limit its clause classification is 70, 30, 9 and so on. I also understand what military significance this rather strategic road holds. Unfortunately, such a serious thing had happened and the Janata Party did not move even a finger or make a protest on it. They did not care about it. I was surprised in my mind. If you do not know these things, for God's sake ask somebody who could help you. It is a vast country where there is no shortage of knowledgeable persons. This is something for which I cannot excuse the defaulters because we have to guard our national integrity very carefully. I know General Zia ul Haque is possibly making a mistake and our Prime Minister in very correct words has given our policy of non-alignment. We are going to stand on our own feet and we are friends to all. If somebody fights against us or is trying to give us some kind of trouble, he will be treated as an enemy. Otherwise, we have not got anything against anybody. Zia ul Haque was in my corps, in my own tank corps, then a junior officer, working sometimes under my aegis. I want to pass these words on to him. "For God's sake, do not indulge in something nasty, because whosoever in the world has been getting foreign aid of armament has destroyed himself." It may be Korea. It may be Kampuchea, Vietnam, Congo, Katanga, Uganda, Nigeria, Iran and now Afghanistan.

"For Gods sake, Zia, do not indulge in this wrong reverse type of race, otherwise you will smother yourself and not us. We our friend. We are not out to attack. My Prime Minister has a big mind. She gave everything that you asked for—I mean you predecessor. Think about mean your predecessor. Think about that we will help you. Why not? This sub-continent has to live by itself. We are both a prime force and we should be friendly. Therefore, we will help you in all matters."

Sir, I am a trained up man and I have to take notice of your bell. I must, therefore, stop. I have a few things to say, but now I cannot. A gracious kindness on your part to let me speak and indulge in this.

15.57 hrs.

ANNOUNCEMENT RE. SUSPENSION OF LUNCH

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before I call upon the next speaker, I have to announce that the Business Advisory Committee at its sitting held today have recommended that the lunch-hour might be dispensed with till the 2nd February, 1980. I hope the House agrees with it.

Accordingly there will be no lunch break from tomorrow the 30th January, 1980.

Shri N. C. Prashar. We are sitting upto 4 P.M. You have only seven minutes.

15.58 hrs.

MOTION OF THANKS ON THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS—Contd.

श्री० नारायण चन्द पाराशर (हमीरपुर) : माननीय सभापति जी, मैं राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण पर आये धन्यवाद के प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ। यह हमारे लिए सौभाग्य की बात है कि सातवीं संसद का उद्घाटन राष्ट्रपति जी ने नेताजी सुभाषचन्द्र बोस के जन्म दिवस पर किया और इन्दिरा जी के नेतृत्व में यह संसद एक ऐतिहासिक रोल अदा करने जा रही है।

राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण में सब से महत्वपूर्ण जो बात कही गई है वह है इस प्रकार की प्लानिंग के प्रति, योजनाबद्ध विकास के प्रति कमिटेमेंट की। हमें खेद है कि हमारी पिछली सरकार ने जो मोरारजी देसाई के नेतृत्व में चलती रही और जनता पार्टी के कार्यक्रम को अपनाती रही, उसने प्लानिंग के कंसेप्ट को सब से ज्यादा हानि पहुँचाई। यह देश का दुर्भाग्य रहा है कि नेताजी सुभाषचन्द्र बोस का नाम लेने वाली और महात्मा गांधी की समाधि पर कसम खाने वाली सरकार ने रोलिंग प्लान का कंसेप्ट निकाला जिसके द्वारा प्लान को ही रोल कर दिया गया। छठा प्लान बन नहीं सका, सातवें की तो बात ही क्या। इस प्लान के बनने के पहले ही जनता पार्टी के मोरारजी देसाई और चौधरी चरण सिंह सभी रोल हो गये।

