

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU (West Bengal): So long as they were there in the Opposition, every day they used to stall the proceedings...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: You adjourn the House. Sir, the House must be adjourned. *(Interruptions)*

The House must be adjourned. *(Interruptions)*

MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE (Maharashtra): Sir, the House must be adjourned. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Nobody should be allowed to play foul with parliamentary decorum.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): Particularly, when the Leader of the Opposition is going to speak, courtesy demands that either the Leader of the House or a Cabinet Minister must remain present to listen to the Leader of the Opposition. It is not fair.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: No, Mr. Pranab, Babu, a Cabinet Minister must always be present in the House. *(Interruptions)*

Sir, you adjourn the House. *(Interruptions)*

Kindly adjourn the House. *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: I adjourn the House for fifteen minutes.

The House then adjourned at six minutes past two of the clock.

The House reassembled at twenty two minutes past two of the clock, MR.

CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

MOTION OF THANKS ON THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS (Contd.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. G. Swaminathan, please continue.

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: Sir, I have been talking about the lady, Fatima Bibi, in whose house some extremists were living, whom the Tamil Nadu Police has arrested and from whom the Police

has also got some bombs. I had been mentioning in the House that she had only rented her house. She didn't know what was happening. The Police said that Fatima was the 6th Division Secretary of the Puratchi Thalathi Narpani Manram and she holds some post in the AIADMK. Sir, AIADMK is a very large party. I have also been mentioning about the Dravidian Party. The very reason why the Police has been searching all the places is of the extremists who took away bombs from Coimbatore. One of those persons is one Aisha, who is considered to have taken the bombs along with her. Sir, people in Tamil Nadu have all the time been talking about this lady, the lady who has taken these bombs and had terrorists in her house. Sir, DMK and the Dravidian parties have always had some soft corner for the Muslims and many of the Muslim gentlemen were there in our party also. This lady, Aisha, whom the Police wanted to arrest and whom they ultimately got arrested was an extremist. The Police were looking for her. Her grandfather was formerly a DMK Town Secretary and he is now the President of the Mansapuram Agricultural Cooperative and Credit Society. Her uncle is a District representative of DMK. Her brother is a Town Panchayat Secretary of DMK. What I want to mention here is...

SHRI C.P. THIRUNAVUKKARASU: From where have you got this information.

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: This has already been published in the Press.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Thirunavukkarasu, please sit down.

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: It is in *The Hindu*, Sir. *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is not yielding, Mr. Thirunavukkarasu. You sit down. You speak when your turn comes.

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: This is a news item in the *The Hindu* datelined Chennai, March 28. It gives this information wherein it has been

mentioned that the information is as given in the statement of my leader, Jayalalitha, and all these things have been very clearly stated. Now, what I want to say is, they can always dispute the facts and bring it before the House. What I would like to say is that this Fatima Bibi had given the house or rent. Sir, a similar thing had happened in Karnataka. You may remember that a house had been rented out to the one-eyed man, Sivarasan of LTTE by Shri Aswathanarayanan who was a Congress member at that time. Then it was said that the Karnataka Congress people were supporting Sivarasan. Later on, they came to the Jain Commission and the Jain Commission said that simply because somebody had rented the house does not mean that they were accomplices to them. I would only wish to say this thing. Sir, not only bomb blasts...
...(Interruptions)...

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: He had not rented his house.

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: One Aswathanarayanan of Karnataka had rented his house to him. ...*(Interruptions)*... Or he was a party to renting the house... *(Interruptions)*... Shrimati Margaret Alva was here. There was a big controversy going on about Karnataka. ...*(Interruptions)*... He was a Youth Congress member. ...*(Interruptions)*... The Karnataka Members were here and they can tell him. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: The House did not belong to him. He had not rented that house. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): Sir, what is the hon. Member discussing here? We are discussing the Motion of Thanks. Mr. Swaminathan is a senior Member of this House. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Swaminathan, either you must not be a victim of interruptions or you go on speaking. ...*(interruptions)*... Let him speak. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: Sir, not only bomb blasts, regular murders of party workers are also being committed. On 28th March, a Commerce Professor of Madurai College... ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Sir, he is talking about so many murders.

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: Sir, this is the situation which has been prevailing over there. ...*(Interruptions)* Finally, Sir, I would say about one more point. Sir, the information regarding bomb blasts in Tamil Nadu... ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: Sir, the information regarding bomb blasts in Tamil Nadu is not a new thing. We have been hearing that information from the CID in Tamil Nadu and from the Centre has gone to the Government of Tamil Nadu. The hon. Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu while replying to the Motion of Thanks to the Address of the Governor stated—I don't have the English version but it clearly says in Tamil, Tamil Nadu, Kowalturai, December, 11. The Intelligence of Tamil Nadu Police had come out that there will be such bomb blasts. Sir, the Joint Commissioner of Tamil Nadu Intelligence again sent a message on December, 21. Sir, again the SP, CID Police sent a message on December, 27, as also the DGP. Then the Government of India sent a message on December, 21. Then a message from DGP Delhi had gone to Tamil Nadu on January, 2. So, messages regarding bomb blasts had been going to Tamil Nadu from December, 11 onwards. These messages had been going on for the last more than two months. As per the statement of the hon. Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu, 2,019 gelatine bombs and detonators, 207 kilograms of explosives and guns were recovered there. Ninety-five people were arrested and 49 cases registered. This has been going on for the last two months.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How much more time will you take?

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: I am about to compete.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please wind up.

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: What I wish to say is that the Tamil Nadu Government has been very inactive. I would like to mention one more point. Sir, when I went to the President—I don't know whether it is relevant or not—for giving the letter, then a discussion came up. He also said that he had received some letters from the people of Tamil Nadu. So, the people have sent messages even to the hon. President. These messages have been there in a Press. These messages have been given by the Tamil Nadu Intelligence; these messages have been given by the Central Intelligence. They knew about it for the last two months. My personal feeling is that they had been preparing for these things for the last more than two years. Otherwise, nothing like this would have happened in Coimbatore. What was the Tamil Nadu Government doing all these years? They are still recovering bombs. So, ultimately I charge the Government of Tamil Nadu and the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu for this inefficiency as they have not done anything so far. I would conclude with only one slogan of the hon. Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu. He is a Tamil point and is very good in punning words. Those days, when Shastriji was the Prime Minister, one Alagesan was a Minister in Railways and there was a rail accident. After that accident, the Dravidian Party, at that time AIADMK was also a part, the present Chief Minister coined a slogan wherein he said in Tamil and I would give it in English: Alagesan of Adiyalur fame, is it not enough that you have ruled, having sufficient people died? This is the slogan he gave. I want to repeat it to the hon. Chief Minister with regard to the death and what is happening there. I want him to resign taking responsibility for what has happened in Tamil Nadu. (Interruptions)

SHRI V. P. DURAISAMY (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Swaminathan, this is not in good spirit. (Interruptions) He is a senior leader! (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do not enter into a dialogue, please. (Interruptions)

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: The Chief Minister is not taking responsibility and the Member should take the responsibility. (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Motion that has been moved and seconded is:

"That the Members of the Rajya Sabha assembled in this Session are deeply grateful to the President for the address which he has been pleased to deliver to both Houses of Parliament assembled together on March, 25, 1998."

There are 164 amendments which may be moved at this stage.

SHRI BALWANT SINGH RAMDOWALIA (Uttar Pradesh): I move—

1. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention any time bound action plan for eradicating corruption by bringing about transparency and accountability in Administration."

2. That at end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention about implementation of any time bound plan of poverty alleviation despite every third person is found to be hungry."

3. That at end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention any time bound plan to make arrangements for providing compulsory primary education to all the children in the country."

4. That at *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

“but regret that the Address does not mention any time frame to bring the production rate of oil seeds, pulses, wheat and rice at par with the maximum production rate in the world.”

5. That at *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

“but regret that the Address does not mention about effective steps to be taken by Government to check the fertile land from becoming barren land due to fall in Ground Water Table in the States like Punjab etc.”

6. That at *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

“but regret that the Address does not mention about any time bound scheme to augment the capital investment in the Agricultural sector.”

7. That at *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

“but regret that the Address does not mention about any concrete steps to be taken by Government to rectify the mismanagement prevalent in the field of water management in the country.”

8. That at *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

“but regret that the Address does not mention about any concrete action to make use of about 50% unutilised water in the country by completing all the projects like Thein Dam without further delay.”

9. That at *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

“but regret that the Address does not mention to repeal the restrictions imposed by the State Government on the right to purchase land in Rajasthan by the residents of Punjab.”

10. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

“but regret that the Address does not mention about the implementation of any time bound scheme to provide drinking water to each village of the country having population over 500 and to connect them by all weather roads”.

11. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

“but regret that the Address does not mention about any concrete measures to be taken for checking the loss of human lives in railway accidents due to human errors.”

12. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

“but regret that the Address does not mention any decision to be taken for reframing the Housing Policy in view of the Housing necessity of the country.”

13. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

“but regret that the Address does not mention about implementation of any time bound action plan for the upliftment of the living standard of the downtrodden, Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes in the country.”

14. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

“but regret that the Address does not mention about the special efforts to be made for the utilisation of electronic media for creating a clean, healthy, moral and harmonious atmosphere in the country and removing the superstitions among the new generation and inspire them to have scientific knowledge and intellectual rationality.”

15. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

“but regret that the Address does not mention about the effective

steps to be taken for removing the causes attributing stickiness in the small scale and cottage industries."

16. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention about the effective steps to the unnecessary delay for years together in providing counselling services to the India immigrants residing in foreign countries, uncertainty of taking decisions about the disputes relating to them, harassment and misbehaviour with them and demand of bribe by some officials of the Embassies, and their harassment at the Indian Airport during their visit to India etc."

17. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention about the effective action to check the usurption of the benefits of reservation by certain prosperous castes due to their inclusion in the Lists of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes which deprives the real downtrodden and Scheduled Tribes from those benefits."

18. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention about punishing the officials who do not pay any attention to provide 3% jobs, as provided by the Law, to the Handicapped in Government and Semi-Government institutions of the country."

SHRI JIPON ROY (West Bengal): I move—

19. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address fails to mention introduction of the system of secret ballot for the purpose of determining the recognition of unions in industries."

20. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address fails to mention about the need for workers' participation in management."

21. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address fail to mention about the need to sanction revival packages for those public sector enterprise which are referred to BIFR like IISCO, MAMC, BOGL, Cycle Corporation of India, Tyre Corporation of India, Jessop, NTC, NJMC, Durgapur and Haldia unit of Hindustan Fertilizer Corporation."

22. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address fails to mention about the need to declare Calcutta and Chennai as A-1 cities."

23. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention about any concrete steps contemplated by the Government to usher in a process of actual and meaningful development in the North-Eastern States and effectively curb extremist activities in the region."

SHRI DIPANKAR MUKHERJEE: (West Bengal) I move—

24. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention about any continued hike in the prices of essential commodities."

25. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention about sickness of industries and effective measures to curb rampant corporate misman-

agement leading to sickness in corporate sector."

26. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention about revival of sick public sector units like IISO, Jesop, Burn Standard, National Instrument, MAMC, BOGL, Tyre Corporation of India, Hindustan Cables Durgapur and Haldia units of Hindustan Fertilizer Corporation, NTC, NJMC, Jute Corporation of India, Bengal Immunity, Smith Stanistreet, Cycle Corporation of India etc."

27. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention about the statutory dues to Central Public sector unit workers."

28. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention about guaranteeing minimum wages to agricultural labours."

29. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention about recognition of single trade union through secret ballot."

30. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention about the concrete measures to be taken to arrest soil erosion in border districts of West Bengal."

31. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention about improvement of navigation in Hooghly river to improve condition of ports at Calcutta and Haldia."

32. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention about large scale subsidence which is taking place in Raniganj-Jharia area due to unscientific mining operation."

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE (West Bengal) I move—

65. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not clearly spell out the implication of treating all the 18 languages included in Schedule VIII of the Constitution as Official language."

66. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention the failure of the Government to resolve the long standing Cauvery Water dispute."

67. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention availability of the resources to earmark upto 60 percent of the plan fund for agriculture."

68. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention about the concrete measures being taken to step up the rate of domestic savings at the level of 30% of G.D.P. over the next 5 years."

69. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention any specific step to involve the labour as equal partner in national reconstruction."

70. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention how the resources will be mobilised to step up investments

substantially in the infrastructure sector."

71. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention the level of investment in the social sector which has been considered to be inadequately funded."

72. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention what specific measures will be taken to reach out the under-privileged and unemployed."

73. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention how the resources will be mobilised to provide free education to women upto Graduation."

74. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention about Ruling Party's immoral and unethical action to create artificial majority by causing defection in other Parties."

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH (Assam):
I move—

75. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention that the Protection of Places of Worship Act, 1991 which freezes the status of all places of worship as on 15th August, 1947 will be strictly enforced."

76. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention of the importance of Khadi and Village industries in promoting employment in rural areas."

77. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention any concrete programme to promote the welfare of Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, and other backward classes."

78. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

"but regret that the Address is silent on the future of Minorities Commission."

79. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

"but regret that the Address has nothing to say about reversing the industrial slow down and sharp deceleration in export growth."

80. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not outline any coherent strategy to achieve the growth rate of 7-8 per cent."

81. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

"but regret that the Address makes no mention of the need to expand agricultural credit system."

82. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

"but regret that the Address makes no mention of the need to expand the mid-day meal programme for school children."

83. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

"but regret that the Address makes no mention of the need to set up a separate National Commission for Scheduled Tribes and give it a statutory status."

DR. SHRIKANT RAMCHANDRA JICHKAR: (Maharashtra) I move—

84. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address fails to mention the measures proposed to be taken for the Melghat tribal area in the Amrawati District of Maharashtra where more than 5000 tribal children below the age of 5 years have died due to malnutrition and disease during the last three years."

85. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address fails to mention the steps proposed to be taken to give relief to the victims of the widespread hailstorm which had hit Vidarbha region of Maharashtra extensively damaging property, standing crops and oranges."

86. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address fails to mention about any programme to give Pneumonia Vaccine to Children below the age of five years."

87. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address fails to mention about receiving all possible vaccines which is the birth right of children below the age of five years."

88. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address fails to mention about the steps proposed to be taken for the prevention and control of AIDS and the need to activate and enthuse NACO and its officers and make them committed for the work of AIDS."

89. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address fails to mention about the need to assist, help and fund the NGO who are tirelessly doing field level work for the prevention and control of HIV/AIDS."

90. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address fails to mention about the most unwise use of huge funds by the officers of NACO, totally neglecting the actual felt needs and field realities in the matter of control and prevention of HIV/AIDS."

91. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address fails to mention about the sudden stoppage of the production of Typhoid Vaccine by the haffkine Institute Biopharmaceutical Corporation, Mumbai on the instructions of the Government of India causing great hardship in the vaccination programme and denying of the in expensive vaccine in favour of the expensive vaccine available in the market."

92. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address fails to mention about the huge number of pending cases for registration under the Foreign Contribution Regulation Act, 1976 and the need for their early disposal."

93. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address fails to mention about the need to take special steps for the Oranges and Cotton crops in the Vidarbha region of Maharashtra."

SHRI S. RAMACHANDRAN PILLAI
(Kerala): I move—

99. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

“but regret that the Address does not mention about the political immorality committed by the present government at the Centre.

100. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

“but regret that the Address does not mention about upholding genuine secularism that stands for separation of politics and religion.”

101. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

“but regret that the Address does not mention that this government will not resort to forceful population control on the basis of belonging to a particular religion.”

102. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

“but regret that the Address does not mention to protect the interests of peasants from adverse effects of GATT agreement and WTO.

103. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

“but regret that the Address does not mention to pass a central legislation providing minimum wages and social security measures to the agricultural workers in the country.”

104. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

“but regret that the Address does not mention to provide a mechanism to protect peasants from the adverse effects of price fluctuations of agricultural crops.

105. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

“but regret that the Address does not mention about fighting corruption and allow law to take its own course in corruption cases.”

MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE
(Maharashtra) I move—

106. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

“but regret that the Address makes no mention of the importance of Khadi and Village industries in promoting employment in rural areas.”

107. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

“but regret that the Address does not mention any concrete programme to promote the welfare of scheduled castes, scheduled tribes, and other backward classes.”

108. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

“but regret that the Address is silent on the future of Minorities Commission.”

109. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

“but regret that the Address makes no mention of the need to expand agricultural credit system.”

110. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

“but regret that the Address makes no mention of the need to set up a separate National Commission for Scheduled Tribes and give it a statutory status.”

111. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

“but regret that the Address does not reflect Government's determination to provide adequate financial and other assistance to the hapless farmers of Vidarbha region of Maharashtra who have lost their crops, orchards, livestock, huts and semi-pucca house due to untimely and unprecedented rains and hails torn so as to heal their wounds inflicted by natural calamity.”

112. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention about Government's action plan to provide adequate financial assistance to the cotton growers of Maharashtra whose cotton crop has been destroyed by non-seasonal rains and who have totally been ruined due to non fulfilment of assurance by Maharashtra Government and cotton Corporation of India to purchase their saved cotton crop at the rate of one thousand rupees per bale which has demoralised the cotton growers and if timely help is not provided immediately, Andhra type situation may develop in the cotton belt of Maharashtra also."

113. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention about the abnormal rise in crimes against women throughout the country and Government's determination to contain crimes against women by enacting deterrent punishment laws for crimes against women."

SHRI WASIM AHMAD (Uttar Pradesh) I move—

114. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention about the growing danger of communalism and casteism."

115. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention about the growing trend of subversion of parliamentary and legislative practices as recently witnessed in U.P."

116. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention about the ill-effects of foreign media in our country."

117. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention about any time bound programme of action for the socio-economic and educational development of the Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, OBCs and Minorities."

SHRIMATI SHABANA AZMI
(Nominated) I move—

118. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention about any concrete time bound programme to provide Housing for all by the year 2020 A.D. and that while there will be private participation in this national endeavour, the Government will not abdicate its own responsibility."

SHRI J. CHITHARANJAN (Kerala):
I move—

132. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention about any specific plan to solve the problem of educated unemployed particularly of the educated youth in rural areas."

133. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention about the need for enactment of a central legislation to protect the interests of agricultural labour."

134. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention about the need for the effective implementation of Land Reform Laws throughout the country."

135. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention about the fall in prices."

of agricultural products like cotton, jute, rubber etc. leading to a situation where a number of farmers have committed suicide in different states."

136. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention about the need to expedite the completion of investigations to Bofors deal and some other financial scandals."

137. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

"but regret that the Address fails to ensure that the religious places at Mathura, Varanasi etc. will not be demolished."

138. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention any effective measures to check corruption at various levels corroding the vital economic and political system."

139. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention about the steps proposed to be taken to stop serious atrocities committed on women and members of weaker sections of the society."

140. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not take note of the rampant violation of labour laws by industrialists denying the benefits of provident fund scheme, ESI scheme, minimum wages etc. to the workers."

141. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

"but regret that the Address fails to mention that the private sector, indigenous or foreign, will not be allowed to enter the Insurance sector"

142. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention about the need to revamp public sector to fight onslaughts of multinationals."

143. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not take note of the plight of the public sector undertakings like SAIL, BHEL etc. suffering from high rate of inventories and under-utilised capacity due to lack of orders for their products due to wrong import policy of the Government."

144. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not take note of the serious problem of insurgency in Manipur and other North-Eastern states and need to take effective measures to solve the problem."

145. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not express its serious concern about the atrocities and discriminations against women in Manipur."

146. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention of any steps to provide fair price to jute cultivators in West Bengal and Orissa and potato growers in West Bengal."

147. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not take note of the failure of the Government to implement the legislation for using 50 per cent of the requirements of packing of cement in jute bags causing immediate difficulties to jute industry and jute workers."

148. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

“but regret that the Address does not mention about the implementation of any time bound plan of poverty alleviation despite every third person is found to be hungry.”

149. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

“but regret that the Address does not mention about any time-bound plan to make arrangements for providing compulsory education to all the children in the country.”

150. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

“but regret that the Address does not mention about the implementation of any time-bound scheme to provide water to each village of the country having population over 500 and to connect them by all weather roads.”

151. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

“but regret that the Address does not mention about the effective steps to be taken for removing the cause attributing sickness in the small scale land cottage industries.”

152. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

“but regret that the Address does not mention about introduction of the system of secret ballot for the purpose of determining the recognition of unions in industries.”

153. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

“but regret that the Address fails to mention about the need for implementing the scheme of workers' participation in management.”

154. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

“but regret that the Address fails to mention about the need to sanction

revival package for those public sector enterprises which are referred to BIFR like IISCO, MAMC, BOGL, Cycle Corporation of India, Type Corporation of India, Jessop, NTC, NJMC, Durgapur and Haldia units of Hindustan Fertiliser Corporation.”

155. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

“but regret that the Address fails to mention about the need to declare Calcutta and Chennai as A-1 cities.”

156. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

“but regret that the Address does not mention about concrete steps contemplated by the Government to usher in a process of actual and meaningful development in the North-Eastern states and effectively curb extremist activities in the region.”

157. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

“but regret that the Address does not mention about the continued rise in the prices of essential commodities.”

158. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

“but regret that the Address does not mention about sickness of industries and effective measures to curb rampant corporate mismanagement leading to sickness in corporate sector.”

159. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

“but regret that the Address does not mention about guaranteeing statutory minimum wages to agricultural labourers.”

160. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:—

“but regret that the Address does not mention about the need for

extending revamped public distribution scheme all over the country particularly in neglected rural areas."

161. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address fails to mention about the staggering decline in the value of rupee against dollars."

SHRI SANATAN BISI: I move

162. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention about the cause of mid-term election."

SHRI C.P. THIRUNAVUKKARASU: I move

163. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention about the need to declare Pondicherry as a State with special status."

164. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not mention about implementation of the interim award passed by Cauvery Tribunal to supply water to Tamil Nadu and Pondicherry."

