

SHRI M. A. BABY (Kerala): This is a very important issue. (*Interruptions*). Madam, you may respond after I have associated myself with this. I am happy that the Minister is here to instantaneously respond. A very important issue has been raised by hon. Birlaji. I do not want to elaborate this due to paucity of time. I only want to associate myself with this. I hope the Government will give utmost importance to constructing the metro railway project. Otherwise, air pollution in the city of Delhi is becoming unendurable. I hope the Government will implement such an important project.

THE MINISTER OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRIMATI SHEILA KAUL): Sir, it has been mentioned just now that the metro rail project is being shelved. I am happy to inform you that there is no such thing as this. We are vigorously trying to implement it. We have had a number of meetings. I think in the next week also we are having a meeting. Having realised that it is very important that we have a metro working in the city of Delhi we are vigorously pursuing the whole project.

MOTION OF THANKS ON THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS—Contd

श्री शिव प्रताप मिश्र (उत्तर प्रदेश): माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपका आभारी हूँ क्योंकि आपने मुझे महामहिम राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण पर अपना मत व्यक्त करने के लिए अवसर दिया है। पहले जब मैंने महामहिम राष्ट्रपति जी का अभिभाषण पढ़ा तो उसमें नववर्ष के शुभारम्भ के पहले, जब दिसंबर महीना उसके स्वागत की तैयारियाँ कर रहा था और उसमें इस राष्ट्र के साथ ऐसी उम्मीद बनाए हुए था कि जिसमें प्रभु राम के महावाक्य को चरितार्थ किया जा सके। उनका महा वाक्य था:

“परहित सरिस धर्म नहीं भाई,
परपीड़ा सम नहि अधमोई।”

सब से बड़ा धर्म वह है जिसमें सभी लोगों का उपकार हो सके, लेकिन किसी को पीड़ा देने से बड़ा अधर्म नहीं है। लेकिन वहाँ एक धर्मकर उत्कापात हुआ।

उस उत्कापात से बहुत दिन का खड़ा हुआ एक दाबरी-मस्जिद का ढाँचा ढह गया। उसकी ईंटें उखड़ गईं। मैं नहीं कहता हूँ कि उसका किन लोगों ने किया, लेकिन मैं यह जानन चाहता हूँ और बताना चाहता हूँ उन लोगों से और उन लोगों को कि क्या यह धर्म का कृत्य था? धर्म तो इसी सदन में 1988 में मैं सांसद था, तब यहाँ पर एक विधेयक आया था कि धार्मिक-स्थलों को किसी अध्यात्मिक या राजनीतिक प्रक्रिया के लिए प्रयोग करना मना है, लेकिन वहाँ पर धर्म के नाम पर जो यह कृत्य हुआ, मैं धर्म की परिभाषा में उसे नहीं मानता। इससे राष्ट्रपति जी का अभिभाषण शुरू हुआ। धर्म की व्याख्या जो हिन्दुत्व को आज कहा जाता है हिन्दुत्व जो सनातन धर्म का पर्यायवाची है और वैदिक धर्म का पर्यायवाची है, क्यों हिन्दुत्व जो है यह अंग्रेजी वेबस्टर्ज डिक्शनरी में, शब्दकोश में और भी जगहों पर मैंने इसको देखा कि जो लोग रह रहे हैं सिंधु नदी के किनारे वह सब पहले ईदुज कहे जाते थे अर्थात् वह हिन्दू हुए। तो इसमें कोई हिन्दू, मुसलमान, सिख, पारसी सभी सिंधु नदी के किनारे जितने भी लोग रह रहे थे सभी हिन्दू कहे जायेंगे। मुसलमान का जो 14वीं शताब्दी उसकी चल् रही है उसका मतलब है समूचा ईमान जो कुरान में रखा या इस्लाम में रखा और कुरान और इस्लाम जो हम लोगों को एक शिक्षा देती है कि ईश्वर एक है, वह हमारे वैदिक धर्म, वह वेदांत के धर्म, वह हमारे पौराणिक धर्म और उसी को आज हिन्दुत्व कहा जाता है, उससे मैं अलग नहीं मानता हूँ। क्योंकि जब पंगम्बर मोहम्मद को आवाज आई गारे हेरा की गुफा में, तो वह एक ही आवाज थी और वह किसी मक्का की मस्जिद में नहीं आई थी कि, “कुलह कल्लाहो अहद”। मोहम्मद कहदो कि अल्लाह एक है और यही वेदों में भी कहा है कि “महत देवानाम् अल मकम” अर्थात् देवता एक है, लेकिन उसका विद्वान लोग कई नामों से वर्णन करते हैं। हमारे उपनिषदों में कहा है कि;

“यानउमानि भूतानि जायन्ते,
यानि जातानि जीवन्ति यत्यप्रत्यभंश
विशन्ति तत सत्य तत ब्रम्ह तत ईश्वर”

जिससे समस्त सृष्टि की उत्पत्ति होती है, जिससे समस्त संसार का पालन होता है और जिससे सब का संहार होता है, वह एक ही सत्य है, एक ही ईश्वर है और वही कुरान में पैगंबर मोहम्मद साहब ने कहा कि, "कुलहु वल्लाहो अहद।" जो उनको आकाशवाणी हुई कि ईश्वर एक है। उसकी गीता में भी कहा है कि,

"वह्मां जन्मनामन्ने ज्ञानवामा प्रपद्यते ।
वासुदेवः सर्वभूतानां महात्मा सुपुन्रभः ॥
ईश्वरः सर्वभूतानां हृद्देशेऽर्जुन तिष्ठति ।
धामयन् सर्वभूतानि यत्पाशुना निपायय ॥
तदेव शरणं गच्छ सर्वभावेन भारत ।
तत्प्रसादात्परां शान्तिं स्थानं प्राप्स्यसि
शाश्वतम् ॥"

बहुत साधना के बाद ही कोई प्राणी यह जान सकता है कि ईश्वरमय यह समस्त ब्रम्हांड है। वह सब के हृदय में व्याप्त है वह शू-पक्षियों के हृदय में भी व्याप्त है और उसकी शरण में जाने से ही शांति हो सकता है और कुरान में फिर कहा गया है कि, "रब्बिल आलमान" अर्थात् वह सब का पालन करने वाला है। यह नहीं कि, "रब्बिल मुसलमीन।" वह मुसलमानों का ही पालन करने वाला नहीं है। वह जानवरों का भी पालन करने वाला है, वह पक्षियों का भी पालन करने वाला है, उंटों का भी पालन करने वाला है, इंसान का भी पालन करने वाला है और जितने भी जड़-जंगम की सृष्टि बनी हुई है, उस सबका पालन करने वाला है... (व्यवधान)... बी०जे०पी० का भी पालन करने वाला है क्योंकि उसमें भी ईश्वर है क्योंकि बुद्धि के संस्कारों से कुत्सित होने का ईश्वर से कोई वास्ता नहीं है। वह तो संस्कारों की प्रक्रिया है। यह गीता में भी कहा है कि—

"गतिर्भर्ता प्रभु साक्षी निवासः शरणं सुदृढ।

प्रभवः प्रलयः स्थानं निधानं बीजम् व्ययम् ॥"

समस्त सृष्टि की उत्पत्ति मुझसे होती है, मुझी में सब का पालन होता है और

मुझी में सब निवास करते हैं। सब का मैं मुहृदय हूँ, सब का मैं मित हूँ, सब का मैं पालक हूँ।

तो यह जो विभिन्न धर्मों के मार्ग हैं ये केवल—

"यथा नदीनां वहवो मध्येगाः

समुद्रमेवभिभुखा द्रवन्ति"

जैसे तमाम नदियां समुद्र में लीन हो जाती हैं, उसी तरह जितने भी धर्म के पथ हैं, वह केवल एक ईश्वर तक पहुंचाने के साधन हैं, लेकिन वह किसी मस्जिद में नहीं मिला था और न किसी मंदिर में मिला था। हम देखते हैं कि वेदांत का सूत्र व्यास जी ने हिमालय की खोहों में लिखा था और पैगंबर मोहम्मद को गाहे डेरा की गुफा में कुरान लाखिल हुई थी और बुद्ध भगवान को बुद्धिज्म का जो ज्ञान मिला था, बुद्ध धर्म का जो सूत्र मिला था, प्रतीत्य समुत्पाद का जो सूत्र मिला था, वह बोध गया में एक वृक्ष के नीचे मिला था। उन्होंने भी एक सत्य माना है और उस सत्य के वर्णन में उन्होंने कहा कि यह शून्य है, लेकिन यह शून्य शून्य नहीं है। यह निष्क्रिय नहीं है। इसमें चेतना है, इसमें निर्माण की शक्ति है, इसमें पालन की शक्ति है और इसमें संहार की शक्ति है और शक्ति है प्रकृति के सामंजस्य की। तभी उन्होंने कहा कि—

"शून्यमिति वक्तव्यं अशून्यमिति नो भवेत्

उभयं नो भवेचेति प्राज्ञं अर्थात् कथ्यते।"

मैं इसको शून्य नहीं कह सकता, न मैं इसको अशून्य कह सकता हूँ, न मैं इसको एक कह सकता हूँ, न मैं इसको दोनों कह सकता हूँ। यह तो—

"यतो वाचो निवर्तनं अप्राप्य मनसा सहः"

और जैसाकि वेदांत में कहा है कि जो बुद्धि के परे है, मन के परे है, वह सत्य है वह ईश्वर है।

श्री शंकर दयाल सिंह : पंडित जी, आपने जो संस्कृत में कहा, वही हिन्दी में है कि—

“शून्य है यह, शून्य है यह, शून्य उत्पन्न होता शून्य है।

शून्य में से शून्य को यदि लें निकाल शून्य तब भी शेष ही रहता सदा।

श्री शिव प्रताप मिश्र तो उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारा जो सनातन धर्म है, हमारा जो वैदिक धर्म है, जिसको आज हिन्दुत्व कहते हैं, उस में किसी को पीड़ा देने का कोई स्थान नहीं है। वह हमारे राजतंत्र में भी था, गणतंत्र में भी था और लोगतंत्र में भी आज है। रथदेव जी का मैं पौराणिक धर्मों में पढ़ता हूँ—

नारहम कामये राज्यं, न स्वर्गं न पुनर्भवम्
कामये दुःख तप्तानाम् प्राणिनामातिताशनम्॥

जितना दुर्ख प्राणी है, हे प्रभो, मैं उनके दुःख से निवृत्ति चाहता हूँ, यही मेरा सबसे बड़ा धर्म है। तो मैं यह बताना चाहता था कि जो यहां पर यह कृत्य हुआ, हमारे संसद के साथी, हमारे संसद के बाहर के साथी, हमारे गांव के साथी, हमारे शहरों के साथी, हमारे किसान साथी, सभी हमसे कहते हैं कि धर्म को राज नीति से अलग किया जाए। अयोध्या की घटना में क्या धर्म का प्रयोग हुआ? मैं कह सकता हूँ कि अयोध्या की घटना में कोई धार्मिक कृत्य ही नहीं हुआ। अब इसमें आपको एक ऐसा विधेयक लाना चाहिए कि राज-नीति में अधर्म का प्रयोग न किया जाए। अगर यह धार्मिक कृत्य होता तो किसी को पीड़ा देने की बात न होती। मैं मानता हूँ कि वहां पर जो बबरी मस्जिद का ढांचा था, उसमें नमाज नहीं होती थी। मौलाना अबुल कलाम आजाद के समय से नहीं होती थी, लेकिन उसमें मानसिकता देश की जुड़ी हुई थी। उस मानसिकता के टूटने से देश में एक उथल-पुथल की स्थिति आ गई। हमारे पड़ोसी देश भी उससे नहीं बच सके और संसार उसको देखकर एकदम से स्तब्ध हो गया। इसलिए जिस चीज ; संसार और प्राणियों

का इन्वाल्मेंट हो, उनकी मानसिकता उसमें जुड़ी हुयी हो तो ऐसी घटना के बारे में यह कहूंगा कि वह अधार्मिक कृत्य था।

मान्यवर, यहां तक राम की बात कही जाती है। हमारे यहां राम की परिभाषा किसी व्यक्ति के रूप में नहीं की गई है। जिसन रामायण को पढ़ा है उसने राम को आदर्श मानकर देखा है। मैंने देखा है बहुत सी जगह आजकल पोस्टर लगे हुए हैं भगवान राम के धनुष बाण के साथ, बाण संसाधन किए हुए चित्रों को मैं देखता हूँ, लेकिन—

“भगतिहि जानहि नहि कछु भेदा,।

उभय हरहि भव संभव खेदा॥”

निर्गुण और सगुण को एक तारतम्य की दृष्टि में देखा गया है। राम को एक ब्रह्म के रूप में देखा गया है। उसमें कहा गया है—

“निगम तेतिशिवध्यान न पावा,।

माया मृग पाछे सो धावा॥”

जिसको वेदान्त कहता है, जिसको वेद कहता है, इतना ही नहीं, और जिसको भगवान शिव ध्यान में नहीं पा सके कि कितनी दूर है। जो अभी श्री शंकर दयाल जी ने कहा, शून्य की बात कही है, तो हमारे यहां धर्म में एक महाकाश है, एक घटाकाश है और एक शरीर का आकाश है, उसमें सारी सृष्टि रखी जा सकती है। विवेकानन्द जी जब अमरीका में बोले तो शून्य पर ही बोले और उसमें संसार के सारे धर्मों का वर्णन किया। मेरा कहना यह है कि एक ऐसा विधेयक आना चाहिए, जिसमें हो कि अधार्मिक कुकृत्य न किए जायें।

दूसरी चीज, मान्यवर, मैं यह बताना चाहता हूँ, जो महामहिम राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने अभिभाषण में कही है, क्योंकि समय कम है मेरे पास, मैं संक्षेप में इतना बताना चाहता हूँ कि राजीव जी के समय में हमारे देश पर 25,000 करोड़ रुपए का कर्ज था, जो वी०पी० सिंह जी के समय

में 69,000 करोड़ रुपया हो गया और उसके बाद यही कर्ज चन्द्रशेखर जी की सरकार के समय में, हमारे उस समय के भूतपूर्व वित्त मंत्री यशवन्त सिन्हा जी वरु हैं, 79,000 करोड़ हो गया। क्योंकि परिस्थितियाँ ऐसी थीं, वह कर्ज बढ़ना गया। आज कर्ज तो जरूर बढ़ा है (व्यवधान)...

श्री नयप्रकाश मालवीय (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उसमें भी आपका समर्थन था।

श्री शिव प्रताप मिश्र : इसमें जो कर्ज था वह जरूर बढ़ा है, लेकिन आपके कर्ज बढ़ाने के साथ 25,000 करोड़ रुपए की ही विदेशी मुद्रा हमारे पास थी, जिससे अपने कर्ज का ब्याज और अपनी आंतरिक स्थितियों को सुधारने की बात थी, वह नहीं हो सकती थी। आज हमारे पास ऐसी आर्थिक नीति है, जिसमें पांच बिलियन अमरीकी डालर रिजर्व है, इतनी चीज जरूर हुई। इसमें हमारा निर्यात भी बढ़ाया गया है 3.4 फीसदी।

तीसरी चीज, मान्यवर, समय कम है, मैं कृषि पर बताना चाहता हूँ, ग्राम विकास पर कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ क्योंकि हमारा देश ग्रामीण और कृषि प्रधान देश है तो ग्रामीण विकास के लिए तीस हजार करोड़ रुपए का हमारी सरकार ने प्रावधान किया है, जो पहले कभी नहीं था। कृषि के लिए अभी 10 फीसदी यूरिया खाद का दाम घटा दिया गया है और पांच सौ करोड़ रुपए का कृषि के बुनियादी ढाँचे की प्रोन्नति के लिए प्रावधान किया गया है। जब से कांग्रेस सत्ता में आई है, पंजाब में जो चुनाव हुआ, उसमें आप देख रहे हैं कि वहाँ आतंकवाद ने एक मंत्री का रूप धारण करके आत्म-समर्पण किया है। नार्थ ईस्ट में जो चुनाव हुआ, उसका परिणाम कांग्रेस के पक्ष में आया। जम्मू-कश्मीर में आतंकवाद जरूर है लेकिन हमारे पड़ोसी राष्ट्र से येतसिन जी आए, जिनसे हमारा समझौता हुआ रुपए के विनिमय का, उसमें हमारा निर्यात बढ़ेगा, व्यापार

बढ़ेगा और हमारी सुरक्षा व आतंकवाद को रोकने में हम उससे सहायता मिलेगी।

भारत का जो समान है, जम्हूरियत में वह कई बर्गों में बंटा हुआ है। तो मैं यह बताना चाहता हूँ कि हरिजनों के उत्थान के लिए डा० अम्बेडकर फाउंडेशन की स्थापना की गई है, यह भी अभिभाषण में है। उसमें विश्वविद्यालय का, विदेशी छात्रवृत्ति का और पुस्तकालयों के बनाने का, इन सबका प्रावधान है। पिछड़ी जातियों के लिए जो उच्चतम न्यायालय का फैसला हुआ है, उसको सरकार रूपायन देते के लिए कटिबद्ध है। अल्पसंख्यकों के लिए आयोग बनाने के बारे में जो 1992 का अधिनियम है, वह पारित कर दिया गया है जिससे अल्पसंख्यकों की सुरक्षा और उनकी प्रगति हो सकेगी। आप चूँकि बार बार कह रहे हैं कि समय नहीं है इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि इन सब चीजों को सरसरी निगाह से देखने के बाद महिलाएँ भी नहीं छूटी हैं। उनके लिए भी एक ऐसा कोष बनाया गया है जिससे कि वे अगर कोई कार्य करना चाहे तो उनको ऋण मिल सके।

इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण का समर्थन करता हूँ और आपका धन्यवाद करता हूँ।

SHRI JAGMOHAN (Nominated):
Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, thank you very much. While I thank the President for his Address, I would like to point out a few reservations and a few disappointments. Much has been said and I would not like to repeat what has already been said. But there is one notable omission which I find in this Address. What is the vision which as a nation we are entertaining? Where are we going? What type of broad framework do we have before us? What is our blueprint for the future? We have no indication of this in his Address. What is the type of civilisation we are going to build? Are we going to have a

consumerist society for a handful of people and a primitive society at the lower level? What type of *tasavvur* are we having? This is absolutely absent. Unless a nation has a vision, it is bound to get into grief. There are inclinations, urges but there is no framework. So unless there is a broad framework and the subsequent decisions fit into that broad framework, well, the nation is not going to progress. We will be just moving in one direction, then, another direction, then, still another direction. So this is my first point which I wanted to submit. If time permits, I will elaborate upon it later on.

The second point is about a specific provision. As you know, Sir, the world is getting highly urbanised. This is the age of urbanisation. The cities are going to present problems for the future. In 1990 the world urban population was 2.4 billion. By 2000 A.D. it is going to be 3.2 billion. In another 25 years, there is going to be 5.5 billion urban population alone. Sixty-six per cent of the population is already living in the cities of the developing countries. In another eight years' time, we will have 71 per cent of the urban population living in the cities of the developing countries. After another 25 years, we will have 80 per cent of the population. What are we doing for them? Look at our own Indian cities. Today, the urban population of India is 210 million. And, in another ten years' time or rather eighty years' time, it will be 350 millions. That is, 100 millions more than the total population of the United States. It is equivalent to the total population of India in 1947. So, in our cities, we are going to face the problem of a population of 350 millions; the whole of the India of 1947 will be in our cities. What are we doing about it? There is no mention in the President's Address about this except for a peripheral reference to local bodies. There is no mention as to what our strategy is for dealing with this great problem of our cities. I have heard almost all the speeches and I found that hardly anyone,

no one in fact, mentioned about this problem. In India, we are going to have twenty cities which are going to have a population of more than 10 millions and 600 cities which are going to have populations ranging from fifty thousands to five lakhs. What is our strategy with regard to this? This usual thing which I hear is urban versus rural. But this is not the problem. The very study shows that the urban population is increasing and the rural population is simultaneously increasing. This phenomenon is not as in the West where you are exchanging one type of misery with another type of misery. This is practically true in the most congested cities like Delhi, Calcutta and so on, compared with the national average space. The space available in these cities is one-fortieth of the national average space. I will give you one instance of Delhi. In Delhi, 77 per cent of the population now lives in sub-standard houses or slums or it squats somewhere. Recently we had riots in Bombay. Very few people understand that these riots are not only due to the communal tension but due to the social tension that is generated in the cities. They only get a channel, they only get a flash point, to their inner irritation. This inner irritation that exists in Ahmedabad and Bombay gets a flash point and we are not understanding the problem. Now, you take the problem of AIDS. About 80 per cent of the people who come to the cities are single families or unstable persons who come to the cities. They visit undesirable areas go back to their villages and transmit the disease to the villages. People are not understanding that this problem of urbanisation is going to create a huge problem for the health of the nation, that it is going to lower the productivity of the nation totally. We do not understand this at all and that is why there is no mention of it in the President's Address.