मेरा कहना यह है कि देश ने आज नहीं आज से 40 साल पहले, जब कांग्रेस का अधिवेशन बम्बई में हुआ था तो नेताजी सुभाषचन्द्र बोस की अध्यक्षता में एक प्रस्ताव पास किया गया था कि योजनाबद्ध विकास के जरिये से देश के सब से ज्यादा गरीबों की किस्मत को सुधारा जाएगा। जवाहर लाल नेहरू की अध्यक्षता में एक कमेटी बनायी गयी थी और बाबू सुभाषचन्द्र बोस की सलाह से बनायी गयी थी तब प्लानिंग के जरिये से इस देश की किस्मत को सुधारा जा सके।

मुझे मालूम है कि जनता पार्टी में कुछ ऐसे तत्व थे जिन का प्लानिंग में न कभी विश्वास रहा था और न है क्योंकि उनके वास्ते तो प्लानिंग का मतलब यही था बड़े बड़े जो लोग हैं, जो अमीर लोग हैं और जो बड़े बड़े राज घराने हैं, उनकी ही सेवा की जाए और उनकी सेवा करने के सिवाए और कुछ प्लानिंग का मतलब नहीं है। सुभाष चन्द्र बोस ने कहा था, कांग्रेस ने कहा था कि प्लानिंग के प्रति हम को कटिबद्ध होना है क्योंकि प्लानिंग से ही हर गरीब आदमी की झोपड़ी में प्रकाश का दीप जलाया जा सकता है। इस वास्ते यह प्लानिंग का कंसेप्ट रखा गया था। इस प्लानिंग को तीन साल तक की छुट्टी दे दी गई, इससे बड़ा दुर्भाग्य देश का और क्या हो सकता था। नेशनल डिवेलेपमेंट काउंसिल की सीटिंग बुलाई गई उस में छठी योजना का स्वरूप स्थिर नहीं किया जा सका और विभिन्न प्रांतों से आये हुए मुख्य मंत्रियों और दूसरे लोगों को यह कह दिया गया कि हम को इस नीति पर विश्वास नहीं है। यह देश के इतिहास में सब से ज्यादा अंधकारमय युग था जब प्लानिंग को छोड़ दिया गया और गरीबों के प्रति जो हमारा संकल्प था सेवा भाव का, उसको भी छुटी दे दी गई। इसके लिए जो सजा श्री मोरार जी देसाई और जनता पार्टी को दी गई है वह सब के सामने है। एक कोने से दूसरे कोने तक एक ऐसी ज्वाला उठी कि जनता पार्टी तारीख से ही भिंट गई। ये लोग आपस में लड़ने रहे हैं। भारत की जनता ने एक काम बहुत अच्छा किया है। जो जगजीवन राम जी और

[प्रो० नारायण चन्द पाराशर]

सिंह जी इकट्ठे बैठते नहीं थे दोनों को अपोजीशन के बेंचों पर उस ने ला कर एक साथ इकट्ठे बिठा दिया है और अब दोनों आराम से बैठेंगे पांच साल तक। मेरा विश्वास है कि अब तो उन्होंने सबक सिख लिया होगा और उनको पता लग गया होगा कि उन लोगों ने असली गलती क्या की है।