The question were proposed

DR. MANMOHAN SINGH: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I thank the hon. President for his gracious Address, but note with regret that it does not project any clear vision of India's future; nor does it contain a clear statement of the challenges, strategies, policies or programmes that our country needs to meet those challenges. This is also true of the so-called National Agenda of Governance as much. We all know politics in our country has ceased to be an engine of purposeful social change. The malfunctioning of our political system has given rise to a good deal of

cynicism all round. We also know that our economy in the last 18 months has greatly slowed down. Industry is clamouring for positive action on the part of the Government. Our exports have nearly collapsed. The external environment for India's development has deteriorated. Developments in Asian countries, have serious consequences on the functioning of our economy. But, none of these have been taken note of in the President's Address or addressed to meaningfully in the so-called National Agenda of Governance.

Mr. Chairman, both the National Agenda and the President's Address talk about evolving a meaningful national consensus. Given the state of our fractured polity, I do agree with the Prime Minister and my colleague, Shri Sunder Singh Bhandari, that all political parties will have to rise above their narrow sectarian concerns if the Governance of this country has to move on the desired lines. We recognise that the country comes first, the political parties come thereafter. On behalf of our party, the Congress President, Smt. Sonia Gandhi, has already promised constructive cooperation so long as the government seeks to implement the agenda in the larger interests of the country and it does not depart from the chosen policies and programmes of the Congress Party. The Prime Minister has paid emphasis on evolving a national consensus on major national issues. Sir, the proof of the pudding, however, is in the eating. Despite all this talk of consensus, I will be less than honest to myself or to this House if I do not point out that our party has serious concerns about the good intentions of the ruling party. I am not going to refer to what happened in the course of election to the office of the Speaker in the other House. But even before that the consensus evolved in the National Integration Council with regard to the handling of Ayodhya dispute was torn apart by the BJP and its cronies to promote their

sectarian interests. We also know what has gone in all these directions. Therefore, I sincerely hope, Sir, that the BJP and, in particular, the Prime Minister, will atleast now set an example so that the governance processes of this country can steer along the desired lines. I believe there is an almost total unanimity in our country and this is on the assumption that the ruling party, as it has stated, has no hidden agenda other than the National Agenda—and if this is correct, then I take it that there is today in our country a near unanimity that divisive issues of Ayodhya, article 370 and Common Civil Code have to be put on the back burner. Now I think we would like the Prime Minister to state categorically that this indeed is the case. I heard my colleague, Shri Sunder Singh Bhandari—I hope I have not misunderstood him, because he was speaking in Hindi—has said that the Government has the National Agenda but the BJP stands by its election manifesto.

I sincerely believe, if that is the case, we are heading for a trouble. The Government may continue to say that Ayodhya is not on its agenda, Mathura, Kashi are not on its agenda and Article 370 is not on its agenda. On all these issues, the Government may express its lack of interest. But if its major nerve centre i.e., the B.J.P., or its frontal organisations, continue to divide our people on these issues, we are back to fractured politics. That is no politics of consensus. Therefore, I would appeal to the hon. Prime Minister, that he should use his tremendous influence with the R.S.S., with the Vishwa Hindu Parishad and with the Bajrang Dal, that they should adopt the same line as the hon. Prime Minister has assured that his Government is going to adopt. That is the only way through which he can create a climate conducive to the growth of national consensus in our country and we need that.

The second thing I wish to emphasize is, as I mentioned earlier, today, politics in our country is in a sad state. It has become a ticket to power for self-aggrandisement. People do not accept politics as a purposeful instrument of social change or for mediating effectively in societal tensions and conflicts which are built into the body politic of a poor country trying to modernise itself. We have to change all that. We need a well-functioning Indian State. We need a State which will be the servant of social sympathies. What does that mean? Here, I appreciate paragraph 36 of what the President has stated in his Address referring to the need for good governance. He said, "This can be possible only when Government rests on the foundation of morality and ethics. All round us today we find increasing cynicism towards morality in politics and ethics in governance. This has severely eroded faith in the State." I entirely agree with the hon. President. I am not going to blame either one party or the other. Maybe, all politics parties have contributed to the degeneration of politics in this country. But, there must be some new beginning. I suggest to the hon. Prime Minister, I suggest to the Government, that it is their responsibility to provide a lead in this direction. Quite frankly, while reading this paragraph of the President's Address and when I tried to tally it with what has been happening in recent months in the State of Uttar Pradesh or what had happened last week in Himachal Pradesh it does not give me confidence that the ruling party is serious about its commitment to morality and ethics as stated in the President's Address. I sincerely hope I am wrong. But, we need to introduce that missing element of ethics and high moral purpose so that politics in our country truly becomes a servant of social sympathies.

Sir, in the same way, the President in paragraph 7 talks about secularism. I quote; it states, "Secularism is integral to India's traditions. My Government is unequivocally committed to upholding our secular values."

I welcome the affirmation of the Government's commitment to our secular values. I also note that between the adoption of the so-called "National Agenda" and the President's Address, there is one important word which is missing because the National Agenda talked of genuine secularism. I may be forgiven if I am somewhat suspicious. But I note that in 1977 when the Janata Party came into power, it tried to play with a similar word. While defining our national foreign policy, it changed it from a policy of Non-Alignment to a policy of genuine Non-Alignment and we saw what happened. The then Foreign Minister went to Beijing. He was well received by the Chinese govt. At that very time the Chinese were marching their forces into Vietnam. So, if you use words which can lend themselves to different meanings, they do invite suspicion. Once again, I hope I am wrong. But, I think, it is the obligation of the Government to clarify its position; and in this context I would like to ask the following questions: First, if you are serious about your commitment to secularism, will the Government and the BJP respect the Places of Worship Act and maintain the status of all religious places as it existed on 15th August, 1947? Two, will it abide by the court's judgement on the issue of Ayodhya? Three, what will be the future of the Minorities Commission? Four, What will be done to ensure proper representation of minorities in public services, including police and para-military services? These are, Mr. Chairman, Sir, practical issues which will really define this Government's commitment to secularism. I hope that when the Prime Minister replies to the debate, he would be gracious enough to answer some of these questions. The same para of the President's Address, talks of the need to combat the menace of terrorism, subversion and insurgency, that has come to hurt common man. It goes on to say violence has no place in a democracy. Differences should and can be resolved through dialogue and discussion. I could not agree more. But, I

do feel that in dealing with this problem of terrorism, subversion and related issues, we must avoid brutalisation of the Indian State. I think, our police forces, our para-military forces need special training in this regard for respecting the human rights of our citizens, and also for ensuring that no innocent citizen is harassed while combating violence, terrorism and subversion. This, I think, will be the acid test of this Government's commitment to the cause of secularism.

Now, I come, Sir, to some issues of defence policies. In paragraph 30 of the President's Address, the President says, "My Government joins the country in saluting the bravery of the personnel of our armed forces who are ever prepared to make sacrifices for the defence of the nation." I endorse these sentiments. But, Sir, it is not enough merely to pay lip service to the cause of our brave and valiant servicemen. We all know that in recent months, over the Pay Commission's Report, there has been a growing discontent among certain segments of the armed forces. I sincerely hope that this matter will be resolved, so that the dissent brewing in the forces on this issue becomes a thing of the past. It is also necessary to discourage political or bureaucratic interference in the promotion, appointment and transfer of senior officers. There has also to be greater transparency in defence contracting so that some vague charges are not brought every now and then against people in authority. We owe it to our people to bring about greater transparency so as to set the record straight and, thereby we will promote a healthy debate, a healthy discussion of issues of defence policy. Today, defence policy issues are the monopoly of a few chosen experts and I do not think that in a democracy of our kind it is entirely appropriate that the bulk of our people should remain as ill-informed about the imperatives of defence as is the case right now.

Therefore, greater transparency, greater freedom of information, greater infor-

mation about the system of contracting all this, I believe, would contribute to a stronger defence preparedness in our country.

Sir, I would like to say a few words about the statement that has been made in the so-called national agenda on the induction of nuclear weapons. After its introduction in the national agenda, so many conflicting statements have been made. A newspaperman recently pointed out, probably the day before yesterday, that Atalji's bomb has produced more confusion than fusion. This is not good for our country. We should not divide our country on the issue of nuclear weapons. We must be fully prepared for defence and this is not a party matter. But I think this thing should not be left as vague, as one day it is said, we will induct nuclear weapons, then the second day you say there is no change in the policy. I heard the Prime Minister say the other day in the other House that there is no change in these policies. So, I think we ought to know from the Prime Minister when he replies to the debate in this House what exactly is our nuclear policy. I am not an expert. I think there should be an informed debate in our country. I would like to submit to those who talk lightly of the induction of nuclear weapons, that an effective nuclear deterrent requires a strong, a credible second strike capability. Therefore, we ought to be assured that before the Government embarks on this venture, it sees to it that all those implications and calculations, domestic policy implications financial calculations and foreign policy implications, are fully realised by the Government. I hope that, when the Prime Minister replies to the debate, he will answer some to these issues.

Sir, there is a small section in the national agenda on foreign policy. I am not going to comment on this. My esteemed colleague, Shri Pranab Mukherjee, when he speaks, will deal with this matter at greater length. But I do notice a sentence in that part of the national agenda. It talks about a generalized sys-

tem of tariff preferences among developing countries. So, this is a non-starter.

I am sorry the BJP's advisors are not well-informed on international affairs. A system of generalized preferences among developing countries has existed for the last 20 or 30 years. Over a period of time it has become dysfunctional. I do not believe that you can flog this dead horse to get much mileage. I sincerely hope that the Government would have a fresh look at this issue with an open mind.

I am happy to note that the President in his Address has expressed concern about the persistence of backwardness in certain parts of our country. But I do not believe that by itself is enough. What is proposed in the Address is not at all adequate. We know which are the backward areas. We also know what are the causes of backwardness. And, therefore, merely stating that a Commission will be set up to identify those areas, I think' is a time-honoured technique of the Government postponing action. When you don't want to take action. We want the backward areas to develop and develop at a faster pace and we know, for example, that the north-eastern region of our country feels isolated. States like Assam are suffering due to a lot of unemployment and in the entire north-eastern Region there is unrest which is taken advantage of by anti-national forces. You don't need an Commission to identify these backward areas. What is necessary is a credible strategy. There is plenty of work in the Planning Commission and elsewhere in our Government. I think Government should take timely action.

I recall that Shri Sivaraman, a former Cabinet Secretary and a Member of the Planning Commission produced volumes on the problems of backward area, on identifying backward areas, on dealing with those problems on a time-specific basis. I had also appointed, when I was the Finance Minister, a Committee to identify these backward areas for tax purposes. You do not need any fresh Commission to deal with the problem of

backward areas. The time has come to act and act quickly. In particular, the problems of the North-Eastern Region cannot, and do not, brook any further delay. What is required is a structured approach to provide both financial and administrative resources for the development of the vital North-Eastern Region of our country.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, there are several passages in this Address which deal with the problem of social justice. But I think these things—whether it is the National Agenda, or, the President's Address—are mostly clichés. I say this with all respect and with all humility. When you say 'Our aim is education for all' 'Health for all', 'Employment for all', etc., I think these are well-known national imperatives. The real thing is to work out. Concrete strategies and programmes. The question is: how are we going to achieve these objectives on a time-bound basis? What strategic approach, what programmes, we need to get these objectives fulfilled? On these points, both the National Agenda and the President's Address are totally silent.

Paragraph 15 says: "By synergising legal, executive and societal efforts, the Government will strive for rapid social, economic and political empowerment and uplift of the Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, Backward Classes and Minorities". Generalities. On this particular section, I would like the Prime Minister, when he replies to the debate, to tell us as to what he is going to do with the Minorities Commission. We heard before that the Minorities Commission may be abolished. Therefore, I would like to hear from the Prime Minister, unambiguously, his Government's views on the future of the Minorities Commission.

Similarly, in the area of tribal development, we feel that there is need for a separate National Commission on Tribal Areas which should have a statutory status. I would like to hear from the Prime Minister what he thinks of this suggestion.

In no paragraph, there is any mention about the need for land reforms. I do believe that there is a lot of unfinished business. I hope this does not reflect the class bias of the ruling party. But I do believe sincerely that there are many unfinished items in the agenda on land reforms and these need attending to.

We have, of course, the Scheduled Caste component plans. We have tribal development programmes. But their working needs to be improved, needs to be streamlined, apart from giving them more resources. I would like to hear from the Prime Minister what he proposes to do to streamline these components of the national plans having to do with the welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes.

I now come to the issue of the economy. I started by saying that the Address does not deal with the challenges that our economy faces. What we find to day is that although the Address talks about having a 7-8 per cent rate of growth, we all know that the growth rate has declined in the last one year. If you want a growth rate of 7-8 per cent, you need a strong, resurgent, growth in our exports. But not a word is mentioned about exports either in the so-called National Agenda, or, in the President's Address. Let me say that whatever your views on Swadeshi economics are, no viable strategy of development of the country is feasible unless you have a strong, robust, export economy as its foundation. No country in the world is wholly self-sufficient. Everywhere, import needs grow, in the wake of successful development. Now, if you do not want India to become an isolated country, it is necessary that we think again as to what has gone wrong with our exports in the last eighteen months and how, working together, we can recapture the dynamism in India's exports which was displayed between 1993-94 and 1995-96 when, in each year, our exports, in dollar value, recorded a growth rate of 20 J.00 P.M.

per cent per annum. Sir, the President's Address talks in terms of raising the national savings rate to 30 per cent. I wholeheartedly endorse this aspiration. But how are we going to increase the national savings rate to 30% with the public sector savings rate in our country being almost zero, taking both the Centre and the States together? There is no viable strategy in which you can increase the national savings rate to 30 per cent if you do not talk about restructuring the public sector to make the public sector a vibrant instrument of our national polity and to make the public sector a profit-generating entity. If we had used the public sector as an instrument of accumulation, there would have been no need for foreign investment. And, if you really do not want foreign investment, then, it is obligatory that we must raise the public sector savings rate to the rate that prevails in China and in other countries of South-East Asia. Merely paying lip-sympathy to self-reliance but doing nothing for exports and doing nothing for promoting savings, I think, is to be neither here nor there.

The Address talks in terms of an increased investment in infrastructure. I wholeheartedly agree. But this requires major reforms in these Sector. For example, Chavanji spoke this morning on the problems of the power sector. If you are not serious about economic reforms in the power sector, we can say good-bye to increased investment in the power sector. Without credible economic reforms, problems of infrastructure will remain unresolved.

I heard Shri Sunder Singh Bhandari say that despite his reservation on foreign investment he would welcome foreign investment in infrastructure. Let me tell him: you may want it, but if you do not have credible reforms in the power sector, if the State Electricity Boards continue to make losses year after after year, if the National Thermal Power Corporation cannot collect its dues from the State Electricity Boards and if the Coal India cannot collect its dues from the State

Electricity Boards, you have to say good-bye to investment; whether public or private, in infrastructure. But not a word has been said about reforms that are needed to ensure that infrastructure really gets more investment, both public and private, including foreign investment.

Sir, I do wish to suggest that there is no possibility of India having year after year a growth-rate of 7 to 8 per cent to which the Address commits the Government and on which I wholly agree, unless you have credible reforms of the fiscal System, unless you have a strong commitment to fiscal discipline, unless you have a strong commitment to public sector reforms and unless you have a strong commitment to financial sector reforms.

What is the *swadeshi* economics that the BJP talks about? In vain did I search for an answer in the so-called National Agenda. There is one sentence in the President's Address;

"India can be and will be built by Indians." I heard Shri George Fernandes saying, "Swadeshi is like patriotism." Does he mean to suggest that those who differ with the BJP philosophy are unpatriotic? If that is so, that is a typical way in which the fascist forces try to deal with these questions. I may differ with the BJP, but I am not going to accuse it of being unpatriotic. They may be misguided patriots, but I am not going to question anybody's patriotism. Therefore, for people like George Fernandes, to equate a commitment to the BJP's economic policy as a commitment to patriotism, I think, is an exercise of cheap type of politics. I hope the Government will resist this.

But, in all sincerity, I want to know what the *swadeshi* economics is which they are talking about. I heard some important leaders in the BJP saying, "Computer chips are welcome: potato chips are not." I also heard Balasaheb Thackeray saying, I think, convincingly, "This is all impractical." In practice, the issues are not that simple. In real life, the choice before this country must be made

on the basis of national interest. Let there be no difference on that point. We should not do anything, which is not in India's national interest. On that there is no difference of views between this side and that side. But, what is in India's national interest? India's national interest cannot be limited to the interests of a few leading families in this country. India's national interest is the interest of our industrialists, interest of our workers, interest of our consumers, interest of our farmers. If you look at all those things in totality and then come to the conclusion that we do not need foreign investment in a particular area, I would be fully there to support it. But, these vague statements like computer chips versus potato chips are causing unnecessary confusion in India and all over the world. In particular, if by potato chips you mean the food processing industry, I would like to submit through you to the Government that the food processing industry is a highly technology intensive industry. It requires the most modern technologies to realise India's immense potential to the full in this vast area. A large part of India's farm produce rots before it reaches the towns. And if we want to increase the farmers' welfare without putting an additional burden on the consumers in our country, then we need a top class food processing industry. That is the only way in which urbanisation and industrialisation of India can go forward without putting too much burden on farmers or consumers. There, I feel, is the role for modern technology. If you want foreign investment, even though it may be in consumer goods, you will create more incomes for farmers, you will create more jobs and you will also at the margin strengthen India's export efforts. So, the choice has to be made on the basis of careful Calculations. In real life sectors are inter-linked. You cannot develop agriculture, if you do not develop fertilisers. You cannot make full use of the agricultural potential, if you do not have modern transport system, if you do not have modern pesticides and chemical industries. Therefore, *ad hoc* rules of thumb

cannot be the guide-stone for making our economic policy. For the sake of our country, I would appeal to the BJP and to the Government that they should be a little more careful when they use these expressions. I certainly would like to be enlightened when the Prime Minister speaks as to what is the Swadeshi economics he is talking about. I heard him say on the television one day that it will be for a better face of India. I wish him good luck. We all want a better face of India. He also said, quoting a statement which I made in 1991, that we want development with a human face. We are all for it. If by that he means that he wants to build an India where there will be one hundred per cent literacy, in which our infant mortality rate would decline to levels which prevail in Kerala, we are all with him. But, if he is going to use this logic of Swadeshi to reverse the process of economic reforms and if he is going to jack-up import duties recklessly, we are not with him. There may be a scope for adding here and there; there may be a scope for rationalisation of import duties, but not for wholesale increase in import duties or import controls.

I am afraid you will be putting the clock back. Let me tell you that if you do that, India will suffer. You will not be able to realise India's developmental potential; you will not be able to achieve the 7 to 8 per cent rate of growth that you talked about.

I read in the President's Address and also in the National Agenda that we will invest up to 60 per cent of Central Plan resources in agriculture. There is also a discrepancy between the President's Address and the National Agenda. The President's Address talks of 60 per cent of Plan funds only for agriculture. The National Agenda talks of 60 per cent for agriculture, rural development and irrigation. I do not want to go into semantics. Let us assume that you want to invest 60 per cent of these resources for agriculture, rural development and irrigation. At the moment, roughly 20 per cent of the total plan—Central and States goes for

this sector. What is your timeframe for raising this 20 per cent to 60 per cent? My own feeling is that if you implement it in the next five years, there will be nothing left for infrastructure, there will be nothing left for education, there will be nothing left for health, there will be nothing left for what you call *be-rozgari hatao*. So, I would like the Prime Minister to clarify some of these issues. Whatever is precise in this Address or in the National Agenda, I found is very misleading. In the same way I heard the Prime Minister saying on the television about one of his commitments. "I make a commitment to the people of India that we will double food production in a period of ten years." Now, the logic of compound interest, elementary arithmetic tells us that if have to achieve this, then, you must get year after year a compound growth rate of 7 per cent in food production. Now, our current rate of growth has been 2.5 to 3 per cent. The Ninth Plan talks of raising it to 4.5 per cent. I agree with that aspiration. But to say that you have found some Alchemic formula of raising the growth rate of agricultural production, food production overnight from 2.5 per cent, 3 per cent to 7 per cent is, I think, deceiving the people of India or displaying your own ignorance. I sincerely hope when the Prime Minister replies to the debate he will be kind enough to enlighten us on this matter also.

I would like to say a few words on India's attitude to international organisations. I think the BJP and some of its leaders have been making statements which if not checked in time can do irreparable damage to India's international interests. We are a member of the WTO and let me say India needs multilateral organisations. We are singly a weak country. If we have to deal with the United States bilaterally, where are we? If we have to deal with Germany or the European Union bilaterally, where are we? But when we sit in a forum like the

WTO, where a majority of the countries are developing countries, we acquire strength. Therefore, do not say or do not do things which will weaken multilateral organisations. A poor country needs the rule of law in the international relations, whether they are international economic relations or international financial relations or international investment relations. The developing countries need these multilateral organisations more than the developed countries. The United States does not need the WTO. The United States can twist the arm of any country in the world. We don't want that to happen. Therefore, we need multilateral organisations. Of course, many times international organisations work under terrible pressure of the developed countries. We must mobilise all the resources of the developing countries to resist that pressure. But these are the fora which give us strength which otherwise we lack. Therefore, through some misunderstanding or for other some reason if you are going to lead this country to a path where we will have needless confrontation with multilateral organisations. I think, that would be a sad day for our country. Sir, I do believe that it is in the interest of development of our science and technology that we should have a first class protection for intellectual property rights. In the past we have been only importers of technology. therefore, we have had a particular view-point. Now that Indian science and technology has developed, we have today capabilities which can be used in Africa, which can be used in the Middle East and in many other countries. So, we have to look at this whole thing in a wider perspective. Therefore, if you don't have credible protection for intellectual property rights in your own country, you are as discouraging the growth of science and technology in your own country. Therefore, I sincerely hope that the issue of patents as well as the dispute that has arisen between India and other countries for the phasing out of import controls will be resolved in an amicable manner without confrontation, in a spirit that India is

a member in good standing at the WTO of course we must fight for our rights. We must seek cooperation from other developing countries to stand erect when something is done which hurts us. But I think to strengthen multilateral organisations is in India's interest. Therefore, Sir, I would like to hear from the Prime Minister, when we reply to this debate, what is India's attitude on these matters of patents legislation, phasing out of quantitative import restriction, matters which have been pending for a long time.