Now, coming to structural adjustments, I am amazed that there is not even one study of the impact of the structural adjustments on our cities.

We have already two levels in our cities; two levels of social life, two levels of culture, two levels of economy. And, the structural adjustments are going to compound that problem. You will have a very hi-tech, hi-informative society and a high percentage of offices are being linked with the global economy with all types of civilisation. And, 85 to 90 per cent of the people are in primitive existence. Is it the society we are going to build? Cities are the spiritual workshops of a nation. It is always said, "Show me your cities, I will tell you about the cultural aims of the people". I think if you see our cities today, you will know what type of culture we are having, what type of civilisation we are building. And it is linked with my first point because we have no vision for our future, we have no vision for our cities. I do not want to dwell on that further. There are many other points I would like to say.

The second thing which is equally pertinent and which is also missing from the President's Address is the administrative efficiency, productivity. Somebody was saying from this side, "You incurred more loans; we incurred which I do not want to go. The issue is more elementary. It is common-sense that if I take Rs. 100/- as loan and do not make Rs. 120/- or Rs. 130/- out of it, I am a fool. Therefore, where is the productivity in the nation? Or, where is the capacity of the nation to invest Rs. 100/- and make Rs. 120/-? For the last three years I have been seeing. There is absolutely no increase in productivity, there is no increase in efficiency. So how are you going to pay back your man? How are you going to make the nation more efficient, more productive? Nobody is applying his mind. All our institutions are declining. You go to any office; hardly anyone is working. The work culture does not exist and we are assuming, the money will come and somebody will pick it up. It may benefit 5 to 10 per cent of the people; it may give you some prosperity, some glitter, but ultimately,

nothing will happen. If you see the statistics, you will find that all our projects are delayed for no less than six months to three years. Even a project which is supposed to have been implemented efficiently because it has an element of 300 per cent to 600 per cent cost escalation, was not implemented in time. I have got all the data and if you see the figures, from 1950 to 1980, if you compare 30 years' data, you will find that India's share in the world's gross domestic product was 2 per cent in 1950. After thirty years, it came down to one per cent. India's share in the developing countries' production was 14 per cent; it has come down to 5.7 per cent.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Mr. Jagmohan, excuse me. Your group was allotted ten minutes' time. You have already taken ten minutes. I will request you to conclude within two minutes.

SHRI JAGMOHAN: All right. I will conclude. In fact I would like to maintain discipline. Whatever you say I will follow.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): No, it is all right.

SHRI JAGMOHAN: I have many points but I will just complete this formulation and end and if you like, I can sit even before that.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): You conclude within two minutes.

SHRI JAGMOHAN: Because discipline is more important in my view rather than making a point which, in any case, is hardly going to be resisted. This is the issue which I am going to make that no one is attending to the issue of how to make our administration more efficient more productive; how to raise productivity in our industries and how to make our institutions more vibrant and dynamic. No attention is being paid to it. So this is the other aspect which I

find totally missing from our President's Address.

Then there are other points relating to Bangladeshis and other things. As I have already pointed out, the statistics show that a very large number of people have come from that area. There is a human element involved in it. I would not like to dwell upon it. But the fact remains that something constructive has to be done. I have studied the environmental problem of Bangladesh in a different context while lecturing in Canada and I found that there is a recognition of the fact that in the coming few years, Bangladesh will not be able to accommodate its population and we have to have some arrangement to ensure that this surplus population, which is being affected by recurring famines, recurring droughts and recurring floods, does not come and compound our problem. Yamuna water is 4800 times inferior to the permissible level at Okhla and if our friends from Bangladesh also come and squat in the river-bed of Yamuna, how much further pollution they are going to create? My statistics show about there lakh Bangladeshis are squatting in the river-bed of Yamuna and they defecate early in the morning and the water flows. We all know about it and we go on talking about environment and all our seminars go on talking about environment, but the problems are daily getting compounded. Let us face the reality. Since you have given me this much time, I will leave other points. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Mr. S. S. Surjewala, You have been permitted ten minutes. Please try to conclude within time.

SHRI S. S. SURJEWALA (Har- yana): Sir, I want to speak on the President's Address and I want to support the salient features mentioned in the President's Address. The President's Address is, in a nutshell,

the agenda of the Government. The opening para of the President's Address mentions the need of a united action of all the political parties, the individuals, the intellectuals in the country, to save the country from disintegration on account of the onslaught of the communal forces, headed by the BJP, the RSS and other organisations, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I think this is the most important part of the President's Address and I would like the Congress Government which has presented this Address to take initiative together with other democratic and progressive parties for having a sort of united action in order to face the onslaught of the communal forces; otherwise, as is well known, the unity and integrity of the country will be threatened by the communal forces. I welcome the step that the Government has taken to ban various communal organisations such as RSS and others. I would also like that a very effective action should be taken to see that their activities should not be allowed to continue and they should ruthlessly be curbed. Even though these organisations have been curbed.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, also want to congratulate the Government on the steps taken to ban the BJP rally of the 25th February in Delhi. In fact, it was very obvious that the intention of the BJP was not only to show its strength but to create again or to repeat the Ayodhya situation in the National Capital. A very, very serious danger had been averted and I think the Congress Party, the Government and our leader Narasimha Raoji deserve very rich congratulations for having taken that action and saving the country from a big disaster.

I would also like to congratulate the Government on the initiative taken in restoring almost total peace in Punjab. I also want to congratulate Sardar Beant Singh, Chief Minister of Punjab, and all the robust

people of Punjab, particularly its peasantry, who have, in fact, taken a great initiative in curbing the extremist activities in the State and putting an agriculturally very rich or an otherwise very forward State again on the rails of normal life.

I would also like to congratulate the Government for bringing forward the Panchayati Raj and Local Bodies (Amendment) Bill to decentralise power and to give more and more power to the rural and urban people for administering their affairs.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, through you, and through this House I would like to have an opportunity to talk about one thing which, I think, has not found an elaboration in this Address. A mention has been made about an improvement in the Punjab situation. It has also been mentioned that the Government is going to take such other steps to resolve the pending problem of Punjab. Sir, most of the problems of Punjab which are known as 'inter State problems' are between Punjab and Haryana and if I only briefly mention, one very important and major problem between these two States is resolving the River-water issue or the distribution of River-water between the two States. I would like to state here that the Haryana province since its very inception has been a great victim in many inter-state matters and every time when the water issue has been reopened, the Punjab State has gained more. I would only like to make a brief mention of the history. When Punjab and Haryana won Statehood, in 1965 the Punjab Government formed two Committees. One Committee was headed by their expert officers and it was known as the Food Committee. Another committee was headed by political people and was known as "Haryana Development Committee". The Food Committee distributed the surplus Ravi-Beas water between Punjab and Haryana and it gave Haryana 4.56 MAF of water out of 7 MAF

which was the total available water at that time. Again, Haryana Development Committee gave the bulk of this water to Haryana. On 24th April 1970, after Haryana was carved out, the Government of India formed a committee of expert officers which gave Haryana 3.78 MAF of water from this. In March 1973, Shri D. P. Dhar, who was the then Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission, was appointed to give a report on the river water matter and he allocated 3.74 MAF of water to Haryana. Finally, on 24th March, 1976, the Central Government gave an award which was popularly known as the Indira Gandhi Award and under that Award 3.5 MAF of water was allocated to Haryana from the 7 MAF of water. On 31st December, 1981, a meeting of the three Chief Ministers was convened by the Govt of India attended by Punjab C. M. the other two being the Chief Minister of Haryana and the Chief Minister of Rajasthan. Shri Shiv Shanker, who was the then Law Minister, was also present at Haryana Government I was also present at that meeting. The river water issue was resolved very amicably with the agreement of the three Chief Ministers and Punjab was given 4.22 MAF of water. It was also given the right to use the share of Rajasthan till such time that Rajasthan makes its own canal. Sardar Darbara Singh, who was the then Chief Minister of Punjab, issued a White Paper on the distribution of Beas-Ravi water commending it as a great achievement for the Punjab Government. After the Akalis formed the Government in Punjab, thinking that the political initiative should not go to the Congress Government or Sardar Darbara Singh, they again demanded that the water issue should be referred to a Supreme Court Judge. As is known to the country, late Shri Rajiv Gandhi entered into an agreement which is known as the Ravi-Longowal Accord and under that Accord a tribunal was constituted consisting of three Judges, Mr. Justice V. B. Eradi of the Sup-

[Shri S. S. Surjewala]
reme Court, Mr. Justice Ahmadi of the Gujarat High Court and Mr. Justice Mathew of the Kerala High Court. This was constituted on 12th April 1986. This Tribunal gave an award at the end of 1987. Through that Award again the river water was distributed as demanded by the Akali Government. Punjab was given 5 MAF of water while Haryana was given 3.83 MAF of water. As you are hearing in this House and outside, Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is almost a normal thing that the political parties of Punjab, particularly Akali Dal and generally all the political leaders, are again demanding that the river water issue between Haryana and Punjab should be reopened. After reopening the issue seven times and getting substantial share of water at the cost of Haryana this is again being demanded. I would like to conclude saying that Haryana has already suffered a lot during the last 25 or 26 years of its existence. Sir, Haryana has spent crores of rupees on the construction of SYL Canal about which I have already mentioned in this House and I don't want to take more time of the House on that. The people of Haryana should be treated with great sympathy. I would like that the Government of India should intervene in the matter and the Punjab Accord should be implemented in toto. The SYL Canal should be completed as early as possible. Sir, the Central Government should give substantial assistance to Haryana to construct its own capital within its own territory. Of course, Chandigarh can go to Punjab. All the Hindi-speaking areas including Fazilka and Abohar can come to Haryana together with the Punjabi-speaking areas which fall in Punjab, they can be exchanged. This should be postponed for some time. These areas can be exchanged through some mechanism either by constituting a committee or by linguistic experts. I want that priority should be given to SYL Canal so that Haryana can get its share of water for the arid land. Sir, Haryana is the only State which does not have its own capital.

It is a great injustice. We don't have any growth centre. We do not have any town and urban area where we can develop our culture, science, modern technology, etc. There is no big project in Haryana. For the last 26 years no large industry or big project has been installed in the State. Only one project of the Rail Coach Industry was to be set up in Bhiwani but it was also shifted to Faridkot in Punjab under political pressure. I would like to request the Central Government to give whatever is due to Punjab. We will support that. The people of Punjab are our brothers. Punjab has done a commendable job. They should be congratulated. We are ready to support them. We have already given them support. But that should not be done at the cost of a neighbouring State. Sir, the people of Haryana are very backward. They should be taken care of. Some big projects should be installed in Haryana. I want that a capital should be constructed and the SYL Canal should be completed immediately. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Mr. Vizol, you have ten minutes. Try to conclude within ten minutes.

SHRI VIZOL (Nagaland): Sir, you have given me only 10 minutes. I think, I will take more than 10 minutes. I have been waiting for long to speak for a few minutes. I thank you for giving me time to speak.

During the discussion on the continuance of the Presidential proclamation in Jammu and Kashmir the Home Minister, while replying to a question, said, "There are a hundred groups of militants in Jammu and Kashmir, hence, to which group we talk to?"

It is gratifying to know that the Government is contemplating to have parleys with Kashmiri militants. We are also happy to know that the Centre has reached an 'Accord' with

the Bodo leaders in Assam. We hope, this 'Accord' will not misfire this time. We wish the accord all success. This House is well aware that this country has been beset with one problem after another. All these problems are mostly on our borders with unfriendly neighbours. We have terrorism in Punjab. We have militancy in Jammu and Kashmir. We have insurgency in the North-Eastern States. Some of these problems are as old as free India itself. We have got all these problems on our heads and yet we are quarrelling on petty, petty things among ourselves. We talk about our relations with Arab countries. We talk about our relations with Russia, with America. But what about our relations with our immediate neighbours? We have all these problems all along our borders. How can we feel happy? How can we feel at peace in mind? I come from a tiny State in North-East, a border State, Nagaland. This State has been beset with this trouble since India became independent. When India became independent in the forties, para-military forces were deployed to contain insurgency in Nagaland. But they failed. So army had to be deployed to carry out counter-insurgency operations against the Nagaland insurgents resulting in serious fight between the Indian Army and the Nagaland insurgents which caused a whole lot of suffering to the people and they went to the jungles to take shelter there. The Naga elders from the rural areas, specially from the country-side, started raising a hue and cry for immediate cessation of hostilities and holding a political dialogue between Government of India and the insurgents for a solution of the problem at political level. This intention of the elders in the Naga Peoples Convention was, however, abused, exploited and hijacked by the bureaucracy and talks were held by Government of India not with those who were fighting with India but with those who had no difference with India and a settlement for a separate State for Nagaland in the Indian Union was made behind the back of the insurgents in the

year 1960. This settlement is a settlement by default. It has failed to bring the insurgents into the mainstream. They are now at large and are better equipped and have escalated their area of operation in other States in the North-East. These North-Eastern States have borders with Bangladesh in the west, Burma in the east and China in the north. These borders are highly volatile and are vulnerable and they will remain a source of concern to the Centre. The borders of Punjab and Jammu and Kashmir are also sensitive and are near explosive. The Centre must not watch and wait for a miracle to happen. These are human problems requiring human approach for their solution. Now I will come back to Nagaland. In the year 1975 Nagaland was under President's rule and India was reeling under national emergency. Taking advantage of the national emergency measures the State Government under President's rule carried out a massive combing operation by Indian Army in Nagaland against Naga insurgents. And in the process, some insurgent leaders were flushed out and were herded to Shillong where they signed an infamous accord, known as the 'Shillong Accord', under duress. This Accord had to be signed in order to legitimise the 'Expatriate Settlement' made in a hush in 1960. Both these two settlements have failed to settle the insurgency problem in Nagaland because the so-called settlements were not made with the insurgents. It is because of this, the people of Nagaland today, irrespective of their political affiliations, are of one opinion that it is high time that this insurgency problem in Nagaland is resolved through a political dialogue, without preconditions, between the Government of India and the militant leaders. And, for this purpose, the Centre is urged upon to lift the ban on a faction of the insurgents, the NSCN in Nagaland. Besides this, I would like to say, for the information of this House, how election in Nagaland was conducted in February last. I would like to highlight only a few points which will be enough for the

[Shri Vizol]

hon. Members to form their own opinion about the way the recently concluded election in Nagaland was conducted. The whole process of election was rigged. Therefore, I lodged a complaint with the Chief Election Commissioner. I quote:

"We feel it our bounden duty and a necessity to bring to the notice of the Election Commission the malpractices and the misdeeds of the Congress (I) in the recently concluded Eighth General Election to the Nagaland Assembly in the best interest of the nation and for immediate measures in the matter."

Further, in that letter, I had brought the various malpractices and misdeeds of the Congress (I) to the notice of the Election Commission. The ballot papers were printed at Nagaland Government Printing Press. After completion of printing of ballot papers for all the constituencies, extra ballot papers were printed again on the excuse that a good number of ballot papers were printed wrongly. With this system of manipulation, extra ballot papers were issued to the selected constituencies. The following points are clear proof of this system of malpractices.

In 9-Kohima Town Assembly Constituency, it was noticed that used and unused ballot papers were of distinct, different colours. And I had written a complaint letter addressed to the Returning Officer with a copy to the Chief Electoral Officer, Nagaland, demanding comparison of the used ballot papers with their counterfoils. This was refused. So, it becomes clear that duplicate ballot papers were used.

In 11-Northern Angami (II) Assembly Constituency, many ballot papers belonging to 58-Shamator-Chesore Assembly Constituency were found. The distance between the two constituencies is about 360 kms. which is at least 10 hours' journey by road. It is a mystery as to how

the ballot papers already used for voting for the candidates in a far-away constituency could be found there. This is a mystery which could not be performed even by magic. In many constituencies, ballot papers were found in excess of the total number of the electorate. For example, in 49 Tamu Assembly constituency, 368 ballot papers were found in excess of the total electorate. In 2-Dimapur II Assembly constituency, more than 4,000 ballot papers were found in excess of the votes polled. Many such cases can be furnished with facts and figures, if necessary.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Please try to conclude now.

SHRI VIZOL: The total electorate of 27-Makokchung Town Assembly constituency consists of only 4,774 voters with three polling stations only. As against the prescribed and scheduled time for commencing polling at 7-00 A.M. the agents of Shri S. C. Jamir, the Congress (I) candidate, hooded in Ninja uniforms, started firing with AK-47 rifles at 5-00 A.M. itself. As a result, the actual voters...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Please conclude now. We do not have time.

SHRI VIZOL: As a result, the actual voters including the NPC candidate himself did not see the polling booths that day. However, polling was completed by 7 A.M. and the booths were closed at 10-00 A.M. itself! The same group went on the same day to Aolengden Assembly constituency and 25-Assembly constituency and captured many booths.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Please conclude. We do not have time.

SHRI VIZOL: In 44-constituency...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): I have to call the other speaker now. Please conclude.

SHRI VIZOL: I would like to have more time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): I am sorry, I do not have that much time with me.

SHRI VIZOL: In 44-Pomching Assembly constituency, the Presiding Officer of 44/4 Polling Station, at Longzang village, Mr. A. Gogoi was kidnapped by Congress(I) candidate, Mr. Kongam, and 800 votes were cast in the jungle hide-out. The matter has been duly reported to the Returning Officer. But nothing was done. About this the poor Presiding Officer has written this note to the Returning Officer, Mon, Nagaland like this:

"Subject: Report on 44/4 Longzang village primary school.

"Sir:

I have the honour to inform you that I was sent as Presiding Officer to 44/4, Longzang village primary school by the ADC, Mon.

Shri Kongyang Konyak, the candidate Congress (I) 44 A.C.,,"

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Please conclude now.

SHRI VIZOL:

"with the help of his bodyguard and strong force of the village youths from Longza village came and took me and the ballot box and the ballot papers for 44/4 Polling Station at gun point and went to the jungle at night..."

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): You please conclude now.

SHRI VIZOL:

"...At night, I was forced to keep quiet while they cast over eight hundred votes in "the jungle..."

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): You please conclude now. I am requesting you again and again. Please conclude.

SHRI VIZOL:

"Only one hundred ballot papers were taken to the Polling Station next morning..."

"The opposite party had made a complaint. But the Congress(I) candidate and his party started to fight with them and the Polling Station had been damaged.... Therefore, I reported the matter to the Returning Officer that the Polling Station had to be changed. That also was refused. So, there was no polling."

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): I am not permitting you now. Now, Mr. Rajni Ranjan Sahu. I am sorry.

SHRI VIZOL: I am bringing this complaint to your notice. "I have made this complaint to you seeking your protection...He threatened my life..."

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): I give you one minute. Kindly conclude.

SHRI VIZOL: But this is important. I wish the other Members also should know something about this. This is important. In Nagaland, in an isolated place, this kind of treatment is meted out to us. How do we bear it? I have brought this matter for the information of the hon. Members here. This is happening. This is no election. We are leading our people to nowhere?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Have you concluded or not?

SHRI VIZOL: This kind of election....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Shri Rajni Ranjan Sahu.

SHRI VIZOL: ... is a mockery of election.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Shri Rajni Ranjan Sahu.

