

under which the Home Secretary speaks to the Chief Secretary; the Special Secretary (Security) also speaks to the DGs and the Home Minister speaks to the Chief Ministers. The Government has constituted an Empowered Committee to deal with these matters, of which some of the Ministers of the Union Government, some of the Chief Ministers of the States which are affected by terrorist movements, are also members. They can sit there and decide. What we have been insisting upon is they should prepare a plan as to how they would like to deal with it. They should mention in the plan as to how they will cooperate with the neighbouring States. Then according to that agreement they should issue instructions to the police. This kind of a mechanism is already there. *(Interruptions)*.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This matter is over. Hon. Members, there will be no lunch hour today. Now further discussion on the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address.

---

#### MOTION OF THANKS ON THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI JASWANT SINGH): Mr. Chairman, Sir, we are resuming the discussion on the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address to the Joint Session of both the Houses. I find that both the hon. Mover of the Motion, as also the seconder of the Motion have found it inconvenient to be present in the House. Sir, that is quite the standard for the Treasury Benches. Not for that reason, but for other reasons, I am unable to lend my support to the Motion that was moved by the hon. Maharaja of Kashmir and seconded by hon. Raashid Alvi. I recognize the complexity of governance in the present day because when this entire system of Motion of Thanks and Joint Session first got introduced, governance and Governments by themselves were much simpler. It is a far more complex exercise now and every Ministry of the Government expects two or three lines to be included in the Motion, which renders the entire text of the Motion as almost incoherent. But I have different reasons for not being able to support this Motion. It is a matter of great regret and sorrow to me that my difficulties of supporting this Motion as also the complexity of governance are compounded by the fact that the Leader of the Congress Party is today acting as the principle opposition to the Government. And it is the Leader who has

found it necessary to send communications in writing to the hon. Prime Minister, who is the Head of the Government. It does raise questions in our mind as to what the respective functions are of the hon. Prime Minister and the Leader of the Congress(I) Party which has formed the Government, and it has raised queries which, I think, some others also have raised. Is it because the hon. Prime Minister and the Leader of the Congress (I) Party are no longer on speaking terms that we have this situation? It is a highly unusual situation that the Leader of the Ruling Party should communicate with the Head of the Government and then send those communications to the Pres selectively, of course. This is a very interesting and an unusual situation. That is why the difficulties arise. If the hon. Prime Minister is following the leader, then, the difficulty arises as followers cannot lead. And, how are we then to support the Motion of the followers.

For the past many decades now, I have had the benefit of listening to hon. Maharaja Saheb of Kashmir, who sadly is not present here. I have always been struck by the fact that he seems to hold either a permanent or a season ticket on the 'line of least resistance'. I have heard him justify his position, no matter what the position that he is required to justify is, and he chooses selectively one or two Sanskrit slokas to confound us all. But whenever the "Opportunity Express" comes his way, the Maharaja Saheb of Kashmir is always on it...

श्री सभापति: "महाराजा साहब" लिखा हुआ नहीं है।

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND THE MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (Shri Priyaranjan Dasgupta): We have data of Dr. Karan Singh, who sacrificed his Maharajaship during Smt. Indira's tenure on bank nationalization and abolition of privy purses. It is a historic act ... (Interruptions) He is the only Maharaja who did not join the bandwagon, and accepted the law of the land.

श्री सभापति: "छोड़िए 'महाराजा' की बात।

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, I hope you would not mind me saying that if Nawab Sahebs can be Nawabs, if Maulanas can be Maulvis and if Bhairon Singhji; can be a Thakur then, Maharaja Kashmir can certainly be the Maharaja of Kashmir. As I was saying, I found this remarkable ability in Maharaja Saheb of Kashmir that he is always on the "Opportunity Express"

no matter which Opportunity Express it is. But if you just peel off the ribbons and you take the wrapping paper and the brown paper away and the rest of the covering, then, in those oleaginous phrases of compromise, you will find nothing. I will give two examples;

I found them typical. First of all, his speech comprised of sentiments as if this Government had rediscovered the wheel, and was astonished—I do not know what else to call it—when he termed the nine per cent growth rate of the country as a "Sikh" growth rate. I felt astonished and I do not know whether to call it sick or whether to call it sycophantic, but the growth rate of the country is the compound of everyone's effort, and, thereafter, for him to say that it was a "Sikh" growth is sick. Then the meeting between the Foreign Ministers of China, Russia and India, it was a structured meeting. But it was not the first ever, Sir. The first ever meeting goes long back, quite a few years back. I do not want to reduce it to the first person, singular, and therefore do not persist. So, I was not convinced by what he said. And, as for the hon. the Seconder of the Motion, when I heard him, declaiming his views with fluent insincerity, I could not help but reflect, sir, that is it is good or a bad thing that we do not have any quality control in politics. And that being the situation, the first point that I have after going through the Speech, Sir, after it had been delivered, is to start, Sir, by the last paragraph, paragraph number 58. Permit me to quote, "The reform of Government, making it more transparent and responsive, and the elimination of the cancer of corruption..." it goes on, Sir, I won't read the entire paragraph. "The Right to Information Act is one means of empowering our citizens, etc., etc..." There are questionable syntaxes here, but that is a different matter altogether. And, it is very said, Sir, that just as the hon. the President was perhaps reading out the last paragraph, and you, Sir, were also just about laying this very same speech, just then, the shabby drama of Quotrocchi was being played. I think this whole question of right to information and information being withheld from the country, from the Parliament, from the Parliamentarians, from the citizens, do not match with each other. Sir, as if that was not enough, may I also share, Sir, that one of the partners to this Alliance, the Government of West Bengal, has consistently refused to divulge and come out with their current plan of industrialisation. A retired civil servant has pieced together facts from various sources to write that the West Bengal Government has plans to

acquire over 140000 acres of agriculture land in nine districts of Bengal, and never in the history of industrialisation of Bengal has so much agriculture area been acquired at any one time by the Government for the purpose of setting up units by private parties for private gains. It is understandable why under the guise of the Right to Information Act, the partners in today's arrangement of governance should be denying information to the country for one reason or another.