Finally, Sir, as I said, the Address says nothing about how we are going to revive our economy. We all know that the growth rate of our country has come down to five per cent as against seven per cent for the last four to five years. We know that our exports growth rate has declined. The growth rate has declined to four to five per cent. We know that India's industrial growth rate which was 12-14 per cent in 1995-96 is now, probably, not more than 5-6 per cent. So, we need a credible strategy to tackle this immediate problem that India faces. In vain do I search either in the National Agenda or in the President's Address any hint as to how the Government is going to tackle this issue. May be they have been too busy winning the vote of confidence. Now that they have won the vote of confidence, I hope that the Prime Minister, when he replies to the debate, will enlighten us about his Government's thinking about how these national tasks are going to be addressed. I started by saying that our party is committed to providing constructive cooperation in dealing with urgent national issues. Whether these are issues of economic development, whether these are issues of defence and foreign policies, whether these are issues of social sector development, we will approach them in the spirit of constructive cooperation in the belief that India has to survive, India has to flourish. Parties are important. But the country is more important. We will oppose things which we believe are against our ideology. But the country comes first.

And it is obligatory on the part of the Government also to make a new beginning. I know the National Agenda that does not mention some very divisive issues which figured prominently in the BJP Agenda. At least on surface, we know that some of those things, they are giving up. If it is a genuine change of heart, I welcome it. But if it is merely a tactical retreat that they are shelving the agenda, the divisive agenda, for the time being and until such time that they get a majority by themselves, they are inviting trouble for themselves, they are inviting trouble for the country as a whole. I hope in this matter, my fears are misplaced. For the sake of our country, I sincerely hope that the BJP and its leaders have had a change of heart and that is what leadership is about—learning from one's mistakes, learning from experience. We will have differences with Atalji, but we do respect him; we regard him as a great national leader and I hope that he will rise to the occasion as a poet said:

इसान वह नहीं है जो हवा के साथ बदले,
इसान तो वही है जो हवा का रुख बदल दे।

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन (उत्तर प्रदेश): सभापति जी, आपने मुझे बोलने का अवसर दिया, इसके लिए मैं आपका धन्यवाद करता हूँ। महोदय, जब मैं अपने अजीज दोस्त आदरणीय श्री मनमोहन सिंह जी के भाषण को सुन रहा था तो कभी मुझे लग रहा था कि जैसे देश का कोई सर्वोच्च अर्थशास्त्री बोल रहा है, कभी लग रहा था कि कोई शिक्षाविद बोल रहा है, कभी लग रहा था कि कोई राजनेता बोल रहा है, जिसे कुछ करके दिखाना है और कभी लग रहा था कि कांग्रेस का एक ऐसा नेता बोल रहा है जिसे अभी भी अपनी राजनैतिक संकीर्णता से मुक्ति पानी है, अन्यथा उन मसलों को उनको यहाँ उठाने की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं थी जो न हमारे राष्ट्रीय एजेंडा में है और न जिनका जिक्र हमारे राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने अभिभाषण में किया है। मैं माननीय मनमोहन सिंह जी से यह कहना चाहूँगा कि न तो काशी मथुरा हमारे एजेंडे में है और न ही अयोध्या की बात हम कर रहे हैं। न ही हमारी ऐसी कोई आकांक्षा है कि हम ऐसे मसले लाएं जिनसे देश विभाजित हो। हम तो उस विचार-धारा को ले कर के चल रहे हैं जिससे समरसता बढ़े, समाज में एकता आए। यही हमारा उद्देश्य है और इस का जिक्र

इस अभिभाषण में राष्ट्रपति जी ने बार बार किया है। मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि अदरणीय मनमोहन सिंह जी ने राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण का वह अंश नहीं देखा जिसमें उन्होंने सामाजिक समरसता की बात की है। अगर वह अंश देखा होता तो वह संभवतः उस प्रकार के आरोप न लगाते जैसे कि उन्होंने आरोप लगाए। उन्होंने यहाँ तक प्रखर रूप से कह डाला कि भारतीय जनता पार्टी फासीवाद की ओर संभवतः देश को ले जाना चाहती है। फासीवाद से हमारा कोई संबंध नहीं है। ..(व्यवधान) फासीवाद से हम बहुत दूर हैं, न कभी फासीवाद थे और न हैं। कहीं अजीब सी बात है कि विश्व हिन्दू परिषद् जो यक्षों मीनूद नहीं है, जो एक संस्कृति संस्था है, राष्ट्रीय स्वयं सेवक संघ जिसका राजनीति से कोई संबंध नहीं है, उसका भी हवाला हमारे आदरणीय फाजिल दोस्त ने दिया। पता नहीं क्यों दिया। अच्छा यह हो कि वे उन बातों को न करें जिनका इस देश की राजनीति से कहीं कोई संबंध नहीं है। ..(व्यवधान)

कुमारी सरोज खापड़ें: प्रधान मंत्री जी इन सब बातों का उत्तर देंगे, आप क्यों उत्तर दे रहे हैं (व्यवधान) प्रधान मंत्री जी, डा० मनमोहन सिंह जी के प्रश्नों का उत्तर देंगे। (व्यवधान)

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन: मैं अपनी ओर से, अपनी पार्टी की ओर से उत्तर दे रहा हूँ। ..(व्यवधान)

कुमारी सरोज खापड़ें: प्रधानमंत्री जी उत्तर देंगे। ..(व्यवधान)

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन: मैं अपने फाजिल दोस्त से कहना चाहूँगा कि जब वे देश के वित्त मंत्री थे, उन्होंने जो भी ठीक काम किये, हमने उसकी तारीफ की लेकिन जो काम उनसे गड़बड़ हुए उसकी हमने आलोचना की। उसके बाद जो दौर आया, वह जानते हैं कि किस तरह से देश को चलाया गया। जो देश की आज दुर्दशा है, जिसकी चर्चा उन्होंने की, उसके लिए कौन जिम्मेदार हैं? पिछले सात वर्षों में इस देश को और अधिक गरीब बना दिया गया। ..(व्यवधान)

कुमारी सरोज खापड़ें: आप डा० मनमोहन सिंह जी के भाषण पर बोल रहे हैं ..(व्यवधान) या राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण पर बोल रहे हैं? ..(व्यवधान)

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन: मैं उत्तर देते हुए राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण पर बोल रहा हूँ। ..(व्यवधान)

कुमारी सरोज खापड़ें: उनके प्रश्नों का उत्तर मन्त्रीय प्रधान मंत्री जी अपने उत्तर में देंगे। आप अपने मुँह पर बोलिये। ..(व्यवधान)

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन: वह आपको कहने का अधिकार नहीं है। (व्यवधान)

कुमारी सरोज खापड़ें: मुझे पूर्ण अधिकार है। ..(व्यवधान)

श्री सुन्दर कुमार सिंगारा (पंजाब): वह अभी प्रधानमंत्री नहीं हैं जब प्रधानमंत्री बनेंगे तो उत्तर दीजियेगा (व्यवधान)

उपसभापति: उनकी पार्टी ने जितना टाइम दिया है वह बोल रहे हैं। ..(व्यवधान)

कुमारी सरोज खापड़ें: उनके अभिभाषण पर बोलें। डा० मनमोहन सिंह जी के भाषण पर नहीं बोलें।

उपसभापति: आप बैठिये ..(व्यवधान) बैठिये ..(व्यवधान)

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन: मनमोहन सिंह जी कह रहे हैं कि हमारे राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण में कहीं कोई स्पष्ट दिश नहीं है जब कि राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण में स्पष्ट रूप से कहा गया है कि वे इस देश को भय, भ्रष्ट और भ्रष्टाचार से मुक्त करना चाहते हैं। अगर यह दिशा नहीं है तो दिशा क्या होती है, राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण में यह कहा गया है कि सरकार की सर्वोच्च प्राथमिकता उन लोगों की सहायता करना है जिनके पास सुविधाएँ नहीं हैं, जो शक्ति सम्पन्न नहीं हैं। अगर यह क्लियर विज़न नहीं है तो विज़न किसे कहेंगे? राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में स्पष्ट रूप से कहा गया है कि अब तक की सामाजिक, आर्थिक नीतियों की कमजोरी रही है, सामाजिक क्षेत्रों की ओर बहुत कम ध्यान दिया गया है। सरकार सामाजिक क्षेत्रों में अधिक धन लगाने की प्रतिज्ञा करती है। अगर यह प्रतिज्ञा स्पष्ट दिशा नहीं है तो वह क्या है? मैं अपने आदरणीय फाजिल दोस्त से कहना चाहूँगा कि वह अपने आप को राजनीतिक संकीर्णता से मुक्त कर के राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण का समर्थन करें जिसमें दिशा ही नहीं है, कार्यक्रम भी है। एक के बाद एक कार्यक्रम हैं। यह कहना कि राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में ऐसी कोई वस्तु नहीं है जिससे अल्पसंख्यकों को कोई लाभ होता हो या पंथ-निरपेक्षता के बारे में कोई स्पष्ट कहि बात हो, ऐसी बात तो नहीं है। राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में स्पष्ट रूप से कहा गया है कि यह सरकार पूर्ण रूप से पंथ-निरपेक्षता के प्रति प्रतिबद्ध है। मैं यह कहना चाहूँगा कि पंथ-निरपेक्षता के संदर्भ में इस प्रकार की भ्रान्त धारणाएं भारतीय जनता पार्टी के संदर्भ में फैलाई जाती हैं, राष्ट्रपति का यह अभिभाषण उन भ्रान्त धारणाओं को दूर करता है।

पंथनिरपेक्षता भारतीय परंपराओं का अंतर्गत अंग है। पंथनिरपेक्षता भारतीयता से जुड़ी हुई है। पंथ निरपेक्षता का संबंध भारतीयता से है और भारतीय जनता पार्टी उस भारतीयता की रक्षा के लिए सदैव संघर्ष करती रही है, करती रहेगी और कर रही है। अब उसे आप समझें न समझें, आप उसे पालोकाद का रूप दें वह आपका सोचना है। लेकिन पंथनिरपेक्षता की वह परिभाषा जो आप समझ रहे हैं कि इसमें व्यवस्थित सुधारका है वह हमारी परिभाषा नहीं है। हमारी परिभाषा तो पंथनिरपेक्षता को यह है कि जो भी गरीब है, जो भी निर्धन है, जो भी अल्पसंख्यक है उन सभी की भलाई के लिए हम आगे आएंगे, सभी को समान अधिकार देंगे, सभी के लिए समान व्यवस्थाएँ की जाएंगी। अगर इस परिभाषा को दृष्टि से देखें आप तो आगेको लगेगा कि भारतीय जनता पार्टी उस रूप में नहीं है जिस रूप में आप सोच रहे हैं।

यह कहना कि इस राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में कोई दिशा नहीं है— यह जनसंख्या की नीति के बारे में स्पष्ट घोषणा दिशा नहीं है तो वह है क्या? जनसंख्या के बारे में यह देश अगर अभी भी नहीं चिंता तो क्या समस्याएँ आने वाली हैं इसको हम सबको समझना है। यह पहली बार है जबकि सरकार ने पुनः जनसंख्या की बात को बहुत गंभीरता से लिया है और राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में उसकी चर्चा की है। राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में सामान्यतया पिछले अनेक भाषणों में जनसंख्या वृद्धि की उपेक्षा की गयी है। हम प्रतिबद्ध हो रहे हैं कि हम जनसंख्या की वृद्धि को रोकने के लिए उसे यही रूप फलने के लिए एक व्यवस्था करेंगे। अगर यह दिशा नहीं है तो दिशा कैसे आने मानी।

मैं यह विश्वास दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी सरकार का कोई छिपा हुआ एजेंडा नहीं है। जो कुछ भी है वह स्पष्ट रूप से है। हम तो पूर्ण पारदर्शिता लाने के पक्षधर हैं। यही कारण है कि जो कांग्रेस नहीं कर सकी, जो संसद में मोर्चे की सरकार नहीं कर सकी वह हम करने जा रहे हैं। हम ऑफिशियल रीक्रिएट एक्ट में परिवर्तन करने जा रहे हैं। हम ऑफिशियल रीक्रिएट एक्ट के अलावा और भी ऐसे एक्ट्स में परिवर्तन करने के अतिरिक्त ऐसी व्यवस्था बनाना चाहते हैं जिसमें कि वास्तव में एक स्पष्ट आम सहमति का वातावरण बन सके।

राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में स्पष्ट रूप से कहा गया है कि यह सरकार आम सहमति से शासन चलाने की पद्धति को विकसित करने का प्रयास करेगी। अगर हम आम सहमति की पद्धति को विकसित करने का प्रयास कर रहे हैं तो हम चाहते हैं कि मन्मोहन सिंह जी आप

जैसे करिए अर्थात्सर्वकों का हमें सहयोग मिले। हमें विपक्ष के नेताओं का सहयोग मिले। हम टकराव की राजनीति नहीं चाहते हैं। यह देश इतना विशाल है कि इसको केवल सहमति की राजनीति से ही चलाया जा सकता है।

श्री नीलोत्पल बसु (पश्चिमी बंगाल): बहुत अच्छा विचार है आपने।

श्री नारायण प्रसन्न गुप्ता (मध्य प्रदेश): जनता ने आपको छुट्टी कर दी है। आप जरा मेहरबानी करके बैठिए ... (व्यवधान) विपक्ष को यह बात जरा अच्छी उत्तर से समझ लेनी चाहिए ... (व्यवधान) विधायनी विस्मृति खत्म होना रही है। इतनी जल्दी आपको क्या पेशानी हो रही है... (व्यवधान) आपको दो दो सरकारें चलती आप कुछ नहीं कर पाए। अब मेहरबानी करके बैठिए। जनता ने आपको कूड़े के ढेर में फेंक दिया है। आप मेहरबानी करके बैठिए। जरा सुनिए। उनको बोलने नहीं दे रहे हैं।

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन: मैं अजीब दोस्तों से मेरा अनुरोध है ... (व्यवधान)

जहाँ तक राष्ट्र की सुरक्षा की बात जो की गयी है, मन्मोहन सिंह जी को वह चिंता मुझे समझ में नहीं आयी। हम जो यह कह रहे हैं कि राष्ट्र और उसके नागरिकों की सुरक्षा सर्वोपरि है। वह राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण का अंग है और कहा गया है कि सरकार इस मामले में कोई समझौता नहीं करेगी। मैं आरोप लगाना चाहता हूँ कि पिछली सरकारों ने राष्ट्र की सुरक्षा की जिस प्रकार से उपेक्षा की है उसका उत्तरदायी कौन है। हमारे राष्ट्र के सकल उत्पाद का लगभग 3 प्रतिशत से अधिक प्रतिरक्षा पर व्यय हुआ करता है। पर पिछली सरकारों ने उसे घटाकर 2.2 प्रतिशत कर दिया। आखिर फाँव क्यों किया गया? क्या यह राष्ट्र की सुरक्षा की उपेक्षा नहीं है। ऐसी बहुत सी योजनाएँ जो अधूरी पड़ी हुए हैं। प्रतिरक्षा की हम उनको पूरा करने का संकल्प ले रहे हैं। लेकिन आप बताएं कि पिछली सरकार ने किस तरह से इस राष्ट्र की सुरक्षा के साथ खिलवाड़ किया। वह तो हम नहीं करेंगे। वह हम नहीं करने देंगे। हमारी प्रतिबद्धता राष्ट्र की प्रतिरक्षा के ऊपर है और वह रहेगी। जहाँ तक सशस्त्र सेनाओं के कर्मियों के लिए हमने जो नमन किया है; उनकी वीरता के लिए, वह कोई मौखिक सहानुभूति नहीं है।

आपने उसे लिए सिपैथी कहा, मुझे आश्चर्य है। यह लिए सिपैथी कैसे हो सकती है जब हम उनका नमन कर

रहे हैं। यह लिप सिंपैधी कैसे हो सकती है जब हम कह रहे हैं कि हम इस संदर्भ में किसी दबाव के समक्ष नहीं झुकेंगे। यह देश के जो महावीर हैं जिन्होंने अपनी कुर्बानियाँ दी हैं, जो कुर्बानियाँ देने के लिए तैयार हैं, हम उनके रक्षा के लिए सब कुछ करते रहे हैं और इसीलिए संकेत रूप में हमने इसकी चर्चा की। राष्ट्रपति का अभिभाषण कोई पंचवर्षीय योजना का परिपत्र नहीं बन सकता। उसमें आप क्या उम्मीद करते हैं? आधे घंटे में, 25 मिनट में राष्ट्रपति कितनी बातें कहेंगे? अगर आपको विशद ज्ञान प्राप्त करना है तो आप पंचवर्षीय योजना के परिपत्र को देखिए जो शोध ही हमारी सरकार के द्वारा आपके समक्ष लाया जाएगा। राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में केवल संकेत रूप में बहुत सी बातें कही जा सकती हैं और इसीलिए हम कह रहे हैं। हम अपनी बात को आगे लाने के लिए और अधिक विश्वास दिलाने के लिए संकेत रूप में अपनी बातें कह रहे हैं और जो कमजोरियाँ हुई हैं उन कारणों का संकेत दे रहे हैं। हमारे यहां भ्रष्टाचार, हमारी राज व्यवस्था में मूल्यों का जो हाँस हुआ तथा राजनीति का जो अपराधीकरण हुआ उसका कारण चुनावी प्रक्रिया में दोष है और उसकी चर्चा हमने की है। हमने चर्चा करते हुए यह कहा कि सरकार नैतिकता और सदाचार की नींव पर खड़ी होगी। इसमें उपहास की बात कहीं है? ..(व्यवधान) हम बार-बार यह कह रहे हैं कि सरकार को इरादा इन तमाम कमजोरियों को दूर करने का है और जब इसका संकेत हम अपने अभिभाषण में दे रहे हैं तो उचित होगा कि ... (व्यवधान) Madam, I am not yielding to them. (Interruptions)...I am not yielding to them, Madam.

उपसभापति: नहीं, वह आपके यौलड करने के लिए नहीं बोल रहे हैं, वह तो अपनी बात वैसे ही बोल रहे हैं। आप अपना बोलिए।(व्यवधान)

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन: मैडम, यह ऐसा गंभीर मामला है कि जिस पर आई नीड यूअर प्रोटेक्शन। ... (व्यवधान) मैडम, अब मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब राजनीति के अपराधीकरण और चुनाव प्रक्रिया के दोषों की इतनी चर्चा हमने की है और सुधार की बात की है तो उसे आप सभी का समर्थन मिलना चाहिए और पूरे सदन का समर्थन मिलना चाहिए। ... (व्यवधान) सदन का समर्थन अगर नहीं मिलता है तो इसमें कहीं न कहीं दोष है। मैं आपके समक्ष कहना चाहता हूँ कि संविधान की समीक्षा करने की बात जो राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में की गई उससे प्रमुख और कोई बात हो नहीं सकती। पिछले 50 वर्ष हमारे सामने हैं। इस बात को दलगत राजनीति

से ऊपर उठकर सभी ने इस पर चिन्ता व्यक्त की है और इन अनुभूतियों के आधार पर यदि हम संविधान की समीक्षा करने की बात कर रहे हैं तो इसमें कोई एतराज की बात नहीं होनी चाहिए। सरकार की बात सेची जा रही है कि संविधान समीक्षा करके हम कोई उसमें ऐसा परिवर्तन करना चाहते हैं जिससे कि देश में हंगामा हो जाए या जिससे लोकतंत्र का लोप हो जाए। ऐसा न कोई उद्देश्य था, न है और न हो सकता है। हम संविधान की बेहतरी के लिए, देश की जनता की बेहतरी के लिए इस दिशा में सोच रहे हैं और आप भी यह सोचते रहे हैं। आपके यहां के अनेक प्रमुख विद्वान, प्रमुख राजनीतिज्ञ भी इस बात के पक्षधर रहे हैं कि संविधान में कहीं न कहीं, कुछ न कुछ ऐसे संशोधन होने चाहिए जिससे कि देश की भलाई हो, भारतीय लोकतंत्र की भलाई हो, देश में राजनीतिक स्थायित्व आए, वही हमारा भी उद्देश्य है। अगर आप फिर भी यह कह रहे हैं कि हमारा यह राष्ट्रपति का अभिभाषण दिशाहीन है तो इसे दुर्भाग्य की बात कहा जाएगा। यह अजीब बात है.... (व्यवधान) एक ऐसी बात की चर्चा यहां कर दी गई कि अटल जी जब बीजिंग गए थे तो उन्होंने कुछ किया नहीं। अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी 1977 में विदेश मंत्री की हैसियत से जब बीजिंग गए थे तो उन्होंने जो समझौता किया, भारत और चीन के संबंधों में जो आधारशिला रखी उसी आधारशिला पर आज भी सरकार चल रही है। हम यह कहना चाहते हैं कि अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी ने विदेश मंत्री की हैसियत से जो दिशा इस देश को दी है चीन के संबंध में सुधार करके वही एक ऐसा मार्ग है जिस पर चल करके देश का सही कल्याण होने वाला है। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जैसा आपने कहा कि वास्तविक गुट निरपेक्षता तो मैं जानता हूँ कि किस प्रकार से गुट निरपेक्षता की आड़ ले करके भारतीय गुट निरपेक्षता के साथ अन्याय किया गया।

यह जो कुछ भी हुआ है, आप भी जानते हैं कि कांग्रेसी सरकारों ने किया है और यही कारण रहा कि जब गुजराल साहब प्रधान मंत्री बने तो उन्होंने इस मामले को एक सही दिशा देने की चेष्टा की और पड़ोसी देशों के साथ संबंध सुधारने की बात की, लेकिन कांग्रेस की नीतियां ऐसी नहीं थीं मेरा आप से अनुरोध है कि आप प्रधान मंत्री पर इस प्रकार के आक्षेप न करें जो कि अर्थहीन और अनर्गल हैं।

मेरा निवेदन है कि देश को सामाजिक टकराव से बचाने और सामाजिक समरसता की जो बात हम कर रहे हैं, कृपया उस ओर ध्यान दें क्योंकि यह देश की आवश्यकता है। इस के लिए कृपा कर के हमें अपना

समर्थन दें ताकि हम सामाजिक समरसता का वातावरण राष्ट्र में उत्पन्न कर सकें।

आप ने एक बात यह कही कि इस सरकार के पास कोई आर्थिक नीतियां आप को दिखाई नहीं देतीं जबकि हम आप से स्पष्ट रूप से कह रहे हैं कि समृद्धि एवं आर्थिक उन्नति का लाभ, अभी तक तो आप की जो सरकारें पिछले 7 वर्षों में रहीं, बहुत थोड़े से लोगों को मिला है। इन पिछले 7 वर्षों में गरीबी की रेखा के नीचे रहने वाले लोगों की जनसंख्या बढ़ गयी है, इन 7 वर्षों में निराश्रित लोगों की जनसंख्या बढ़ गयी है। हम उस समस्या का निराकरण खोजना चाहते हैं और इसीलिए हम राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण के माध्यम से यह घोषणा कर रहे हैं कि यह सरकार थोड़े से लोगों तक सीमित न रह कर अंतिम पंक्ति में बैठे हुए लोगों तक समृद्धि को पहुंचाएगी जिस के लिए इस सरकार के दो उद्देश्य होंगे। एक तो रोजगार के अवसरों को सृजन कर के गरीबी को पूर्णतः समाप्त करना और दूसरे सकल घरेलू उत्पाद की 7 से 8 प्रतिशत तक की अभिवृद्धि दर को नियमित करना ताकि बेरोजगारी हटाओ योजना के मूल मंत्र को पूरा किया जा सके। महोदया, मैं जानता हूँ कि 7 से 8 प्रतिशत तक की अभिवृद्धि करना बहुत कठिन काम है, लेकिन मुझे विश्वास है कि अगर सदन का सहयोग रहा, आप सब का सहयोग मिला तो हमारी सरकार निश्चित रूप से इस लक्ष्य को प्राप्त कर सकेगी और आप अपनी ओर से "कंसट्रिक्ट कोआपरेशन" के वायदे को न भूलें। लेकिन कंसट्रिक्ट कोआपरेशन का नारा देकर आप ने जिस प्रकार की आलोचनाएं की हैं, उस तरह की आलोचना का कोई मतलब नहीं है। यह कंसट्रिक्ट कोआपरेशन नहीं है बल्कि यह नकारात्मक राजनीति है। हमें इस देश को नकारात्मक राजनीति से बचना होगा और यह कार्य कोई एक दल नहीं कर सकता। इस के लिए सभी दलों को मिलजुलकर बैठना होगा इसीलिए हम आम सहमति की बात कर रहे हैं। तभी हम आप को कह रहे हैं कि इस नकारात्मक राजनीति से देश को बचाने के लिए हमें आप का सहयोग चाहिए।

उपसभापति: नरेन्द्र मोहन जी, आप कितनी देर और बोलेंगे?