श्री रजनी रंजन साहू : (विहार)
उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, ... (व्यवधान)

SHRI VIZOL: And we...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): I have called another Member. You have not co-operated with the Chair. I have called another name. Yes, Mr. Rajni Ranjan Sahu.

श्री रजनी रंजन साहू : उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं संसद के समक्ष भारत के राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण के समर्थन के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ। पिछले कई दिनों से राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण पर इस सदन में विचार-विमर्श हो रहा है। मैंने अपने साथियों को सुना। आज शिव प्रताप मिश्र जी ने बड़े विद्वतापूर्ण भाषण द्वारा, श्लोकों से और पुराण से उद्धृत कर ईश्वर के बारे में, उनके स्थान के बारे में तर्क सदन के समक्ष रखा; लेकिन मुझे अफसोस है कि जिन्हें यह समझना चाहिए था, उस समय शायद एक-दो माननीय सदस्य भारतीय जनता पार्टी के उपस्थित थे। अभी तीन-चार हैं, जो नहीं थे रिकार्ड देख लेंगे, तो उन्हें पता चल जाएगा।

बात यह है कि सोये हुए को जगाया जाता है, जगे हुए को नहीं जगाया जा सकता। यह सारी बात वह समझते हैं। दो रोज पूर्व सुषमा स्वराज जी का भाषण भी, उनके विचार भी बड़े गौर से सुनने का मौका मिला। एक अच्छे वकील की तरह एक कटघरे में खड़े भारतीय जनता पार्टी, विषय हिंदू परिषद की जमानतदारी के लिए वह दलील कर रही थी और ऐसा लग रहा था कि उनकी वगल में बैठे साथी, विष्णु कान्त शास्त्री जी उन्हें हौसला दिला-दिला कर कभी टेबल, कभी पीठ थप-थपा उनका हौसला बढ़ा रहे थे और अपने को मुजरिम समझ रहे थे। अगर खुल कर नहीं, तो दिल ही दिल

में जहर समझ रहे थे कि जो ढांचा मस्जिद टूटा 6 दिसम्बर को, वह कार्य निंदनीय हुआ और इसलिए इनके नेताओं ने मस्जिद का ढांचा टूटने के बाद यह कहा कि मिसैचीवियस एलिमेंट ने ऐसा काम किया है। कल्याण सिंह जी ने कहा कि "अनंतोन मिसैचीवियस एलिमेंट ने इसे तोड़ा।"

मैं अपने साथियों को बताना चाहता हूँ, जो सामने बैठे हैं कि उनकी इच्छा दिल्ली की गद्दी पाने की है और होनी भी चाहिए, लेकिन जो रास्ता उन्होंने अपनाया है, राम को माध्यम बना कर, मंदिर-मस्जिद की दीवार को उठा कर वह सत्ता में आयें, दिल्ली की सत्ता हथियाना चाहते हैं, यह माध्यम उनके लिए ठीक नहीं है, क्योंकि अगर यही होता तो रथ यात्रा के बाद जिसमें जब वह चले थे, उनके नेता, तो उसके बाद जो चुनाव हुआ, उसमें ही राम उनको गद्दी दिला देते और दिल्ली में उनका शासन होता। पर ऐसा नहीं हुआ। आज तक कभी ऐसा नहीं सुना गया है कि राम ने किसी को रोजगार भी दिलाया हो, या किसी भूख को खाना भी दिलाया हो। यह सारी बातें काल्पनिक ढंग से चल रही हैं और सब लोग मानते हैं। लेकिन उसके लिये कुछ काम करना पड़ता है और एक सही माध्यम का इस्तेमाल करना पड़ता है। इस बात को इनके नेता खुद भी समझते हैं। इनके नेताओं में भी काफी मतभेद हैं। जो माडरेट, हैं, वे समझते हैं। जैसे वाजपेयी जी इस सदन के सदस्य थे तो मैं उनका भाषण सुना करता था। उस सदन में भी कभी-कभी जाकर सुनने को मिला है। उस ढांचे के टूटने के बाद वह खुद मायूस थे और मैं उन्हीं को उद्धृत करता चाहूंगा जो उन्होंने 20 दिसम्बर को कहा :

"I would like to stand on the sea-shore or by the high mountains covered with snow, and mix with people who do not know me."

आत्म निरीक्षण के बाद उन्होंने यह भी महसूस किया कि,

"Often at times in crowded public meetings, I feel completely isolated."

तो ऐसे जो इनके बीच में नेता है उनसे भी इनको सलाह लेनी चाहिये। लेकिन मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि ऐसे नेताओं की संख्या इनके बीच में नगण्य है और यह तोड़-फोड़ की नीति जो इनके माध्यम से आर०एस०एस खेल रही थी, जिसके हाथ में बी०जे०पी० एक खिलाड़ी था, वह इन सब कामों को करवा रहा था। बड़े सही मौके पर हमारी सरकार ने आर०एस०एस० पर, बंजरंग दल पर या बी०एच०पी० पर पाबन्दी लगाई। अगर बी०एच०पी० पर पाबन्दी नहीं लगाई जाती, आर०एस०एस० पर पाबन्दी नहीं लगाई जाती तो 25 फरवरी की रैली फूलाप नहीं होती। उनकी तोड़-फोड़ की नीति में ये पुनः आ जाते। यह पाबन्दी लगाना आवश्यक था। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, यदि 6 दिसम्बर के पहले यह पाबन्दी लगा दी जाती तो शायद आज का यह दिन हमें देखना नहीं पड़ता। अपने देश में और विदेशों में हिन्दुहत्या का सिर नीचा नहीं होता और हिन्दुस्तान की जो ख्याति रही है उस ख्याति में बट्टा नहीं लगता। इसीलिये शायद बहुत पूर्व स्व० जय प्रकाश जी ने भी कहा था, जिसको मैं उद्धृत करना चाहता हूँ :

"जनसंघ में धर्म निरपेक्षता के दावों पर विश्वास नहीं किया जा सकता जब तक आर०एस०एस० के तंत्र से अपने संबंध नहीं तोड़ लेता। इस तरह आर०एस०एस० को भी तब तक सांस्कृतिक संगठन नहीं माना जा सकेगा जब तक वह किसी राजनीतिक दल का परामर्शदाता बनी रहती है और उनकी लगाम अपने हाथ में रखती है।"

यह बात स्वर्गीय जय प्रकाश नारायण जी ने दिल्ली में 1968 में दूसरे सांप्रदायिक विरोधी सम्मेलन में कही थी और

आर०एस०एस० पर पाबन्दी लगाने का अनुरोध किया था। इतना ही नहीं, भूतपूर्व प्रधान मंत्री श्री मोरारजी देसाई ने भी 3 मार्च, 1979 में एक पत्र द्वारा चेतावनी दी थी, जिसे मैं उद्धृत करता हूँ,

"कुछ मित्रों ने यह शिकायत बराबर की है कि आर०एस०एस० सरकार का नेतृत्व हथियाना चाहता है। अन्य राजनीतिक पार्टियों की तरह उसे राजनीति में अपना प्रभाव बढ़ाने की आजादी है। वह ऐसा कर भी रहा है। मुझे आपत्ति सिर्फ इस बात पर है कि आर०एस०एस० यह सब कुछ सांस्कृतिक संगठन होने का संवाग रच रही है। मैंने आर०एस०एस० के नेताओं को सलाह दी है कि वे या तो समान धर्मी अन्य संगठनों में समा जायें या फिर संघ को जनता पार्टी के संबंध हो जाने चाहियें। मैंने आर०एस०एस० के हिन्दू राष्ट्रवाद की संदेह भर्त्सना की है, क्योंकि यह खतरनाक विचाराधारा है और संयुक्त राज्य के, राष्ट्र के हमारे आदर्श के विरुद्ध है।"

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इसके बाद सिर्फ इतना ही नहीं, उन्होंने कहा कि,

"जनतंत्र में हर संगठन को अपनी विचाराधारा और दर्शन का प्रचार का हक होता है। यही जनतंत्र का सार है। फिर भी जब आर०एस०एस० राजनीति पर हावी होना चाहे तो हमें सतर्क होना पड़ेगा, क्योंकि कहीं इनका दर्शन या इनकी विचाराधारा भारत के राष्ट्रवाद के आधारभूत दर्शन को ही खींचला न कर दे।"

उन्होंने उस वक्त ही इस बात की चेतावनी दी थी। हमारी सरकार अगर 6 दिसम्बर के पूर्व इनके इतिहास को देखती और पाबन्दी लगा दी होती तो यह सब हमें, आज भुगतना नहीं पड़ता इस तरह भा०ज०पा० को अपने इस

[श्री रंजनी साहू]

हिन्दू स्वतंत्र को बदलना होगा और पूर्णतः धर्म निरपेक्ष होना पड़ेगा और अगर वह ऐसा नहीं करती तो उसे राजनीति से अलग हो जाना चाहिये। इस तरह सरकार का प्रतिबंध एक मुनासिब और समझदारी का कदम है। धर्मनिरपेक्ष होने का दावा करने वाली इस संस्था को चाहिये वह अपनी इन संकुचित प्रवृत्तियों के घेरे से ऊपर उठे। महोदय, मैं पुनः 2 अगस्त, 1979 के इंडियन एक्सप्रेस में छपे वाजपेयी जी के एक लेख को उद्धृत कर रहा हूँ जिसमें उन्होंने कहा था कि, "सामाजिक एवं सांस्कृतिक संगठन होन का दावा करने वाले आर०एस०एस० को यह साबित करने का अधिक प्रयास करना चाहिये कि वह कोई राजनीतिक भूमिका अदा नहीं करना चाहता। महोदय, यह तो इन्हीं के नेताओं द्वारा कही गयी बातों को मैं इनके समक्ष रखना चाहता हूँ। महोदय, अगर 1947 से लेकर आज तक का यदि हम इनका इतिहास देखें तो आर०एस०एस० का सांप्रदायिक स्वतंत्र हमारे सामने आ जाता है। हिन्दू राष्ट्र का मुखौटा पहन कर दिल्ली को गद्दी को 1947 से हो लेने के लिये ये लोग प्रयत्नशील हैं, लेकिन उन्हें आज तक सफलता नहीं मिली। 1947 के दिसम्बर माह में दिल्ली के रामनीला मदान में आर०एस०एस० के सरतंत्र चालक गोलवलकर जी ने अपने भाषण में स्वयंसेवकों को दिल्ली की सत्ता संभालने के लिये आव्हान किया था और उसी के बाद महात्मा गांधी जी हत्या हुई। महोदय, भारत की जनता की सूझबूझ से आज तक इनका प्रयास असफल रहा है और देश में कोई न कोई ऐसा नेता होता रहा जिस पर कि जनता का विश्वास रहा और इनके इरादे सफल होते रहे हैं। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस देश की आजादी की बुनियाद सर्वधर्म समभाव को आधारशीला पर टिकी हुई है। इसलिये सभी धर्मों की समान प्रतिष्ठा हो ऐसा संकल्प हम सब लोगों ने लिया है जिसे कि हमें निभाना होगा। भारतीय जनता पार्टी को

एक राजनीतिक पार्टी होने के नाते आर०एस०एस० के नापाक इरादों से बचना चाहिये। इसीलिये राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने अभिभाषण के प्रथम पराग्राह में इस बात का जिक्र किया है। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे इस बात का अकसोस है कि ऐसे मौके पर जबकि देश को एक रखने की समस्या हमारे सामने खड़ी है और प्रधान मंत्री श्री नरसिंह राव जी एकजुट होकर, सब लोगों को लेकर, देश के सभी नताओं के विचार लेकर, देश को एकजुट करने में लगे हुये हैं, उसी अवसर पर भारतीय जनता पार्टी के लोगों ने राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण का बहिष्कार किया। उन्हें इस बात का आत्म-निरीक्षण करना चाहिये कि जब देश को एकता और अखंडता की आवश्यकता है और जिन मुद्दों को राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने अभिभाषण में इंगित भी किया है, उन सभी बातों पर उन्हें विचार करना चाहिये।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, राष्ट्रपति जी ने सरकार की अनगिनत उपलब्धियाँ रखी हैं, मैं उन उपलब्धियों को दोहराना नहीं चाहता हूँ। पिछले दो साल में हमारी पार्टी को जो उपलब्धियाँ रही हैं, पंचायत बिल से लेकर पूर्वोत्तर राज्यों में चुनाव कराने से लेकर पंजाब की समस्याओं के समाधान को बताते हुये राष्ट्रपति जी ने सारे कार्यों को अपने अभिभाषण में रखा है और इसी के फलस्वरूप जान मेजर और विदेश के जितन राजनीतिक नेता भारत आये, उन सभी ने इस बात का जिक्र किया है, उन्होंने जो महसूस किया है और जो अखबारों ने आया है, उसे मैं उद्धृत करना चाहूँगा।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री संयद लिब्ते रंजी) : कृपया कोट मत करें, समय कम है।

श्री रंजनी रंजन साहू : मैं इसे एक अखबार से कोट कर रहा हूँ।

"The British Premier, Mr. John Major, expressed confidence in India's economic liberalisation. 'Reforms always affect entrenched interests and, so, take time to implement.'"

4.00 P.M.

"For me unidirection of reforms is more important than its pace and there can be a little doubt about India's commitment here."

तो ऐसा विदेश से आये हुये राज-
नेता ने भी हमारे बारे में कहा है,
जिनमे सारी बात आ जाती है। जो
हमारी उपलब्धियां हैं, उसका उन्होंने
इसमें जिक्र किया है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, "हिंदुस्तान
टाइम्स के एडिटोरियल में भी कहा
गया है, इसको मैं कोट करता हूँ-

"The growing interest of the in-
dustrialised nations in the country
is evident from the recent visits of
their leaders."

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं बिहार से आता
हूँ और कांसिल आफ स्टेट का सदस्य
हाने के नाते बिहार के बारे में एक
लाइन में अपनी बात जरूर कहना
चाहूँगा कि आज बिहार की स्थिति,
आर्थिक स्थिति बड़ी गंभीर है, ऐसे समय
में मेरा भारत सरकार से आपके माध्यम
से अनुरोध है कि बिहार की जो भी
आर्थिक रकम देय है, उसका भुगतान किया
जाय ताकि बिहार की सरकार और
बिहार की जनता को राहत मिल सके।
इसके लिये मैं इस सदन के माध्यम से
अनुरोध करता हूँ। धन्यवाद।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED
SIBTEY RAZI): Shri Kamal Morarka.
Your party has 8 minutes.

SHRI KAMAL MORARKA (Rajas-
than): Sir, I wish to confine myself
only to one aspect of the entire Presi-
dent's Address. I feel that is the
central point which is engaging the
attention of the country consciously
or sub-consciously, and that is the
polity that is being developed in the
the country with the events of 6th
December. Sir, I do not want to go
into the event for paucity of time.
It has been discussed before in this
House, but I say with a lot of
anguish that after the event, in the

last three months the kind of tone
and tenor that is being adopted has
a very very serious foreboding for
the future of this country. I say that
with all seriousness. I stay in Bom-
bay. What has happened in Bom-
bay in January, if I recount it in this
House, I am sure people will be
shocked beyond belief. A lot has
been printed in newspapers. I do
not want to go into the details of
these incidents. But suffice it to say,
for a person like me who was born
at the dawn of independence, we
have taken a lot of things for granted.
We have grown up in free India. De-
mocracy is a way of life which we
have accepted from birth. For a per-
son like me, the issue today is not
of secularism or communalism, the
issue is of the rule of law or vanda-
lism. A civilized India or a baraba-
ric India, that is the central issue
facing us today. In a political pro-
cess different parties have different
views. The BJP is accusing the
Congress of being communal, has
accused the Janata Dal and us of be-
ing pro-minorities. We have been
accusing them of a particular line
of thinking. But after 6th Decem-
ber all that has changed. The issue
today is not of communalism. BJP
is not just a communal party in my
opinion. It is anti-Constitution. What
the BJP is trying to do today is to
demolish the entire structure that
has been built ever since the dawn
of independence. I think the Parlia-
ment, both Houses of Parliament and
the people in general must start de-
bating this point.

Sir, I do not support the steps taken
by the Government immediately after
6th December. We have held the
Government guilty of inaction be-
fore 6th December and of over-action
and wrong type of action after 6th
December. For instance, dismissal
of the three Governments, other
than Uttar Pradesh; we see no logic
in doing it. Banning of organisations;
when democracy is in full play, un-
less there is an emergency, think

[Shri Kamal Morarka]

banning of organisations is impracticable. All that we have opposed. But that is not the issue. We know that the Leader of Opposition in Lok Sabha enjoys a Cabinet Minister's status. There were a lot of objections when he was arrested. We ourselves thought that, probably, when Parliament is in session, he should have been allowed to attend it. But what happens in the mean time? On the 7th December, people who are defensive about what has happened, because of this turn of events, when these leaders are released from the jail, the entire atmosphere is changed, the entire tone is changed; they adopt a militant tone.

Sir, enlightenment is difficult. To go into darkness is very easy; ignorance is very easy. I am one of those who believe that our freedom struggle threw up the greatest of leaders that any part of the world could be proud of. I believe that our Constitution, as adopted in 1950, is one of the most enlightened and incontrovertible documents that could be produced in any part of the world. Over the last 45 years we have had a lot of difficulties. We have amended the Constitution. We are trying to make it work. But, Sir, I would plead that what India is doing is one of the most fantastic adventures in world history. We are trying a peaceful socio-economic transformation of one-sixths of the world's population by the democratic process. Nowhere else in the world can anybody claim to be doing even a part of this experiment. The only other country is China, and they do not have a democratic process. In all the developing countries, from Iran to South Asia, democracy has been extinguished. India is a country where democracy has been in its full play. Every five years and, recently unfortunately, every two, three years there have been Lok Sabha elections—free and fair elections. I have no objection if the BJP, as a political party, wants to try to come to power. After all, they are in the political process:

one day they want to come to power. I have no grievance about that. But what they are doing now is to take the country backwards—into darkness. What they are today trying to tell us is that some part of our population are lesser Indians than the rest of us.

Sir, I am Hindu; I am proud to be a Hindu. But after 6th December—mark my words—when I meet people from another community, specially a Muslim friend of mine, I have to hang my head down. I have to admit before him that some of my brethren have done him wrong.

Sir, what are the issues that are being raised every day by them? They are petty issues—what they call, appeasement of minorities. Their entire tone is, the minorities have had it too good in this country; the Constitution is for the majority. Sir, they have got it all wrong. The Constitution, as a document, is only meant to protect the minority. The majority elects Parliament. Why do we need Constitution? We don't need a Constitution: normal rules are enough. But the Constitution is meant precisely for this purpose: it is to protect those who are not in a majority.

Parliament, even by unanimity, can pass a law. An aggrieved citizen can go to the Supreme Court, and the Supreme Court can strike it down. The majority will can, unanimously, pass a law and still it can be struck down. That is enlightenment. The Constitution-makers have kept a provision that when a minority is sought to be trampled upon by the majority, the Court will protect them. The Constitution, as a document, must protect a minority.

Today I hear, why should the minorities be pampered? I do not understand. It is the minorities which have to be protected in any civilized society, whether it is the Blacks in America, a religious minority or a

caste minority or tribals. I put it to them: If their thesis is correct—that this structure was a disputed structure, the courts took too much time and so we went and took control of it—by this doctrine, in the case of a disputed property, 200 people can enter a house and say, “The court is taking too much time and we are taking possession.” And then if somebody tries to intervene, their logic is, “No no, we are doing something wrong, let’s take a vote.”

Now, Sir, I don’t understand it. You cannot decide properly disputes by a vote. The voting process is meant to elect a Government. Having put a Government into place, the voting process comes again when its term ends or when the Government loses majority in Parliament. Every issue cannot be put to the people. This is a very dangerous doctrine. If we go by their thesis that the majority must have its own way, why on a religious majority only and why not on economic majority? Why should not the slum-dwellers of Delhi be allowed to enter others’ houses and say that they belong to them? Why should not all the jhuggi/jhonpriwallahs say, “Let’s take a vote whether all these housing colonies should belong to us or not?”