I have also found, Sir, that this Address to the Joint Session was either insensitive or it was indifferent or it suffered from amnesia. Paragraph 2, Sir, refers to Panipat and paragraph 42 refers to Assam; it has taken 40 paragraphs to finally come to Assam. It is as if paragraph 2 and Panipat certainly must be referred to as a matter of concern, that is everyone's point, but that Assam should come as an afterthought to this Government is negligence. Assam, Sir is the State which has returned the hon. Prime Minister to Parliament. It is not that that parochial concern ought to have persuaded him to mention Assam. You have mentioned Assam in paragraph 42, but there is no mention of ULFA. And, if in the second paragraph itself Panipat comes and the ULFA is forgotten 40 paragraphs later and it is left out, it does make us wonder as to what the priorities of this Government are. Over 70 Indian citizens were killed in Assam in Tinsukia, Dibrugarh, and they were killed not because of terrorism but because of insurgency. And I do chare this Government over the kind of the very—I do not know that what adjective to use—for the manner in which Assam has been neglected by the very representative of Assam in our House. I was led, therefor, to the conclusion, Sir, generally speaking, when this entire speech is read to totality or heard, for this Government or the arrangement of this Government, truth is so important that they must always protect the truth by a whole battalion of untruth, and what is presented to us is only the untruth and truth remains somewhere disguised under the protection of untruth. This, Sir, is another reason for my difficulties is going along with the mover of the Motion of Thanks.

Sir, the hon. mover of the Motion of Thanks spoke lyrically as he is given to about 9 per cent growht. It would have done well, Sir, if he had spent a little time on inflation. The President's Address does talk of inflation. It is a principal concern. It is really largely on account of mismanagement on the supply-side. Growth is not a competition, Sir,

also not as to at which stage we had what rate of the Wholesale Price Index. The question here is of mismanagement on the supply-side. We have had a situation in which shortage, for example in wheat, or shortage in pulses was clearly, it could be seen, was coming. Procurement had fallen. I would not go into the figure because earlier, during the Question Hour, this very matter has been referred to. A very learned economist questioned this earlier. When wheat procurement fell in January of 2006, and by April, another off-take from that very same wheat stock and had further depleted the stocks, when further procurement did not cross even 9MT, then the forewarning to the Government was clear enough. An because it did not act in time, it is not sufficient reason for the Government to now say, "We imported", or "We did this". You acted but you acted when it was not timely. You acted too late and you acted in a manner that has caused great distress to the country. Sir, it is not a question who won the election. The Hon. Prime Minister found in his wisdom to advise the country that the inflation must be fought by the State Governments. I found it an astonishing observation; which is, the Prime Minister is handing over the responsibility of the management of the economy to the States of the Union. How are the States to manage inflation if the mismanagement on the supply-side is gross, and is at the Central-level? There are two commodities which are unique to India. We are the only country in the world, of a billion-plus citizens, which does not use animal fat for cooking. It is a cultural and a civilisational requirement. We are the only country in the world what has more vegetarians by way of food habit than any other country in the world. Pulses, dal, therefore, is an essential requirement. I am told, Sir, that pulses, dal, had gone up to Rs. 80 a kilo. I face this problem every day from my wife, Sir. I am not very knowledgeable on the daily fluctuations of prices, but I am sufficiently knowledgeable about the malfunctioning of the Government. And I do charge, Sir, that along with delayed responses the factor that has caused problem to us is also because the ailment and the remedy are not matching. I am not going to an economic dissertation on that, Sir.

But it would be a great error to work on the basis that simply because we handed over the economy growing at 8.4 per cent of the GDP, Sir. It would have been an error on our part as it is an error on your part to think that 9 per cent plus growth of the GDP means everything under this is perfectly satisfactory. It is not so. I tried to educate myself on this from

my learned colleague and friend, hon. Arun Shourie, and I was struck by what he cited to me as an example. He cited the example of Japan. Japan had marvellous rates of growth but it was getting hollowed out internally, but a great deal of it was misuse of money, mal-use of money on account of spiralling property prices. Please be cautioned if we are also somewhere not going down that very same path. I do not refer to the erratic behaviour of the stock exchange but roughly about 55 per cent of our economy is already globalised. We cannot have the benefits of globalisation and not suffer the minus effects of globalisation. If Shanghai falls by seven or eight per cent, the whole of the rest of global stock exchanges have a problem. And if Bombay Stock Exchange has fallen by almost 2000 points, then it is a pointer, Sir. It is a pointer that a great deal of it could be speculative and it is a caution. It is a timely caution. But if the Government were to respond to this caution in the fashion in which it has responded to the inflation that hit the country, to the shortage of essentials like wheat or pulses, then we are in for some difficult times.

Sir, I have refrained in the past three years or so to speak on the economy or to speak on matters related to the security of the country for a very good reason because I have served in those very Ministries and in the sense that I have served there, I have a continuing sense of responsibility as also loyalty to those Ministries. But I do wish to say a few things ... (*Interruptions*)... Sir, I do wish to share a few thoughts about Defence. My good friend, the hon. Defence Minister, whom I have known for many years is, a man of great gentility and is a gentleman, he is both a gentle man and also gentleman. But I wish to share with him that it is very necessary for us to reassess the entire security threat to the country. We need also—I would not elaborate these, Sir, because time will not permit me—to be very clear in our mind about the nature of warfare that has altered beyond recognition and in the context of the threat that we face and the nature of warfare, it is essential, Sir, that the role of Army, Navy and Air Force is redefined. It is timely, it is necessary, that we do so now. I also appeal to the hon. Prime Minister present here that over the decades in the manner in which we have gone about with this great and grave responsibility, the equipment procurement systems and methods have been so paralysed by what I call the C-3 paralysis—CBI, C&AG as also the CVC—the Chief Vigilance Commissioner—that now no decisions are forthcoming from the civil service. We have paralysed the decision-making in the Ministry of Defence with the result that we

have paralysed the Defence preparedness of our country. It is very important that all political parties sit together and come to a decision about how it is important that the Central Bureau of Investigation be not used as a political tool by one party or another. You use it to your preferences.