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन: पांच मिनट का समय और दे दीजिए।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is because I have to divide the time among the Members who have to speak.

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन: महोदया, मैं एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ कि राष्ट्रपति जी के इस अभिभाषण का सब से श्रेष्ठ भाग वह है जिस में कहा गया है कि हमारे संविधान में उल्लिखित सभी 18 भारतीय भाषाओं के विकास के लिए प्रयत्न चल रहा है। महोदया, पिछले 50 वर्षों में भारतीय भाषाओं की जैसी उपेक्षा हुई है, वह चिंता का विषय है। यह पहली बार हुआ है कि किसी राष्ट्रीय सरकार ने देश की सभी भाषाओं के लिए अपनी प्रतिबद्धता व्यक्त की है। इस में तमिल भी है, उर्दू भी है, मराठी भी है, गुजराती भी है और बंगाली भी है। हमारी इस प्रतिबद्धता के प्रति आप को शंका नहीं करनी चाहिए। महोदया, इस सरकार का झगड़ा भारतीय भाषाओं से नहीं है, इस सरकार का झगड़ा अंग्रेजित से है। इस सरकार का झगड़ा उस भाषा से है जिस ने भारतीय भाषाओं को गुलाम बना दिया है। इसीलिए हम बार-बार कह रहे हैं कि भारतीय भाषाओं के समुन्नयन के लिए, उन की समृद्धि के लिए हमें काम करना है और इसीलिए पहली बार ऐसा हुआ है कि भारतीय भाषाओं की समृद्धि के लिए राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण में स्पष्ट घोषणा की गयी है।

मेरा आप से निवेदन है कि राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण में जो एक आम सहमति की बात कही गयी है, जो एक आम विश्वास लाने की बात कही गयी है, जनता की समस्याओं को दूर करने के लिए एक वातावरण बनाने की बात कही गयी है, उस के प्रति आप का समर्थन प्राप्त होना चाहिए। यह नकारात्मक राजनीति छोड़ दीजिए, जिसके द्वारा आप सिर्फ विरोध दिखाने के लिए विरोध कर रहे हैं। महामहिम राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण पर 107 से अधिक संशोधन का लाया जाना यह संकेत करता है कि जो माननीय सदस्य संशोधन लाए हैं, उन्होंने राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण को नहीं समझा, उन्होंने राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण के चरित्र को नहीं देखा, उन्होंने सही ढंग से उसको पढ़ा भी नहीं। मेरा आपसे निवेदन है कि आप उसको सही रूप में समझें और आप जैसे विद्वान, अनेक विद्वान सदस्य वहां बैठे हैं, वे अपना नकारात्मक सहयोग दें, जैसा कि आपके द्वारा अभी कहा गया। बहुत बहुत धन्यवाद।

उपसभापति: डा० बिप्लव दासगुप्त।

कु० सरोज खापर्डे: आप किस भाषा में बोलेंगे, बंगला?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Dr. Biplab Dasgupta, you should speak in Bengali.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: West Bengal if only an arrangement had been made for translation. Madam, this Presidential Address is a Constitutional fiction. It is delivered by the President of the country in a ceremony but it is written by the Prime Minister of the country and it incorporates all the major views and the agenda of the Government of the country. So what I am saying is that when I say there are many parts in this speech which smack of insincerity or is hypocritical or full of double-speak, it is not meant to be addressed to the office of the President or to the individual holding the position but to the Government of the country which is insincere, which is hypocritical and which is indulging in double-speak. Madam, you will recall when the speech was being read in the Central Hall, whenever there was a reference to secularism in paragraph 7, to fighting corruption in paragraph 6 or there were gems like the statement that the Government rests on the foundation of morality and ethics, there was spontaneous outburst of derisive laughter in the Central Hall. Why did the people laugh? Why did the people not listen to it with respect? It was because this Government has lost credibility even before it has taken office. Nobody believed that the Government is really interested in fighting corruption. Nobody believes that the Government has any view on public morality which is why there was this spontaneous outburst of cynical and derisive laughter. Madam, when I look at the speech, one of the statements which strikes me is in paragraph and I think it is a very interesting statement, "Parliamentary arithmetic alone cannot provide the key to good governance." That is absolutely right. But I find that the arithmetic has taken over the governance. Governance has given way to parliamentary arithmetic and the way the BJP has done it, I think it would make Machiavelli proud. The way the TDP has been manoeuvred would make Machiavelli proud. But has it done anything for the good governance? We can see it immediately.

You strike a bargain with TDP. You obtain 12 votes but what has that done to the governance of a particular space which should remain unnamed? What has it done to the particular space? I am not naming it. Governance has been forsaken for the sake of arithmetic. When we think of coalition which is now in power, is there anything to bind them together? Is it not an unholy alliance, an unprincipled alliance where the partners have nothing in common among themselves? If this was an alliance between BJP and Shiv Sena, I would understand because there will be a lot in common between BJP and Shiv Sena. (Interruptions)

श्री ओ० पी० कोठारी (दिल्ली): आपके पिछली दो सरकारों का क्या हुआ? (व्यवधान).....

श्री नारायण प्रसाद गुप्ता: आपकी दोनों सरकारें इतनी अच्छी थीं, तो चली क्यों गई? (व्यवधान)..... गैरम, मैं आपके माध्यम से कहना चाहता हूँ कि आपकी दोनों सरकारें चली गईं। फिर कुछ है आपके मोहरे। (व्यवधान).....

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन: उत्तर प्रदेश में आपकी केन्द्र सरकार ने क्या किया था? (व्यवधान)..... वह क्या भूल गए आप ?..... (व्यवधान).....

श्री नारायण प्रसाद गुप्ता: इस देश में, बड़ा केन्द्र में कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी की कभी सरकार नहीं रही। (व्यवधान).....

उपसभापति: अच्छा, अभी आप बैठिए। (व्यवधान).....

श्री नारायण प्रसाद गुप्ता: सौ साल तक भी कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी को हुकूमत हिन्दुस्तान में, केन्द्र में नहीं हो सकती। (व्यवधान).....

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Pleased sit down. (Interruptions) Please, everybody sit down. Narendra Mohanji, please sit down. (Interruptions) please. We are discussing the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address. Let us discuss it with some dignity. (Interruptions) Sit down now.

श्री नारायण प्रसाद गुप्ता: जिस भाषा को आप समझते हैं, वह हम समझ देते हैं आपको। (व्यवधान).....

उपसभापति: बैठिए, बैठिए। ... (व्यवधान) ...
बैठिए न। ... (व्यवधान) ...

श्री नीलोत्पल बसु: ये शब्द इस्तेमाल न कीजिए।
... (व्यवधान) ... हाउस चल नहीं पाएगा इस तरह से
बोलने से। ... (व्यवधान) ...

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन: यह धमकी क्यों दी जा रही है कि
हाउस चल नहीं पाएगा? ... (व्यवधान) ...

श्री उसीम अहमद: यह धमकी दे रहे हैं।
... (व्यवधान) ...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. (Interruptions) Please, take your seats. (Interruptions) Please sit down. Otherwise, I am not going to allow anybody to speak. (Interruptions) Sit down. (Interruptions) Please sit down. (Interruptions) Please take your seats. I have a request. If you have anything to say, please address the Chair and not the Members. But if you are replying, then I would put your name in the reply. If anyone of you wants to reply to whatever they speak, please give your names and you will be allowed to speak. But don't interrupt. It doesn't look nice. Neither his speech will be completed, nor yours. If you want that, it is very fine. (Interruptions) Nobody should interrupt.

श्री संजय निरुपम (महाराष्ट्र): मैडम, मैं एक छोटा सा निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ।

उपसभापति: कहिए।

श्री संजय निरुपम: मैडम, मैं काफी देर से देख रहा हूँ कि जब डा० मनमोहन सिंह जी बोल रहे थे तो बहुत सारी आपसिजनक बातें कही गई थीं लेकिन हममें से किसी ने विरोध नहीं किया, एक शब्द हमने नहीं कहा, लेकिन जैसे ही नरेन्द्र मोहन जी बोलने के लिए खड़े हुए हैं तो लगातार उस तरह से टोक-टोकें छे रही हैं और उनके डिस्टर्ब किया जा रहा है, यह एक गलत परम्परा है। आप, विपक्ष में जो धार्मिक सदस्य बैठते हैं, उनके समझाए कि हमारे सदस्यों को बोलने दिया जाए। यह गलत हो रहा है। ... (व्यवधान) ...

श्री उसीम अहमद: जब-जब कोई बोलता था, हरकत की स्थिति में इंटर्प्ट करके नरेन्द्र मोहन जी की आदत बन गई थी ... (व्यवधान) ...

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन: मैडम, मेरा नाम लिखा गया है, मुझे आप बोलने का अवसर दें।

उपसभापति: ठीक बैठिए, जहाँ बिल लिखा है।

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन: मैडम, मेरे को अवसर दीजिए दें, मेरे ऊपर आरोप लगाया गया है।

उपसभापति: Just one second देखिए इस हाउस की परम्परा है कि जब भी लीडर आफ द हाउस या लीडर आफ दि ओपोजीशन बोलते हैं तो टोक-टोकें करने की आपकी आदत पड़ गई है।

I have been sitting here much longer than anyone of you. So, I can say that कोई इस ज़ुर्म से खाली नहीं है, सब उठकर टोक-टोकें करते हैं, चाहे इधर से सदस्य करें, चाहे उधर से सदस्य करें। But if you want a meaningful discussion, if you want to add something to the debate, please listen. Naturally, Biplab Dasguptaji is not going to say something which all of you will like. Nor Narendra Mohanji and others are going to say what the Congress will like. But there should be some tolerance.

THE MINISTER OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI RAM JETHMALANI): Madam, whatever he speaks, I always learn from him. Nobody will interrupt.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, everybody should be getting educated.

DR. BIBLAB DASGUPTA: Thank you, Madam. I have lost ten minutes and I hope you will not add that to my time.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Only if you don't speak something which causes fireworks.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: All that I was saying, Madam, was that the coalition which has been struck is an unholy coalition because there is nothing in common between the partners to bind them together. Now, have I made any wrong statement?

SHRI NARENDRA MOHAN: Yes, it is a wrong statement. (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No. Please sit down. (Interruptions)

Please sit down. ... (Interruptions) ... I just now said, it is his viewpoint. He says that yours is not a holy alliance. You can

call their alliance whatever way you like...*(Interruptions)*... What he is going to speak...

SHRI JIBON ROY: You declare yourself as a holy alliance...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Madam, as I mentioned...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Definitely he is going to speak what he wants to. Narendra Mohanji spoke whatever he wanted to speak. I was objecting then also saying, "Don't interrupt him." But, if he feels that your alliance is not holy, then you answer when you speak to get up and say, no, it is holy. Finish it. ...*(Interruptions)*... This is Parliament. Are you not a Member of Parliament? We are not in a classroom with a book where everybody is going to read the same lesson. This is Parliament. There is going to be debate. There are going to be different viewpoints. You should have some tolerance. You answer what he is alleging here. You will have a chance to reply to him. But, please don't expect him to read out your book or you will read his book.

SHRI O.P. KOHLI: Madam, we should be allowed to give a prompt reply.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I cannot permit a prompt reply. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI R.K. KUMAR): Madam, can I have a word?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Whoever interrupts gets nothing.

SHRI R.K. KUMAR: Madam, would you ask the hon. Member to yield for a minute?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please yield for the Minister.

SHRI R.K. KUMAR: Madam, he is entitled to call this alliance by any name.

But the problem is the previous Government was a post-poll unholy alliance, and this is a pre-poll alliance. The people have voted for this Government...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI JIBON ROY: There is a common understanding...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Madam, if the Parliamentary Affairs Minister has to teach the business rules, I mean, anybody can interpret it in anyway. That does not mean that he will have to get up. That is what he is teaching...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Madam, I am very surprised...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am repeating it again. Definitely, he is not going to speak what you like. So, have tolerance and listen. I am sure what you all speak is definitely not going to be palatable to them. This is our Parliamentary debate. This is not a classroom. You ask a lawyer, does his opponent agree to what he says?

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: They would realise when they characterise something as unholy, that is the best evidence that it is holy.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay, fine. That is better. Now Dr. Biplab Dasgupta.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Madam, I am very surprised the Minister has now made a very fine distinction between a pre-poll alliance and a post-poll alliance. Where is the pre-poll alliance? Smt. Lakshmi Parvathi was a partner of the pre-poll alliance. What has happened to Lakshmi Parvathi?

Bansi Lal was a member of the pre-poll alliance. What has happened to poor Bansi Lal? Let them not talk about pre and post-poll alliances because they don't believe in all this. I have a certain name for the BJP kind of politics — the political economy of disposal goods, any partner who cannot deliver for the BJP can be discarded. Like you discard a

handkerchief, like you discard things which are dirty, you drop them; you find new partners. This is the kind of alliance which cannot remain stable. It cannot remain for long. It is a fragile alliance which has really nothing to bind them together. With the United Front, with all these defaults and all these defects, there are two things in common — secularism and federalism. If there was an alliance between the BJP and Shiv Sena, I could understand. But, what is there to bind the BJP with Ramakrishna Hegde, with George Fernandes, with Jayalalitha, with Mamata Banerjee? I don't understand this. So, I think this is an alliance which is only for achieving power, for the lust for power. It has no other basis. I remember a pop song. When I was young, there was a pop song by a Swedish group called ABBA. There was an interesting line in that song. Easy come, easy go. Anything comes easy goes easy. All those partners who have gathered together have come easy and they will also go easy. I feel sorry for the partners of the BJP because the National Agenda which the BJP has worked out, is only for a year or two. After that the BJP will go to elections and appeal to the people and try to come back to power alone. Only then will they find BJP's agenda which is now hidden. So, Madam, I would appeal to you to look into those parts of the Presidential speech which clearly show hollowness of the attitude.

I remember, a few years back a BJP member made one interesting statement to me. His suggestion caused almost a heart failure to me. I almost collapsed. He said, there is something in common between the BJP and the CPIM. I asked him what is it that is common between us. He made a number of points. He said, both of us are cadre-based parties and we believe in discipline. All right. Both of us have a contempt for defectors. Both of us have contempt for corrupt people. He also said, both of us have an ideology. "You may not agree with our ideology of Hindutva. You also have an ideology. We both have devotion to our

ideology and have loyalty." What is happening now? That was a few years ago. Where is the BJP today?

I remember in this House. We had been discussing telecommunications. Some BJP members were with us. We stalled the proceedings of the House for several days. Congress friends were not happy with us. Manmohan Singh was not happy with us. I remember, the man, who was the kingpin of the scandal fought with telephone as the symbol, and won the election. Now he is a great friend of the BJP. He is in alliance. Now, Ram has been forgotten and Sukh Ram has taken over Ram. That is the position of the BJP.

I remember the sugar scam. Here, in this House, BJP members were with us discussing the sugar scam. The man, who is the kingpin of the sugar scam is now with the BJP. How can you talk of moral values? I remember, also, many of the issues but I do not want to go into the details. Let the BJP not talk of consensus.

I have seen the Address by the President. A lot of things have been said about a national consensus. On page 7, there is a reference to consensus on the mode of governance. What are the issues identified? Electoral reforms, Centre-State relations, population policy, reservation for women, water dispute, environment; maybe, there is room for discussion on these. But there should be national consensus on 2-3 other very important issues. One issue is about defection. Can we not agree to one broad rule that any person, a Member either of Parliament or of an assembly, who leaves his party, no matter what the reason is, should resign from his position and contest in the name of whatever party he has joined? Why cannot there be a consensus on this issue? What is there to stop the BJP from not accepting this? This is number one.

On corruption, we will be willing to bell the cat. Who will be doing this from that side? On corruption, can we not take

a decision in this House? Everything cannot be in the Constitution. Not everything can be in the rule book. Can we not say that we will never take corrupt people into our party or into our alliance? Can we not afford a national consensus on this?

On secularism or federalism, why cannot we have a consensus, which people will understand and which involve certain policies which have something to do with the welfare of the people? I find in the President's speech a lot about women. I am very surprised. There is talk of gender disparity, free education of women, reservation, bank development, all nice things. I cannot help thinking of that person on the BJP benches who has faked documents of divorce of his wife and married has sweet-heart. That is his business. A great champion of women is now with the BJP. What have they done with him? The court has declared that the documents have been faked to get a divorce. Being the champion of women what has been done by the BJP for women? That is the question. When you talk of women, have you done anything to stop *sati*? It is taking place in those States, whether it is Rajasthan or Madhya Pradesh or Uttar Pradesh, where BJP is in a powerful position. these are the States which have the highest number of incidents of atrocities against women. What have you done to stop these atrocities? Why are there cases of bride-burning? Why has Delhi, which is a small State, the largest number of cases of atrocities against women? Why can't you give good governance? Why have our women come to this position? The same is the case with the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. We find States where there are atrocities against women there are also atrocities against the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. These are the States in which BJP has been powerful for a long time. But nothing has been done.

I also see in the Address a suggestion for reviewing the Constitution. Now why have you to review the Constitution? The

American Constitution was written in 1776. Is it right? ...*(Interruptions)*... Have they restructured it? No. The British have not changed it. What is there for India to change its Constitution within 50 years? I do not know whether there is any hidden agenda behind it. If the change is to be suggested because BJP wants to give more powers to the States, more financial powers to the States, that should be clearly spelt out. If it is for proportional representation, I can understand it. We may discuss it. If it is to amend article 370 or to have the presidential form of Government or to amend the Preamble of the constitution so that it does not include any reference to socialism or secularism, I would like to be specific on this. You cannot ask the august House to change the Constitution without knowing your mind, the mind of the Government as to what it has in its mind when it talks of changing the Constitution of the country. If it is to review article 370, we will certainly oppose it. If it is with regard to the Preamble of the Constitution in order to make it a non-secular State, we will certainly oppose it. If it is for more powers to the States, we will consider it. If it is for proportional representation, we will discuss it. But there is nothing in the Address which indicates how the mind of the Government is working.

Similar, I would like to say something about *swadeshi*. Dr. Manmohan Singh has said a lot about it. I also do not understand the term '*swadeshi*'. When we were in the United Front, in my speeches and in the speeches of Ashok Mitra, we have been very critical of the economic policy of the United Front. We have made it clear in the House. We have not said anything which is unknown to anybody. We have made our point very clear. When the BJP says *swadeshi*, what does it mean? I have seen an article by John Fernandes, I do not know whether you have seen it, wherein he says *swadeshi* means more competitiveness. What it means, I do not know. Now all kinds of definitions for *swadeshi* are

there. But, if *swadeshi* means some approach which is away from globalisation for self-reliance, for import substituting industrialisation, etc., that should be clearly spelt out. But that is not mentioned here. On the one hand, you talk of *swadeshi* and on the other hand two years ago when the 13-day wonder of the BJP Government was there, they got the Enron pact revoked. They went in not for *swadeshi* but for globalisation. I was also a Member in the last Parliament. I was a Member of the Standing Committee on Finance. The question of insurance came. On the insurance issue, we noted that America wanted India to open up the country. India had been on the hit list of Super 301 for several years because the United States wanted India to open up the insurance sector. When we discussed in the Standing Committee, I am sorry to say, not a single BJP Member opposed globalisation. We gave a note of dissent. But the BJP did not. Now I understand that the Prime Minister of the country is getting phone calls from Mr. Clinton. I do not know what has transpired between Mr. Clinton and Mr. Vajpayee. But, one of the issues which is coming up, on which I may be having differences with Dr. Manmohan Singhji, is, the W.T.O. issue. The W.T.O.'s membership was taken by issuing an Ordinance. When this Ordinance came, the entry conditions have to...(interruptions)...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Madam, membership was not taken through any ordinance because membership was not to be taken under any law ... (interruptions)... So, there is no question of any Ordinance ...(interruptions)...