Are we living in a civilized society? That is the issue today. The issue is not of communalism, the issue is not of fundamentalism. Those issues are behind us, those issues are prior to 6th December. After 6th December 1992 the issue is whether we are going to run this socio-economic process, which we have adopted in 1947, by this system or we are to bring about some basic changes in which the democratic process itself is extinguished. That is the issue. I do not understand this. They are very senior leaders. I have great personal respect not only for their competence but for their integrity. I may not agree with them, but I have great respect for them.

But, Sir, something has gone wrong. And what has gone wrong? A very

simple thing is that they see power coming. There is religious frenzy. It is like holding a plebescite in Kashmir. I put it to them: Are they prepared to agree that there should be a plebescite in Kashmir? Why not? If people’s will is going to determine everything, why do we not allow a plebescite in Kashmir? Why not? If people’s will is going to determine everything, why do we not allow a plebescite in Kashmir? No, because they know that a plebescite in Kashmir cannot be a free and fair plebescite. The entire atmosphere is charged with religion. So, the issue will be obfuscated. So, the same thing applies to them. What they have done is that they have created an artificial frenzy and showed the muscle of the majority to trample upon the minority, and they want a vote to be taken.

I belong to a party which has opposed this Government on its economic policies. It is they who supported this Government. When we said that our ethos of 45 years should not be extinguished by notifications, and if Jawaharlal Nehru and Indira Gandhi had taken so much time to build an economic structure, not to demolish it by notifications, they did not listen to us. Why? Because the party of the Leader of the Opposition and the Congress, both the parties combined together, have about 400 people in the Lok Sabha. Mr. Advani said, “This is the best Prime Minister the country has ever had” They supported the economic policies. When they were supporting them, they were basking in the glory of the support of the Opposition party.

Sir, I put it to you and I put it to this House that 4,000 years of holosophy and culture cannot be wiped out by all of us who are pigmies in this process. What we are seeking to do is to convert Indian culture and history into a strait-jacket which is envisaged by a few of us. It is not possible.

[Shri Kamal Morarka]

There is substance in some of the things they say. Only their inferences are wrong. For instance, they say that India is secular because it is predominantly Hindu. They are correct. Because 85 per cent of the Indian population is Hindu and because Hindu tradition talks of religious tolerance, you are able to have this polity. So, what is wrong with it? Why are we developing an inferiority complex today? Why do we want to change it? I am proud of it. Eighty-five per cent of our population—largely illiterate, in poverty suffering privations, and yet wants to live in dignity and allow others to live in dignity. I think this is a proud thing. But they say today that 85 per cent of us are allowing the rest of the 15 per cent to live here. That is not true. India was never a Hindu country. India was India. If at all they want to use a word, they must use "Sanatan Dharm." The very meaning of "Sanatan Dharm" is what is perpetual, what is true for all times to come. The Hindu philosophy is one philosophy where there is not one book, not one *guru*, not one final authority. I am a Hindu, I can never be expelled from Hinduism. The Shankaracharya cannot expel me. Nobody can expel me. Ashok Singh certainly cannot.

Sir, I do not understand this. The Vedas are there. The Upanishads are there. The Bhagawadgita is there. The Bhagawat is there. The Ramayan is there. The Mahabharat is there. We have got a treasure-house of wisdom in the Hindu pantheon. Today I find that somebody has got an organisation, got it registered under the Societies Act, and he wants us to believe that he has the last word on interpretation of Hinduism. This is not acceptable. They may not agree with me today.

If their only aim is to win elections, they already had governments in four States. In the electoral process,

somebody wins and somebody else loses, but they will never be able to change the ethos of the Hindu mind. Aurangzeb ruled here. It is history. Aurangzeb did not tolerate the way of worship by the Hindus and their religion. In spite of that, he could not convert the Hindus to become anti-Muslim. What Aurangzeb could not do in 60 years, I am sure the RSS and the VHP cannot do. They are trying to convert the Hindu mind and to make India a Hindu version of Pakistan. It is not possible. Then they are barking up the wrong tree. The very things they want to do, they keep on denying. Mr. Advani will say in a press conference that India can never become a Hindu version of Pakistan. Why does he say so? He says so because that is the ethos of their movement. They want to make India into a Hindu country. They are trying to say this was always a Hindu Rashtra. Then they say the Indian Muslims should call themselves Muhammadis Hindus. I don't understand this. If they have got such a large heart that they are prepared to agree that Muslims here are also part of the same ethos, then what is the fight about? The RSS says it wants to unify the Hindus. 85 per cent of the population is Hindu. If they can really unite the 85 per cent, then all the 100 per cent will get unified. I don't understand against whom they want to unify the Hindus. If you want to unify all the countrymen against a foreign aggressor, I can understand that, but the moment you say you want to unify the Hindus, it means against those who are not Hindus. They may go on saying they are not anti-Muslim but every step of theirs leads you only to that. I am sorry Sushma Swaraj Ji is not here today. Day before yesterday she spoke very well. But see how the mental attitude comes out. She said: "We are proud of our heritage; we are proud of our culture. We do not have a culture where a King imprisons his father. We do not have a culture where the King kills his brother to get to the throne." There she

was referring to Aurangzeb. But Ashoka was not on her consciousness. He killed hundred of his brothers to get to the throne. Was he part of the culture or not?

Sir, we are not educating our masses today. We are de-educating them. For 4,000 years they themselves have got a natural feel. Those who do not speak in Parliament and those who are not articulate, even they understand that the ethos of Hinduism is to live and let live. That cannot change. I do not understand what is the big change after 6th December. Till 6th December, Mr. Narasimha Rao was the best Prime Minister the country ever had. And after 7th December, they say, his Government must go and elections must be held. I do not understand this transformation. They have grounds to feel that suddenly the Hindu inferiority complex has been awakened successfully by them and they will be able to garner the Hindu votes. This is not correct. We are doing a lasting damage to this country. Posterity will never forgive us. I do not grudge their coming to power. Many of them are very competent people. Let them rule in the States and let them rule at the Centre if the people elect them, but let them not destroy the heritage of this country for which the people suffered imprisonment and shed their blood. It is my earnest request to them that the BJP as a political party must revise its stand and try to undo the damage that had been done on 6th December. If they are serious about solving the problem, the ball is in their court. They must open a dialogue with the Muslims community and heal their wounds. If they want to show patriotism, it is their patriotism which is on test. They cannot say that a Muslim in India has to prove his patriotism. I mention this with anguish. Mr. Satish Pradhan is not here. In Bombay, the statements made by the Shiv Sena Chief were uncivilised. He told the Time magazine that the Muslims have to be kicked

out of this country. The next day he clarified by saying that he did not say that. What he meant was that Pakistanis and Bangladeshis and also those who help them must go. So, his clarification is not much of a clarification. But in this he has given his mind. He feels Muslims have no place in this country. Then he adds that those who are patriotic can stay. Now, who is going to give a certificate of patriotism? We are living in a civilised country. If anybody does anything anti-national, there are enough laws. Please book him, lodge an F.I.R., try him in the courts whether he is a Muslim or a Hindu. You cannot decide suddenly about patriotism, saying because somebody was seen clapping at a cricket match for a Pakistani, cricket player, his patriotism is in doubt, if he is a Muslim. If I say Imran Khan is a good bowler, my patriotism is not in doubt, since I am Hindu. But if a Muslim claps for Imran Khan, immediately eye-brows are raised, why was he clapping for a Pakistani bowler. Can there be anything more petty? This is not childish; this is churlish. You cannot talk like this.

Then they say Namaz was being held on the streets and on loudspeakers and they occupied the roads. As a counter, in Bombay, *Maha Arti* was started. We all talk of religion. In Islam, there is a concept of collective prayer on Friday; in Christianity there is a concept of collective prayer on Sunday. In Hinduism there is no such concept. They gather as a crowd in front of a small Ganesh Mandir. And just to carry on the *Arati* for three hours, they sing *Arati* of all the gods. This is blasphemy. What are they trying to tell us about religion? They want to create a law and order situation. They want to make a normal Hindu feel, "Look here, the Muslims have had it too good. You better come with us." Sir, there is an air of terror in them. After the 6th December, I see a normal Hindu is not able to speak up, he is not able

[Shri Kamal Morarka]

to say what they are saying is wrong. My concept is, Hindu religion, Hindu philosophy is tolerant. Sir, I will just end by saying what their concept is. Their concept is, "We believe in Hinduism. The Hindu religion is very catholic in its spirit. We are very tolerant. If you don't agree with us, we will beat you up." Thank you, Sir.

श्री संघ प्रिय मोहन (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपसभापति महोदय, माननीय मोरारका जी ने ऐसा गंभीर मुद्दा उठाया है जिस पर सदन में चर्चा होनी चाहिये, चर्चा की आवश्यकता है। समय बहुत थोड़ा है।

महोदय, राष्ट्रपति का अभिभाषण इस बात का प्रतीक होता है कि केन्द्रीय सरकार ने राष्ट्र की बहुमुखी समस्याओं के समाधान के लिए क्या-क्या कदम उठाये, उसकी क्या उपलब्धियाँ रही और आज की ज्वलंत समस्याओं के समाधान के लिये सरकार क्या करना चाहती है। मुझे अफसोस है, मैं खेद व्यक्त करता हूँ कि जो देश की मुख्य समस्याएँ हैं उनके समाधान के लिये राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण में कोई संकेत नहीं है। माननीय मोरारका जी ने जिस बात का जिक्र किया वह तो अनेक भयंकर समस्याओं में से एक समस्या है। इस देश की सबसे बड़ी समस्या है बढ़ती हुई आबादी। इनके आंकड़ों को देखें या दूरदर्शन को, टी. वी. को देखें ? (व्यवधान)

Please don't interrupt me. I have listened to you patiently. I want the attention of the House also.

तो मैं निवेदन कर रहा था कि हम दूरदर्शन को सही माने या आंकड़ों को सही माने ? कहा गया कि आबादी पर रोक बनी रहे, इसके प्रयास करेंगे। जब सुबह से शाम तक टी.वी. खोलते हैं तो शुरू में एक मीटर जनगणना का दिखाई देता है जिसकी सुई बड़ी तेज घूमती हुई दिखाई देती है। सालों से न इस सुई की रफ्तार बन्द हुई, न कम हुई, रफ्तार बढ़ती ही जा रही

है। इन कांग्रेस के लोगों ने वक्तव्य दिया कि दो या तीन बच्चे से ज्यादा जिसके पास होंगे वह विधान सभा का या पार्लियामेंट का टिकट नहीं पा सकेगा। आज जरूरत इस बात की है कि एक से ज्यादा बच्चा जिसका होगा उस को कोटा, लाइसेंस, परमिट, एजेंसी, मकान, दुकान, जमीन, नौकरी, एम.पी., एम.एल.ए. की टिकट पाने का अधिकार नहीं होगा तो इस देश की जनसंख्या रुकेगी, बया इस इच्छा शक्ति का प्रदर्शन इस सरकार ने किया ? इसके बिना इस देश की जनसंख्या कम नहीं हो सकेगी और यह बहुत बड़ी समस्या है।

दूसरी समस्या, मान्यवर, आर्थिक समस्या है। इस आर्थिक समस्या को कैसे सुलझायेंगे, कैसे उत्पादन बढ़ायेंगे और कैसे रोजगार देंगे, इस अभिभाषण में इसका जिक्र बिल्कुल नहीं है। इस अभिभाषण में एक उल्लेख हुआ, कितना धोखा दिया इस देश को, यह कहा गया है कि 1992-93 में हम लघु उद्योगों के माध्यम से 1,66,400 रुपये का उत्पादन पैदा करेंगे और इससे 1 करोड़ 29 लाख लोगों को रोजगार मिलेगा। लेकिन यह नहीं बताया कि कितना उत्पादन हुआ और कितने लोगों को रोजगार मिला और आगे के लिए आप कितन लघु उद्योग स्थापित करना चाहते हैं और उनके माध्यम से कितने बेरोजगारों को रोजगार देना चाहते हैं जिनकी संख्या तेजी से बढ़ती जा रही है। इसका लेखमात्र भी संकेत राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में नहीं है।

मान्यवर, तीसरी समस्या इस देश के प्रदूषण की है। अभी थोड़ा सा जगमोहन जी ने कहा। प्रदूषण पानी का है, प्रदूषण हवा का, शोर का प्रदूषण और आबादी का प्रदूषण। जहाँ पर दस मंजिले और 24 मंजिले ऊँचे मकान इस दिल्ली में, जिन्हें हम पोश कालोनीज कहते हैं, नजर आते हैं, उन्हीं के नीचे हजारों झुग्गी झोपड़ियाँ पड़ी हुई हैं जहाँ न टट्टीघर है, न पेशाबघर है। झोपड़ियों में रहने वाले वह लोग सड़कों

पर टट्टी करते हैं, पेशाब करते हैं, मैला डालते हैं, बदबू आ रही है, प्रदूषण बढ़ रहा है। आखिर ये लोग कहाँ से आते हैं? ये गांव से पलायन कर रहे हैं क्योंकि वहाँ पर काम नहीं है और सुरक्षा नहीं है। क्या सरकार ने इस प्रदूषण को रोकने की, शहरों में आबादी को रोकने के लिये कोई ऐसा कदम उठाने की बात कही कि गांव में लोगों को रोजगार मिलेगा। कतई इस बात का जिक्र अभिभाषण में नहीं है।

दूसरी समस्या है देश की एकता और अखंडता की। मुझे आज खेद है हमारे सभी भाइयों ने व कांग्रेस के लोगों ने या तो बी.जे.पी. पर आरोप लगाये या इन्होंने अपने इतिहास को दोहराया और हमारे जो विपक्ष के सदस्य बैठे हुये हैं, मोरारका भाई जी आप विद्वान साथी हैं मैं बड़े गौर से आपको सुनता हूँ, आप सब ने भारतीय जनता पार्टी पर आरोप लगाये। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस देश के अन्दर आज कितनी सारी समस्याएँ हैं इनकी जननी यह कांग्रेस पार्टी है। मैं आजादी से पहले की देश की एकता और अखंडता की बात कहता हूँ। इन लोगों ने कहा था देश के टुकड़े नहीं होंगे। महात्मा गांधी के माने कांग्रेस और कांग्रेस के माने महात्मा गांधी। गांधी जी ने कहा था कि मेरे जीते जी पाकिस्तान नहीं बनेगा और पाकिस्तान बनेगा तो मेरी लाश पर बनेगा। मुझे खेद है कि पाकिस्तान बना और देश के टुकड़े हुये। गांधी जी जिंदा रहे। इस देश की एकता को भंग करने वाले ये कांग्रेस के लोग हैं। ये हैं देश को तोड़ने वाले।

इसके बाद कांग्रेस के लोग इस देश में कभी काम के नाम पर और कभी प्रोग्राम के नाम पर पब्लिक के बीच में नहीं गये। सन् 1952 में आजादी के नाम पर इन्होंने मलाई खाई और चुनाव जीत कर आये। 1957 में गांधी जी के नाम पर चुनाव जीत कर आये और 1962 में नेहरू

जी के हाथ मजबूत करने के नाम पर जीत कर आये। 1967 में जब कुछ नहीं रहा तो संविधान को इन्होंने तोड़ा। संविधान को तोड़ने वाले ये लोग हैं। राजनीति में अस्थिरता पैदा करने वाले ये लोग हैं। बड़ पैमाने पर कांग्रेस के अन्दर दल बदल हुआ। यह 1967 में हुआ। कांग्रेस के लोगों ने 9 राज्यों ने दल बदल करके अपनी सरकार बनाई। इन्होंने देश में दल बदल आरम्भ किया व कराया जिसकी वजह से राजनीति में नैतिकता का पतन हुआ। राजनीति में अस्थिरता पैदा हुई। सन् 1973 के अन्दर जो इनके राष्ट्रपति पद के लिये उम्मीदवार थे श्री संजीवा रेड्डी, जिनका इन्होंने राष्ट्रपति पद के लिये नामीनेशन कराया उन्हीं को हरा दिया। इन्होंने पार्टी अनुशासन को तोड़ा। अन्तरात्मा की आवाज पर श्री वी.वी. गिरि साहब को मतदान करने के लिये कहा। ये वही लोग हैं जिन्होंने इस देश के अनुशासन को तोड़ा। इन्होंने संविधान को तोड़ा। पार्लियामेंट की गिन्याद पांच साल की होती है। 1967 के बाद 1972 में चुनाव लोक सभा के होने थे लेकिन इन्होंने 1971 में लोक सभा को भंग करके चुनाव कराये। इस तरह से कांग्रेस के लोगों ने संविधान को तोड़ा। ये हैं दोषी। इसके बाद इन्होंने देश में इमरजेंसी लगाई। इस देश के अन्दर लोकतंत्र को तोड़ा। इस देश के अन्दर सिन्धो-रिट्टी के आधार पर जजों की नियुक्ति की परम्परा को तोड़ा। सुप्रीम कोर्ट में सीनियर न्यायाधीश थे उनको सुपरसीड करके जस्टिस रे को चीफ जस्टिस बनाकर सुप्रीम कोर्ट की अवमानना इन लोगों ने की। ये हैं वे लोग जिन्होंने राष्ट्र के संविधान की अवमानना की। आज जो राष्ट्र की संस्थाओं में गिरावट आई है इसके दोषी ये ही लोग हैं।

इन्होंने जमींदारी को खत्म किया लेकिन वे ही जमींदार एम०एल०ए०, एस०पी० और मिनिस्टर बनकर यहां बैठे। इन्होंने ही बैठे। राजा आज भी बैठे हुये हैं। इन्होंने कहा कि हम

[श्री संघ प्रिय गौतम]

जोत की जमीन पर सीलिंग लगायेंगे। छः-सात साल तक प्रचार किया लेकिन कानून लागू नहीं किया। जितने भी बड़े-बड़े राजा-महाराजा जमीन वाले थे उन्होंने अपने कुत्ते, बिल्लियों के नाम बेनामी पट्टे पर जमीन ट्रांसफर कर ली और किसी गरीब को सीलिंग के बाद की जमीन नहीं दी गई। इन्होंने बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण करते हुये यह कहा था कि यह हमने गरीबों के लिये किया है। लेकिन किसी गरीब को खेत के लिये, ट्रेक्टर के लिये पैसा नहीं मिला। ब्रस के लिये पैसा नहीं मिला। टेम्पों के लिये पैसा नहीं मिला। कारखाने के लिये पैसा नहीं मिला। भट्टे के लिये पैसा नहीं मिला। पैसा मिला पांच हजार रुपये सुर्गी पालन के लिये, सूअर पालन के लिये, भैंस पालने के लिये। वह भी आधा दलाल के पास गया। गरीब के पास पूरा पैसा पहुंचा नहीं। और इस देश का गरीब आदमी गरीब ही रह गया। इन लोगों ने कहा कि हम अनुसूचित जातियों को ऊपर उठावेंगे, लेकिन आरक्षण आज तक पूरा नहीं हुआ। उनकी आवादी के अनुसार उन पर जो पैसा खर्च होना चाहिये था वह भी नहीं हुआ। आठवीं पंचवर्षीय योजना में पब्लिक सेक्टर में टोटल एलोकेशन 4 लाख 34 हजार। सौ करोड़ रुपयों का है। कल्याण मंत्रालय जिसमें शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स, शेड्यूल्ड ट्राइब्स, बैकवर्ड क्लासेज, विमेन, ये सब शामिल हैं, इसका एलोकेशन 4 हजार 173 करोड़ रुपये है। यह 1.7 परसेंट है। ये इनके आंकड़े हैं अनुसूचित जातियों के लिये राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में कहते हैं कि हमने 75 करोड़ से 125 करोड़ रुपये कर दिये हैं। शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स, शेड्यूल्ड ट्राइब्स डेवलपमेंट और फाइनंशियल कारपोरेशन भी उसमें शामिल है और यह सब 125 करोड़ रुपये है। दूसरी तरफ क्या कहते हैं कि 312 योजनाएं इनकी भलाई के लिये, विकास के लिये बनाई गई है और रुपये 277 करोड़ रखे हैं और 54 करोड़ रुपये खर्च किये गये हैं। आप इस समाज को क्यों धोखा दे

रहे हैं। इन्होंने सौ करोड़ रुपये रखे हैं, लेकिन कहते हैं कि 277 करोड़ की योजनाएं हैं।

मान्यवर, मैं दो तीन बातें कह कर अपनी बात खत्म करता हूं। जहां तक पिछड़ी जातियों का प्रश्न है। बैकवर्ड क्लासेज कमिशन ने सिफारिश की थी, अकेले नौकरियों के लिये नहीं, पब्लिक सेक्टर में जो नौकरियां हैं, प्राइवेट सेक्टर में जो नौकरियां हैं उनमें भी रिजर्वेशन हो। इसके अलावा फाइनेशियल एसिस्टेंस मिले, एजुकेशनल कंसेशन मिले। ये उसने सिफारिशें की थी। ये जनता दल वाले डींग मारते हैं। लेकिन इनके लिये कहा जा सकता है कि छोटा पहाड़ निकला चूहा और वह भी मरा हुआ। इन्होंने कहा कि हम नौकरियों में 27 परसेंट इनको रिजर्वेशन देंगे। लेकिन जैसा मुष्मा जी ने कहा कि नौकरियां हैं कहा। वह भी नहीं मिलीं, लेकिन अब क्रीमी लेयर की बात आ गई। इस देश में शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स और बैकवर्ड क्लासेज के ही लोग गरीब नहीं हैं, इस देश में ब्राह्मणों में भी गरीब हैं, राजपूतों में भी गरीब हैं और वैश्यों में भी गरीब हैं। अगर इस देश में सामाजिक समता लानी है तो क्रीमी लेयर सबसे पहले श्री नरसिंह राव पर लगानी पड़ेगी। श्री नरसिंह राव प्रधान मंत्री हैं। उनका एक बेटा आंध्र प्रदेश में मंत्री है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): No, no. You cannot say like this.