When it is convenient to get some ministers of yours, who are your allies or related to you or close to you, you get them exonerated and no more appeals can be filed against them. But you will file an appeal against a person, a friend, whom I have known for so many decades because you charge him on the persuasions of your allies and ask the Central Bureau of Investigation. Mr. Prime Minister, Sir, you were good enough the other day to share on the television screen and you said, "I affirm solemnly". It is not necessary to affirm solemnly at all. You could have simply said, "I say". It did not carry conviction. The CBI is being used as a tool of the ruling party and the CBI is therefor, being misused and if you use that agency for defence procurement of weapons, then it will not work. I do appeal to the Defence Minister to re-examine this question and I am sorry that the former Defence Minister had in fact sent so many cases to the Central Bureau of Investigation. You are not then inquiring into the political leadership alone. You begin to inquire and bring to a stop the entire decision making system.

Sir, please also reflect on what the role of the Army, Navy and the Air Force is going to be and in that context, now that it has become common knowledge, please pay particular attention to the challenge of the Indian Air Force. Of the total number of squadrons that we ought to have, it is minimal to what it ought to be. Our projections would cross 50 squadrons, but in actual reality is not even 29 squadrons and of those 29 squadrons, the equipment state is very bad. One more thing, Sir, we are perhaps the only country in the world which is indulging in a luxury of a multiple variety of aircraft. It is not sustainable. We have the MiG family, we have the tupalene family, we have the Sukhoi family we have Jaguar, we have Mirages, we have Light Combat Aircraft. I am not talking of the different requirements of the Army, Navy and the Air Force. Even within the Air Force, this is required. The Navy says then need. MIG 29-K. That is the aircraft that would be operational on Admiral Gorshokov, renamed Vikramiditya. No other aircraft will work. It is very important for long term planning that this great diversity of aircraft is streamlined, no country in

the world is today in a position to afford it. I know that this Government or the previous Government had inherited the situation and the situation is born of circumstances but it is our responsibility to begin to address it, that is why I name it. I am not going into the Army's requirements of helicopters and how the Navy should no longer be content to operate between the States of Malacca and the 7-degree channel and Sri Lanka. We will have to make our presence well enough known.

So, it is in the context threats I wish to share in all seriousness, with the House, what is called a 'String of Pearls' strategy of the People's Republic of China. It is a contain India. If we don't voice it and if we don't recognise it, we are not recognising a reality. The extension of the Railway line to Lhasa, the extension of road communication into Myanmar, the lease on Cocos Island, negotiations on the port of Chittagong with Bangladesh, also the initial moves with the Sri Lankan Government, the construction of Port of Gwadar, the strategic alliance with Pakistan all this is a string of pearls around India.

It is necessary that we recognize it and necessary that we address it, not always move away from it.

I find, Sir, that on the nuclear question, the speech is silent. I wish to share only one thought. Strategically, the challenge is profound, because, as the global non-proliferation regime is flawed, it is inadequate for our purpose, and it is discriminatory, continuously discriminatory, against India. What 1998 did was to break this flaw, break the monopoly of the P-5 and N-5. What we are now trying to do is to enter this world to get the benefits of this world, therefore, also simultaneously acquire the dishonesty of the arrangement. It is a profound challenge. This challenge can only be addressed by India and it cannot be addressed fully by us, unless the total nuclear question is debated and discussed in its totality, not as a contentions issue between the Government and the Opposition; but as a challenge that the whole country is today facing. The answer, Sir, to pass it off as only an energy-related question would be a grave error. And, I therefore, also leave a thought on the question of missile development, because of the various developments that are taking place on the front of missile, this is not unknown to the Government; it is not unknown to very many eminent Indians what the actual state of our



2.00 P.M.

Missiles and our missile development programmes. It is very important that we take note of it. This also has to be inter-related with the question of whether it should be manned aircraft or missile which should eventually go into the aerial Defence of the country. These are the questions that we have to begin to address and ask ourselves, because it is the beginning of the 21st Century and when we plan for Defence, we have to plan, at least, for twenty years from now.

Sir, I will have to share a few thoughts on foreign policy. I run through whatever I have to say. It is a subject by itself requiring a discussion. We had a discussion last year. So, we cannot repeat it. But the challenges on the front of Foreign Policy to India are monumental. They are historical. Our response, I am sorry to say, is timorous, it is tentative and it is apologetic. Sir, India currently is surrounded by a whole chain of either collapsed countries or countries that are on the edge of collapse, existing civil wars or incipient civil wars. We have witnessed the shattering silences of the Government on the great inhumanities of Guatanamo or Abu Gharib or CIA's clandestine flight carrying citizens of one country to another, to an unknown destination. I am disturbed by the immobility of the Government of the India in the face of corrugated and coiled instability of the Middle East. Our neighbour, Pakistan, recently, hosted a conference of five Sunni countries. We are witnessing a great Shia-Sunni divide being demonstrated in Iraq. It is on account of one of the most profound foreign policy failure and that is the failure of the US intervention in Iraq and, if you permit to me to say so, also in Afghanistan. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization is for the North Atlantic. I don't know how geography has got so redefined that we see the NATO active, today, in Afghanistan. And, I am disturbed, Sir, that in the face of all this we are met really by a bewildering silence on the Government, or, an immobility that is not becoming of India. There are five civil wars either existing or incipient. The internal situation in Pakistan is not hidden from anybody. Afghanistan is already in a State of civil war. Iran is being threatened daily by the United States of America in one fashion or another. And, it is only now, after months, that we found it possible for our Foreign Minister to visit Iran. Iraq is already in a State of civil war. The position of Palestine and Lebanon is also no better. I don't go to the Central Asia to Bangladesh which has a very difficult situation or what Nepal has gone through or what is happening in Sri Lanka. In the face of all this, what marks the conduct of the Government of India is

completely bewildering immobility, a silence that really is a great disservice to the country.