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: No. But the entry conditions have to be fulfilled to get exclusive marketing rights ...(interruptions)...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Madam, that is a different issue. That is in regard to the amendment to the Patent's Act ...(interruptions)... An ordinance can be issued only in relation to a

law. Signing the W.T.O. agreement is an executive act and as per the Constitution of India, you do not require any legal sanction.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: That is a different thing ...(interruptions)... What I am saying is ...(interruptions)...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: That is an amendment to the Patent Act of 1970 ...(interruptions)...

SHRI NARENDRA MOHAN: That required the ratification of the Parliament ...(interruptions)...

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Madam unless an Ordinance is passed ...(interruptions)...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: My ruling was there on that. There was a discussion when Mr. Mukherjee was the Minister of Commerce. There was a discussion in the House. There was a demand to reject this agreement which he had signed in Marrakesh. There was a ruling, if you go back. Anything which the Parliament does not have to rectify, it cannot reject. ...(interruptions)...

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Madam, I am not questioning that. What I am saying is, entry conditions were to be fulfilled for getting the membership of the W.T.O. by way of ordinance. Now they are now longer fulfilled because the Ordinance lapsed. Now, there is a pressure from the W.T.O. The issue has gone to the Disputes Settlement board. America is putting a lot of pressure on the Indian Government to bring it back. There the concept of *Swadeshi* will be tested. On the Patent issue, you were on our side. We wanted to see whether the patent issue is again brought back under the pressure of the W.T.O., under the pressure of the U.S.A. and where the B.J.P. stand on this issue would be the ultimate test of whether they are really believing in *Swadeshi* or not.

Madam, two or three major issues I would like to raise. There are other speakers who will speak on other aspects. I do not intend to take their time. I will

speak on two or three major issues. Number one is, what is the concept of India? It must be very clear. India, as a State, as a polity, has two concepts. One concept of the B.J.P. as I understood earlier, was a very clear concept. I do not understand the current concept because the original concept of the B.J.P. was summarised in an expression: Hindi, Hindu and Hindustan. What does it mean? It means, India is only one nation with one language, with one religion and it did not accept the plurality of the Indian states ...*(interruptions)*... Madam, what is this? ...*(interruptions)*... Yes. They do not accept the plurality of the Indian States ...*(interruptions)*... We took a decision that India is a multi-cultural State, a multi-national State, different States have different cultures, different histories and different languages with diversity which is the essence of the Indian life. The B.J.P. had a view, a highly centralised view, as to what should be the language, what should be the culture, what should be the religion.

I did not agree with it but, I understood it. Now, I find something which I do not understand. In the President's Address, the B.J.P. has come out that all 18 languages would be considered as official languages. A Commission would be appointed for this purpose.

Is it like the Jain Commission, which took seven years to come to a conclusion? By that time this Government will be over. I do not think that the B.J.P. believes in this. The B.J.P. does not believe in having more than one centre ...*(interruptions)*...

The Minister of Law, Justice and Company Affairs: SHRI M. THAMBI DURAI Tell me, what is wrong in giving importance to all the 18 languages as official languages? Is there any thing wrong in giving official status to all the 18 languages? ...*(interruptions)*...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Madam, is he replying? ...*(interruptions)*...

SHRI M. THAMBI DURAI: Not replying. I am only saying that ...*(interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, you address the Chair.

SHRI M. THAMBI DURAI: Madam, it is the aspiration of the people of every State to have their language as an official language of India. In our party also a resolution was adopted to accept Tamil language as one of the official languages ...*(interruptions)*... It is a national language ...*(interruptions)*... What is wrong to have it by evolving some kind of a procedure ...*(interruptions)*...

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Madam, I am not talking about that ...*(interruptions)*... Madam, I am not yielding to that ...*(interruptions)*...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Madam, he is a Cabinet Minister. Is he replying on behalf of the government? ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Madam, let me submit. Are we having a new practice where an individual Minister gets up while a Member is speaking and ...*(Interruptions)*... I can understand a private Member getting up. But a Cabinet Minister getting up and interrupting a Member ...*(Interruptions)*... It is absolutely uncalled for ...*(Interruptions)*... it is absolutely uncalled for ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI M. THAMBI DURAI: Madam, when the Member yields, only then I speak. He yielded, and that is why I spoke ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: He is inviting trouble for the new Government ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Actually, the hon. Minister has been a Presiding Officer in the other House. I just wanted to remind him of the rules. That is it.

It is much better that a comprehensive reply comes from the hon. Prime Minister. That is his prerogative, not the prerogative of all the components of the

Government. so, let the Prime Minister answer what the view point of the Government is ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI M. THAMBI DURAI: he yielded. Then only I intervened.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Madam, I do not have any quarrel with anyone. All that I am saying is, the Minister probably did not follow what is said ...*(Interruptions)*... I was trying to point out the contradictions in the position of the BJP. The BJP had a position which it has held for many years. What I am saying is, it is not new. "Hindi, Hindu, Hindustan" has been their slogan for many years. I want to know ...*(Interruptions)*

श्री नारायण प्रसाद गुप्ता: यह फिर उतार दीजिए। हमने नहीं कहा। ...*(व्यवधान)*... आप असत्य बोल रहे हैं। ...*(व्यवधान)*...

श्री संजय निरुपम: ऐसा भाजपा ने नहीं कहा है। ...*(व्यवधान)*...

श्री नरेन्द्र मोहन: ऐसा भाजपा ने नहीं कहा। ...*(व्यवधान)*...

श्री ओ.पी. कोहली: जो कुछ आप कह रहे हैं वह हमने नहीं कहा। ...*(व्यवधान)*...

श्री नारायण प्रसाद गुप्ता: आपके पास क्या प्रमाण है? आप जिम्मेदारी से कहिए। ...*(व्यवधान)*...

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: I am not sure what is wrong in what I have said ...*(Interruptions)*... Are they saying that now they are convinced that what they were saying was wrong? ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Will you conclude or do you want to go on?

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Fifteen minutes have been taken up by them. What I am saying is this that there has to be a national policy. There has to be a clear understanding what the national polity is all about. There is a lot of confusion because for gaining short-term political advantage, the BJP is making all types of compromises in which the BJP itself does not believe. The BJP had certain centralised views of the Indian

policy which I do not think agrees with our understanding of the plural nature of the Indian society, of the diversity of the Indian conditions. This is the point that I was making. Which is why I was saying, the partners which the BJP has *, would not stay with the BJP because there is a fundamental contradiction between their position and the position of the BJP ...*(Interruptions)*...

एक माननीय सदस्य मैडम * शब्द का इस्तेमाल किया है * असंसदीय शब्द है। यह रिकार्ड में नहीं जाना चाहिए। ...*(व्यवधान)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That word will not go on record. Please ...*(Interruptions)*... I am sitting here. I would not allow anything, which is not proper to go on record. It has not gone on record. Unfortunately, when all of you speak I cannot have that much voice ...*(Interruptions)*... It will not go on record ...*(Interruptions)*... It will not go on one record ...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Madam, my last point is about the BJP's concept of secularism. What is secularism? That has to be clearly understood.

Madam, my last point is, ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am sitting here. ...*(Interruptions)*... It has not gone on record. Unfortunately, I do not have that much voice as you people have. ...*(Interruptions)* It has not gone on record. I have already said it. ...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI NARAIN PRASAD GUPTA: Madam, he is a senior Member of the House ...*(Interruptions)*

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Madam, my last point is about the concept of secularism. What is secularism? That should be clearly understood. When the BJP talks about secularism, what does it mean? We should understand this, Madam.

In the West, there is a certain concept of secularism. What is that? When, in

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

England, or, in France, they adopted secularism, nobody pressurised them to adopt it. But they found that if State and religion are mixed up, it is neither good for the state, nor good for the religion. What is the position? If somebody wants to practise religion, let him practise it at home. Let him go to the mosque. Let him go to the church. Let him go to the temple. But the State should be governed only by the rule of law. This means, everyone would be equal in the eye of the State. That is the simple understanding of secularism as we see it in the West.

AS the West adopted this concept of secularism, it prospered. Because they adopted it, they introduced the concept of rationalism. The age of reason, renaissance, has come because one can dissect, analyse and examine the elements of nature in terms of scientific attitude. It has come because the State is not controlled by religious views. Religion has its own autonomy. The State has its own autonomy.

What do you find in India? Here, on the one hand, there is an attempt by the BJP to mix up the two. There is an attempt to impose religion and to take away the concept of rationalism. (Interruptions) I am giving examples. Don't shout. (Interruptions) Please listen to me. (Interruptions) What is the answer you are giving to this? (Interruptions) When the question came up, what answer did you give? When you say that Babri Masjid was ram Janma Bhoomi, what is the proof? In Ramayana, is there any reference to this? In Ramayana, is there any diagram to indicate that Rama was born in that particular place? There is no proof. There is no documentary evidence. What is your answer? You say that it is your *bhavana*. You say that it is your *viswas*. (Interruptions)

श्री नारायण प्रसाद गुप्ता: आप प्रमाण दीजिये ... (व्यवधान) आपको ऐसा नहीं बोलना चाहिये ... (व्यवधान)

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: What I am saying is this. No question of authentication. No question of archaeology. It is only your *bhavana*. It is only your *viswas*. You say: 'It is our belief. Whatever we believe is right'. This is not a Twenty-first Century concept. It is a Fourteenth Century concept. It has no place in the modern society.

Madam, they talk about the Hindu religion. But even the Hindu religion they have interpreted it in a way which has nothing to do with the Hindu religion. I came from Bengal. We had Ramakrishna Paramahansa Deva. he was a great religious figure. (Interruptions) Please listen to me. What did Ramakrishna Paramahansa Deva say? (Interruptions)

श्री नारायण प्रसाद गुप्ता: आपके पास और कुछ नहीं है बोलने के लिए ... (व्यवधान)

श्री नेत्र मोहन: मैडम, यहाँ राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण पर चर्चा हो रही है। ... (व्यवधान)

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: Madam, Ramakrishna Paramahansa Deva became a Muslim. He came a Muslim. He started saying: 'Allah, Allah'. He started offering *Namaj*. (Interruptions) This went on for ten days. Then, he became a Christian. He started talking about Jesus and all that. This went on for a few days. Then, he practised some other religions. Eventually, he came up with a statement which is very interesting. He said:

यह सब जग-भर

It means: 'There are as many ways as there are views'. There is no uniform concept of religion in Hinduism also.

We had another great saint, Swami Vivekananda. (Interruptions) You talk about Vivekananda. Once, some cow protagonists came to Swami Vivekananda. They went to him to seek his help. They told him: 'We want to protect cows; please help us'. (Interruptions) Swami Vivekananda told them: 'I am all in favour of protecting cows'. (Interruptions)

200/K2/1 715

उपसभापति: इनको बोलने दीजिये ताकि बहस जल्दी समाप्त हो जाए। ... (छवषधान)

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: They do not want to listen to me. (Interruptions) What did Swami Vivekananda say? (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Why don't you allow him to speak? He has got his own views. He has got every right to say whatever he likes to say. (Interruptions) आप उनकी तरफ मत देखिये। मेरी तरफ देखकर बोलिये... (छवषधान)

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: I do not want to say what they want me to say. Swami Vivekananda was approached by the anti-cow-slaughter group. They came to Swamiji and said, "We want your support to save the cow." Swamiji said, "I am all in favour of it. But where do you come from?" They told Swamiji where they came from. Swamiji said, "I have heard that herewas famine in the area. Have you done anything about it?" Then this group said, "No, Sir. We specialise in cows and not in human beings." then, Swamiji said, "If you are interested only in cows and not in human beings, I am not interest in that. There is drought. You can go." Then, they said, "We are the children of cow." Swamiji said, "I understood who your mother was by the way you spoke." What I am saying is that Swamiji was a national person. Now, there are differences.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Explain the story again.

DR. BIPLAB DAS GUPTA: No, if you do not understand, I do not want to say anything. All that I am saying is this. (Interruptions)

What they say has nothing to do with Hinduism. Hinduism is not a highly centralised religion. Hinduism is diferent in diferent parts of the country. (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please let him finish.

DR. BILAB DASGUPTA: They have no right to impose a unilateral, centralised concept of Hinduism on the rest of the country. What the BJP says is not Hinduism. They have got only 20 to 25% votes. Hinduism is not what the Vishwa Hindu Parishad says. Hinduism is what is practised in different parts of the country in different ways. Now they are trying to change the character of Hinduism also. When they talk of Hindutva, it has nothing to do with the Hindu religion as understood in this Country.

Madam, what I am saying is that the BJP is hiding its real stand. For the time being the BJP is not in a position to bring it to the fore. When they bring it to the fore, they will divide the country and destroy the country, and we cannot allow them to destroy the country.

I appeal to all the Members not to support the BJP and to reject this Address.

Thank you very much.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Madam, may I speak?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Do you want to intervene? you cannot. If the Government wants to respond, it will go against the time of the Government.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Yes, of course, it will go against the time of the Government, sure.

Madam, I am taking this time only out of respect for my very, very dear friend, Dr. Biplab Dasgupta. That a distinguished intellectual like him should grossly misunderstand the BJP's attitude to the Constitution is a little surprising. All that the National Agenda says is that there will be a Commission to review the Constitution in the light of experience and to make suitable recommendations. Speaking for myself, and I hope I am speaking for the entire party and the Government—I am a student, a respectful student of Dr. Ambedkar—I consider the Constitution a sacred document and so does this Government.

We do not easily tinker with the document. You have treated the document in the past with scant respect. In 50 years you have given to it the reverence which is probably owed to the Cattle Trespass Act or the Municipal Corporation Act. In 50 years you have amended it nearly a hundred times. We do not accept that the Constitution of India is such a trivial document that it should be tinkered with lightly.

Then, there was the Kesavanand Bharati doctrine: No process of amendment, even if you have a two-thirds majority, even if you have a complete majority, even if you are unanimous, can alter the basic features of the Constitution. If the basic features of the Constitution cannot be altered by both the Houses unanimously, surely you do not expect that the BJP, with the kind of thin majority that it has, is unilaterally going to tinker with the Constitution. Why should not the Constitution be reviewed? There might be some flaws, some lacunae, which 50 years of experience might have disclosed. The Commission will look into them and make a Report. The report will ultimately become the property of the whole House. We will consider it. And if we are all agreed, some Constitutional amendments we might go into, provided we muster a two-thirds majority. Mr. Biplab, be sure, if you do not support the Constitutional amendment, it cannot go through the House.

You talked of defections. You said why can't the BJP cooperate? Surely, when the Commission looks into this problem, they will also look at the Tenth Schedule and the manner in which it has worked so far. The Tenth Schedule, according to me, is a terribly flawed Constitutional Amendment. The theory of the Tenth Schedule is if one person does something, it is immoral and wrong, but if a group of conspirators are there, the immoral things suddenly becomes moral. According to me, the Tenth Schedule requires to be looked at again in the light of the manner

it has worked for the last 50 years. If you make this kind of a proposal to the Commission, the Commission will consider it. Be sure that you would get all the respect that you command in the House and we will look into this matter. And if you say that a person, who does not support this party or who just went into greener pastures, must resign, the Commission will consider it and we will all consider it in this House again. So, please don't be alarmed. the BJP has great respect for the Constitution and it will not allow it to be tinkered with in the manner in which it has been tinkered with for the last 50 years.

Well, you talked of.....

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Mr. Minister, would you yield for a minute? Madam, I would like to have a direction from you and also from the Government. It is very welcome if the Minister intervenes as another Minister was trying to intervene earlier. We have no problem, if the Minister intervenes, if they want to make certain points. It is for the Government to decide. But, as we understand, the practice of this House has been this and this type of impropu interventions by Ministers, we have not seen, at least during my experience. During the debate on the President's Address, the Government used to field certain Ministers, who made certain points. They can surely make certain points. The time which they are given, to be more precise, must be given from out of the time of the Government parties. Please ensure that the time consumed by the Ministers is from out of the Government's time.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: But, I have also been in the House at least for the last 10 or 12 years. I have found that Ministers on small points were permitted these interventions. There had been no rule or practice, which prohibited them.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jethmalani, will you please take your seat? I have to make a point clear. Ministers can make intervention. I said

that you can make intervention. That is why I wanted to clarify if you were making an intervention in between. So, definitely the time will come from the Government side. That is what I was trying to ask the Minister for Parliamentary affairs. Because I do not know how we are going to finish today's list. Today's list is not complete. There are political parties which have got their time. They would not be able to finish it today. Their names are there for today. Even from the ruling party's side only two Members spoke. So, if you are brief, it will be nice.

SHRI RAM JETMALANI: Madam, I will not take more than two minutes, I wanted to cut short the debate so that there is no misunderstanding where the Government stands.

You objected very seriously to what the Law Minister said about languages. Language is a part of culture and there is a Constitutional provision which says that every cultural group has a right to strengthen its culture. Culture includes language. If there is a legitimate aspiration in some part of the country that the language—and not one language, but all languages—needs to flourish a little more, surely you cannot quarrel with the aspirations. *(Interruptions)* Ultimately our attitude to language is laid down in the Constitution as it exists and it is laid down in the Official Languages Act. That is a piece of legislation. Now, if any change has to come about, it will come about again either by a Constitutional amendment or by at least a majority in both the Houses. So, the matter will be debated after some proposals are precisely formulated. You need not have any kind of apprehensions of imaginary character that the BJP is out to foist 16 or 18 or 20 languages. You yourself all the time said, we are proud, it is multilingual country. If you say, why should not the people speaking a particular language want both...*(Interruptions)*

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA: I have no point to make about the Sixteen language issue. He misunderstood my point about language. The question is it is in contrast with the stand of the BJP all these years. What was the earlier stand of the BJP on this issue?

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Mr. Biplab, I have no serious difference about the Union List. You are only trying to make a verbal point which is not required to be made in this House. Let us make a very serious point because this is nothing about which we are fighting.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jethmalani, if it is going to become our debate, when should I call the names of other Members are in the list?

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Madam, I seek a clarification from you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No clarification.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: This is regarding a structured debate.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Well, I am asking him to conclude.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Madam, I want to seek a clarification on the structured debate.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Madam, one last sentence. If the BJP has ever said that we are one nation, then, I think the BJP should be proud of it, all of us should be proud of it. If the BJP says that India is one nation, then, India is one nation and it will remain as one nation. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Madam, I want to seek a clarification. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Narendra Mohan, please sit down. Now, you are not in the Opposition. Please take your seat.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Madam, regarding the business procedure, henceforth if a member makes any point and if the Minister does not agree with it,

he will get up and clarify the Government's point of view, the debate will go on like this. It means a structured debate on a particular subject and then converting it into a question hour. My question is about structuring of the debate.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay. It should not be like this. That is why I told Mr. Jethmalani in the beginning itself whether he was going to make an intervention on behalf of the Government. He said, yes. That will become a part of the Government's reply, not an intervention by the Minister on the spot. Do you understand?

Now, I would request the Government to have a comprehensive reply at the end of the debate because there will be many points on which they may not agree.(Interruptions)... Mr. jethmalani, if you think that by your explanation some member is not going to mention it, then, you have a wishful thinking.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I have explained because they should not misunderstand us.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: They will definitely make their viewpoint which they have in their mind. So, it will be better if the reply is given at the end of the debate which has some meaning. Otherwise, it will go on like this.

SHRI SANATAN BISI: Madam, I was submitting regarding some contradiction on secularism made by the present Government. The other thing was about poverty alleviation programme. The third thing was about the causes of the mid-term poll. Madam, I would like to draw the attention of the House to the Address of the President delivered to the Parliament on 2.4.1996. In that Address there was nothing about secularism, not a single word was stated about secularism. But in the President's Address delivered on the 25th March, 1998, in paragraph 7 it has been said, "Secularism is integral to India's traditions. My Government is unequivocally committed to upholding

our secular values." So, my question is: What made the present Government to come forward with such a statement, "Secularism is integral to India's traditions....."? So far as the Constitution is concerned, secularism has been completely defined in the Preamble as well as in article 25. In the earlier Address it was not there, but now I am astonished to find such a statement in the present Address. Generally it has been treated as a hidden agenda.

The other thing we have been discussing is about the poverty alleviation programmes. So far as poverty alleviation programmes are concerned, it is a State subject. These programmes are being monitored by the Panchayat Samitis after their constitution. I would like to know from the Government what they are going to do if these poverty alleviation programmes are not going to be implemented properly. The third thing I would like to submit is so far as the causes of summons are concerned, as stipulated under Article 87. In paragraph 3 of the Address, they have mentioned 'mid-term election'. Why was a mid-term election held? What were the causes thereof?

These are the three points on which I seek clarifications from the hon. Prime Minister.

Thank you, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is all?

SHRI SANATAN BISI: Yes, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I wish that everybody should follow him.

SHRI SANATAN BISI: Madam, we have got three more persons.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He is always very disciplined. Now, Shrimati Margaret Alva.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA
(Karnataka): Madam Deputy Chairperson, we are with the President's Address which has been presented after a

new verdict. In fact, in the last about four years, this is the third President's Address which we are discussing from a new Government. Everyone is telling us that the verdict of the people has been respected and those of us on this side have no business to tamper with the verdict of the people. Madam, I would like to ask on what basis is the verdict analysed? If you look at the percentage of votes cast, the Congress, by itself, got 25.81 per cent of the votes polled whereas the BJP, on its own, got 25.34 per cent of the votes polled. As far as percentages are concerned, the Congress did get more than the BJP did. It is true that you—I mean the BJP—went round and had allies in every State in order that you may get a foothold. And based on the popularity of those local parties, you today claim that you have more seats—249 with your allies. We had very few allies. We have 166 without allies because we did not go for these kind of alliances. At least the United Front, having learnt from its experience, went to the polls with a common manifesto. They decided, after their experience, that they had to go with something to present as a common manifesto; which you did not think was necessary. So, you actually fought on different manifestos, came together and today claim that they were pre-poll allies. In fact, they were more seat adjustments than alliances because you did not have a common manifesto. But that aside, I agree that you have had to make compromises, you have had to give up a lot of what you talked about in the campaigns and you have, therefore, had to form a Government of compromises and alliances of compulsion. Somebody has just said that they were all pre-poll alliances. Well, I suppose the TDP was with you before. I may be wrong with the facts. But you seem to claim that all of them were with you even before? Both Bansi Lal and Chautala were with you before the elections? I mean the way you are going on is as if they were all with you all along and nothing has changed after the elections. But that aside, I am particularly glad that

this kind of an 'alliance Government' of BJP has been formed for the simple reason that what the people could not compel them to do, the political parties which are sitting with them today compelled them to do. In fact, I must say, many of us were afraid that if a purely-BJP Government came, what their programme would be, what the repercussions would be. It is not because we have no faith in individuals. All of you are our friends for whom we have great respect, particularly Mr. Vajpayee. But the manifesto did set before the nation certain priorities which did worry many of us in the country, whether it was the question of your definition of Hindutva, whether it was your commitment to Kashi and Mathura, the building of the temple at Ayodhya—issues which were going to lead to divisions; to bloodbath and to absolute instability in the country. These items of your agenda were not going to be universally accepted and there was going to be trouble. And therefore, I am glad, that thanks to those so-called alliances and compromises and consensus which you were compelled to enter into in order to form a Government, they have been shelved. I am not talking of a stable Government.