श्री संघ प्रिय गौतम : क्रीमी लेयर में पहले इनको निकालना पड़ेगा। पहले जो 25 लाख की कम्पनी थी और जो आज सौ करोड़ की कम्पनी हो गई है दूसरा बेटा उसका डायरेक्टर, वह भी धोखाधड़ी में लिप्त और तीसरा लड़का पी. सी. सी. का जनरल सेक्रेटरी। क्रीमी लेयर में पहले इनको खत्म करना पड़ेगा।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Try to conclude please.

धी संघ प्रिय गौतम : जज का बेटा जज बनता है और आई०ए०एस० का बेटा आई०ए०एस० बनता है, इस क्रीमी लेयर को पहले आप खत्म कीजिये ताकि छोटे लोग भी आगे आ सकें। चपरासी, खलासी और पटबारी का बेटा भी आई०ए०एस० बन सकें। ब्राह्मणों में भी क्रीमी लेयर हैं। जब तक आप इस क्रीमी लेयर को खत्म नहीं करते हैं तब तक कुछ नहीं हो सकता है। कोई उपराष्ट्रपति बन जाये और उस का बेटा हाई कोर्ट का जज बन जाये, फिर सुप्रीम कोर्ट का जज बन जाये और बाद में उसको चीफ जस्टिस बना दिया जाये, यह क्रीमी लेयर इन लोगों को भी लागू होनी चाहिये।

अब मैं अंतिम बात कहना चाहता हूँ। आप मुझे इजाजत दीजिये। यहां पर सामाजिक सौहार्द की बात कही जाती है। मैं इस संबंध में एक बात कोट करना चाहता हूँ। 1927 में मद्रास में कांग्रेस का अधिवेशन हुआ। मौलाना मोहम्मद अली बड़े देश भक्त थे, उन्होंने कहा था कि हम मुस्लिम प्रत्यसंबंधकों की सुरक्षा की गारंटी होनी चाहिये। पंडित मदन मोहन मालवीय जी ने भाषण दिया और ऐसा भाषण दिया जो दिल को छूने वाला था। मान्यवर, उसकी दो तीन लाइनें मैं पढ़ता हूँ। श्री एच०बी० कामत जो कांस्टिट्यूट एसेम्बली के मेम्बर थे उन्होंने इनको रिप्रोड्यूस किया था।

I am reproducing those three or four sentences.

"There was a question about safeguards and Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya made a moving speech that straightaway went into the hearts. 'What safeguards did you ask from the Secretary of State for India or from the Government of India? We are here. What better safeguards do you want?' After his speech, Maulana Mohd. Ali came to the rostrum, embraced Pandit Malaviya and said: 'I do not want any safeguard. We want to live as Indians, as part of the Indian body-po-

litic. We want no safeguards from the British Government. Pandit Malaviya is our best safeguard.'"

If any so-called minorities come forward and say "you are our best safeguard ... (interruption) ... We do not want those safeguards", I will embrace those persons. But none has come forward.

और यह लोग जितते यहां बैठे हैं सब उनका साथ देते रहे।

आखिरी बात कहता हूँ, मुझे इजाजत दीजिये। मैं आखिरी बात कह रहा हूँ। हमको आप अपराधी सिद्ध कर रहे हैं कि हमने डांचा तोड़ दिया। मान लिया तोड़ दिया तो अपराधी को सजा ही तो मिलती है। कबूल कर लेते हैं तब भी सजा मिलती है। अबूल करने पर भी गवाही देकर सजा मिलती है। कल्याण सिंह ने अपना पद छोड़ दिया। सरकार का त्यागपत्र दे दिया। हमारे खिलाफ आपने मुकदमे कायम किये। आपने हमको जेल में भेज दिया। हमारे संगठनों पर प्रतिबंध लगा दिया। आपने "मीमा" में हमको बन्द कर दिया और हमारी पार्टी की रैली पर रोक लगा दी और हमारे नेताओं और हमारी पार्टी के संसद सदस्यों को टीटा इतना जो हिन्दुस्तान के इतिहास में कभी नहीं हुआ

What else do you need?

और आप क्या चाहते हैं! इसके बाद मैं एक कहावत सुनाकर अपनी बात खत्म करता हूँ।

चार दोस्त गांव के थे। वे शहर में चले गये। खेतिहर किसान थे। शहर में पैसा कमाया। लेकिन गन्ना चसने के आदी थे। जमीन खरीद ली और उन्होंने उसमें ईख बो दी। लेकिन दिन भर काम करते थे। कहा कि रखवाली कौन करे। एक कुत्ता पाल लिया। वह उस ईख की रखवाली करता था। दूसरे कुत्ते गांव के दस बारह कुत्ते आ गये और उस कुत्ते पर दूट पड़े, जैसी कुत्तों की आदत होती है।

उस कुत्ते को एक टांग टूट गयी। उन चारों दोस्तों ने एक एक टांग बांट रखी थी कि इस टांग का यह मालिक है और इस टांग का यह मालिक है। जो टांग टूट गयी थी उसका मालिक आया उसने पुचकारा और कहा कि क्या किया जाय। लोगों ने कहा कि इस पर कपड़ा लपेट कर तेल डालकर सेक दो। वहाँ दूसरा तेल नहीं था, मिट्टी का तेल था उसे डाल दिया। जब सेक करने लगे तो उसमें आग लग गयी। कुत्ता भागा ईख में और सारी ईख में आग लग गयी और ईख जल गयी। सब ने तखमीना लगाया कि ईख 800 रुपये की थी। व तीनों दोस्त बोले कि भाई तुम्हारी टांग से आग लगी है इसलिये 800 रुपये में से 200 रुपये काट लो और 600 रुपये हम दे दो। वह सब के पास गया। सबने यही कहा कि तेरी टांग से आग लगी है, जैसा ये सभी बोल रहे हैं कि यह सब बी.जे.पी ने किया है। फिर वह किसी एक बड़े के पास गया और कहा कि तुम मेरी बकालत कर दो। उसने कहा कि ठीक है मैं तुम्हारी बकालत करूँगा। जब वह सुप्रीम कोर्ट में गया कहा कि इन तीनों की टांग से आग लगी है, इसलिये उन को पैसा देना चाहिये। वे बोले कि क्यों। जिस टांग में कपड़ा बंधा था वह इसकी टांग थी, आग तो उससे ही लगी है। तो वह बोला कि अरे भाई अगर यह तीन टांगें साबुत न होती तो कुत्ता भागता नहीं और अगर भागता नहीं तो आग कैसे लगती? इस ढाँचे को तोड़ते वाले थे और तुम सब लोग हो। ... (व्यवधान) ... अगर आप हिन्दुओं के साथ अपमान, अन्याय और नुकसान की हरकतें नहीं करते तो शायद ऐसा नहीं होता।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Please conclude, Mr. Gautam.

श्री संघ प्रिय गौतम : मैं आपसे अर्ज कर रहा हूँ....

उपसभाध्यक्ष : सैयद सिद्दिके रज़ी कृपया खतम करें।

श्री संघ प्रिय गौतम : आखिरी लाइन सर। मेरा 15 मिनट का टाइम था।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): You have taken twenty minutes.

श्री संघ प्रिय गौतम : मैं लास्ट लाइन कह रहा हूँ। मुझे एक बात इनके बारे में कहनी है। आप कहते कि हमारी कांग्रेस से दोस्ती है। हमने तो देश के हित में जब इंदिरा जी 1971 में युद्ध जीती थी तो...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (सैयद सिद्दिके रज़ी) : खतम करें प्लीज।

श्री संघ प्रिय गौतम : उनको भी देवी कह दिया। जब राजीव गांधी प्रधानमंत्री हो गये तो हमने उनको भी भला आदमी कह दिया और जब श्री नरसिंह राव जी ने गद्दी संभाली और लिब्रलाइजेशन की बात कही तो हमने उनकी नीयत पर शक नहीं किया और उनको भी अच्छा आदमी कह दिया। लेकिन ये साम्यवादी जब जब कांग्रेस गड्डे में गई इन्होंने उसका साथ दिया। इलेक्शन कांग्रेस के साथ समझौते से लड़ा।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (सैयद सिद्दिके रज़ी) : आप समाप्त करें।

श्री संघ प्रिय गौतम : ...तो कांग्रेस को बचाने वाले ये साम्यवादी हैं, मोरारका भाई की पार्टी के लोगों के समर्थन से कांग्रेस ने सरकार चलाई और उन्होंने कांग्रेस के समर्थन से सरकार चलाई।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Please conclude, Mr. Gautam.

श्री संघ प्रिय गौतम : चौधरी चरण सिंह ने अपनी सरकार कांग्रेस के समर्थन से चलाई। सारे पाप के जिम्मेदार ये कांग्रेसी और विपक्षी लोग हैं।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (सेयब सिक्ते रजी) : आप समाप्त करें। आपका समय समाप्त हो गया है।

श्री संघ प्रिय गौतम : मैं यह कहकर अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ कि :

“बूम तो नाहक बेचार मुफ्त में वदनाम है, इन हसीनों ने उजाड़ी ये अनेकों बस्तियां।”

श्री शंकर दयाल सिंह (बिहार) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरे मित्र ने एक शेर से अपना भाषण समाप्त किया है। भाषणों का जो दौर चल रहा है, वह बंद होने का नाम नहीं ले रहा है। राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण पर भाषणों का जो दौर इस सदन में चला है, बाहर लोग इसके बारे में क्या सोचते हैं, हम लोगों को यह भी समझना चाहिए। संसद की तस्वीर बनती जा रही है और संसद की उस तस्वीर में जनतंत्र का कौन सा मुखड़ा लोग देख रहे हैं खासकर पढ़े-लिखे बुद्धिजीवी लोग, इसकी ओर मैं आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। किसी ने कहा है—

भाषा

उस तिकड़मो दरिदे का कौर है

जो सड़क पर और है

संसद में और है

इसलिए बाहर आ

संसद के अंधेरे से बाहर निकल कर

सड़क पर आ।

महोदय, मैं चाहता हूँ कि हम लोग संसद में जब बैठते हैं तो केवल इसी को पूरी दुनिया न मान लें, इसी को पूरा देश न मान लें बल्कि बाहर की दुनिया को ही असली दुनिया समझें क्योंकि हम उनके नुमाइंदे के रूप में यहां आए हुए हैं। इसलिए मैंने जब शुरू किया, मैं बराबर गौर में उन सारी पत्र-पत्रिकाओं को पढ़ने का प्रयास करता हूँ, उनमें यह ढूँढ़ने का प्रयास करता हूँ कि कहां मानवता कराह रही है, कहां दर्द है और जनतंत्र के लिए सही मायनों में किस के मन में कौन सी हुक-मुकार उठ रही है। अभी यह

पत्र “सर्वोदय जगत” हमारे सामने है, इसमें भवानी प्रसाद मिश्र जी की कविता कोट की है —

चुप रहने का वक्त भी हो सकता है
मगर यह वक्त नहीं है चुप रहने का, यह
कहने का वक्त है।

यह अपने मन की बात, आस पास की घनी रात
घोषित करने का वक्त है।

चुप रहने का वक्त भी हो सकता है
मगर यह वक्त दिन दहाड़े, अंधेरा उतारन के
खिलाफ

खड़े होकर कुछ ठीका बातें कहते का वक्त है।

महोदय, इसलिए मैं उन्हीं ठीक बातों को संक्षेप में कहते के लिए आपके सामने खड़ा हुआ हूँ। महोदय, सब से पह राष्ट्रपति जी ने राष्ट्र की भाषा में राष्ट्र को आह्वानित किया, इसके लिए मैं उनको धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ। राष्ट्रभाषा में, हिन्दी में राष्ट्रपति जी का अभिभाषण हुआ, हालांकि वह जो भाषण है सरकार का तैयार किया हुआ होता है, सरकार राष्ट्रपति की ही है, यह भी मैं जानता हूँ लेकिन फिर भी पहली बार जब से मैं यहां लोक सभा और राज्य सभा में आया हूँ मुझे यह देखने को मिला कि हिन्दी में राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपना भाषण पढ़ा, उसका तर्जुमा अंग्रेजी में हुआ। मैं चाहता हूँ कि आगे भी इस बात का लोग ख्याल करें और भारतीय भाषाओं में भी इस तरह का भाषण होता रहे।

महोदय, राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण का एक अंश मैं केवल कहना चाहता हूँ जो हमारे प्रान्त बिहार के मुत्तालिक है। राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने भाषण में कहा था कि बिहार के कुछ हिस्सों में सुखाड़ है और बिहार में गरीबी भी है। वहां सुखाड़ और गरीबी है इसलिए कि केन्द्र की नाराजगी है और केन्द्र की उदासीनता के कारण ही हमारे यहां गरीबी रहती है। अभी देखिये, मैं और बातों की तह में नहीं जाना चाहता हूँ। कोल इण्डिया के पास हमारी बिहार सरकार का 137 करोड़ रुपया बकाया भुगतान के लिए है। बार-बार लिखा जा रहा है लेकिन पैसा नहीं

[श्री शंकप दयाल सिंह]

मिल रहा है जबकि प्रधानमंत्री जी ने भी कहा कि यह पैसा मिलना चाहिए। बिहार सरकार ने परिवार कल्याण विभाग को लिखा है, 206 करोड़ रुपये का भुगतान उनको बिहार सरकार को करना है लेकिन परिवार कल्याण मंत्रालय ने यहां से यह भुगतान नहीं भेजा। कोयले पर स्वामित्व की दर कोयले के वजन पर नहीं बल्कि उसके मूल्य पर हो, इसके लिए बार-बार बिहार सरकार द्वारा लिखा जा रहा है लेकिन कोई सुनवाई नहीं हो रही है। राष्ट्रीय उच्च पथ जो जी०टी० रोड वहां से पार करता है, उस शेर शाह सूरी मार्ग की मरम्मत हेतु अतिरिक्त धनराशि के लिए बार-बार बिहार सरकार द्वारा लिखा जाता रहा है लेकिन कोई सुनवाई नहीं हो रही है। सात विद्युत गृहों के लिए बार बार लिखा गया है जिनमें उत्तरी कारणपुरा विद्युत केन्द्र में कार्य प्रारम्भ करने की स्वीकृति देने के बाद इसकी राशि नहीं भेजी जा रही है, इसके लिए भी लिखा गया है लेकिन कोई सुनवाई नहीं हो रही है। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार सब से पहले इसकी सुनवाई करे।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, देश की जो हालत है, इसके बारे में यहां बहुत कुछ कहा गया और बड़े लम्बे चौड़े ढंग से कहा गया। मैं उससे आगे बढ़ जाऊंगा, ऐसा मैं नहीं समझता। लेकिन देश की आर्थिक हालत देश की राजनीतिक हालत और देश की नैतिक हालत, तीनों खराब हैं सरकार सब को कुछ देने की बात कहती है लेकिन जो सब से जरूरी चीज है नागरिकों के लिए वह उनकी सुरक्षा, नैतिकता और राष्ट्रीयता, इसकी शिक्षा सरकार नहीं दे रही है। इसलिए मैं सब से पहले कहना चाहूंगा कि केवल आर्थिक पक्ष को सरकार पहले ले ले। आज हमारी स्थिति क्या है। हमारी स्थिति दुनिया के देशों में एक बड़े भिखमंगे की होती जा रही है। भारत के ऊपर 2,43,314 करोड़ रुपये का कर्ज है और इस कर्ज का मतलब यह है कि 87 करोड़ की हमारी जो देश की आबादी है इसमें प्रति व्यक्ति के ऊपर 2,693 रुपये का कर्ज है। सवाल है कि इस विदेशी कर्ज

के बदले में हम क्या कर रहे हैं। अपने आपको हम गिरवी रखते जा रहे हैं और यह जो गिरवी रखते जा रहे हैं वह केवल आंकड़ों की ही बात नहीं है बल्कि तथ्यों की बात है।

महोदय, इस सदन में और सदन के बाहर भी डंकल प्रस्तावों के बारे में बहुत सारी बातें रोज होती रहती हैं। सरकार से यह कहा जाता रहा है कि उनका खुलासा करे लेकिन सरकार बगलें झांकती रही है। डंकल प्रस्ताव के बारे में न तो चर्चा हुई है और न ही सरकार ने अपनी मंशा स्पष्ट की है। मैं आपके द्वारा सरकार से कहना चाहता हूँ कि डंकल प्रस्तावों का अगर सब से बुरा असर कहीं होगा तो कृषि और ग्रामीण अर्थ व्यवस्था के ऊपर होगा जो कि हमारी सब से बड़ी पूंजी है और गांधी जी ने जिसकी बुनियाद पर आजादी की कल्पना की थी। इन प्रस्तावों में उस बुनियादी अंतर को नजरअंदाज कर दिया गया है। आत्मनिर्भरता और भोजन की सुरक्षा के लिए दी जाने वाली रियायतें और निर्यात प्रोत्साहन के लिए रियायत जरूरी होती हैं लेकिन दुख की बात है कि डंकल सुझावों को अगर मान लिया गया तो भारत सरकार के लिए यह असंभव बन जाएगा कि वह किसानों को समर्थन मूल्य दे सके क्योंकि इन सुझावों में स्पष्ट निर्देश है कि विकासशील देश अपने कृषि उत्पाद की कुल कीमत के 10 प्रतिशत से अधिक समर्थन मूल्य नहीं दे सकते हैं।

महोदय, इसके साथ ही मैं यह भी कहना चाहूंगा बड़े ही दुख के साथ कि भारत के वित्तीय संसाधनों का इस्तेमाल जो हो रहा है वह ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों के विकास के लिए नहीं बल्कि बड़े बड़े घोटालों के लिए हो रहा है। यह जो प्रतिभूति घोटाला हमारे सामने आया जिसने पूरी दुनिया की आंखें खोल दी इससे हमारे वित्तीय संस्थान अब एक हाशिये पर खड़े हो गये हैं प्रभ-चिन्ह के रूप में। आज उनकी स्थिति क्या है। राष्ट्रीय आवास बैंक का घोटाला 1,271.20 करोड़, द स्टेट बैंक ऑफ सौराष्ट्र का घोटाला 174.93 करोड़, एस. बी.