जनरल स्पेरो ने बड़े अच्छे ढंग से बताया है कि टीम के तौर पर लोग चल नहीं सके। देश चाहता है कि जो सत्ता की कुर्सी पर पहुंच जाए वह अपनी जिम्मेदारी को समझे, देश को सम्भाले, परसनल बातों को हटा दे। इन लोगों ने देश की एकता के साथ उसकी अखंडता के साथ मजाक किया। पांडिचेरी और सिक्किम के बारे में क्या किया और क्या कहा? श्री मोरारजी देसाई ने देश की एकता के साथ कैसा मजाक किया वह इसी बात से साबित हो जाता है कि जब उन्होंने कहा था कि उनका अपना विचार है कि सिक्किम को इस तरह से मिलाया नहीं जाना चाहिए था। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या देश के साथ इस तरह की बात करना न्याय था? सिक्किम के प्रतिनिधियों के साथ यह न्याय था? वे लोग हमारे साथ कदम से कदम मिलाकर, कंधे से कंधा मिला कर चलना चाहते थे जहां कांग्रेस पार्टी और उस की नेता श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी देश को एक रखने के लिए आगे बढ़ते हैं वहां दूसरी तरफ श्री मोरारजी देसाई महात्मा गांधी की समाधि पर कसम खाने के बाद सिक्किम को यह हवा देते हैं कि वहां पर दूसरे तत्व सिर उठाएँ। इसके अलावा पांडिचेरी के विलय का सवाल जब आया और प्लेबे साइट और रेफंडम की बात आई तो श्री मोरारजी देसाई ने कहा कि हमें मालूम है लोगों का मंशा क्या है और इनका नतीजा क्या निकलेगा। वहां के लोग मद्रास में शामिल होना चाहते हैं। पांडिचेरी मिल कर रहेगा। आज श्री मोरारजी देसाई सदन में नहीं हैं लेकिन पांडिचेरी एक ईकाई है। लोगों ने यह साबित कर दिया है कि तानाशाह कौन है, श्री मोरारजी देसाई थे जनता पार्टी थी जो लोगों की भावनाओं को कुचलना चाहते थे या श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी और कांग्रेस पार्टी थी। इतिहास ने यह साबित कर दिया है। पांडिचेरी में आज भी कांग्रेस आई को तथा उसके दूसरे साथियों को विजय मिली है और श्री मोरारजी देसाई की पार्टी को सिफर। अब मैं समझता हूँ कि देश की एकता और प्लानिंग दोनों को एक नया जोड़ मिल है, एक नया प्रोत्साहन मिला है और आने वाले सालों में देश की एकता और भी मजबूत होगी और हमारा प्लानिंग का प्राप्ति और भी आगे बढ़ेगा।

प्लानिंग की जब मैं बात करता हूँ तो हमें एक बात को ध्यान में रखना होगा। सारे देश के लिए प्लानिंग एक समान नहीं हो सकता है, उस में एकरूपता नहीं लाई जा सकती है क्योंकि

देश के कुछ ऐसे इलाके हैं जो सीमाओं पर स्थित हैं, बोर्डर स्टेट्स हैं और कुछ हिल एरियाज हैं और उन के लिए हमें प्लानिंग का क्राइटीरिया डिफेन्ट रखना होगा। अगर हम 1 रेलवे लाइन प्लेज में पंजाब में डालना चाहते हैं तो हो सकता है कि उस पर तीन या चार लाख रुपया खर्च हो लेकिन हिमाचल में या जम्मू काश्मीर में उस पर 35-40 लाख रुपया खर्च होगा।

MR. CHAIRMAN: You conclude today because the Prime Minister will reply tomorrow.

SHRI G. M. BANATWALLA (Pomani): But, Sir, there are several others who have not spoken. The Muslim League is totally shut out of the discussion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What can I do?

SHRI G. M. BANATWALLA: That is not fair.

प्रो० नारायण चन्द पाराशर : हिमाचल, काश्मीर, नागालैंड, मणिपुर, अरुणाचल आदि के लिए वही यार्ड स्टिक नहीं हो सकता है जो उत्तर प्रदेश, बिहार, हरियाणा या पंजाब आदि के लिए आप रखते हैं। ऐसा आपने किया तो यह देश कि किस्मत के साथ न्याय करना नहीं होगा। राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण में जहां प्लानिंग के प्रति कमिटमेंट है वहां में यह भी चाहता हूँ कि आप इस बात का ध्यान रखें कि यह क्राइटीरिया भी डिफेन्ट हो। अप्रैल 1975 में विज्ञान भवन में आल इंडिया हिल पीपल्स वेलफेयर एसोसिएशन की तरफ से एक सेमिनार का आयोजन किया गया था जिस में पर्वतीय प्रदेशों के विकास संबंधी योजनाओं पर विचार किया गया था और उस में श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी आई थी और उन्होंने उसका उद्घाटन किया था। उन इलाकों की समस्याओं को सामने रखते हुए उस में एक प्रस्ताव पारित कर सरकार से यह कहा गया था कि विपुल धनराशि 'सफीशेंट रिसोसिस उपलब्ध किए जाने चाहिये प्रदेशों के उन हिस्सों के लिए जो पहाड़ी हैं ताकि वहां पर लोगों का आर्थिक विकास हो सके। ताकि वहां पर लोग अपना आर्थिक विकास कर सकें।