I am talking of forming a Government. I am glad that many of these issues, as you have repeatedly said, have been kept aside for the present. Mr. Bhandari is not here. We were in a debate recently. We were in a discussion with others. Everyone of them has made one point clear. "This we say as the basic priority of our manifesto as far as the B.J.P. is concerned. They are our priorities as far as our agenda for the party is concerned. But in Government, we will follow this agreed programme. What the party does, what the party's priorities are, the Government has nothing to do with them. The Government will follow the Common Programme." In fact, I object to calling it a 'national agenda' because this is not the national agenda. It is the agenda of the Government, of the Coalition. You should call it the

'coalition agenda' because it does not become a national agenda. All the same, you have still repeatedly reiterated that those items are still your priorities as far as you are concerned. But for the present, because of the alliance, they will not become Government priorities overnight. One of those who have had discussion with us said: "We cannot stop our party cadres or the V.H.P. from doing things. As long as the Government does not do it, we are not responsible." अगर हमारे कैडर करते हैं तो हम क्या कर सकते हैं? हम कुछ नहीं कर सकते हैं।

"The law will take its course". Like they sent Kalyan Singh to jail for one day. But they have repeatedly said that they have not given up their agenda. Their agenda stands. But because of compromises in the Government, they have set it aside as far as the Government is concerned.

Madam, we are today here fifty years after freedom. Mr. Jethmalani, who was present in the House, has just disappeared. He made a very interesting intervention. He spoke about the Constitution Commission. I was also going to raise this issue. He said that it is very necessary for us to review the Constitution. If that is the general opinion in the country, then we have to have a Constituent Assembly. Let us forget Parliament, call for a Constituent Assembly, sit together for three years or five years and have a National Government or whatever it is and set up a Constituent Assembly, to go into it. But one Government, that too a Government which has, I think, seven parties in that Government, which are one-member parties; others, who have five Members, three Members, sitting together and saying: "We feel that the Constitution must be recast or needs to be looked at", creates a feeling that you are literally running even before you have begun to settle down. The Constitution Commission is going to consist of whom? Who is going to select them? From where are the people going to come? Are they

going to come from a national consensus, by voting, by electing them or will you just handpick people who suit your thinking and put them on a Commission and say: कमीशन की रिपोर्ट आ गयी है? These are not issues which can be treated lightly. The fundamental features of the Constitution have been spoken about. There are basic issues which just cannot be settled by a Commission however much you may want it. But what is more important today is the question which we have discussed so much. We have seen from experience the need for electoral reforms. We have talked about it; we have reports, we have come to a consensus on electoral reforms to strengthen the democratic institutions. What is happening today? How much faith do the people have in the electoral process? We have seen the interviews on television. We have seen the discussion. What is the Common voter's perception of the people they elect, of the process by which elections are actually conducted? Do all sections of the people feel confident that the processes are correct and that they are happy with what happens. Madam—the violence that goes with it in some States, the threats, the fear in the minds of the people to cast their vote, money power and the criminals behind the electoral process? We have had so many discussions on the TV. Names of candidates of the B.J.P. with criminal records put up for elections this time were taken. We have all talked about fighting the criminalization of politics. How many of your candidates had criminal cases in courts? It is true, the argument is: जब तक उनका कोर्ट में कन्विक्शन नहीं होता है तब तक वह इन्नोसेंट है।

That is the criterion being used, but in the process people are getting elected in spite of being on bail, becoming Ministers, being rehabilitated yet this House has seen debate after debate on fighting criminalisation! How many parties, I would ask, among you have really taken steps to see that these people are not given tickets? We have the lists. They have been documented on the

cover-pages of magazines. But you say, well, it is a part of the electoral game and we are fighting criminalisation!

Madam, I must congratulate the Election Commission; they have over the years tried to take steps to ensure certain systems and a certain fair-play. But, after we passed the Anti-Defection Law with great hope, with great faith, what have we done with the loopholes that have come to light? I am not criticising any particular presiding officer. The provisions are misused to suit the ruling parties, the way the decisions are given, delayed for three months, six months till a whole Government has been established, re-established, and so on and so forth, and then we are told, "We will go to court now to fight it!", the whole system of defections is जो मिले उसको ले लो। कुछ नहीं है तो कुर्सी में बैठा दो। कहीं तो बैठा दो। कुछ तो कर डालो।

I am not talking of any individual party or individual. I am talking of the system, and I think what we need to give attention to immediately is the law. It was passed when I was the Parliamentary Affairs Minister; we were all part of it. The Rajiv Gandhi Government, With great hopes and aspirations Passed it. At that time when we had pointed out the loopholes, all the parties said, "Let it work for some time. We will see the loopholes, we will plug them later and we will come out well after our experience." I think, now we have had enough experience, of 10 or 15 years. Let us see how these loopholes can be plugged first so that the Defection Law does not become a joke. Nothing has been said about it in the President's Address, but I think that is the basic issue with which we have to deal today.

Madam, another thing which worries many of us is making regional agendas our national priorities. I come from Karnataka. Some others also come from there. We have our local priorities. We have our local interests and we, the representatives of the people, are here to represent their point of view, but to

make regional agendas national priorities is something that bothers us. One man controlling 12 Members can dictate terms to the Prime Minister and to the Central Government! He can keep them on their knees. Somebody who has, on local issues, won five, four, three seats, becomes a king maker! He dictates terms to the Prime Minister! I am not against having very powerful local leaders; it is very important, but when the regional parties fight elections on regional agendas and then begin to say, the Central Government must run as per the regional priorities of each small group, then you have the threat of your national view, your national vision and your national priorities getting eroded. Don't misunderstand me. I am not saying regional parties are not important, but I think if you are talking about national elections, we will have to agree that the definitions of national parties are mutually accepted and only national parties are allowed to contest for national election; and regional and local parties for assembly elections. Let us get the definitions of national parties: You must contest in five States; You must have a broader agenda etc. Let us have a definition agreed on; that should be a part of the electoral reforms so that just one small State with small issues which are totally local, does not dictate terms to the Central Government.

Madam, we have talked so much about corruption. I do not want to go into this issue. The Lok Pal Bill drafted by consensus is ready, is pending, supposed to be passed. Our Government completed it. The BJP has raised the issue of corruption. The Bill was ready. But the BJP at that time said in writing—Mr. Jaswant Singh's letter is on the file—"This Government has no business to come with it. You are at the last stage of your Government. After the elections the new Government should do it." Two new Governments came. But they were not able to pass it by consensus. It is still there. The Law Minister is here. Please see to it that you

pass it. You have made a commitment in your programme which the Prime Minister has announced. We had also agreed to pass it at that time. You make it your priority. Please pass it. But this House, Madam, was held to ransom for ten days by all our great friends here saying "Sukh Ram *hatao*". सुख राम को हटाओ," 13 दिन हाउस नहीं चला।

We said, "Let the courts look into it. Let us have a commission." They said, "No. Till he goes out. So long as he remains, there is no question" (*Interruptions*) Today he becomes their Deputy Chief Minister in Himachal Pradesh. (*Interruption*)... Today he becomes their Deputy Chief Minister and they bring his son to the Rajya Sabha. To reward the father and son who have got arrested in corruption charges. मैं नहीं बोलती हूँ कि वह कोई कन्विक्टेड है, मैं बोल रही हूँ कि आप लोगों ने यहां बैठकर जो बात की, ऊपर पहुंचते ही आप उसे भूल क्यों जाते हैं? यहां खड़े होकर एक-एक ने, मेरे पास सब क्वेश्चन्स हैं पर मैं आज बोलना नहीं चाहती हूँ, जो-जो बातें कही थीं आपने, आपने और सबने, आज आप सब लोग उन्हें क्यों भूल गए? आज तो मैं चीज़ हुई कि वह-तो डिप्टी चीफ मिनिस्टर बन गया है, उसका बेटा तो संत बन गया है, राज्य सभा में आएगा, सब करेंगे। आपके यहां आते ही सब संत बन जाते हैं, जो यहां बैठते हैं वे सब चोर बन जाते हैं, यही क्या आपका तरीका है?

All I say is that the country has seen their commitment to remove corruption and their double standards. As far as dealing with the question of corruption is concerned, I need not say much.

यह तो इंसिडेंट है, मैं बहुत इंसिडेंट्स दे सकती हूँ पर दूंगी नहीं।

Madam, another question, which we have been repeatedly debating in this House, is the question of judiciary and the legislature. We have seen that over the years, gradually, public interest litigations—I am glad the Law Minister is here—are taking precedence over pending cases in the courts for years and years. There is a fight against corruption. If we say anything, they say we are afraid of being caught, so, we are fighting against the judiciary. The point is that

anybody who goes and makes a charge gets priority over everything else. People can be waiting for 25 years for normal litigation cases. I would, therefore, appeal to them to set up to a Bench in every High Court for public interest litigation. Keep one Judge to deal with them so that the other cases don't get tied up. Look at the pending cases. Lakhs and lakhs of cases are pending today and people are waiting for two generations to get a judgement. Two generations pass before they get justice. I think we need to look into judicial reforms a big way. I hope that it will receive some attention.

I am glad that the reservation for women is part of their National Agenda. Each Government that comes says, "We are more committed than the previous one." I hope that they who have with them 22 parties committed to their National Agenda and those who are sitting on this side had also made such commitments on this question in the past. One of their Members who took part on 8th March in a national programme on the TV said, "This will be the first Bill of the new Government." The commitment made to the nation on 8th March on the national TV was that this would be the first Bill, that is, 33% reservation for women, that the new Government would pass. I hope they will keep that commitment and, maybe, some of us who are going out will be able to come back through, at least, this 33% reservation for women once you pass it.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shrimati Margaret Alva, with due apology to the House, I must say that no political party is committed to its own commitments. They have never kept their promises. It is only on paper. We thank them for putting it in writing. But as far as action is concerned, none of them did it. I think two lady Members, yourself and Mrs. Renuka Chowdhury, are not coming back to the House. I don't know who else will not be coming back.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: Madam, their Members are saying that theirs is a Government with a difference. With three women making them dance on their toes, I am sure, they have no other alternative but to listen to the women. Now they are so dependent on them. Madam, the other question that I am raising is that of Swadeshi which has been dealt with in detail. I must say very honestly that Swadeshi was the watchword of the freedom movement. It was the Congress and Mahatma Gandhi who gave that slogan. Anybody can say that it is theirs today. The entire freedom movement saw Swadeshi as a part of the resurgence of Indian nationalism. I think that none of us in this country today are saying that we are not committed to it. It is not the agenda of any one political party, of any one ideology or thinking. Madam, we have seen our newsprint industry closing down. We have seen our public sector being taken over. We have seen various changes coming in over the last few years. But I do think that we have to congratulate our scientists on the super-computer that has been commissioned in Pune three days ago in the face of all the challenges from the United States and others which refused to give us the basic technology. It was Rajivji's commitment at that time. He said, "36 months and 36 crores of rupees". The scientists agreed that within Rs. 36 crores and within 36 months, they would find an alternative. And they did it. It is not even Rs. 36 crores. I met a scientist on the flight this morning. He said, "it was not even Rs. 36 crores; we did it within Rs. 30 crores." This is the basic infrastructural development that was required. This is what I am talking about. When we talk of Swadeshi, we are talking about the national pride to be able to meet the challenges and to create things from within. We don't have to import everything and I am one of those who believe that the consumer market does not have to be flooded with foreign goods. We have the capacity to meet our needs. But on certain items, certain things, there is no way you can avoid

imports; international commitments have to be perhaps met. But I think that we have to fight to protect Indian industry, to prevent its take-over by companies which have the money and, most of all, provide the necessary infrastructure as far as foreign investment, is concerned, let them go into roads, into bridges. Let them invest in areas, on whatever terms that you say, where investment is really needed. Madam, unfortunately, ever since the so-called negotiations of these parties for forming the Government started, each party leader has been waxing eloquent on the economic policy of the country. We had so many shadow finance ministers coming. There was Mr. Ramakrishna Hegde. There was Mr. Subramanian Swamy. There was somebody else. Each one of them, is one programme or the other, were giving their views. Mr. Swamy was there with me when he said that he would abolish income-tax altogether. And he was so popular. And you know what Mr. George Fernandes said about foreign investments, about foreign companies! Each one of them has his own perception of what Swadeshi is, of what international finance should do, with the result that you are going to have problems, trying ultimately to get your own definition of what Swadeshi is, what your economic policy is and what you are going to implement. I wish you luck. But we have seen these experiments, what happens with the common agenda and what happens when each leader begins to give his own agenda and his own interpretation. Even here you have five Ministers. Somebody has spoken about a Commission. Somebody has said something else. Somebody has talked about court cases. Each one is making statements, projecting his own local agenda as if it was Government's national priority. Whatever we do, let us not forget that development has to be with social justice. Two-thirds of the people of this country are yet to be reached with the development that has taken place. I think that our priority has got to be that development and whatever progress we

make has to improve the lives of people who have been left out.

I would say, therefore, what we need -- in your programme, you have it -- is an effective population policy. We had passed resolutions in Parliament unanimously. Unless and until an accepted population policy is implemented, no matter what programmes we launch, no matter what investments we make, the content and the quality of the life of the people cannot change.

5.00 P.M.

A commitment has been made for six per cent of the GNP to be given for education. It is not part of your agenda today but I think the slogan *garibi hatao* that was given by Mrs. Gandhi is valid even today. Every party in this country has to make the commitment that we will fight poverty, discrimination and exploitation. The day before yesterday I was reading something which shocked me. All of us are responsible. I am not blaming any party. Even today in Bhaiya Mandi labour is brought and auctioned in the market place, and One boy was left out because he had a limp on his leg and could not work. So they sent him back. This is happening today openly in U.P. They say that on Sundays it is a women's market. Girls are auctioned.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I thought it was in Punjab.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: They are brought from U.P. and they are called Bhaiya Mandi in Punjab. This is what is happening today and therefore, I say while we are fighting across parties, issues and so on. I say here, that what we really need today, and I agree on this is consensus on basic policies which this country needs, to deal with these problems. Foreign policy consensus has existed but listening to the Defence Minister's statements these days I do know how long the consensus on foreign policies can hold.

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA: I would like that the sitting of House be extended for one hour.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We will sit till six of the clock. Do you want it till seven?

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA: No, till six o' clock.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA: The question of small States has come up. I would only like to ask -- I agree and I think some more States are in the making -- why Jharkhand has been renamed Vananchal. Why? You want to call it a forest State? Vananchal, according to the Jharkhand M.P.s who were speaking to me, in their language means *kadu*. It mean it is a forest State. Why not Jharkhand? The demand has been for Jharkhand. You are giving it to them. Why do you rename it and call it a forest State? What is the implication? Why? Why hurt the feelings of the people? Jharkhand they think, is associated with Congress support. The people are asking for it. You change the name and you think that you are going to get votes of the people by calling it a forest States. Don't politicise even the name and hurt people and the people to whom you are giving it. There is going to be a great deal of agitation on this and I want you to take note of it.

Finally, Madam, this is my last speech. I have been in this House for 24 years. I have seen eight Prime Ministers come and go, agendas presented, Motions of Thanks passed, amended, changed, depending on the composition of the House but one thing I wish to say today before I retire is that politics of confrontation, politics of vendetta cannot work in this country. We are too large a country, we are too diverse a people and we have so many different issues which can be sorted out if only there is understanding, compromise and a spirit of give and take. You might be on that side today, we have been there for long years. You have been on this side for

long years. You know benches change. I had been on the back bench there and then. On the front bench. This is politics; the wheel of fortune in politics never stands still. It keeps moving. Therefore, let us not believe that those of us who are somewhere will be there permanently. Governments come and go. But at least now, 50 years after freedom, we realise that this country needs progress and development, that there should be give and take, understanding of the common people's perception, of what we are doing in this House. This is telecast. What we watch of the Lok Sabha, what we watch on television of either House is the impression that people particularly the younger generation, have of the success or failure of democracy. I would plead that we behave in a way, with greater commitment to the promises we make at election time, that we strengthen the institutions of democracy in this country. It is so easy to pull down each other, it is so easy to try to destroy all that has been built over long years of work, sacrifice and toil by the people of this country. I think we need to dedicate ourselves to this and not forget that these are instruments of democracy of the State. They are not of a party, they are not of one Government and they cannot be destroyed because somebody is in power today or tomorrow. I would say that though Governments may come and go national interests continue to be common. somebody just now said—and I was very upset when they said that,—that is, the BJP have said that India is one nation. Which of us has not said that India is one nation? You don't have to be a Hindu to be one nation. We are all part of the mainstream of this nation's life. Why should it be said that BJP has said that India is one nation. All of us have said this.

Madam, the call in 1942 was 'Bharat Chhodo'. The call today has to be 'Bharat Jodo'. We need to come together to make common cause and find solutions to the problems of this country. For

whatever the worth of the President's Address, we have read it, we will debate it, but that is not going to be the end of it. But what is achieved, what is implemented by way of commitments made to the people, is what is going to determine the future of democracy. I hope all of us together will find answers to the problems of people and make the country richer and greater. Thank you.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It may be your last speech, but not the least. It is one of the best speeches you have made. And nobody dies politically. You will come back.

श्री लक्ष्मीराम अग्रवाल (मध्य प्रदेश):
उपसभापति महोदया, राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने अभिभाषण में एक बहुत ही सुन्दर बात कही है कि यह सरकार देश में आम सहमति के जरिए इस देश की समस्याओं का समाधान ढूँढ़ने का प्रयास करेगी।

उपसभापति महोदया, मैं कहना चाहूँगा कि हम लोकतंत्र के बहुत बड़े चुनाव से निकले हैं और लोकतंत्र के चुनाव में कटुता, आरोप-प्रत्यारोप, मुद्दों पर काफी चर्चा होती है और उसके कारण कटुता भी होती है। यह हमारी राजनीतिका दुर्भाग्य है कि पिछले कुछ समय से एजनीति में कट्टरपन, छुआछूत और कटुता का निर्माण हुआ है। इस सारी बातों को देखते हुए वर्तमान सरकार ने आम सहमति से समस्याओं का समाधान करने का आव्हान किया है। लेकिन उपसभापति महोदया, मैं कहना चाहूँगा कि हमारे कुछ मित्र अभी तक इन चुनावों के परिणामों को पचा नहीं पाए हैं और इसके कारण राष्ट्रीय आम सहमति की बात में भी उनको मीन-मेख दिखाता है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (कुमारी सरोज खापड़ें) पीठासीन हुईं।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदया, पचास साल हमारी आजादी को हो गए हैं। हम स्वतंत्रता की स्वर्ण जयन्ती मना रहे हैं। हम बहुत बड़ी-बड़ी योजनाएँ बनाते हैं, बहुत बड़े-बड़े देश में विकास भी हुए हैं, लेकिन मैं एक मूलभूत बात कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस देश में 75 प्रतिशत आबादी है वह गाँवों में रहती है, उनकी छोटी-छोटी समस्याओं का भी क्या हम समाधान कर सके हैं? क्या हम उनके स्वच्छ पीने का पानी उपलब्ध कर सके हैं? क्या हम उनके आवास-व्यवस्था उपलब्ध कर सके हैं? क्या हम बारहों-मासी सड़के उनको दे सके हैं?