आई कैपिटल मार्केट विल 121.36 करोड़, स्टैंडर्ड चारटर्ड बैंक 400 करोड़, कैवफिना, 43.69 करोड़, आन्ध्र वित्तीय सेवा लिमिटेड जिसकी चर्चा रोज हो रही है, 205.12 करोड़। इस तरह से घोटाले थे 4,024.45 करोड़ या लगभग 5,000 करोड़ रूपया साबित हो गया है, उन बैंकों और वित्तीय संस्थानों का, मैं समझता हूँ कि सरकार को इसकी जवाब देही लेनी चाहिए।

महोदय, मैंने प्रारम्भ थे ही आपको कहा कि मैं बहुत विस्तार में नहीं जाऊंगा। लेकिन दो बातों की ओर मैं आपका ध्यान आकृष्ट जरूरी समझता हूँ। मैं पिछले कई वर्षों से इस बात को देख रहा हूँ कि मध्य वर्ग और बुद्धिजीवी दोनों को सरकार अपने कार्यक्रमों में वह हिस्सा नहीं दे रही है जो हिस्सा उसे देना चाहिये। इस देश के बौद्धिक लोग बाहर चले जाते हैं। बिहार थे एक बहुत बड़े वैज्ञानिक, मैथ, मैटीशियन पैदा हुए डा वशिष्ठ नारायण सिंह। दुनिया में उसका नाम हुआ। दुख के साथ कहना पड़ना है कि गरीबी और पीड़ा में वह आदमी पागल हो गया। दो तीन दिन पहले उसको बैंगलौर के पागल खाने थे भर्ती होना पड़ा है। केवल एक नाम मैंने विलया है, लेकिन आज देश के बुद्धिजीवियों की यही स्थिति हो रही है। इसलिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार जब भी कोई कार्य क्रम चलावे, पतो पहले उनकी बात सोचे, इन बातों को समझे।

मैंने आपको बताया था कि इस देश की जो स्थितियाँ और परिस्थितियाँ इन दिनों हो रही हैं, उनके लिये जवाब-देही केवल सरकार की नहीं, बल्कि हर नागरिक की, हर राजनीतिक दल की भी है, लेकिन इस संबंध में मैं आपको यह कहना चाहूंगा कि आज जो भी हमारी योजनाएँ बन रही हैं, सबसे बड़ी शिकायत उनके ऊपर यह आ रही है कि वे योजनाएँ हमारी अपनी समस्याओं को ध्यान में रख कर नहीं बनाई जाती हैं। बराबर इसे सदन में कहा गया कि जो हमारी योजना है, आर्थिक नीति है, चाहे औद्योगिक नीति है, उनका आधार गांधी नहीं है, उनके आधार रचनात्मक कार्यकर्ता नहीं

हैं, उनके आधार कुटीर उद्योग नहीं है, उनका आधार ग्रामीण व्यवस्था नहीं है, उनका आधार पंचायती राज नहीं है, उनका आधार अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय मुद्रा कोष है, उनका आधार विश्व बैंक है।

इसलिये, मान्यवर, मैं आपके द्वारा सरकार हेतु अनुरोध करना चाहता हूँ, कि भारत की जमीन पर वही योजना सफल हो सकती है, जो भारतीय जनता को अपने सामने रख कर वनेगी। मैं सरकार से कहना चाहूंगा कि आप जब भी इन चीजों को बनायें, आप उसमें भारत की तस्वीर को पहले रखें। आप विदेशी पूंजी को भारत के विकास के लिये इस्तेमाल कर सकते हैं, लेकिन विदेशी पूंजी लाकर आप भारत की को गिरवी नहीं रख सकते हैं।

मैंने स्वयं ही आपको कहा कि मैं इन बातों के लिये न पत्र-पत्रिकाओं में बराबर जांकता रहता हूँ कि आखिर इनकी प्रतिक्रिया क्या है और बुद्धि-जीवियों की प्रतिक्रिया क्या है मनमोहन सिंह जी की मैं कद्र करता हूँ और यह भी जानता हूँ कि इन्होंने प्रयोग करने की दिशा में कदम उठाये हैं, लेकिन बुद्धिजीवी क्या कहते हैं, आप जरा सोच लें। (व्यवधान)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SYED SIBTEY RAZI): Please restore normalcy in the House... (Interruptions)

श्री शंकर दयाल सिंह : मैं विदित टू-निट्स खत्म करता हूँ। (व्यवधान)

श्री शंकर दयाल सिंह : "खबरदार"। मनमोहन सिंह जी, यह पत्तों में आ रहा है कि "खबरदार"। वे आ रहे हैं—

"स्वागत करो, सजाओं वन्दनवार
वे आ रहे हैं
दुनियाँ के बड़े-बड़े महाजन, सेठ साहूकार
तुम्हारी नीलामी में ;
बोलियाँ बोलने
वे आ रहे हैं

तुम्हारे खेतों की, तुम्हारी फसलों की
तुम्हारे बीजों की, तुम्हारे फलों की
तुम्हारे बँलों की, तुम्हारे हलों की
नीलामी में बोलियां बोलते
वे आ रहे हैं
स्वागत करो, पहनाओं गले में हार
उन आगन्तुकों में नहीं हैं वे
जो आये — पुराने जमानों में
नालन्दा और तक्षशिला
ज्ञान की प्यास लिये
वे आ रहे हैं
मुनाफे की आस लिये
जैसे आई थी ईस्ट इंडिया कम्पनी
बढ़ने लगी दिन दूनी रात चौगुनी
बनाने लगी किले, फिर जिले
और फिर सारा देश
हो गया उसका उपनिवेश

मान्यवर, इन बातों के जरिये मैं
सरकार को कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप
समझें—

“कोई उन्हें रोके नहीं, कोई उन्हें टोके नहीं
उनके इशारों पर नाचती है सरकार
वे हैं हमारे शाही मेहमान
महाप्रभु दयावान
उन्हें बुला रहे हैं देश के तमाम
अमीर-उमरा हाकिम-हुकाम
उनके लिये ला रहे हैं वे
अन्तःपुर के नये साज-समान
स्वागत करो
बड़े हो जाओ बांध कर कतार

महोदय, यह आज देश के आम
लोगों की बात है, जो मैं आपके जरिये
यहां पहुंचाना चाहता था। सरकार के
कान में नगाड़े की भी आवाज नहीं
पहुंचती है, लेकिन अगर इन बुद्धिजीवियों
की, इन गांधीवादियों की, इन रचनात्मक
कार्यकर्ताओं की, इन पत्रकारों की अगर
आवाज सरकार के काम तक पहुंच सकी,
अगर आप पढ़ सकें, तो मैं समझता हूँ
कि इस देश का बहुत बड़ा भला होगा।

महोदय, बहुत सारी बातें कही गई
हैं। अयोध्या के बाद देश की हालत
क्या हुई, जो विषाक्त वातावरण हुआ
समाज का, जो राजनीति का हुआ और
सरकार की जो धज्जी उड़ी, उसके

बारे में इस सदन में इतना कुछ कहा
गया है कि उसमें मैं अधिक नहीं जोड़ना
चाहता। लेकिन मैं इतना जरूर कहना
चाहता हूँ कि क्योंकि मैंने शुरूआत की
थी, कि अगर इन बातों को गंभीरता
से नहीं सोचा गया, तो कल का भारत
जो है और खतरनाक भारत जो है और
खतरनाक बन जायेगा।

इसीलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि
जब तक सामाजिक प्रतिष्ठा के साथ
सरकार दोनों, हिन्दू और मुसलमान के
दिलों को जीतते का प्रयास नहीं करेगी,
जैसा गांधी जी ने किया था, तब तक
दोनों के बीच तफर्का पैदा करते हुये
और अपनी गद्दी बचाने के लिये सरकार
जो करेगी, उसका असर किसी के ऊपर
होगा नहीं।

मैं बड़े ही अदब के साथ नजीर
बनारसी को यहां पर कोट करना चाहता
हूँ। मैं इस शायर को इसलिये कोट कर
रहा हूँ कि मैं इस शायर का आज सब
से बड़ा राष्ट्रीय एकता का प्रतीक
मानता हूँ और जिसे मैं कबीर का अवतार
मानता हूँ और पिछले दिनों में इस
आदमी ने अपने परिवार के कई लोगों
को खोया और उसका नतीजा हुआ कि
पैरेलिसिस के अटैक से वह 85 साल का
बुढ़ा शायर बनारस में पड़ा हुआ है
बिस्तरे पर, लेकिन बिस्तरे पर से भी
तो वह आवाज दे रहा है। आज
हमारे कानों में अगर वह आवाज पहुंच
जाय, मैं समझता हूँ कि कि यह अमृत
बूंदें हैं उन्होंने कहा है :

“जिसे जिस तरफ हो जाना वह खुशी
के साथ जाए,
हो बतन के साथ प्यार जिसको वह
हमारे साथ आए।
न जनाव शेख का न जनाव ब्राह्मण का,
है बतन तो सिर्फ उसका जो बतन के
काम आए।”

इसके साथ ही मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि
यह जो भारत को समाप्त करना चाहते
हैं और राष्ट्रीय एकता को समाप्त करना
चाहते हैं, उनके लिये मैं कह रहा हूँ,

“कलम लगायेंगे दुश्मन का सर कलम करके,

नये कलम की जरूरत है अब चमन के लिये,

ये हिन्दू, हैं सिख, ये मुसलमान और ईसाई क्या,

वतन तो उसका है, जो खून दे वतन के लिये।

मैं चाहता हूँ कि आज हम में से सब की भावना इस तरह की होनी चाहिये जिससे हमारा यह टूटता हुआ देश, कराहता हुआ देश, यह देश जो कि कगार पर पहुँच गया है आर्थिक रूप से, राजनितिक रूप से वह देश प्रेरणा ग्रहण कर सके।

अंतिम बात, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि मैं किस सरकार से अपनी बात कहूँ, जिस सरकार के लिये राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपना अभिभाषण दिया था, जिसके धन्यवाद प्रस्ताव पर हम आज चर्चा कर रहे थे, जब राष्ट्रपति जी ने अभिभाषण दिया था उस दिन सरकार अन्नाद्रमुक की मदद से किसी न किसी रूप में बैसाखी पर खड़ी थी। अन्नाद्रमुक ने जब अपना समर्थन वापस ले लिया, आज आप स्वयं देख लीजिये यह अल्पमत सरकार है। यह अल्पमत की सरकार है और मैं चाहता हूँ कि वह नैतिकता से काम ले। उसे रहते का कोई अधिकार नहीं है। इसलिये सबसे पहले मैं सरकार से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि राष्ट्रपति जी ने जिस दिन अभिभाषण दिया था उस दिन उस दिन बैसाखी के सहारे वे खड़े थे, अन्नाद्रमुक की मदद से खड़े थे, उनकी मँजोरिदी थी, आज उनकी मँजोरिदी नहीं है। अल्पमत में है। इसलिये क्या अल्पमत की सरकार के प्रधानमंत्री को यह हक है कि दोनों सदनों का सामना करें? वह अपने अंतर दिल से पुछे और तब यहाँ पर आ करके बात समझें।

धन्यवाद।

SHRI HIPHEM (Mizoram): Thank you for calling me. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the motion moved by Mr. Narayanasamy and which was very impressively and skillfully supported by Mr. Bhatia. Sir,

I have only a few points to make. The President has rightly said that we have to guide the nation with courage, wisdom and discipline. And he has rightly started with the most tragic events of 6th December, last year. Was it wise to destroy the mosque? We can all say that it was not a wise one. What have we gained out of that? We have gained nothing but shame and humiliation. We have gained only communal riots causing loss of many lives. We have gained destruction of many Hindu temples in India and abroad. So, we must not hate other communities. We must not show the path of misunderstanding and mistrust. India is a great nation; we are trying to make it greater. India is a strong country; we are trying to make it stronger. India is a united country; we are trying to make it more united. India is a developing country and we are trying to make it a developed country. We are marching towards a better tomorrow.

5.00 P.M.

The destruction of the mosque has damaged the image of the nation within the country and abroad. So, I would like to appeal to all the national leaders that this kind of misunderstanding should be stopped immediately. We have to apply our mind, we have to apply our thoughts and we have to apply our thinking very very wisely to take the nation forward. Now, under the dynamic leadership of the present Prime Minister, Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao, we cannot say that the nation is climbing down. We are only going up.

Sir, when this Government assumed office in June 1991, our foreign exchange reserves were only Rs. 2600 crores and now they have increased, according to my figures, to Rs. 15,500 crores. Can we say that we are climbing down? No. We are going up only. Let us try to understand. When I first joined this Parliament, the State of Punjab was burning. Today, peace has returned there, democracy

Shri Hiphei (Mizoram): Contd.

has returned and normalcy has returned. Let us take up the case of Jammu and Kashmir. At that time, what was the condition there? Kashmir also was burning. On 15-8-90, our national flag was burnt under the full view of the security forces. Our currency, Indian currency, was not allowed to be used in the markets there. Today, the situation, though not yet normal, has improved. I would like to tell the people of Jammu and Kashmir that we do not like them to be separated from us, but we need them here. Some day they would realise and peace would return to the State of Jammu and Kashmir.

Sir, I have only two or three points to make. One is about population control. Now, para 23 of the President's Address deals with population control. I am very happy to note that the population growth has decreased. But this decrease, to my mind, is attributable only to the affluent people. Population control is very much necessary among the poorer sections of the people. Today, the slum dwellers are not adopting the population control measures. Population control methods are adopted only by the affluent people, by the higher-class people. The slum dwellers have the same desires in spite of their poor living conditions, in spite of their poor nutrition. In spite of all this, they have children in large numbers. So, population control should be started from amongst the lower classes of people. I would like to put forward my humble suggestion, put my suggestion on record, in this connection.

[Mr. Chairman in the Chair]

We must have a separate Ministry exclusively to deal with population control. We must give more money for population control.

Sir, there is the Scheduled Caste Finance and Development Corporation. I am very happy to note that more money has been given to this

Corporation. But till today we do not have a Board of Directors. So, all applications are no pending. So, I would like to request the Government that immediately the Board of Directors should be formed so that the Corporation can function in a better way with more money.

With these words, Sir, I conclude, and I support the Motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now the hon. Prime Minister.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to the hon. Members who have participated in this debate and made valuable contributions.

Sir, this year's President's Address has specially laid emphasis in its very first paragraph on the need to restore confidence and communal amity which have been shaken by the tragic events of the 6th December last year and what followed thereafter. Today, the nation's agenda, unfortunately, has been diverted from the economic programme which was the agenda mentioned by the President last year in his Address, to something which impinges on the very survival of the nation as a secular entity. And, therefore, the change is note worthy. We have to understand the change. And we have to do something about changing the agenda back to economic activity, economic programme and development. We are a poor country. We can ill afford these bickerings in the name of religion, in the name of language, in the name of region. Therefore, I would like to say that the very first paragraph of the President's Address has got a very significant beginning, and that significant beginning is to warn the nation that something wrong has happened, something out of the way has happened, and this needs to be corrected.

Sir, the unfortunate attempt to bring in religion for political purposes and making it operate on the minds

of the people in their political activity has been there for quite sometime. It has been on the increase. But it was anticipated even during the debates in the Constituent Assembly, and from that point of view, it is not starting or it is not new. What has really increased during the last few years is its intensity and the deliberate attempt, the deliberation, the planned way in which it is being done. In the earlier days, maybe it was done in a sporadic manner here and there. But this is totally different. And this has to be combated with all our might if the nation has to survive. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Members to a Resolution which was tabled even as early as 1948 in the Constituent Assembly where this matter was clearly referred to. The mover of the Resolution was Shri Ananthasayanam Ayyanagar, and the Resolution said:

"Whereas it is essential for the proper functioning of democracy and the growth of national unity and solidarity that communalism should be eliminated from Indian life, this Assembly is of the opinion that no communal organisation, which by its constitution or by the exercise of discretionary power vested in any of its officers or organs admits to, or excludes from, its membership persons on grounds of religion, race and caste or any of them, should be permitted to engage in any activities other than those essential for the bonafide religious and cultural needs of the community and that all steps, legislative and administrative, to prevent such activities should be taken."

Now, this was only in connection with the composition, but naturally the composition of a party determines the activities of the party and that is what the Resolution very clearly states, that this kind of activity should be stopped. In the same debate, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru stated: "We must have it clearly in our minds and in the mind of the country that the alliance

of religion and politics in the shape of communalism is the most dangerous alliance and it yields the most abnormal kind of illegitimate growth." Those are the words he employed 'illegitimate growth'. Now, these are very serious matters and they were anticipated even during the debates of the Constituent Assembly. Since then, several attempts have been made laws have been passed; legislation has been brought on the Statute Book which to some extent has tried to mitigate this menace and control this menace but only to some extent. Ultimately it has not been possible to eliminate this tendency. We have been only making some efforts to minimise it or to diminish it, but to eliminate it, no effort has been made, and in a matter like this I think, unless you eliminate it lock, stock and barrel, the tendency of this is only to grow. Any half-hearted measure will only make it grow. It will not control it. This has been the experience.

We did not use the word 'secular' in the first draft of the Constitution. It was not there. But the idea was that it has to be secular because you cannot have real democracy in a pluralistic society unless you have secularism, unless all are equal. Equality was ensured. It was guaranteed. All the characteristics of secularism were guaranteed. But the word 'secular' was not used. Twenty-five years later, during the forty-second amendment, Mrs. Gandhi, then Prime Minister, realised that this is necessary. It is not enough if it is only implied from other provisions of the Constitution. It should be specifically and explicitly mentioned in the Preamble, and only then we will know what kind of democracy we are going to have here. So, in the forty-second amendment, this word was added. It was made abundantly clear that the kind of democracy we want to have here is secular democracy and of no other kind. Now, this being so what has been done since adding this word 'secular' needs to be gone into. We have not been able, in spite of adding this word, to contain or to

[Shri P. V. Narashimha Rao]

stop the activities of communal bodies in this country. We have banned some of them from time to time; we have tried to control some of them from time to time and confiscated their moneys and so on, but this has not really worked. Therefore, because of the political advantage that the religion can give to a particular party at the polls, this electoral advantage has been the real reason why we could not control communalism, why we could not control the entry of communal politics in the elections. This is the crux of the whole thing. I have been receiving suggestions from several friends since the last two or three months. I have said on many occasions that this is the effort we have to make jointly. It is no good for any party to be called communal. They are in political life, in a secular democracy. They should not be communal. They should not be branded as communal. Today, the BJP has been referred to, is being referred to, in other countries as a Hindu extremist party. I do not know what kind of credit they derive out of it. No party in this country should be referred to as communalist, and they should not be communalist. Whatever communal venom has gone into their hands and heads just for the sake of electoral success, that will have to be removed from there. And that will be removed only if, legally and constitutionally, we make provisions which are absolutely foolproof and which will not allow any such activity, any such entry of religion into the political arena, for election purposes.

I have invited a public debate on this. I have invited several friends to give me suggestions. Suggestions are coming. They have been examined in the last two months. I have got them examined in the Law Ministry here. I invite a debate in Parliament. We can debate in Parliament. I have no immediate answer because there are so many guarantees in the Constitution. Freedom of association, for instance. Freedom of

thought. Freedom of religion. All these freedoms are there. In spite of all these guarantees, you have to find a place, we have to find a place, for a provision which clearly draws the line that you cannot make religion enter the political field. There it has to stop. It has to work within the religious field. You can have religious bodies. You can have religious programmes. You can have religious worship. That freedom is available. But the moment religion is brought into politics, particularly, electoral politics, the equality which is really the crux of the entire democratic process, that a voter can vote freely, according to his opinion, not according to his religion, that freedom is lost.

Today, if you think that people should be compartmentalised on the basis of religion, why do you have elections? There is one community which is 85 per cent and if that be one party, what is the point in having elections? It is only when the majority party and the minority party, particularly, the majority community, divides itself on ideological lines and says what it is going to do for the people, what the people have got for them in it, in a programme, it is only when it comes forward with an ideology, with a vision, for the country, only after this with this insight, the people can decide which party to vote. But today, if it is only Hindu, Muslim or Christian, elections will be a farce: democracy will be a farce in the country. Therefore, this has to be stopped at a point beyond which it should not go. It has to stop within that limit, work within that limit, and it should not be allowed to cross that limit. This is what we have to do. It is easier said than done. We have been going into several alternatives. But whatever you want to do, it may impinge on, it may violate, one of these freedoms given in the Constitution. You have to steer clear of these freedoms given in the Constitution because what you are doing is not stopping the

freedom, but stopping the misuse of that freedom. This is very important. This has to be understood.