इसके अलावा और बहुत सी चीजें हैं, लेकिन समय कम है। मैं आपका ध्यान इस बात की ओर दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि जनता पार्टी ने देश की किस्मत के साथ न्याय नहीं किया और इसलिये नहीं किया क्योंकि उनका एप्रोच यही रहा कि कांग्रेस द्वारा जितने भी विकास के काम शुरू किये गये उन को खत्म किया जाए। स्वर्गीय ललित नारायण मिश्र ने 22 दिसम्बर 1974 को हिमाचल प्रदेश में पहली बड़ी रेलवे लाइन का उद्घाटन किया...

16.00 hrs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It has been announced that the House will conclude at 4 p.m. to enable Members to witness the Beating of the Retreat. So, you please conclude.

PROF. NARAIN CHAND PARASHAR: Please give me five minutes at least.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, how can I? कल प्रधान मंत्री जवाब देंगी, इसलिये आपको आज ही अपना भाषण खत्म करना है।

प्रो० नारायण चन्द्र पारशर : मैं कह रहा था कि उस रेलवे लाइन का उद्घाटन हुआ, उसके लिये राज्य सरकार ने जमीन दी, लेकिन उस लाइन को पूरा नहीं किया जा सकता क्योंकि सरकार ने यह कहा कि कांग्रेस सरकार में यह काम शुरू हुआ था और उसकी कोई रूप रेखा नहीं है इसलिए इस काम को पूरा नहीं किया गया। अभी हाल ही में श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी जी ने हिमाचल में यह घोषणा की थी कि उस लाइन को पूरा किया जायेगा, इसलिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस लाइन को बनाया जाए।

इसी प्रकार डा० शंकर दयाल शर्मा ने 19 दिसम्बर, 1976 को यह घोषणा की थी कि हिमाचल के लिये पी० एंड टी० सकिल होगा और उस दिशा में काम भी शुरू हुआ था। मैं चाहूँगा कि उसको भी अब पूरा किया जाय।

भारत की प्रतिष्ठा जनता पार्टी सरकार के जमाने में बहुत नीचे गई है और टि-यन अखबार में कहा गया है कि विदेशों में हमको वह सम्मान नहीं मिलता है जो पहले मिलता था। हमें आशा है कि नई सरकार के आने से भारत की प्रतिष्ठा बढ़ेगी। और प्रदेशों में जो भावना है कि हमारे साथ न्याय नहीं किया गया था जो विकास के

काम शुरू किये गये थे लेकिन जनता सरकार के समय बन्द हो गये थे उनको दुबारा शुरू किया जायेगा और पहाड़ी लोगों के साथ न्याय किया जायेगा। विदेशों में हमारा मान बढ़ेगा। हम चाहते हैं कि जो नया युग आरम्भ हुआ है उसमें भारत का सर ऊंचा हो और भारत के लोग भी प्रसन्न हों और समृद्ध हों।

BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE FIRST REPORT.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS AND IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH): I beg to present the First Report of the Business Advisory Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I propose to adjourn the House now to enable Members to witness the Beating of the Retreat. Before doing so, I may remind Members that tomorrow at 11 A.M. two minutes silence will be observed by the House in memory of those who gave their lives in the struggle for India's freedom. The Speaker will take the Chair a little before 11 A.M. The Members may kindly take their seats in the House by 10.55 A.M.

The House now stands adjourned to meet again tomorrow at 10.58 A.M. 16.03 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till fifty-eight minutes past Ten of the Clock on Wednesday January 30, 1980/Magha 10, 1901 (Saka).