On the question of Pakistan-I have to rush through what I have to say because I don't want to take all the time-it appears that there are multiple policies; there are multiple voices; there are a variety of agents, backroom agents, frontroom agents. It is very difficult to make out as to what is happening, but what has happened and what is clearly in evidence, is the loss of strategic initiative. It was India that was determining the pace of events, the direction of events and what was to happen with regard to Pakistan; it is now Pakistan who, every now and then, comes up with a suggestion and all that the Government of India is doing is to react to what the President of Pakistan is voicing. This loss of strategic initiative is a very telling loss. I don't know whom to believe, whether I have to believe emissaries like the Mirwaiz, or, I have to believe the President of Pakistan because it is astonishing that in respect of the Ministries of Home and Defence and External Affairs, different voices emerge when it comes to Pakistan. Today, Sir, there is an intelligence meet that is taking place in Pakistan. The two Governments are coming together to share information, to determine how to work together on intelligence sharing. I find this very disturbing because how do you equate the perpetrator of a crime with the victim of that crime? I also found the timing of this announcement that we will share Intelligence very odd, to say the least. It has been preceded by the blasts in Bombay, which had then had the hon. Prime Minister say that we will have nothing to do, we will not talk, and he goes to Havana, and suddenly, from there, a great leap is taken and the Prime Minister begins to say that Pakistan is also a victim of terrorism and we will talk about it. It is not a question of talking alone, Sir. Pakistan employs cross-border terrorism as an instrument of State policy against India. It has a two-faced approach to terrorism-one face points to the West as for the United States of America; one face points to the East, for India. The United States of America, Negreonte or Vice-President-Cheney, or Condoleeza Rice they can all find fault with Pakistan; Canada finds fault; the United Kingdom finds fault, but the Prime Minister of India does not find fault; and says, "Pakistan is a victim of terrorism". If Pakistan denies all the charges that we feel are in their quarter, for which they are responsible, then, what intelligence will be shared with us? They continue to deny that they are not doing this, and that none of

them is a perpetrator of any crime that is happening almost every fortnightly in India. And, yet, India goes and says, 'Okay, we will talk; we will exchange views on terrorism.' It is a very bewildering circumstance. It confuses us. And, how can we therefore, act on the basis of partnership with Pakistan on terror when Pakistan, as a policy, has terrorism as a plank of State policy? Sir, the reality is that Pakistan has not been able to establish a viable, functional State. Its nationhood is based on that—because this is an openly stated fact—otherwise, there would not have been a claim made by Late Mohammed Ali Jinnah that Muslims are a separate nation and cut this land into two. On those grounds it was cut. Therefore, Pakistan's sole sustainability, survivability lies on continuous, generated, constantly fed animosity towards India. Late General Zia-ul-Haq had once said this. He shared this in a conversation. People asked, 'Why do you keep doing this?' He said, "look, it is very simple. If Turkey stops being Islamic, it will still be Turkey. If Egypt stops being Islamic, it will still be Egypt. But, if Pakistan stops being blatantly Islamic and anti-Indian, then, it will become India." Now, if that is the approach, then, what intelligence is the Government sharing? What intelligence will the Prime Minister, as he announced, now share with Pakistan so that we can have a joint approach? I can understand the Prime Minister's nature persuades him to say that they are also victims of terrorism. But his responsibility is towards India, Sir. His responsibility is not towards Pakistan. And, if they are a victim of terrorism, then, they have to address themselves to that. Pakistan has sold its soul to the U.S.A. Even Faust could sell his soul once. Pakistan cannot continue to sell its soul. We have a problem here, and the best way to address this problem is to confront it foursquare.

Sir, I do not know whether I have time to talk about terrorism. I am sure, if very objectively I were to share the two great shackles of India, we do not have a real foreign policy, and we do not have settled boundaries. And, we do not have a settled relationship with our neighbourhood; any of our neighbourhood which we can call a stable, sound relationship. This is a great foreign policy failure; continued failure. I do not charge this or any other Government. The other failure, profound and extremely damaging is the absence of a sense of law and order within the country. How can you have a sense of law and order within the country if this is the arrangement of the Government that when it comes

into office, the first thing it does, as its bounden duty, is to abolish POTA, which was a weapon to fight against terrorism? I do not know how you will deal with it. We have also dealt with it. When I was for some months in the Ministry of Defence, in an Army Commanders Conference, I was asked this question. "How do we deal, Sir, with terrorism? What do we tell our troops when confronted with the challenge of terrorism?" I have no difficulty in repeating here because that is the creed to which I belong to and which I believe in. There is only one answer. You have to instil in the country a spirit which will stand up against terrorism. If you cannot instil this in the country because your approach is governed by electoral advantage, then, it will not work. Secondly, Sir, the approach has to be clear and categorical. The terrorist has to be terrorised. The whole approach to terrorism has to be different; otherwise, these two menaces will shackle us and will cripple the growth and potentials of India in the coming decade. I am very struck, Sir, that every time an incident takes place and 60, 70 citizens get killed. The Prime Minister has stock phrases. He says, "My heart goes out". I don't know how many times the Prime Minister's heart has now gone out to all those who have died. These have become simply numbers now. So insensitised have we become that these are now just statistics अब इतने मर गए, कल इतने मर गए।

Thereafter, the Prime Minister finds it necessary to say that his Government is "resolved". I think you are resolved only to be irresolute, and you are resolved only to confuse the country in this regard. "We will find the perpetrators of this dastardly crime."