Therefore, I invite a public debate. I invite a debate in Parliament. Let us, if possible, in this very Session — I would appeal to both the Houses — decide on something which makes sense, which makes the future of the country secure for all time to come. There will be no other activity unless we do this and this is my first appeal. We have come to the conclusion that the present provisions in the Constitution, electoral laws and other enactments, are not adequate to meet a situation in which a political party takes upon itself directly or indirectly to take up specific or general religious issues. This is the lacuna. If we have discovered it, if we are convinced of it, we will have to do something about it. BJP might come out with some solution, we may come out with some other solutions, but what is important is that the Houses should debate and come to a conclusion and that conclusion should be enshrined in the Constitution, in the law, wherever it has to be enshrined, so that it becomes effective forthwith.

This is what I am suggesting and I hope my suggestion will find favour with you.

We have passed an Act which prevents this country, fortunately, from continuing its political life only on the basis of temples and mosque which is the next temple, which is the next mosque we have to demolish, if that is the perpetual programme that this country has. then I think it will go to pieces — number one — and it will be the most backward country in the world, if at all it remains a country. Countries which are one-tenths or one-twentieths of our size; look at them what they have done in the last 10 years. They were much behind us, they are miles and miles ahead of us today. Therefore, there is something which

is wrong in this country, in such a great country. Hindu extremism — is it not a contradiction in terms? Who could ever call Hinduism extreme? If it were extreme, it would never have remained so far, it would have been dead long ago. For thousands of years it has remained merely because it is not extremist, it is all inclusive. So, what we are doing today is to disfigure the face of Hinduism in its pristine glory, in its pristine form which hundreds of saints have built up in this country and abroad. Overnight that face is disfigured and Hinduism is seen as extremist. What kind of service are we doing to Hinduism? What kind of service are we doing to the country — just because we get a block vote, just because we can make people mad at election time, for our own purposes? This, I think, should be resisted with all our might and my appeal would be that everyone who has been doing it and who has not been doing it will have to come into it as a consensus because enough is enough. All right, if a party has got one election, two elections, let them say that they will not really continue with this kind of a thing because people will see through this game. People are already seeing through this game. People are already back on the old problems of development which they are facing. I have visited several States where I find that the enthusiasm, the excitement, the anger, all kinds of things which were there on the temple issue are waning. They are no longer there in their intensity as I found them two or three months back. Therefore, before the people tell us, we should understand that the attitude of the people is changing. Therefore, it is better that we change our agenda willingly, gracefully. Otherwise, the law will have to change it, the Constitution would have to change it, the people will change it. In fact, there is no such thing no space, no place for, a non-secular party in our democracy. There should be no place for them, I am quite emphatic on that. The only

[Shri P. V. Narashimha Rao]

thing is, we express our opinions and that too, try to take advantage of our utterances only without doing anything practically in the matter. That is why I am saying now, rhetoric apart, let us very coolly go into the provisions of the Constitution and see what can be done to effectively checkmate this and see that it does not happen in future at all. Therefore, my first point would be that a time has come when what the Constitution says we have to ensure. Today what is happening in the country is at variance with what the Constitution says in its essentials. Therefore, we have to bring political life, electoral life — electoral process — in line with the constitutional provisions and that, very simply put, is the objective. And we need not do anything more than that. If we are able to do that, then everything else will take care of itself.

Sir, fortunately there has been a return to the economic agenda during the last two months. Many people thought, here and elsewhere, that after Ayodhya and the riots, the country will never come back to normal. This will be a continuous process and whatever efforts the Government and the people were making on the economic side will come to nought. This has not happened, although we have lost quite a bit. As a result of the riots, people have lost their lives, their properties and so much havoc has been caused. At the same time, we have to take some consolation from the fact that after the worst was over, the agenda has already started changing. Those who had left Bombay, for instance, in those dark days are returning. Economic activity everywhere has started and, I cannot say that we have come fully back to normal, but I can certainly say that we are fast returning to normal, and that is what we have to take advantage of once again.

Now, how do we take advantage of this? The only thing is, we have

anticipated the need to take advantage of this change, and that's how you have a Budget which is a growth-oriented Budget—I will not go into the details because you are going to have a discussion on the Budget; all the details will come before the House. But what I would like to say is that to the vast majority of the people in this country who are engaged in economic activity, namely, the farmers, we have given a new package which gives them a new hope. Till date we have not given so much of importance to agriculture as we have given this year, for various reasons. In agriculture we had become self-sufficient but, after self-sufficiency, the production remained, more or less, stagnant — 177 or 180 million tonnes. This year we are going to touch, I am told, 177 million tonnes, but the range has been just 10 or 20 million tonnes this side or that side. Now, is it going to be enough? What is the rise of India's population? What are the changes that are coming in the nutritional standards of India?

The nutritional research people will tell you that the vast majority of people in the villages do not get all the nourishment that they need. And with their purchasing power going up as a result of the Jawahar Rozgar Yojana or any of these things which we are pumping in a big way into the country — this year, for instance, we are pumping in Rs. 5,000 crores for the Jawahar Rozgar Yojana and other programmes which give employment to the people — we do not want them to remain there and get employment — and if Rs. 5,000 crores are pumped into that area, naturally he would like to eat more, he would like to live better he would need. On a rough calculation which I have made, I have come to the conclusion that what we are producing today is going to be grossly inadequate in a couple of years' time. You can no way remain at 187 or 180 million tonnes if you really have to feed your people

well, as the people have to be fed in a civilized country. Then, India is one of the very few countries on the list of agricultural producers. There are many countries which are agricultural countries, but the output of India ranks amongst three, four, five in the world, which means that if you have really to keep your place in the comity of nations, if you have to keep your place as an important developing country, you will have to be able to give a helping hand to other developing countries also. It is no great achievement to feed your own people. Well, you have to do it in any case, and no one is going to feed you. We know that. We have seen droughts, we have seen pestilence, we have seen famines, at the end of which, thanks to Indira Gandhi again, we have had the Green Revolution. That Green Revolution has come to stay so that we can say, "Yes we can feed ourselves according to certain standards which need to be greatly improved." But at the same time, you have to be able to help others. So, it is not just being self-sufficient, but you also have to have something to spare, something extra, you have to produce something extra, so that you can give it to others and get the goodwill that is needed for a country like India which has to play its role in world affairs. So, it is not only a question of domestic consumption, but it is a question of India's foreign policy being buttressed by India's capacity to help others, whether it is in the industrial field or the agricultural field, and I am sure that in the agricultural field our tradition gives us the greatest advantage of being able to help others. We have done it in the past. We have diverted ships which were coming to our side over the high seas to other countries which, we thought, needed the grains more than we did. We could wait for six months, but that country could not wait. Mrs. Gandhi was asked Rajivji was asked. An SOS came from that particular country, and they were diverted there. So, this has happened before, and this has brought us the goodwill which cannot be really valued in terms of

money. This is what one has to understand. Goodwill internationally is something absolutely invaluable, and we cannot do without it. A country like India cannot do without it. We have a certain vision of the world, and if that vision has to be realised, it can be only through India being able to help others not only in international councils, not only by voting, not only by making peace, bringing about agreements and so on, but also economically being able to help other countries. Less advantageously placed countries, we have to help.

Therefore, our agricultural production has to be increased in the next few years by not less than 50 per cent. If you can do it by 60 to 70 per cent, that will be ideal. Taking into account the natural growth of the Indian population meanwhile, is it going to be possible? It is a mind-boggling thing. We have stagnated for the last 15 years at a particular point. In the next five to ten years, to make a quantum jump like this, is not going to be easy. It means a spurt in science and technology, a spurt in research, a spurt in agricultural investment which has found its way into other channels over the last fifteen, twenty years.

Go to any village. You will find that there is no new investment at all. If there is a big landlord or a good farmer who has earned some money, he would rather go and build a house in the taluka centre or the district centre, but he would not build anything in the village. There are various reasons for this. In some areas there are armed insurrections and armed activities are taking place, terrorist activities are taking place. There are many things going on in the country, which have inhibited agricultural investment going up. They just go on with what they have. Therefore, it is necessary for us to have more investment.

This year in the Budget we have made a good investment. I cannot say it is massive or it is really commensurate with the needs but it is

[Shri P. V. Narashimha Rao]

good enough, big enough for giving a shot in the arm to agriculture once again. In the new agricultural policy we are thinking of diversifying agriculture. It is just not producing for ourselves or producing raw material for other countries. It is something which diversifies into a large programme of agricultural exports, exports for profit, exports for trade. So, the trade aspect in agriculture is going to be given the pride of place hereafter. That is a new package that we have to come up with.

I would like to repeat that the outlays on certain areas have been increased appreciably. In the rural areas, for instance the outlays on education, on employment, on social welfare activities have been increased considerably this year for the first time. We should see that the people take full advantage of it. Outlay on agriculture has been increased by 16 per cent, on rural development, by 36 per cent, on education by 29 per cent and on health and family welfare by 17.6 per cent. These increases have been brought about deliberately because we have to see that where we are liberalising on one front—on the industrial front—the effect of this should not be to create a lop sided economy. It should not create a situation where the countryside is totally neglected, because industrialisation will not go straight to the countryside. It will go only slowly. It will take some time to reach the countryside. But, meanwhile, the country-side should not suffer. People in the rural areas should not suffer. There need not be too much disparity. As a result of the disparities there should not be much of a tension in the society. This is what we have ensured on both sides. On these outlays it is going to be possible for us to some extent to keep the disparities under check.

I have already submitted about the agricultural policy. It has been en-

dorsed by the Chief Minister at a conference recently. It will come before Parliament. Then we would like to elicit the opinions of Members. Then it will be finalised and put into action. This is what I wanted to say about the agricultural package.

SHRI YASHWANT SINHA (Bihar): Mr. Prime Minister, will you yield for a moment? Sir, I must congratulate the Prime Minister on the fact that his speech has put half the House sleep.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI (Maharashtra): No. It is a very effective speech. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI S. K. T. RAMACHANDRAN (Tamil Nadu): No. He is mesmerising the House. (*Interruptions*)

श्री रजनी रंजन साहू : प्रेस वालों ने आ-
की बात नोट कर ली है।

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I do not have to respond to that, but I did not expect this.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: He himself was asleep. That is why he said this. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI MURLIDHAR CHANDRAKANT BHANDARE (Maharashtra): It did not fit with the dignity.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: The question of fertilisers has been engaging the attention of farmers. This matter has been raised several times by the Members of Parliament. There has been a Joint Parliamentary Committee, which has gone into it and it has come up with a package. That package has been accepted by the Government. The package, of course, is known to all of us. The concession of Rs. 1,000 per tonne on de-controlled fertilisers was announced for rabi 1992-93 at a cost of Rs. 34 crores. A Rs. 500 crores scheme of assistance to small and marginal farmers for promoting infrastructure development was also announced. Now, Sir, there is a particular difficulty in the case of fertilisers, particularly those which are not produced

fully in the country. In the case of potash fertilisers, we don't produce anything at all, everything is being imported. In the case of DAP, I am told that we produce only about 45 to 50 per cent and the rest of it has to come from outside. Today a particular situation, a peculiar situation has come out whereby the fertiliser which is being imported is almost two-thirds the price of the fertiliser produced in the country. I am talking of the DAP alone which, of course, is very important as phosphatic fertiliser. From the farmer's point of view, we would like to pay the lower price. From the manufacturer's point of view, the factories will close, if they are not helped. But evidently the farmers cannot be made to pay the higher price fixed by the factory. Now, this is the dilemma. We have to find a solution. The Ministry, all of us, have been thinking about it. I would like the hon. Members also to intervene and give us their opinions. Now one of the ideas that presents itself is to have a pool, a stock, a buffer-stock of fertilisers when their prices are lower, then, have a pool price combining with the local production. This should be able to tide over the crisis of the industry plus also give a good deal of relief to the farmers in buying the fertilisers. This is one point.

The second part of this programme is to undertake a thorough overhaul of the fertiliser industry, try to see how we can make it competitive, how we can bring its expenditure down and how to make its product within the reach of the farmer. Now again going into details, we have been told that the fertiliser factories have come up with some package of their own. Therefore, some suggestions of their own are being examined at the moment. Therefore, this problem which has become rather a difficult problem for the farmers has been taken up in right earnest by the Government and we would like this problem to be solved to the entire satisfaction of the farming community as well as the

indigenous fertiliser industry which has been built up at great cost and great effort over the years. We do not want to fritter it away. We want to make it as useful as possible and as affordable as possible. This is the package, the new package which is being worked out.

On the backward classes question, we have initiated action for the implementation of the Supreme Court judgement. The time frames specified are being strictly adhered to. An expert committee has been constituted to advise the Government for specifying the basis applied, the relevant and the requisite socio-economic criteria to exclude socially advanced persons and section. A permanent body for entertaining, examining and recommending request for inclusion and complaints of over-inclusion and under-inclusion in the list of other backward classes of citizens is also being constituted. The programme is exactly as laid down by the Supreme Court and within the time laid down by the Supreme Court. It is going exactly as per the schedule. This is what I want to report to the House.

At the same time, Sir, we have found that as in the case of hill areas, as in the case of island areas, as in the case of desert areas, we have very different problems. The problems of the hill areas are very different from the desert areas and from areas with special difficulties. We have found that the areas in the coastal belts are also very different from the problems of other areas, whether it is a cyclone or a tidal wave or whatever it is. The entire coast of India is open to some dangers, some natural calamities which have not been fully gone into. We have been only giving help wherever it is needed. But it is just not possible, after a natural calamity, to make up for all the loss. I have visited the areas hit by the cyclones and we have cyclones almost every year. Which part of the coast is hit, we do

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao] not know in advance and, therefore, the entire coast is open to this danger. We have to do something for the entire coast and the people living in the coastal areas. So, I would like to have an authority or some mechanism, governmental mechanism, to go specially into the problems of the coastal areas and also to ensure some permanent measures—not just measures from year to year or season to season, but some permanent measures—in order to alleviate the suffering when suffering comes in order to prevent the suffering where suffering can be prevented. There has to be a programme, a fairly imaginative programme, and that is what we are drawing up. I hope we will be able to come to the House after some time with the details of the programme. But this is one area which has been left out from areas with special problems and that is being included now.

This is what I wanted to say on the economic side. The policy implications and other things, what has been given, concessions have been given, not given—all these will come in the Budget. I do not have to really dilate on these although there is an overlap of what is contained in the Budget and what is contained in the Presidential Address. I would like not to touch upon those.

In Punjab, we have full normalcy. The Bodo Agreement, the Bodo Accord, has been signed only a few days back. I am sure we will make all the efforts to make it hold. We have gone into it, we have worked on it, for more than a year now and I am sure it will be a good solution not only to the Bodo question but also to other areas where similar questions with certain variations may be cropping up, and are cropping up from time to time. So, in the Bodo thing... (Interruption).

SHRI INDER KUMAR GUJRAL (Bihar): Mr. Prime Minister, I am glad that you have referred to Punjab and in the correct way. May I

also ask you to kindly elaborate if you have any schemes pertaining to Punjab for meeting their needs and demands or the Package of Punjab, kindly elaborate on that.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, even without my saying anything, there have been mentions about the Punjab Accord, the Punjab Package. It became very difficult for me to deny it because at that moment, when it came in the newspapers, we were not considering it. But somehow, when two Chief Ministers come here, there is always speculation that a package is coming. I would like to assure you in the House, Sir, that now that normalcy has been restored in Punjab, the time has come for us to tackle outstanding question of Punjab. We have started some preliminary work on that. I cannot say we have made much headway because, as Gujralji knows—we have all been in it for a long time—much depends on how quietly you do it and we are initiating some efforts. Beyond that, I could not say anything because I am myself not very sure whether what we are doing is going to click tomorrow or make matters worse. One has to be extremely careful in a question like this. Meanwhile, Punjab is getting what it should get by way of development. The normal activity, economic activity, of Punjab has been restored. We have tried to find money, to the extent possible, to see that whatever was dismantled as a result of terrorist violence for the last ten or twelve years is put back on rails. This activity, I think, is much more important because that stabilises peace stabilises the mood of the people. Dewali and all the other festivals went off peacefully and the elections at the lowest levels also have been completed. So, this is what we have been concentrating, on not getting lulled into a false kind of complacency that everything is over now we can certainly jump on the question. Once you jump on the question, it is possible that the question may defy solu-

tion immediately. Therefore, we have to tackle it bit by bit.

On Kashmir, Sir, we are not in a very happy position. On the whole, it is under control but we are not satisfied with that. We have to do much more to not only bring it under control but under inevitable process of democracy. We cannot have any part of India devoid of the process of democracy. That is the bottom line and we are working on it. In the next few days, probably, we will think of a new set-up which will bring a new picture in the sense that a new effort will be made, because what we have been doing has come to a stage where, perhaps, a change in the set-up is expected or is necessary. We do not want to mark time with the same thing. It has given us results and the results have been good. But at the same time, they have been limited and to extent those limitations have to be crossed, we have to do something new. That is being contemplated.

Relief in the riot-stricken areas. We are monitoring in all the States, all the areas affected. They are going ahead with the programme according to the schedule and I understand that by and large, the programme is going ahead without any hitch. I hope that it will be possible for us to give whatever relief is possible after that carnage that has taken place. Whatever we do, is going to be irreparable, nothing is possible beyond this and we cannot really restore it to the original situation. That situation has unfortunately changed and now whatever is possible under the circumstances, with the utmost expedition, with the utmost sympathy and goodwill, we will do and we the doing it. This is what I would like to report.

SHRI MOHAMMED AMIN (West Bengal): Sir, one general complaint we are receiving is that in most places where riots place, the culprits have not been arrested. That is the main complaint.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I hope the Home Minister will come with the latest report on that. I don't have the details. Probably, if you want, he will come up with the details. Sir, there has been one question raised—probably it was raised here also on the Ayodhya issue. The reference that was made to the Supreme Court has been criticised. Why was it not under 138? Why was it under 143? I would only like to say that we can go on arguing about it, but the fact remains that we cannot have this hanging fire for the next twenty years in a endless litigation and agitation. What is really facing us is a long-drawnout litigation and agitation. We would not like to continue with this. If 138 had been invoked, it would have taken a long time. Yes. But it could have been invoked only under circumstances of complete consent, and no agitation, no going into the streets. If one party goes into the streets and starts an agitation, all your litigation is going to come to a naught. For the next twenty years, it will never be completed. Therefore, after going into all the details, we have come to this conclusion, the Government has come to this conclusion that the crux of the matter has to be referred, under 143, to the Supreme Court. This was considered in Mr. V. P. Singh's time; this was considered in Mr. Chandra Shekhar's time. In fact, this year, on the 8th of November, we were expecting agreement on this. It has not come up for other reasons, particularly reasons having nothing to do with the merits of the matter, but reasons having everything to do with the motivations. That is why it did not come up. Therefore, to say that 143 reference is not correct, I would submit, is really not the right thing to say because there is not... (Interruption)...

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH (West Bengal): Mr. Prime Minister, just now you have stated that even if the case was referred to the Supreme Court under Article 138, this would not

[Shri Dipen Ghosh]

have precluded other parties or other groups from agitating. But how does your reference under Article 143 preclude that possibility? Would you kindly clarify it?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I am only talking of the time-frame. You see, we have taken ... (*Inter-ruption*) ...