हम उच्च शिक्षा की बातें करते हैं। मैं यह भी पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या हम उनके लिए प्राथमिक शिक्षा का भी प्रबन्ध कर सके हैं? भारतीय जनता पार्टी की सरकार ने राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में इन सारी समस्याओं को छूने की चेष्टा की है। पाँच वर्षों में इस देश के प्रत्येक नागरिक को, गाँव को स्वच्छ जल देने की, पीने के पानी के प्रबन्ध की बात की है। यह हमारा दुर्भाग्य है कि 50 साल की आजादी के बाद भी हम इस साधारण चीज को जो जीवन के लिए अति आवश्यक है। स्वच्छ पीने के लिए पानी का प्रबन्ध नहीं कर सके हैं। हम चाहे कितनी बड़ी-बड़ी बातें करें। यदि हम गाँवों में जाकर देखें कि लोग कैसे इन समस्याओं से जूझते हैं तब हमको इन बातों का पता लगता है। भारतीय जनता पार्टी ने न केवल स्वच्छ पीने का पानी का प्रबन्ध करने की बात कही है बल्कि आवास-व्यवस्था और चिकित्सा उपलब्ध कराने की भी बात कही है। उसने यहां तक कहा है कि इस देश में सदियों से जो महिलाएं शिक्षा के क्षेत्र में पिछड़ी हुई हैं, जिनको शिक्षा उपलब्ध नहीं हुई है, लड़कियाँ उम्र में बड़ी हो जाती हैं, उनको पढ़ने में कठिनाई होती है, इस देश के गाँवों में रहने वालों की आर्थिक दशा ऐसी नहीं है कि वह उच्च शिक्षा अपनी लड़कियों को दिला सके। भारतीय जनता पार्टी ने पहली बार इन समस्याओं को देखा है और उनका समाधान करने के लिए राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में अपनी बात कही है। उसमें यह कहा गया है कि इस देश की महिलाओं के लिए ज्ञातक तक निःशुल्क शिक्षा का प्रबन्ध किया जायेगा। मैं समझता हूँ कि गाँव के गरीबों की लड़कियों के लिए शिक्षा के क्षेत्र में आगे बढ़ने में यह घोषणा उनके लिए प्रभावी होगी। भारतीय जनता पार्टी की सरकार ने इस देश की एक बहुत बड़ी महिलाओं की निरक्षरता की समस्या की तरफ ध्यान दिलाया है। महोदय, मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस देश में बहुत बड़ी-बड़ी समस्याएं तो रही हैं और उनका समाधान भी हुआ है लेकिन हमको इस देश की छोटी-छोटी समस्याओं को छूने का प्रयास करना चाहिये, निपटारा करना चाहिये। इस देश का आम नागरिक 50 साल की आजादी के बाद उन समस्याओं से पीड़ित है, कराहता है। लेकिन सुनाई नहीं होती है। भारतीय जनता पार्टी की सरकार ने राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण में इन समस्याओं को गहराई से अनुभव किया है और उनका उल्लेख व उनके समाधान की इच्छा व्यक्त की है।

जहाँ तक इन समस्याओं के ऊपर शंका और संदेह की बात है तो मैं विश्वास के बैचों पर बैठे अपने भाइयों से कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस देश पर 40-50 साल तक

कांग्रेस ने राज किया और आज ये प्रतिशत निकालकर बताते हैं कि आपको इतने प्रतिशत वोट मिला और हमको इतने प्रतिशत वोट मिला। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि स्वतंत्रता के बाद कितनी बार अपने 50 परसेंट से ऊपर वोट प्राप्त किया? एक-दो चुनाव की बात मैं नहीं कहता, आपको 50 प्रतिशत से ऊपर कभी वोट नहीं मिले तो क्या आपने जनादेश का पालन किया? हमारे चुनाव की प्रक्रिया ऐसी है इसलिए आज आप प्रतिशत की बात करते हैं। आपने पिछले 50 वर्षों में कभी प्रतिशत की बात नहीं की और 50 वर्षों तक आपने राज किया। अपने ढंग से इस देश की समस्याओं को सुलझाने का प्रयास किया।

भारतीय जनता पार्टी को सभी दलों ने मिलकर हराने की चेष्टा की। पहली बार, इस देश के नागरिकों के विश्वास ने पिछले 40 वर्षों से धीरे-धीरे अपने संघर्ष और विश्वास के बल पर आज इस स्थिति में पहुंचाया है। आज पहली बार जब भारतीय जनता पार्टी का मिले-जुले दलों के साथ राज आया और उन्होंने मिलकर जब

इस देश की समस्याओं को सुलझाने का कार्यक्रम बनाया तो उससे आपके पेट में दर्द होने लगा। हमने 40-50 साल, तक प्रतीक्षा की और आपके राज को सहा और देखा। आज जब भारतीय जनता पार्टी का राज पहली बार आया है तो आप लोगों को वह बर्दाश्त नहीं हो पा रहा है। भारतीय जनता पार्टी तो राष्ट्रीय आम सहमति लेकर, आप सबकी राय लेकर राज चलाना चाहती है और इस देश की समस्याओं का समाधान चाहती है। मैं आपसे अनुरोध करूँगा कि हमारे बाजू में बैठे हमारे भाई निरर्थक नारे न दें। मैं अपनी जवानी की अवस्था में इनका नारा सुनता था रोटी, कपड़ा और मकान। आज कहाँ गई रोटी, कहाँ गया कपड़ा और कहाँ गया मकान। आज तो बेचारे एक ही नारा लगाते हैं—सांघदायिकता, सांघदायिकता। न इनको रोटी की चिंता है, न कपड़े की और न ही मकान की चिंता है। चिंता है तो केवल सांघदायिकता की। आज कहाँ है सांघदायिकता? इस देश में कोई सांघदायिकता नहीं है। यह सांघदायिकता केवल आपके वोट की राजनीति की सांघदायिकता है। आप जिन लोगों को सांघदायिकता कहते हैं वे इस देश के करोड़ों लोगों द्वारा चुनकर आये हैं। मैं आपसे सीधा सवाल करना चाहता हूँ कि जिन्होंने वोट देकर चुना है क्या वे भी सांघदायिक हैं? क्या इस देश के करोड़ों लोग सांघदायिक हैं? इस प्रकार क्या इस देश से कभी सांघदायिकता मिट सकती है? आप लोकतंत्र को नकारते हैं। आप दुनियाँ में कहते हैं फासिज्म, फासिज्म/फासिज्म

यही है कि जो लोकतंत्र के आदेश को न माने, उनके आदेश का आदर न करे, उनकी भावना की कद्र न करे और मैं जो बोलता हूँ यही ठीक है, यही फासिब है? आप इस को, जनमत को नकार नहीं सकते।

श्रीमती मारग्रेट आल्वा: ...क्या बात करते हैं आप?... (व्यवधान)

श्री लक्ष्मीराम अग्रवाल: मैं आपके भाषण में आपके कभी डिस्टर्ब नहीं किया है। आप आल्वा जी बैठ जाइये। आप थोड़ा बर्दाश्त करिये। वास्तव में इस देश के करोड़ों लोगों ने हमें वोट से चुनकर भेजा है। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि मुद्दीभर लोग एक-दो प्रदेश से चुनकर आते हैं और पूरे देश के पुरोहित बन जाते हैं और कहते हैं कि ये साम्प्रदायिक हैं। ये साम्प्रदायिक नहीं हैं। आप सारे देश के पुरोहित बन गए कि यह साम्प्रदायिक है और यह साम्प्रदायिक नहीं है। आपके कहने से कोई साम्प्रदायिक नहीं होगा। इस देश की जनता यह फैसला करेगी कि कौन साम्प्रदायिक है और कौन नहीं है। यह लोकतंत्र है, यहां आपकी पुरोहित-गिरी नहीं चल सकती। इसलिए आप इस शोधे नारे को छोड़िए। आप यह वोट की राजनीति छोड़िए। वास्तव में इस वक्त पहली बार देश संत्रमण काल की स्थिति में आया है। किसी भी बड़ी पार्टी को पूर्ण बहुमत नहीं मिला है। सारी पार्टियों को जनता का संदेश यह है कि मिलजुल कर, सरकार बनाकर, परस्पर आप सहमति से देश को चलायें। इसी कारण आज भारतीय जनता पार्टी ने अपने गठबंधन दलों के साथ सरकार बना ली है। मैं आपसे निवेदन करूंगा कि आप सारी कटुताओं को भुलाकर इस सरकार को आम सहमति के आधार पर इस देश की समस्याओं को समझने में सहयोग दीजिए।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं एक दो बात और कहकर अपनी बात समाप्त करूंगा। महोदय, यहां पर छोटे राज्यों की बात आई है। मारग्रेट आल्वा जी ने भी यह बात उठाई है। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ और मैं इस बात को स्वीकार करता हूँ कि इस देश में छोटा राज्य होने से ही उस राज्य का विकास होता है। इस भावना के आधार पर पिछले कई वर्षों से इस देश में उत्तरांचल, वनांचल और छत्तीसगढ़ की मांग होती रही है। मैं सदन का ध्यान इस ओर दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि पिछले वर्ष मैंने छत्तीसगढ़ राज्य का निर्माण करने संबंधी एक संकल्प इस सदन में रखा था और उस संकल्प का अधिकांश सदस्यों ने समर्थन किया था। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस देश में जब राज्यों का पुनर्गठन हुआ तो मध्य प्रदेश एक राज्य बना लेकिन जब प्रवेश एक इतना विशाल राज्य है कि उसका एक छोरे राज्याध्यक्ष से

मिलता है और दूसरा छोरे बिहार, आंध्र और महाराष्ट्र को कूता है। इतने बड़े राज्य के कारण छत्तीसगढ़ के लोगों को वहां आने में बड़ी परेशानी होती है। छत्तीसगढ़ से भोपाल पहुंचने में भी इतनी ही देरी लगती है जितनी कि दिल्ली पहुंचने में लगती है। बस्तर मध्य प्रदेश का इतना बड़ा जिला है कि अकेला यह जिला केरल राज्य से भी बड़ा है। जो हमारा बस्तर जिला है वह केरल राज्य से बड़ा जिला है। दो करोड़ की आबादी वाला यह क्षेत्र है जिसके अंदर खनिज सम्पदा है, जल सम्पदा है, कृषि सम्पदा है। सारी सम्पदाओं से भरपूर यह दो करोड़ की आबादी वाला क्षेत्र है। लेकिन यह क्षेत्र अपने विकास के लिए पिछले 40 वर्षों से तड़पता रहा है। कांग्रेस और दूसरे राजनैतिक दलों के नारे तो बहुत लगाए लेकिन कभी भी इस पर गंभीरता से विचार नहीं किया। लेकिन वर्तमान भाजपा सरकार के आने के बाद राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने अभिभाषण में छत्तीसगढ़ की जनता की भावनाओं का आदर करते हुए छत्तीसगढ़ राज्य की निर्माण की बात कही है। इसके लिए मैं छत्तीसगढ़ के निवासियों की ओर से इस सरकार को बधाई देना चाहता हूँ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करूँ उससे पहले मैं एक बात कहना चाहूंगा। मेरे सामने विपक्ष के नेता बैठे हुए हैं। वह बहुत बड़े अर्थ-शास्त्री हैं, विशेषज्ञ हैं। मैं तो अर्थ-शास्त्र का ज्ञाता नहीं हूँ। उन्होंने स्वदेशी की बात कहते हुए एक बात कही। मैं इस बात को इनके ध्यान में लाना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने कहा कि मैं तो स्वदेशी समझता नहीं कि यह स्वदेशी क्या है। उन्होंने उदाहरण दिया आलू चिप्स और कंप्यूटर चिप्स का। उन्होंने कहा कि इसमें कोई भेदभाव नहीं करना चाहिए कि कंप्यूटर चिप्स चाहिए और आलू चिप्स नहीं चाहिए। उन्होंने कहा कि इसमें भेदभाव नहीं होना चाहिए। डाक्टर साहब एक बहुत बड़े अर्थ शास्त्री हैं। मैं उनसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या आलू चिप्स के लिए इस देश में विदेशी उद्योगों की जरूरत है, विदेशी टेक्नीक की जरूरत है? नमक के लिए विदेशी टेक्नीक की जरूरत है?

SHRI MANMOHAN SINGH: This is a total misrepresentation of what I said.

श्री लक्ष्मी राम अग्रवाल: मैं डाक्टर साहब से कहना चाहता हूँ कि आलू चिप्स हर घर में गृहणियां बना लेती हैं और हमारा स्वदेशी का मतलब भी यही है।..... (व्यवधान).....

SHRI MANMOHAN SINGH: This is not what I said.

श्री लक्खी राम अग्रवाल: हमारा स्वदेशी का अर्थ यही है कि जिसे हम अपने घर पर कर सकते हैं, जिसको हम अपनी प्रतिभा से कर सकते हैं, अपनी क्षमता से कर सकते हैं उसके लिए हमें विदेशियों का मुंह नहीं ताकना चाहिए। हम अपने बल पर काम करें। आलू चिप्स, कोका कोला, नमक, साबुन इनसे देश का विकास नहीं होना वाला है। इतनी बात कह कर, मैं फिर से एक बार सदन को यह आह्वान करना चाहता हूँ कि यह सरकार आम सहमति से आप सब का सहयोग ले कर इस देश की समस्याओं का समाधान करना चाहती है। आप चुनाव की और दूसरी कटुताओं को भुला कर इस सरकार को सहयोग दे कर के समस्याओं का समाधान करिये, अवसर दीजिये, समय सारी बातें कह देगा। धन्यवाद।

श्री खान गुफरान ज़हीदी (उत्तर प्रदेश) उपसभा-ध्यक्ष महोदया, मैं आपका शुक्रगुजार हूँ कि आपने सदरे मोहतरम के शुक्रीये की तजवीज़ पर बोलने का मौका दिया। मैडम, अभी मैंने सत्ता पक्ष, खास तौर से भारतीय जनता पार्टी के साथियों को सुना। मैं डा० मनमोहन सिंह जी ने सदर के ख़ुतबे पर जो भाषण दिया है, उसके एक एक शब्द की तारीफ़ करते हुए यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि शुक-शुबहा इसलिए पैदा हो रहा है कि पांच साल मैं कुछ करने की जो बात कही गई है इस दस्तावेज़ में जो मदरे जमूरियत के ख़ुतबे से ताल्लुक रखता है, वह काम जो मुसलसल करने का है और जिसमें मुसलसल इम्प्लैमेंट करना चाहिये, उसमें जिस तरह के ख़ूबसूरत अल्फ़ज़ में बातें रखी गई हैं, सेहत सब को, पानी सब को, दवाएं सब को। ऐसा मालूम होता है कि न तो पानी किसी को मिल रहा है, न दाना किसी को मिल रही है, न मकान किसी के पास है, न कपड़े किसी के पास हैं 50 सालों में हिन्दुस्तान कहां से कहां पहुंचा, उसको नकार कर के आप सब को सब कुछ देना चाहते हैं और वह भी इन पांच सालों में कितने ख़ूबसूरत अल्फ़ज़ में यह बात आप कह रहे हैं आपको यह भी पता नहीं है कि पांच साल पूरे भी होंगे या नहीं।

सामान सौ बरस का पल की ख़बर नहीं।

महोदया, मुझे जेनुइन शब्द पर बड़ा मज़ा आ रहा है और ज़ून भी आ रहा है। यह नेशनल एजेंडा फ़ॉर गवर्नेंस जेनुइन है या प्रेज़ीडेंट आफ इण्डिया का ख़ुबता जेनुइन है या यह जो सारी 22 पार्टियां हैं, उनका मैनिफेस्टो जेनुइन है। आज इसी पर बहस हो कि जेनुइन क्या चीज़ है और इसलिए यह सारी बहस का मुद्दा बना हुआ है। दिल में तरह तरह के ख़याल उठ रहे हैं कि बाहर जो कुछ कहा जा रहा है, जिसकी बुनियाद पर

आपने वोट हासिल किये हैं, जिसको जनादेश कह रहे हैं आप मिल कर काम करने की बात कह रहे हैं, चुनाव मैनिफेस्टो एक तरफ़ कर दिया, क्या वह नानजेनुइन हो गए। यह सत्ता का मुद्दा ले कर सत्ता के लिए जोड़ गांठ कर अब यह जो नेशनल एजेंडा बनाया गया है, यह जेनुइन हो गया है? अभी हम उस पर आएं लेकिन फ़िलहाल यह देखना होगा कि कौन सा डाक्यूमेंट जेनुइन है। जब डाक्यूमेंट की जेनुइनेस साबित हो जाए तो फिर उसमें जो कुछ कहा गया है, उसके बारे में बात की जा सकेगी। मेरा ख़याल में यह डाक्यूमेंट अपने में नामुकमल हैं। यह नीतियों को दिशा नहीं दे रहा है। बल्कि एक रणनीति बता रही है कि ऐसे-ऐसे करके अपनी सरकार को चलाउंगा। यह मैनिफेस्टो आपका था। हमें ख़ुशी है कि आप 50 बरस में खयालात का लिबास बदलने की बात कर रहे हैं। अभी चुनाव मैनिफेस्टो को भी आपने नहीं नकारा कि वह हमारा नहीं है। जब हम आपसे कहते हैं उसमें आपने यह-यह किया, उसमें आपने यह-कह कहा तो आप यह कहते हैं कि चित भी मेरी पट भी मेरी और दहिया मेरे बाप का। तो मैं यह कहूँ कि चित भी आपकी और पट भी आपकी—वह दस्तावेज़ भी ठीक है और यह दस्तावेज़ भी ठीक है और सत्ता मेरे हाथ में। तो यह कौन-सी बात हुई। किसी एक चीज़ पर आप भी जमिए। हमें इसी की तरफ़ इशारा करना है। तो यह नीतियों का नहीं यह कोई पालिसी मैटर का डाक्यूमेंट नहीं यह सिर्फ़ रणनीति है, हिकमत-अमली है और कुछ भी नहीं है कि किसी हिकमत से कोई काम कर लो। कोई जादू की चीज़ ले आओ, जादुई चीज़ कर लो। मैडम, पहले जमाने की एक पुरानी कहानी याद आती है। एक जादूगर हुआ करता था। यह बचपन में सुनाई जाती थी। हर भाई यहीन ने वह कहानी सुनी होगी कि एक जादूगर अपने पालतू जानवर को, परिन्दे को या चरिन्दे को, चार पाए वाले को—लेकिन वह पालतू होता था—उसमें अपनी जान डाल दिया करता था और क्यों जान डालता था कि परिन्दे में जान डाली और परिन्दे को उड़ा दिया। उस परिन्दे को कुछ ऐसे रखा कि वह वापस नहीं होता था। उस जादूगर के मुखसिफ़ ने कभी कभी उसको पकड़ में ले लिया और उस परिन्दे की जब गर्दन मोड़ी तो उस जादूगर की जान चली गयी। हमारे मोहतरम प्यारे वज़ीर आजम को अभी चन्द दिन हुए हैं इस ओहदे पर फ़ायज़ हुए जिनका कानपुर से भी ताल्लुक रहा है और इलाके से कुछ मेरा भी ताल्लुक रहा है। बहुत ख़ूबसूरती से, हिकमत-अमली से, जादूगरी से गठजोड़ करके अर्थमैटिक बनायी। हालांकि प्रेज़ीडेंट साहब कह रहे हैं कि अर्थमैटिक से कोई काम नहीं होता है। लेकिन उन्होंने

बहुत इंजीनियरिंग के साथ, बहुत खूबसूरत सा एक हल बनाकर पेश कर दिया। वे सरकार को चलाने के लिए जिस जादुई छड़ी का इस्तेमाल कर रहे थे इतिहास के परिन्दा उनका अपना नहीं है। जुनूबी हिंदुस्तान, साउथ अफ्रीका, दक्षिणी भारत के 12 सदस्यों वाला परिन्दा है। उसमें जान दे दी। वे किसी बात वक्त इधर से उधर जाते तो सरकार चली जायेगी आज जेनुइन सेकुलरिज्म की बात है। यह एक बड़ा अजीब मामला है। बड़ी खूबसूरती से कम से कम कई सौ शब्दों में एक शब्द आया है। हमारे सदर मोहतरम ने पता नहीं कितना जोर मारा होगा तब शायद आपाया होगा। इसलिए कि यह क्लब तो कैबिनेट बनाती है जैसा कि हमारे सीनियर्स बताते हैं कि कैबिनेट तैयार करती है सदन का खुतबा और फिर वह जाता है, फिर वहां देखा जाता है। इसमें आया है। जरा-सा पढ़ें, मुलाहिजा फरमाएँ: "The Government will strive for rapid social, economic and political empowerment and uplift of the Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, Backward Classes and Minorities." क्यों अभी भी तुष्टीकरण कर रहे हैं? छोड़िए छोड़िए। 50 साल तक तुष्टीकरण का लिबास हमारे ऊपर डालते रहे हैं आप यह तुष्टीकरण, वह भी तुष्टीकरण। कुछ पैसे दिए—50 करोड़ का फंड इनके लिये दिया कुछ गरीबों का भला हो जाए, स्टैंडर्ड बन जाए। वह भी तुष्टीकरण। अब आप ने लफ्ज इस्तेमाल किया है। उसमें आपने डिटेल् नहीं है। ठीक है डिटेल् नहीं है। ठीक है डिटेल् का यह डाक्यूमेंट भी नहीं है। लेकिन मिर्नटी कालफ़ज़ लिखा और जेनुइन सेकुलरिज्म लिख कर आपने कमाल कर दिया है। मुझे अच्छी तरह याद है कि ईदी अमीन एक बहुत बड़े डिक्टेटर हुए हैं लीबिया के गदाफ़ी साहब, मुसोलिनी और हां हमारे बराबर के न पाकिस्तान में आयूब खान सहाब थे। "असली जम्हूरियत" के नाम पर हमारे कुछ साथी फ़ारेन सर्विस में रहे हैं वे सब जानते होंगे—इन लीडरों ने एक नयी जम्हूरियत का लबादा पहनाना शुरू किया। सिर्फ सेकुलरिज्म में कौन सी बात कम है, सेकुलरिज्म, मैं मानता हूँ इस कंस्टीट्यूशन के बनाने वालों को, महोदया, जब यह मुल्क आजाद हुआ था खून-खराबा हो रहा था दो कौमी नज़रियों ने मजहब की बुनियाद पर एक नया मुल्क बना दिया था उस वक्त इस मुल्क की अकसरियत कितनी विशाल हृदय थी और उन्होंने सेकुलरिज्म की बुनियाद को बनाया था और इस मुल्क के कंस्टीट्यूशन की बुनियाद सेकुलरिज्म के नज़ारथ पर रखी गई थी। कितना विशाल हृदय था बराबर के मुल्क में खून हो रहा है, एक मुल्क मजहबी बन रहा है,

इस्लामी मुल्क डिकलेयर किया जा रहा है। हमारे जिसम के दो टुकड़े करके एक हिस्सा उधर चला गया, एक हिस्सा इधर रह गया। वह सेकुलरिज्म कैसा था जो यहाँ अपनाया गया और उसमें कोई जेनुयिनिटी है या नहीं? उसी सेकुलरिज्म का नतीजा है कि आज इस मुल्क की मिट्टी में वह सेकुलरिज्म रचा-बसा हुआ और इसी सेकुलरिज्म का नतीजा है कि जब मजहबी आधार पर बनने वाले मुल्क ने तीन-तीन हमले किए तो हमारे देश ने अब्दुल हमीद भी दिया, ब्रिगेडियर उस्मान भी दिया और अब अब्दुल कलाम दिया है। हम ने चारों तरफ इस नज़रिये के आधार पर अच्छी मिसालें मुसलसल देते चले आ रहे हैं। एक सेकुलरिज्म वह है। उसमें भी जेनुयन सेकुलरिज्म की बात की गई। हमें कोई एतराज नहीं है। आज प्राइम मिनिस्टर जो कह रहे हैं हम उसमें यकीन किए लेते हैं। यकीन और भरोसे पर हम चल सकते हैं, लेकिन बाहर क्या कहा जा रहा है? अभी हमारी एक सदस्या साथी ने बताया कि बाहर क्या बयान आ रहे हैं और गवर्नमेंट का बयान क्या है। क्या हम अंदर जो कहा जाए उसको बाहर न मानें, क्या जो बाहर कहा जाए उसको अंदर नहीं मानें? दोनों तरफ कहीं तो सामंजस्य होना चाहिए, कहीं तो एक फैसला होना चाहिए। लेकिन ऐसे नहीं हो रहा है। सन् 1977 में सेकुलर लोगों के कांधे पर बैठकर आपकी पार्टी बड़ी पार्टी बन गई। फिर उनकी तादाद 54 हो गई और वह पार्टी सिमटती चली गई, जिस कांधे पर आप बैठे थे आज वह पार्टी है नहीं, बहुत कम मुक्तसर रह गई है सारी पार्टियों के साथी हमारे साथियों में से हैं हमें तो कहना है इन 22 पार्टियों से कोई संकेत नहीं दे रहा हूँ, सिर्फ तबीह कर रहा हूँ कि अगर मिलना है तो यकसां फिक्कर के साथ शक-शुबाह नहीं। तुम सोच वही बनाओं जो सोच बड़ी पार्टी की है। जब बड़ी पार्टी की सरकार हिमायत पर यूनाइटेड फ्रंट की सरकार नीहें चल पाई तो छोटी पार्टियों की हिमायत पर चाहे इसमें पांच सात बारह या बाइस पार्टियां हो, सरकार कैसे चलेगी? अब हिंडन एजेंडा की तो तफसील आ रही है, सामने आ गया है और प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने लोक सभा में बड़ा जबर्दस्त तौर पर तरदीद की कि हिंडन कोई चीज़ नहीं है। सब साफ-सुथरी है। लेकिन हमको ऐसा मालूम होता है कि,