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

Then it becomes a competition of adjectives, paragraph two has 'cowardly', 'dastardly' and all that. And, when they run out of these adjectives, they go to paragraph 42, and it has a different description of what happened in Assam. Assam, Sir, was in insurgency; Indian insurgents acting against India. Please call a spade a spade. Therefore, one is left with an impression that your approach is of surrender.

सर, बहुत हो गया। मैं इतना भी नहीं कहना चाहता था, लेकिन कुछ उद्धृत करना चाहूंगा। हमारी संसद में पंडित विद्यानिवास मिश्र बहुत विद्वान सांसद थे, दुर्भाग्यवश वह रहे नहीं, मैं उनका बहुत आदर करता था। पंडित जी का देहान्त दुर्भाग्यवश एक मोटरगाड़ी के एक्सीडेंट में हो गया। अनायास अभी पिछले दिनों, उनका एक लेख पढ़ने का मिला। मैं उसके पूरे अंश नहीं पढ़ रहा

हूँ। मैं सोचता हूँ कि कुछ अंश संदर्भिक हैं, सटीक हैं, बहुत कुछ उन्हीं का है, कुछ अंश में पंक्तियाँ मेरी भी हैं। पंडित जी लिखते हैं कि 26 जनवरी को लाहौर में हुए कांग्रेस के अधिवेशन में, वे उन दिनों की बात करते हैं, "26 जनवरी को लाहौर में हुए कांग्रेस अधिवेशन में रावी के तट पर स्वाधीनता की शपथ ली गई थी। ... देश जब तक स्वतंत्र नहीं हुआ था..... 26 जनवरी का जुलूस स्वाधीनता दिवस के रूप में सड़कों पर निकलता था, तरुण तरंगिणी के रूप में उपहृत था। उस दिन तिरंगा फहराया जाता था और बंदिशें लगती थीं, तब भी तिरंगा लहरा ही जाता था।" ....26 जनवरी, 1942 को इलाहाबाद विश्वविद्यालय में दीक्षांत समारोह था। तिथि पहले से पक्की, पर तत्कालीन ब्रिटिश गवर्नर ने कुलपति पंडित अमरनाथ झा को पत्र लिखा कि इस समारोह में तभी उपस्थित हो सकूंगा, जब उस दिन छात्र संघ के भवन पर छात्र तिरंगा न फहराए। फिर पंडित जी लिखते हैं, "झा साहब वैसे तो थे बड़ी ठसक् के साहब, पर भीतर से वे देश के लिए स्वाभिमान रखने वाले व्यक्ति थे। उन्होंने शिष्टापूर्वक लिख दिया कि विश्वविद्यालय छात्रों का है और वे अगर एक दिन अपनी आकांक्षा का उत्सव करते हैं और शालीनता के साथ करते हैं, तो उसे मैं रोकूंगा नहीं। आपने पहले तिथि दी थी, दीक्षांत समारोह होगा और दीक्षांत समारोह हुआ। दीक्षांत भाषण महामना पंडित मदनमोहन मालवीय ने दिया। वे वृद्ध थे, स्वस्थ भी नहीं थे, उन्हें कुर्सी पर बैठाकर लाया गया। उन्होंने बैठे-बैठे अंग्रेजी में भाषण दिया। पर अंत में छात्रों ने जो काम 26 जनवरी को किया, वह किया। उन्होंने दो पंक्तियों में बहुत ही क्षीण स्वर में, पर दृढ़ पुकार के साथ दोहराने की कहा—

"सब मिल बोलें एक आवाज़,  
अपने देश में अपना राज।"

उपसभापति महोदय, मुझे दुख है कि आज यह भावना, यह शंका, यह पीड़ा हमारे मन में क्यों है कि अपने ही देश में अपना राज नहीं है, परदेसी राज है? पंडित जी आगे लिखते हैं, मैं ज्यादा वक्त नहीं लूंगा, बहुत संदर्भिक है। "स्वाधीनता की परिपक्वता के साथ-साथ आशा तो यही थी कि इस उमंग में प्रतिदिन वृद्धि होगी और अनुदिन नई-नई रचनात्मक संकल्पनाएं आएंगी, पर उल्टा हुआ। ये आयोजन, जैसे यह राष्ट्रपति के अधिभाषण का अनुष्ठान — इस साल का नहीं कह रहे हैं, पंडित जी तो हैं नहीं — "राष्ट्रपति के अधिभाषण का अनुष्ठान। और भी अधिक अनुष्ठान हो रहे हैं।" फं विद्यानिवास मिश्र जी थे, इसलिए वे कहते हैं, "अनुष्ठान भी विधि से संपन्न होता है और उसमें एक सौष्ठव आता है, पर इन अनुष्ठानों में अब एक ढर्रेंदारी आती जा रही है, मानो जैसे-तैसे मात्र रस्म अदा करनी है। ... पहले जोखिम उठाकर अभय की छाया में जन-उत्सव के रूप में मनाया जाता था, आज सतर्कता और भय की छाया में सरकारी ढंग के तौर पर मनाया जा रहा है।" आज हमारे नागरिक सड़कों पर स्वतंत्र घूम नहीं सकते क्योंकि कोई बीबीआईपी आ रहा है। हमको डुकम होता है, दूर हटो, दूर हट जाओ, उधर देखो भी मत — ऐसा भी कहा गया है,