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Suppose the Supreme Court says, "There was a temple". What would happen? Suppose the Supreme Court says that there was a mosque. What would happen?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: We will enforce the opinion of the Supreme Court.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: How does it preclude? How does it preclude that possibility?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: It is not precluding. It is a question of finality. The Parliament of India puts a seal on it, it becomes final; otherwise, it goes on for the next 20 years. There will be no finality. This is the difference. We have gone into it in great detail. After a lot of cogitation, after a lot of thinking this has been done. Please understand this, because we cannot really have that kind of agenda for a long time. In fact, some dissatisfaction is being expressed that even after three months why it is that nothing is happening. Now I cannot really ask the Supreme Court to give its opinion tomorrow; but at the same time I would never have been able to ask any court to decide anything for the next 20 years otherwise. This is the time-frame which is absolutely important. In this time-frame we cannot afford to have this long-drawnout thing. I have already said it and in pursuance of that this has been done. It will be implemented. The Parliament of India will implement it. We will make it a law, if necessary, make it a part of the Constitution, if necessary, and it will be implemented with every power at

the disposal of the Government. This is the only thing.

SHRI INDER KUMAR GUJRAL: One minute, Mr. Prime Minister. I wish you well but may I ask you whether unlike 6th December you do have some contingency plan if the Supreme Court comes tomorrow and says that they cannot adjudicate upon this?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: They cannot...

SHRI INDER KUMAR GUJRAL: If the Supreme Court were to come back and say that the issue is of such a nature that the Supreme Court is not in a position to adjudicate upon it, I hope there is some contingency plan in your view.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, is it possible for me to speculate on that contingency? All I can say is it did not escape our attention at the time

This is to be very properly understood, Sir, there is a possibility of distorting it to say that I want everybody's consent and I am running after parties for their consent. I am not running after anybody for consent. Somebody said just now, "Because the BJP wants 143, you want 143, you are asking for their consent." I am not asking for their consent or anybody's consent I am taking the course which gives me an expeditious result. This I would like to be noted. Right-wrong is a matter which had to be considered much earlier. Today we have taken this decision and the rationale of that decision is the time-frame. Yes, if they had agreed when they were in power, then for 20 years, they would not have agitated, we would not have been bothered. It is obvious. They did not agree at that time. Today if we go that line, you will be landed with agitation, you will be landed with disagreement. This is my point. I want this august House to appreciate this and

not to add to or believe any distortions that are likely to take place. I know every word from me is open to distortions because people are interested in distorting it. This is the only rationale, this is the only reason and I want the House to appreciate it. Thank you very much

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT): Mr. Chairman, may I take half a minute? Just half a minute... (Interruptions)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will give only half a minute.

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT: Sir, I will take just half a minute. I want to raise only one point. Quite a number of issues have not been touched by the Prime Minister. Some of them were very important, Sir... (Interruptions)...

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: What about Tripura? ... (Interruptions)... What is it that the Prime Minister is going to say about Tripura?

SHRI SUKOMAL SEN (West Bengal): Sir, the Prime Minister has not said anything about Tripura? ... (Interruptions)...

6.00 P.M.

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त : सदर साहब, मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने, प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब की सरकार ने बी०जे०पी० की चार सरकारों को बर्खास्त किया। उस सिलसिले में आपके बयान में कुछ नहीं आया, मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ? ... (व्यवधान) हम जानना चाहते हैं कि आप उन बर्खास्त की हुई सरकारों का चुनाव उन प्रांतों में चुनाव वक्त पर करायेंगे या नहीं? मैं सरकार से यह जानना चाहता हूँ। (व्यवधान)

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त : सदर साहब मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब ने, प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब की सरकार ने बी०जे०पी० की चार सरकारों को बर्खास्त किया। उस सिलसिले में आपके बयान में कुछ नहीं आया, मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ? ... (व्यवधान) हम जानना चाहते हैं कि आप उन बर्खास्त की हुई सरकारों का चुनाव उन प्रांतों में चुनाव वक्त पर करायेंगे या नहीं? मैं सरकार से यह जानना चाहता हूँ। (व्यवधान)

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: What about Tripura, Mr. Prime Minister?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will allow you later.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, we are all... (Interruptions)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will you please listen to him? I will give time. We have debated this matter for 16 hours and 38 hon. Members have spoken. So, I will give to some people party-wise. But I would like you to take only one or two minutes party-wise.

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त : प्रधान मंत्री जी, मैं यह अर्ज करना चाह रहा था कि जैसा कि चेयरमैन साहब ने फर्माया कि बहुत अर्जों से बहस हो रही थी और आनरेबल मंत्री ने बहुत अहम सवाल उठाए और जाहिर बात है कि उन तमाम सवालों का जवाब तो नहीं आ सकता लेकिन कुछ सवालों बहुत अहम थे। आपकी आज की इवेंटुअल तकरीर के हिस्से में जो जोरे बयान सरफ हुआ वह आईन की और जम्हूरियत की हिफाजत के सिलसिले में था। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि बी०जे०पी० की सरकारों की

[श्री सिकन्दर बख्त]

खर्चाती हुई क्या वह आईन की जम्ह-
रियत की हिफाजत हो रही थी या कोई
तारीख हिन्दुस्तान में दोहराई जा रही थी ?
अब मैं आपसे यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि
क्या 6 महीने की मुद्दत के खत्म होने से
पहले पहले उन प्रांतों में चुनाव करा लिए
जायेंगे, महरबानी से इस संबंध में बताइये ?

ہوئی کیا وہ آئین کی جمہوریت کی حفاظت ہو رہی
تھی یا کوئی تاریخ ہندوستان میں دوہرائی جا رہی
تھی۔ اب میں آپ سے یہ جاننا چاہتا ہوں کہ کیا
۶ مہینے کی مدت ختم ہونے سے پہلے پہلے ان پرائنٹ
میں جیٹاؤ کر لئے جائیں گے۔ ہماری اس
سبندھ میں بتائیے۔

شری سکندر بخت : بروہان منٹری میں
یہ عرض کرنا چاہ رہا تھا کہ جیسا کہ جینیر میں صاحب
نے فرمایا کہ بہت عرصہ سے بحث ہو رہی تھی
اور آئین کی مجلس نے بہت اہم سوالات اٹھائے
اور ظاہر بات ہے کہ ان تمام سوالات کا جواب
تو نہیں آسکتا لیکن کچھ سوالات بہت اہم
تھے۔ آپ کی آج کی تقریر کے ابتدائی حصے میں
جو دو خط بیان صرف ہوا وہ آئین اور جمہوریت
کی حفاظت کے سلسلے میں تھا میں یہ جانا چاہتا
ہوں کہ جو بی۔ جے پی کی سرکاروں کی برعکس

श्री पी०वी० नरसिंह राव : बर्खास्त
शत फीसद आईन की हिफाजत में थी
और हम आईन के पाबंद हैं। आईन जो
भी कहता है उसके हिसाब से चुनाव होंगे।

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त : चुनाव कब होंगे मैं
यह जानना चाहता हूँ ? .. (व्यवधान)

इस मामले में एश्योर करना चाहिए कि
चुनाव कब होंगे। क्या मुद्दत के खत्म होने
के पहले-पहले चुनाव होंगे या नहीं ?
चेयरमैन साहब, साफ जवाब प्रधान मंत्री
जी की तरफ से आना चाहिए (व्यवधान)
मैं दरखास्त करूंगा कि आप साफ-साफ
फर्मियें कि 6 महीने की मुद्दत के खत्म होने
के पहले पहले उन प्रांतों में चुनाव करा
लिए जायेंगे या नहीं ? (व्यवधान) चेयरमैन
साहब, प्रधान मंत्री जी से जवाब तो
मिल जाए।... (व्यवधान) वह जवाब दें,
फर्मियें कि 6 महीने की मुद्दत खत्म होने
के पहले-पहले वहां चुनाव होंगे या नहीं,
यह बतायें ?

شری سکندر بخت : جیٹاؤ کب ہو گئے ہیں
جاننا چاہتا ہوں۔ مداخلت : اس سلسلے میں
ایسور کرنا چاہیے کہ جیٹاؤ کب ہو گئے۔ کیا آرٹ
کے ختم ہونے کے پہلے پہلے جیٹاؤ ہو گئے یا نہیں۔
جینیر میں صاحب : صاف جواب بروہان منٹری میں
طرف سے آنا چاہیے۔ مداخلت : میں درخواست
کردی کہ آپ صاف صاف فرمائیں کہ ۶ مہینے کی مدت
کے ختم ہونے کے پہلے پہلے ان پرائنٹوں میں جیٹاؤ
کر لئے جائیں گے یا نہیں۔ مداخلت : جینیر میں صاحب
: بروہان منٹری سے جواب نوٹل جائے۔ مداخلت :
وہ جواب دیں۔ فرمائیں کہ ۶ مہینے کی مدت ختم ہونے
کے پہلے پہلے وہاں جیٹاؤ ہو گئے یا نہیں۔ یہ بتائیں

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:
Sir, I have answered this question.
We are bound by the Constitution, by
every word of the Constitution. Elec-
tions will take place according to the
Constitution. I cannot help you if I
am not giving you an unequivocal
answer. (Interruptions)...

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त : सर, हमें इस जवाब पर बहुत एतराज है और हम इस हाउस से वाक आउट कर रहे हैं।

شیخ سکندر بخت : سر میں اس جواب پر بہت اعتراض ہے اور ہم اس ہاؤس سے واک آؤٹ کر رہے ہیں۔

[At this stage some hon. Members left the Chamber.]

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Mr. Chairman, Sir, for some time past, for so many days, the Tripura issue has been agitating the minds of the Members of the House. We were having a lot of discussion on this issue on the floor of the House also. There has been a constitutional crisis in Tripura. Even an elected Government a Congress(I)-led Government, which was charged with the responsibility of holding the elections could not hold the elections within its tenure, even though that Government was allowed to continue. What action has the Centre taken? That is the first part of the issue. The second part of the issue is that a Union Minister, a member of the Prime Minister's Council of Ministers, has exposed to many as 16 officers to action by the Chief Election Commissioner and, according to the Chief Election Commissioner's order, 16 officers have been transferred. Those 16 officer were exposed to the action by the Chief Election Commissioner only because of certain mala fide and manipulative activities indulged in by a member of his Council of Ministers. I would like to know what action the Prime Minister proposes to take against that member of his own Council of Ministers. (Interruptions)... Sir, what is his reply to this? (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Shanker Dayal Singh. (Interruptions)...

The Prime Minister is replying.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, the kind of allegations and the wild statements that he hon. Member is making, I don't think they call for any answer. (Interruptions)...

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: I am not satisfied with the reply. This is the allegation, complaint made by the Chief Election Commissioner. According to that you are taking action against 16 officers. Why are officers bearing the brunt of the inspection of the CEC? Your member of the Council of Ministers is enjoying the ministerial berth and you are not taking any action. So, we walk out in protest.

[At this stage some hon. Members left the Chamber]

श्री शंकर दयाल सिंह : सभापति जी, आज प्रधान मंत्री के इस जवाब के लिए हम लोग बहुत दिनों से इंतजार कर रहे थे और हमें इस बात की उम्मीद थी कि प्रधान मंत्री अपने जवाब में कुछ ऐसी ठोस बातें कह सकेंगे जिसके लिए पूरा देश वित्तित है। प्रधान मंत्री को मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ और याद भी दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि 6 दिसम्बर को जिस दिन अयोध्या में यह दुखद कांड हुआ, उस दिन आपने दूरदर्शन पर कहा था कि नई मस्जिद बनेगी। उस के बाद राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने अभिभाषण में यह कहा कि मंदिर व मस्जिद दोनों बनेंगे और इसके लिए ट्रस्ट बनेंगे। आप इसके लिए जो बहाने-बाजी कर रहे हैं, यह दुख की बात है। आपको अधिकृत रूप से कहना चाहिए था कि मस्जिद और मंदिर वहां आप कब तक बनायेंगे? मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप हिंदु और मुसलमान दोनों को बराबर लड़वाना चाहते हैं, कटवाना चाहते हैं आपसी

† [Transliteration in Arabic Script.]

[श्री शंकर दयाल सिंह]

सौहार्द समाप्त करना चाहते हैं, देश को टुकड़ों में बांटना चाहते हैं। इसलिए हम वाक आउट करते हैं। हम संतुष्ट नहीं हैं आपके जवाब से।

[At this stage some hon. Members left the Chamber]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. The Prime Minister is speaking. (Interruptions). Please listen to the Prime Minister.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: On this point, even if the Members are walking out, I think, it is desirable for me to say that both a temple and a mosque will be constructed, as said by Rashtrapatiji. We are in the process of setting up the trusts. I did not elaborate it because there was no need. It was so clear from the Address. But it is good to go on record because people have raised it. There is no question of either going back or dragging our feet on that. But it should be appreciated that if a temple is being built, it is not like having a few engineers put there. We have to have certain authority in temple building, certain authority in mosque building. Now, all this takes a little time and a little effort to talk to people, sound them out and then put them together. It is not easy to put together an authoritative trust like this. (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please. I cannot allow a general debate on this. I can allow only one or two Members to speak. (Interruptions).

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA (West Bengal): You have said, you will allow party-wise.

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN (Tamil Nadu): Sir...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will you finish in one minute?

SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN: Sir, we are deeply disappointed and distressed with the reply of the hon.

Prime Minister. Sir, two most vital points were raised by the Members of our party. The most important point raised by us was the unilateral rise in the prices of rice, sugar and other commodities by increasing the administered prices consequent to which the State Government has been put in the dock not only by the other parties but also by the party in power. Sir, it is well known that the State Government cannot subsidise rice because it has already subsidised it. This Government has never consulted the State Government, neither at the Chief Ministers' Conference nor at the NDC. They have neglected the Chief Ministers and they have not consulted them. Ultimately the people of Tamil Nadu are suffering. The Prime Minister has not mentioned anything in this regard in his reply. Another most important point raised by us was the reducing of the Tamil broadcasting time and introducing Hindi. We have raised this point several times and requested the hon. Prime Minister that Tamil broadcasting should be restored to the original timings. We also met the Prime Minister and other Ministers personally. They assured us that it will be considered. But nothing has been said by the Prime Minister in his reply. We are sorry to say, are disappointed and distressed by the reply of the Prime Minister. So, in protest we walk out from the House.

[At this stage some hon. Members left the Chamber]

श्री यशवन्त सिन्हा : सभापति महोदय, इस चर्चा के दौरान इस सदन में बहुत सारे महत्वपूर्ण बिन्दु उठाए गए थे, मुझे अफसोस है कि अपने जवाब में, अपने उत्तर में प्रधान मंत्री जी ने उन बिन्दुओं का कोई जिक्र नहीं किया। एक बहुत महत्वपूर्ण बिन्दु जो उठाया गया था इस डिबेट में कई माननीय सदस्यों के द्वारा, वह बिन्दु था कि सरकार की डंकल के प्रस्तावों के ऊपर क्या प्रतिक्रिया है। भारत पराधीनता की ओर धकेला जा रहा है इस सरकार के द्वारा

हम दुबारा गुलामी की ओर जा रहे हैं इस वास्ते कि इस सरकार ने पूरी तरह से मन नहीं बनाया है डंकल प्रस्ताव को रिजक्ट करने का और गांव-गांव में डंकल प्रस्ताव का कुप्रभाव फैलने वाला है। इसलिए चूंकि सरकार घुटने टेक रही है विदेशी साम्राज्यवाद के सामने, हम लोग अपने दल की तरफ से प्रोटस्ट करते हुए, प्रतापवाद के रूप में, इस सदन का बाह्यकार करते हैं और वाक-आऊट करते हैं।

[At this stage some hon. Members left the Chamber]

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA:
Sir, one minute... (Interruptions)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Prime Minister is replying; please sit down.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I have to say something about this. The Dunkel question is going to come to both the Houses of Parliament for discussion. I can assure the hon. Member that nothing that he alleges will be done.

वह अपनी-अपनी जहूनियत का सवाल है कि कौन किसके सामने घुटने टेकता है। वह जहूनियत हमारी तो नहीं है और फिर हमारे किसान के लिए कोई नुकसान किसी तरह से करने नहीं देंगे, होन नहीं देंगे। यही मुझे कहना है।

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA:
Sir, my point is, the Prime Minister made a statement regarding improvement and advance of agriculture. He stated that agricultural production has improved. Sir, I draw your attention and the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that the objective reality of the country is otherwise. We had to borrow foodgrains from outside after many years. Our food stock has been going down. Therefore, according to me the agricultural situation is being painted in a different way. I would like the Prime Minister to state to the country the reasons for holding up the programme of

land reforms. According to the Planning Commission and according to the National Commission for Rural Labour the land reforms have been held up. Government owes an explanation to the country as to why land reforms are being held up. Without land reforms there cannot be agricultural development. Secondly, I was a member of the National Commission for Rural Labour. Ninety per cent of the rural workers are without any social protection. We submitted a report to the Prime Minister after he assumed office. More than two years have passed but Government did not take any action so far as extending social security to the unorganised labour is concerned. I would like the Prime Minister to respond and as a protest against the policy of the Government so far as land reforms and rural workers are concerned I seek to walk out.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: It has become rather farcical that people walk out and I answer them after they walk out. But it has to go on record. Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta, you are not walking out. The programme of land reforms has not been abandoned, has not come to a halt as alleged by the hon. Member. In 1991 a new programme, a time-bound programme was given to all the States. The programme is in operation and I could give you the latest figures but I do not have them right now with me. I can send them to the hon. Member. Now, this programme has been taken up with full vigour with the Rural Development Ministry and I can assure you of that.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA:
Justice is otherwise. It has not been done.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMI
(Uttar Pradesh): I have no intention of walking out. And I have the power to make others walk out. Now, the important part of the Prime Minister's speech dealt with curbing communalism and enforcing secularism in

[Shri Subramanian Swamy]

a meaningful way. Now, Sir, I would like to know through you, from the Prime Minister, having dismissed the four Governments for promoting communalism, whether he is aware that there are other parts of the country where the members of the banned organisations are freely holding rallies and processions and one of them is slated there shortly. I would like to know whether he would systematically and uniformly see that the minorities are protected in every part of the country, not only in North India but in South India as well.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY:
He should give this assurance.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:
The answer is in the affirmative, Sir, so far as protection is concerned.

SHRI SUBRAMANIAN SWAMY:
The 21st March rally at Madras must be banned and the Centre should give a directive for that.

श्री आनन्द प्रकाश गौतम (उत्तर प्रदेश) : सभापति जी, माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी ने राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण के उत्तर में बहुत सारे मुद्दों का जवाब दिया है—किसानों के बारे में कहा, अल्पसंख्यकों के बारे में कहा, डा० अम्बेडकर के बनाए संविधान को बार-बार आपने दोहराया कि उसके साथ चलेंगे, लेकिन मुझ बड़े अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि अनुसूचित जाति और जनजाति के बारे में एक शब्द भी आपके भाषण में नहीं आया। . . . (अवधान) . . . नहीं बोला, अभी रिकार्ड है। चलिए, मैं सुन रहा हूँ। मैं माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि आजकल, इस समय आरक्षण की बड़ी चर्चा है और इतने सालों से आउट स्टैंडिंग जो बैंकलाग है सविस्तर में, उसको पूरा करने के लिए क्या कोई बहुत बड़ी राजनीतिक इच्छा-शक्ति के साथ आपके पास कोई कार्यक्रम है? एक और मुद्दा जो सुप्रीम कोर्ट की जजमेंट के बाद बहुत उठा हुआ है, वह है कि

अनुसूचित जाति और जनजाति के लिए प्रमोशन में जो आरक्षण है, उसके बारे में प्रधान मंत्री जी की क्या प्रतिक्रिया है, इस संबंध में मैं जानना चाहता हूँ।

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:
Sir, in filling the backlog and also in giving meaningful posting to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, anyone who goes into the record will give me full marks and I have no doubt about it. Those who do not know the facts might make allegations but if you go into the facts even today, from day to day, I am making it a point that wherever it is possible, between a Scheduled Caste candidate equally qualified with a non-Scheduled Caste candidate, the better posting has to be given to the Scheduled Caste candidate because they have not perhaps been given as much as they expected or what we had to give in the past. That is being done.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, if the House so agrees, we shall put all the amendments together to vote.

The amendments were negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I shall now put the motion to vote.

The question is:

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

"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 the 22nd February, 1993."

The motion was adopted.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at twenty-one minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Friday, the 12th March, 1993.