"एक चेहरा इस चेहरे पे लगाए रखिए,
लोग पहचान न ले खुद को छुपाए रखिए।"

और यही एक बहुत जबर्दस्त खूबसूरत चीज़ है। ऐसे खूबसूरत अलफाज़ का इस्तेमाल किया जाए कि उसके मुखलफ मायने हों और वह जिस-जिस तरफ चाहें हम

अपनी जरूरत के मुताबिक गेज्ड लें और इसी तरह की सारी कैफियत पूरे एजेंडा में नक़्श आ रही है। अरे हद है कि कैसी-कैसी, यहां पर व्यक्तियों का सवाल नहीं है, महोदया, यहां ज़ाहियत का सवाल है जो 50 साल से माहौल बदलता चला गया वहां बाहर नफरत की दीवारें खड़ी हो गईं, तासुब और बर्बाद हुआ है, बिखरा है, नुकसान पहुंचा है हमारे मुल्क के कंस्टीट्यूशन का कोरेक्टर पैटर्नल है, सब जानते हैं और इतिहास यह बताता है, हमारे मुल्क की हिस्ती भी यही बताती है कि जब-जब मरकज़ कमजोर हुआ है, मुल्क कमजोर हुआ है, बिखरा है। लेकिन इसका यह मतलब नहीं है कि रियासतों को ताकत न दी जाए मगर इतनी नहीं कि मरकज़ कमजोर हो जाये। सरकारी आयोग निक्र किया गया है रडियों को ताकत दी जाए, लेकिन मरकज़ की ताकत को मजबूत बनाए रखा जाय। ऐसा हो कि इलाकाई पार्टियों ही मरकज़ पर कब्ज़ा पा जाए जैफ़ि अपनी क्षेत्रीयवादता में फंस जाए, अगर ऐसा हुआ तो प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब को पेशानी होगी जो एजेंडा दिया है, उस के बाहर के एजेंडा में क्या-क्या देना है? तमिलनाडु में क्या देना है? बंगाल में देना है? महोदया, अंग्रेजी में एक लाफ़्ज़ है "टाटा" लेकिन उसे हिंदी में लिखते हैं तो "ताता" लिखते हैं। फिर बंगाल की "ताता" का क्या होगा? तमिलनाडु की "ताता" का क्या होगा और समता पार्टी की "ताता" का क्या होगा, यह तो आप ही जानें और आप ही समझें कि बाहर का एजेंडा क्या-क्या है? महोदया, असली बात यह है कि अब मछली बड़ी हो गयी है और छोटी-छोटी मछलियों के प्रति उसका एक तरीका होता है। अब मैं तो नहीं कहूंगा कि छोटी को खा जाएगी बड़ी मछली लेकिन आप के पहले रोज के बयान से तबियत खुल हो गयी थी, लेकिन पहली कैबिनेट के जो रिजल्ट आप के सामने आए हिमाचल में आप ने कहा कि सेक्शन-356 का इस्तेमाल नहीं करेंगे। अब हमें यह भी बेचना है कि आप 356 का इस्तेमाल कब तक नहीं करते क्योंकि बाहर का एजेंडा तो तभी पूरा होगा जब आप 356 इस्तेमाल करेंगे। मुझे तो आप के ऊपर थोड़ा तरस आता है कि आप को सरकार भी चलाना है, इलेक्शन दोबारा न हों यह भी देखना है, लेकिन पेशानियां भी अपनी जगह हैं, दबाव भी ऐसे है जिन से निकल नहीं सकते हैं आप। तो कैसे क्या किया जाए कि इस सूरत हाल से निकला जाय। इसलिए आप बार-बार कहते हैं सहमति। "सहमति" से सरकार चलाएंगे, तबुन से सरकार चलाएंगे, इरातयक से सरकार चलाएंगे। यह आज की अहम जरूरत है और इस जरूरत को प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने बहुत अच्छी तरह से पहचान लिया है। काश कि वह

अपनी इस जरूरत को जिसे उन्होंने पहचाना है, उस में काम चला ले जाएं। हमें यह उम्मीद कम है, इसलिए शुभहात घेर रहे हैं। इन शुभहात से निकलने की जरूरत है। वह तो तबुन बताएंगे कि कल क्या होगा? महोदया, "आज तक" कार्यक्रम में जो खबरें सुनाते हैं वह कहते हैं कि आज की खबरें आज तक, कल तक का इंतजार कीजिए। इस के लिए 5 साल की जरूरत नहीं है। आज तक आप को बताएं दे रहा हूँ कि क्या हुआ है, कल तक का आप इंतजार कीजिएगा। कल कब आएगा, जो खतरा का कल है, उस वक़्त मैं कहूंगा कि यह जेनरुन एजेंडा है या यह मेनीफेस्टो जेनरुन एजेंडा है, यह मैं नहीं कहता वक़्त बताएगा। अभी प्राइम मिनिस्टर ने बड़ी अच्छी बात कही लोक सभा में। एलफ़क से मैं वहां सुनने पहुंच गया था। वह मेरा हक था। मुझे बैठाया गया। बड़ी अच्छी बात कही कि जब मैं ये तीनों बातें कहता था 370, यक़स सिविल कोड, क़शी मधुप तब भी आप को पसंद नहीं आई और जब उन बातों को छोड़ा गया तब भी आप को पसंद नहीं आ रही। तो क्या पसंद आ रहा है? आप की पसंद से कहां तक चलें? ठीक बात आप कह रहे हैं। आप ने जो लिबास बदला है इसी लिबास को पहन रखिए, जेनरुन शब्द इटाइए और जो सैकुलरिज्म पहले से चला आ रहा है, जिस्ने इस मुल्क को जानदार बनाया है, ताकत दी है, शानदार बनाया है उसी पर चलिए। हम पर तुष्टीकरण का इल्हाम न लगायें और अंदर सलाहियत पैदा करने की जरूरत है। ... (समय की घंटी) ... महोदया, क्या कुछ टाइम फ़िक्स कर दिया है?

उपसभाध्यक्ष (कुमारी सरोज खापरै): जी हां।

श्री खान गुफ़ारान ज़हीदी: चलिए, मैं खतम करता हूँ। अब डर और खौफ क्यों होता है, जब हम बाहर की अलवाबें सुनते हैं? आप ने कहा कि आम सहमति का सवाल है। मेघालय में क्या हुआ? वहां 60 की एसेंबली में 27-28 मिनिस्टर्स हैं। अरुणाचल में क्या हो रहा है? वहां 28 मिनिस्टर्स हैं। हमें तो डर लग रहा है। यहां 22 पार्टियों की सरकार है। हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब को कहीं मजबूर न कर दिए जाए कि 200 आदमियों को मिनिस्टर बनाएं। हमारे उत्तर प्रदेश में 95-96 मिनिस्टर्स हैं। फिर एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव एक्सपेंडीचर में कमी की बात भी आप करते हैं। ये कांटेडिक्शंस कैसे एक होंगे? कैसी सूरत बनेगी? बाहर निकलकर हमारे भारतीय जनता पार्टी के मुअज्जिज लीडरान अक्सर और बेहतर कहते हैं कि देखो 89 में राम मंदिर के निर्माण के लिए हम सरकार छोड़ आये थे और अब की सरकार बन जाने दीजिए आदरणीय वाजपेयी जी की। हमें कोई एतराज नहीं।

आपने छोड़ दिया, मुझे क्या एतराज हो सकता है? बख्शी खुशी की बात है, छोड़े रखिए। इतिहास बनाए, कौमी एकता यही चाहती है, बहुत अच्छी बात है, लेकिन सत्ता के लिए राम मंदिर के निर्माण को छोड़ने का क्या तर्क था? सत्ता और राम मंदिर कौन सा सवाल आपको प्यारा है?

मैडम, हमें याद आता है, कांची के शंकराचार्य जी दिल्ली आए थे। माननीय प्रधानमंत्री जी, वहां पर किसी ने नाप लगा दिया। नाप लगाने का सबको हक है और मर्यादा पुरुषोत्तम राम के लिए नारे क्यों न लगाते। 'जय श्रीराम' नाप लगा दिया। इस पर उन्होंने अपने भाषण में एक बात कही, कितनी अच्छी प्यारी बात कही कि हमें तो उस राम की तलाश है, जो गांधी जी की मुख से उस समय निकला था जब उन पर गोलियों चलाई गई 'हे राम'। हम उस राम की तलाश में कांची में बैठे हुए हैं, लोगों को उपदेश देते हैं, आदर्श बताते हैं, आदर करते हैं। आज हम देखें कि आज हम किस जगह पर बैठे हुए हैं। इसी बाहर की तकरीरों से, बाहर के नारों से, मैनिफेस्टों के मुद्दों पर इस मुल्क में पिछले नौ-दस साल में जो कुछ हुआ है, सब जानते हैं कि हजारों लोगों का कलेआम हुआ, खून बहा, न जाने कितने बेटों के बाप नहीं रहे, बाप के बेटे नहीं रहे, माएं नहीं रहीं, बहूएं नहीं रहीं। वह तो वक्त गुजर गया। अगर फिरकों के दमियान इतिहाद, इतिफाक रखा जाता तो यह सब कुछ न होता....(समय की घंटी)... बस, एक दो मिनट में मैं खाम करता हूँ, मैडम।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (कुमारी सरोज खापर्दे): जहदी साहब, मेरे सामने आपकी पार्टी के स्पोर्ष के और भी नाम हैं और 6 बजे तक यह हाऊस चलने वाला है। आपको मैंने काफी समय दे दिया है। अगले 5.20 से अपना भाषण शुरू किया था और अब 5.41 हो गया है। आप संक्षेप में बोलिए, दो मिनट से अधिक समय मैं आपको नहीं दूंगी।

श्री खान गुफरान जहिली: मैडम, मैं कोशिश करूंगा कि उसी समय में मैं अपनी बात पूरी करूँ। मैं अर्ज कर रहा था कि विकास कैसे होगा। इस सत्कार ने भी महसूस किया कि यह सरकार अनेकता में एकता का तत्त्व मानती है। बहुत से धर्म हैं, बहुत से मजहब हैं, बहुत सी चीजें हैं। मैं मुसलमान हूँ। मेरे मजहब के कई मसलक हैं, जैसे आपके यहां अर्ध-समाजी, सनातन धर्मी होते हैं, ऐसे ही हमारे यहां भी कई मसलक हैं। ऐसा नहीं है कि हमारे यहां नहीं है या हम कोई आपसे अलग हैं। हम भी तो इसी मिट्टी के हैं। हम वहाँ के चांद पर

अपनी ईद करते हैं, ऐसा नहीं है कि हम किसी और के चांद को देखकर ईद करते हैं। हम यहां का सूरज जब डूबता है तब नमाज पढ़ते हैं। मैं अर्ज कर रहा था कि एक धर्म के, एक कुरान के, एक नमाज के मानने वाले जब हम में आपस में टकराव हो जाता है एक एक छोटी सी जमीन के लिए यहां पर शफाखाना बने या यहां पर मस्जिद बने तो इस टकराव से एक खूबसूरत चीज आवाम के लिए नहीं बन पाती। इस मुल्क में इतिहाद की कितनी बड़ी आवश्यकता है। इतिहाद, इतिफाक, इशतराक और तआवुन की कितनी बड़ी आवश्यकता है कि कई तरह के मजहब, कई तरह की जुबान बोली जाती है, कई तरह के क्षेत्र हैं जब तक यह सब हक होकर बात नहीं करेगी तो विकास भी नहीं होगा। पिछले नौ-दस साल में हंगामे हुए हैं, कल्लोहारतगरी हुई है, मुसीबतें आई हैं। हमारे हक साथी भाजपा से बोल रहे थे कि कहां सड़के हैं, कहां पर पानी है, कहां पुल है? यह क्यों होंगे, कैसे होंगे, जब नाइतफाकी होगी, फिरकावारीयत फैलेगी? तो कुछ देर के लिए आपकी नियत पर सवाल खड़े हो जाएंगे, अच्छी बातों पर अमल की जरूरत है और वह अमल तब आएगा, जब यहां एकसुई होगी, जब एकता की उसकी बढ़ेगी। उम्र नहीं बढ़ रही है। हमें अफसोस है कि खूबसूरत अलफाज का दस्तावेज बेअमली का शिकार अगर हो गया तो फिर ताबीलें पेशी की जाएंगी कि हम यह करना चाहते थे, हम तो वह करना चाहते थे, हम यह नहीं कर सके। मेरा खयाल है कि जो यह दस्तावेज दी गई है, इसमें हकीकत और अमल का कोई तत्त्व नहीं है। धन्यवाद, शुक्रिया।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): Shri Margabandu.

SHRI R. MARGABANDU (Tamilnadu): Madam,— I will have my turn tomorrow.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): Do you want to speak tomorrow?

SHRI R. MARGABANDU (Tamilnadu): Yes, Madam.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): Otherwise also your party does not have much time left. Other Members have consumed the time. I would like to give the floor to other Members.

SHRI S. PETER ALPHONSE (Tamilnadu): Madam, I thank you for giving me this opportunity to participate in the Discussion on the Motion of Thanks to the President's Address, on behalf of the Tamil Manila Congress Party.

The President's Address which was delivered by the President to the Joint Session, but for the coinage of words, is nothing but a verbatim repetition of the National Agenda of the BJP.

When I read the President's Address, my memory could not avoid a story which I had heard during my student days. On a Sunday morning in a church, when the morning service was going on, the priest was giving long sermons about stealing other's properties, how it is bad before law, how big the sin is, etc. Finally, he made emotional appeals to all the people assembled before him. He said, "After the service is rendered, you go to your homes and return all the properties you have stolen to their owners." His wife was one of the faithfuls before him. She was moved by the emotional words of the priest. Immediately she sent a note to the priest asking, "What should I do with the stolen chick of the neighbour, which I have kept for cooking for today's breakfast." Immediately the priest sent a note, replying, "All this is only for the public consumption, and not for you." When I went through the President's Address, I remembered this story. The tall words, the expressions, the sentiments, the ideas about corruption, about ethics in public life, about building democratic institutions etc., I think, are only for the Opposition parties, and not for the Treasury Benches. I have been watching my learned friends on the Treasury Benches now, for the past 18 months. When they were here, they were talking about Ram. When they have gone to that side, they are talking about Sukh Ram. The power has brought that difference. I think the Government has baptised them and all of a sudden, they talk about secularism, they talk about the rights of

the minorities and their protection. I do not understand this.

I am not prepared to believe your words. The learned Minister for Urban Development and the learned Bhandarji were telling us, "Why should you suspect us? Secularism is not your monopoly. When we talk about secularism and protecting the minorities, you should be happy about it."

But my doubt is there because you never kept your words in your past history. The history shows that you have been a habitual violator of the promises you had given to the august forums of this country. You violated the solemn affidavit that you had given to the Supreme Court. You violated your leader's assurance to the National Integration Council. When the affidavit was pending before the Supreme Court, you demolished the Babri Masjid. You never kept your promise. While your leaders gave a promise to the National Integration Council that you would not destroy the Babri Masjid. So, when we go through the history, your actions were never in tune with the words you spoke. How do you expect us to believe you now after you assumed power?

Our revered Prime Minister is also here. The other day, Advaniji, speaking to the lower House, said, "The BJP manifesto is no more relevant. The Government is going to be guided by the National Agenda." The manifesto is the most important document. You have been talking about so many things, about article 370, the special status of Kashmir, about building a temple at Ayodhya and all other contentious issues. Now I want to know from the horse's mouth whether you have given a go-bye once for all to all those things and whether you have given up your idea or your stand on the Ram Temple once and for all. You talk about consensus. I talk about your conscience. Tell this to us. We will allow you to be in power. We will also support you to be in the Prime Minister's chair and your colleagues to be in their

ministerial chairs. You give us an assurance. You make a solemn declaration to the people that you will not press for Article 370 hereafter. It cannot be that; as long as you are in power you will not talk about Pseudo-Secularism and Article 370, but once you are out of power, you think the only way to catch power is to make people move on religious fundamentalism. That has been your idea so far. Now that everything has ended and since the BJP after so many births and rebirths has come to power, we are happy that power has made you decide and sober. You can now give a promise to the nation in the august House that you will not any more raise all these religious fundamental issues. When my learned friend initiated the discussion on the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address, he spoke about the relationship between the RSS and the BJP. He said that it was only a cultural organisation. As far as we know from its history, you all belong to the Sangh Pariwar. BJP is the political arm of the RSS. If you say that the BJP is not connected to the RSS or that no political contact is there with the RSS, we will be happy. But, hardly a week back, the Chief of the RSS said in Bangalore that Hindutva is the real spirit behind the organisation. He gave a different meaning to Hindutva. We would like to hear from those in the Government whether once and for all they have given a convenient go bye to the Hindutva theory or your political philosophy.

You talk so much about corruption. Even from my childhood and student days, I have been watching the great leader, Vajpayee Ji and his spotless public career. Why should he allow people, who are tainted with corruption to sit in the Ministerial posts?
(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): Have I allowed you? Please sit down.

SHRI N. THALVAI SUNDARAM (Tamilnadu): For one and a half years my learned friend has been holding the post as a Congress Member. Then he made an application...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): I am not allowing you. Please sit down.

SHRI S. PETER ALPHONSE: The President's Address says that corruption is the worst evil that is affecting our society, and that the main fight of this Government will be against corruption. I do not know how you are going to fight corruption. If my memory is correct, the stand of the BJP Government when the chargesheet was filed against Mr. Laloo Yadav and one of his Cabinet colleagues in the Patna High Court, was to ask the Prime Minister to drop the concerned Minister of State from the Cabinet. It was just because a chargesheet was filed, did you not press for the ouster of Laloo Yadav? Now, how many chargesheeted people are there in your Cabinet? Yesterday a Minister goes to the court, files a petition before the court of law saying that he is a Minister...
(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): Mr. Margabandu, I have not allowed you. Please sit down.

SHRI S. PETER ALPHONSE: Madam, I do not ask for consensus, but I ask for the conscience of the Prime Minister. A Cabinet Minister goes to the Court, files a petition under section 317 Cr. P.C. ... (Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): I have not allowed you. Please sit down. Nothing will go on record.

SHRI R. MARGABANDU:
(Interruptions)**

SHRI S. PETER ALPHONSE: Madam, I did not ask for anything, I just asked the treasury bench, which is answerable to me as a Member of the Opposition. Just a week back one of their Ministers goes to the court and files a petition under Section 317 Cr. P.C. that he will not be able to attend the court because he has got some Ministerial pre-occupations. This is the type of your governance. You speak of your Government will be free of corruption. When you rewarded the former Minister Sukhran the entire country felt ashamed. He hid crores of rupees beneath newspapers. The Congress Party had suspended him. You have accommodated him as the Dy. Chief Minister. You have nominated his son to the Rajya Sabha. Is this the way to fight corruption? On the one hand you give sermons and on the other you practise another thing. How can there be a consensus when you don't have a conscience? I don't understand the reality of the President's Address. You talk about all the promises given in the National Agenda which subsequently found a place in the President's Address. You talk about the National Water Policy. I would like to ask: What are your plans for Tamil Nadu? The Cauvery Water Tribunal has given an interim award in our favour. We have been requesting the Government of India to implement that interim award. ... (Interruptions) ... We have been asking for it. Now, if you want to start the whole history again, it will take a long time. If you are going to form a committee to formulate a National Water Policy, how long would it take? I think it would take another 7 years to formulate it. ... (Interruptions) ... He is not here. Don't talk about him.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): Mr. Peter, how much time would you take to conclude?

SHRI S. PETER ALPHONSE: I will take two minutes to conclude. The Cauvery Water Tribunal has given an interim award in our favour. It should be implemented as early as possible. You should give a time-frame to implement it. When the National Agenda was formulated, the AIDMK party which demanded their pound of flesh should have demanded the time-frame also. ... (Interruptions) ... It should be fulfilled. You cannot disappoint the entire 5 crores of people of Tamil Nadu. My point is the President's Address should have mentioned about the time-frame to implement it. I would request the Prime Minister to give an assurance to the people of Tamil Nadu on the Cauvery water dispute that the interim order of the Tribunal will be fulfilled in letter and spirit, as early as possible. He should give us some time-frame.

Regarding reservation of 69 per cent, there is no mention about the Government service. In the President's Address, the reservation policy with regard to educational institutions alone finds ways and means to accommodate as per the State's desire. But there is no mention about 69 per cent reservation in the Government service for backward classes, Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. There is no mention of it. It has to be included in the Ninth Schedule. But our demand is that there should be a constitutional amendment. We want a categorical assurance from the Prime Minister that there will be a Constitutional amendment and it will protect 69 per cent reservation for the backward class people and weaker sections of the society in Tamil Nadu. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): think we have decided that we will sit up to 6 o'clock

*Not Recorded.

Now, it is going to be 6 o' clock. Would you like me to adjourn the House?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (MISS SAROJ KHAPARDE): Before I adjourn the House, I will announce the name of the next speaker. The next speaker is Mr.

O.P. Kohli. Now, the House stands adjourned till 11.00 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at fifty-nine minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 31st March, 1998.