मुझे कहा गया है। जिस जन-उत्सव को सैलाब होना चाहिए, वह अब "सरकारी अनुष्ठान के रूप में एक छोटी सी 'माइनर नहर' रह गया है।" मैं बैठे-बैठे इसका निदान करता हूँ। यह सब क्यों हुआ, यह सब कैसे हो गया? डिप्टी चैयरमैन साहब, यह एक यक्ष प्रश्न नहीं है, यही तो मूल प्रश्न है। क्योंकि "एक ओर रसरंग और दूसरी ओर विनाश, विध्वंस, रक्तापात और सब कुछ स्वाहा। उस स्वाहा में देश भस्म नहीं होता। केवल व्यक्ति बलिदान की वेदी पर चढ़ते हैं, ठीक है। संकट में कभी-कभी हमें देश की स्वाधीनता का पुनः आभास होता है पर वह टिकता नहीं है।" यह बड़े दुख की बात है। "अगर वह टिकता तो उसकी आंच में इतने सारे अनैतिक व्यापार, जो ऊपर से नीचे तक हो रहे हैं, आज चल रहे हैं, वे नहीं चल पाते।" इसलिए प्रश्न उठता है, ऐसे अनुष्ठानों के अवसर पर, "कौन राख के नीचे चिंगारी संचित करेगा और कौन देश के स्वाभिमान की आग को धधकाएगा? कौन आज बोलेगा, "इंद्राय तक्षकाय स्वाहा।" यदि तक्षक भी इंद्र के सिंहासन के नीचे शरण लेगा तो इंद्र के साथ वह भी भस्म हो जाएगा। कौन आज वह आंच सहने को तैयार होगा? यह मैं नहीं कह रहा हूँ, पंडित जी इस प्रश्न को पूछ रहे हैं। "कौन आज देश की भाग्यलक्ष्मी को स्थिर करेगा? जाति, क्षेत्र, ऊँच-नीच, गांव-शहर के भेद भूलकर देश के महायज्ञ में शामिल होने के लिए कौन रवेगा निर्मंत्रण पत्र? कौन उसे बांटेगा, कौन उसे पढ़ेगा, कौन उसे गुनेगा, हम स्वतंत्र हैं, यह छोटी बात नहीं है, लेकिन यह अनुभव व्यापक क्यों नहीं हो रहा है?" आज फिर क्यों देश में गुलामियत की बदबू हमें घेर रही है? क्यों स्व० बंसीधर शुक्ल जी का अनुताप, उसका भावार्थ हमें घेरे हुए है-

"आज जे आइन तेऊ चूसिन,  
पहिले जब अइहें तब भी चुसिहें,  
तुमरी सगरी सरकार बराबर है,  
बोलें फिर किन कूचन जइहें?"

परतंत्रता की गैरत शरत चन्द्र चट्टोपाध्याय ने इस रूप में मानी थी कि हमें विदेशी सरकार ने इतना लुंज-पुंज बना दिया है कि हम दुर्दांत दस्युओं का प्रतिरोध नहीं कर सकते। सव्यसाची के भाई ने दुर्दस्युओं-से आहत होने पर अपने भाई को शपथ दिलाई थी कि तुम किसी भी क्षण यह मत भूलना कि हमें इन विदेशियों ने इतना असहाय बना दिया है। आज वही असहायता फिर क्यों? आज सामान्य नागरिक क्यों विदेशियों के सामने असहाय हैं? सरकार के सामने असहाय हैं, आतंकवाद के आगे नागरिक असहाय हैं, हमारी अपनी सरकार के झूठ के आगे हम असहाय हैं। इस असहायता को एक बार चीरकर फेंक देने के लिए फिर संकल्प क्यों नहीं जागता है? इन सुरक्षा के वंचना-दुर्गों को तोड़कर असुरक्षा के महासागर में कूद पड़ने का साहस करना पड़ेगा और क्या इसका समाधान हमको तरुणों को उत्तेजक चित्र, चल-चित्र दिखाने में ही होगा या समाधान उपभोग की आग में घी छालने वाले नृत्य-गीतों से ही मिलेगा? यह समाधान सरकारी आश्वासनों में नहीं है। ये प्रश्न हैं और

ये केवल प्रश्न नहीं हैं, ये लोहे की तपाई हुई सलाखें हैं, जो जड़ता को भेद सकती हैं, लेशमात्र ही सही, पर तोड़ने की शुरुआत तो कर सकती हैं। और सबसे बड़ा प्रश्न तो यह है कि वे प्रश्न उठाने वाले कहां हैं? क्या आज देश में प्रश्नकर्ताओं की कमी हो गई है? यही मूल प्रश्न है, यही इस अभिभाषण की मूल कमी है और इसीलिए पीड़ा से प्रेरित हम हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी की तरफ देखते हैं और अनायास इतिहास हमें चीख-चीख कर कहता है—

“सल्तनते शाह आलम,  
अज दिल्ली ता पालम।”

क्यों यह हो गया आज भारत भूमि पर, हम कैसे यहां पहुंच गए, कि मुझे एक लाइन कहनी पड़ती है—

“होश में आ ऐ नादान  
तेरी बरबादी के मश्वरे हैं आसमां में।”

धन्यवाद।

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र (उत्तर प्रदेश): उपसभापति महोदय, हमारी पार्टी को जो समय आपने दिया है, उसमें से थोड़ा समय मैं छोड़ूंगा हमारे नेता अमर सिंह के भाषण के लिए, जो बाद में होगा। प्रस्तावक महोदय डा० कर्ण सिंह ने, जो अभी यहां उपस्थित नहीं हैं, अब की बार थोड़ा सा अपने को सुधार दिया। पिछली मर्तबा प्रस्ताव पेश करते हुए और धन्यवाद देते हुए, राष्ट्रपति महोदय के बाद प्रधान मंत्री जी, आपको और कांग्रेस के अध्यक्ष को भी धन्यवाद दे दिया। तो हमने टोका था कि तीन आदमियों को एक साथ धन्यवाद देते हैं प्रस्ताव में, अलग-अलग कभी नहीं दिया जाता है। अब की बार उस बात को उन्होंने दोहराया नहीं, इसलिए मैं उनकी तारीफ करना चाहता हूँ और बधाई देना चाहता हूँ। जो कोई धन्यवाद प्रस्ताव पेश करता है, आम तौर से देखा है कि उसकी तरक्की हो जाती है। इस सदन में धन्यवाद करने वाले कई लोगों को हमने देखा कि कोई चीफ मिनिस्टर हो गया, कोई गवर्नर हो गया। दो बार डा० कर्ण सिंह ने धन्यवाद प्रस्ताव पेश किया है, मेरा ख्याल है कि अबकी बार वे राष्ट्रपति हो जाएंगे और अगली बार हम उनके दिए हुए भाषण पर बहस करेंगे हमने सुना है ....(व्यवधान)....

SHRI R.K. DHAWAN (Bihar): Are you supporting him?

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र: हमने सुना है कि हमारे चेयरमैन साहब भी राष्ट्रपति पद के लिए उम्मीदवार हैं, तो हमारे लिए एक संकट यह आ गया है कि “गुरु गोबिंद दोऊ खड़े, काकै लागू पांय।” बड़ा मुश्किल सवाल हो गया है। आपने पूछा न कि are you supporting it, तब मैंने कहा। हम लोग थोड़ा संकट में पड़ गए हैं, लेकिन अच्छा ही होगा। यह राष्ट्र के लिए अच्छा होगा। उन्होंने अच्छा काम किया है। हमारे सामने चार दस्तावेज आ गए हैं। एक छब्बीस जनवरी की पूर्वसंध्या

पर राष्ट्रपति महोदय जी ने जो भाषण दिया था, दूसरा सेंट्रल हॉल में उन्होंने संसद के सामने भाषण दिया, तीसरा रेल मंत्री जी ने जो भाषण दिया और चौथा वित्त मंत्री जी ने भाषण दिया। भाषण की एक साथ चार कॉपियां दिमाग में कितना ऊहापोह करती हैं, यह मैं अच्छी तरह से जानता हूँ। हालांकि इतने ऊहापोह में नहीं रहना चाहिए। सभी लगभग एक ही तरह की हैं। लालू जी तो वाक् जाल में बहुत काबिल हैं। एक दिन उन्होंने अपनी गाय का तबेला वगैरह रखा और अखबार वालों से बोला कि मैंने गाय का तबेला रखा है और एक विदेशी सांड मंगा लिया है। मैं जैसे गाय के दूध की एक-एक बूंद निकाल लेता हूँ, वैसे ही रेल की एक-एक बूंद निकाल लूंगा। रेल कमाई करेगी, आमदनी करेगी। हमें हंसी आई कि सांड तो दूध देगा नहीं, दूध गाय ही देगी। जो शरीफ आदमी होता है, वह गाय का आधा दूध अपने लिए निकालता है, क्योंकि वह उसे खिलाता-पिलाता है, मजदूरी करता है। दूध हमारे पीने के लिए नहीं है। गाय के बच्चे के पीने के लिए है। जो इंसाफ पसंद आदमी होता है, वह आधा गाय के बच्चे के लिए छोड़ देता है। उसके रखरखाव के लिए छोड़ देता है। जब हमारे रेल मंत्री बोले तो हम बड़े चक्कर में पड़ गए कि यह क्या हो रहा है। इतनी बूंद-बूंद निकाल रहे हैं कि कभी सद्भावना एक्सप्रेस, तो कभी मद्रास में रेल चल ही नहीं पा रही है। रेल टूट जाती है, बिखर जाती है। हमें सोचना पड़ेगा कि यह रेल उखड़ क्यों रही है, बिखर क्यों रही है। अगर थोड़ी देर के लिए आतंकवादियों की बात छोड़ दीजिए तो क्या यह सच नहीं है कि रेल के जो मालगाड़ी के जो डिब्बे हैं-चौदह टन लादने के होते हैं, उसमें बीस टन, पच्चीस टन लादा जाता है। उसका असर पहिए पर नहीं पड़ता है, ट्रैक पर उसका असर नहीं पड़ता है। वह बिल तो चौदह टन का देता है, लेकिन बाकी पंद्रह टन, चौदह टन, बारह टन, जो एक्स्ट्रा होते हैं, उसका कोई हिसाब-किताब नहीं होता है। हम चाहेंगे कि इसकी जांच होनी चाहिए कि क्यों रेल के माल डिब्बों में, जहां चौदह टन की कैपेसिटी है, वहां चौबीस और तीस टन लाद देते हैं। वहां चौदह टन का बिल होगा और बाकी का कोई हिसाब नहीं होगा। जब दूध की बूंद-बूंद चूसने की बात करते हैं, तब मैंने यह इशारा किया है। थोड़ा सा हिसाब से चलिए, कहीं रेल धंस न जाए। उनके लिए तो इतना ही कहूंगा और चिदम्बरम साहब से इतना कहूंगा कि हमारे चूल्हे में आजकल दाल नहीं पक पा रही है। थोड़े दिन पहले तक तो हमारे घर पर लड़के क्या करते थे कि दाल में टमाटर, पालक वगैरह डाल देते थे। वह स्वादिष्ट लगता था। हमने पूछा कि यह रोज-रोज क्या कर रहे हो। बोले, जानते हैं कि दाल क्या भाव हो गई है। साठ रुपए किलो। किसकी वजह से हुई। हमारे घर में जो हमारी पत्नी या बेटी दाल पकाती है, उसकी वजह से हुई। क्या गांव में जो किसान अरहर, उड़द बोता है, उसकी वजह से हुई या आपके वायदा कारोबार की वजह से हुई। वायदा कारोबार में थोड़े दिनों के लिए इंडिबल ऑयल आ गया। यह 2002 या 2003 में बना होगा। पहले एक लाख करोड़ का कारोबार होता था। अब तीस लाख करोड़ का कारोबार हो गया है। इसमें इंडिबल ऑयल ही नहीं होता है, इसमें दाल भी आ गई, गेहूं भी आ गया, मसाले भी आ गए, सभी कुछ आ गया और अभी सुनते हैं, कि बहुत सा सामान



उसमें और आने वाला है। आप महंगाई पर चिंतित होते हैं। अपने बनाए हुए कानून, जिसका कोई हिसाब-किताब नहीं हो सकता, वायदा कारोबार का कोई हिसाब-किताब नहीं, उसकी कोई चेकिंग नहीं है इसके लिए आप अपने को जिम्मेदार-आप से मेरा मतलब सरकार अपने को जिम्मेदार नहीं मानेगी। कई बार हमने प्रधानमंत्री जी को सुना कि महंगाई का मुकाबला करना है और जब से ये गंभीर हुए हैं, तब से वायदा कारोबार से शायद दाल को खत्म किया गया है, इसलिए वह 55 रुपए से आजकल 35 रुपए किलो पर आ गई है। हमारे चूल्हे पर दाल नहीं पक पा रही है, चिदम्बरम साहब से बजट की यह तस्वीर है। सरहद पर एक हमारा प्रदेश है-अरुणाचल प्रदेश, उसको चीन वाले कहते हैं कि यह हमारा है। हम लोगों ने आज़ादी के समय नारा लगाया था-“भारत माता की जय”, आप भी “भारत माता की जय” कहते हैं। यहां की मिट्टी को हम मां मानते हैं, हमारी मां की बांह को पकड़ कर कोई कह दे कि यह तो हमारी मां है, हम अपने साथ ले जाएंगे, तो कैसा लगेगा? आप सरकार चला रहे हैं, आपने इस पर कितना ऐतराज़ किया है? आपने केवल चिट्ठी लिख दी है। हमको याद है कि जब हम यूनिवर्सिटी छोड़कर आए थे, हम नए-नए थे, 1962 की लड़ाई हुई थी, हम लोग बाहर गैलरी में बैठे रहा करते थे। लड़ाई के दिनों में इस सदन से और उस सदन से भी एक प्रस्ताव पास हुआ था, एक बार श्री जसवन्त सिंह जी ने उसको दोहराया था कि -

**"The House affirms the firm resolve of Indian people to drive out the aggressor from the sacred soil of India, howsoever long and hard the struggle may be."**

यह एक लाइन का प्रस्ताव था, इसे मैंने आज तक मुंहजुबानी याद किया है, यह 1962 का प्रस्ताव है। मैं मेंबर नहीं था, लेकिन मुझे लग रहा था कि यह कोई मंत्र है देश को बचाने का, देश की सरहद को बचाने का। उसने बांह पकड़कर कह दिया कि यह तो हमारा है। **Howsoever hard and long the struggle may be** -कहां गया वह वाक्य, यह हम आपसे जानना चाहते हैं। हम यह नहीं चाहते कि आप चीन पर हमला करें, लेकिन इसका तगड़े रूप में कभी आपने प्रोटेस्ट किया?

उपसभापति जी, गांधी जी को हम लोग राष्ट्रपिता कहते हैं, गांधी जी के बच्चों के जरिए, कुछ अमरीकन फोर्सेज और कुछ अपने पालतू कुत्तों के जरिए, गांधी जी को बदनाम करने की कोशिश कर रही हैं। यह जानकारी आपको भी होगी कि हर तरह की बदनामी-शराब से लेकर महिला तक की, उनके ऊपर थोपी गई है। हमने जिसको बाप कहा, आज वह बदनाम हो रहा है, हमने जिसको मां कहा, आज उसकी बांह कोई पकड़ रहा है, हमारी हांडी में दाल नहीं पक पा रही है, प्रधानमंत्री जी, हम कहां जाएं? आपसे विनम्र निवेदन है कि इस देश की अपनी कोई अस्मिता होगी या नहीं

होगी? राष्ट्रपिता अपमानित हो रहा हो, भारत माता अपमानित हो रही हो और घर आए, तो बिना दाल के रोटी मिले, हम चाहेंगे कि देश की इस तस्वीर को आप अपने दिमाग में जरूर रखें। यह बहुत बिगड़ी हुई तस्वीर है।

उपसभापति जी, बताया गया है कि 9 सैकड़ा विकास की गति रही है, राष्ट्रपति जी ने भी अपने अभिभाषण में कहा है, लगता है कि बाजा बजेगा, लगता है कि पूरा देश खुशहाल हो गया है, हमने अब तक जो नहीं पाया, वह मिल गया, हम आगे बढ़ गए हैं, क्योंकि विकास की गति 9 सैकड़ा हो गई है, क्या इस विकास की गति का बंटवारा ठीक से हुआ है? अब भी हिंदुस्तान में 30 करोड़ महिलाएं और अन्य लोग ऐसे हैं, जो इस कड़कड़ाती सर्दी में भी बिना जूते और चप्पल के चल रहे हैं, 40-50 करोड़ लोग ऐसे हैं, जो प्लास्टिक की चप्पल और जूते पहनकर घूम रहे हैं, 25-30 करोड़ लोगों के घरों में कंबल और रजाई नहीं है, जो पुराना कपड़ा फट जाता है, वह उसकी कथरी बनाकर और पुआल बिछाकर सोते हैं। 9 सैकड़ा विकास दर कहाँ गई? इसका बंटवारा हो पा रहा है या नहीं, कौन इसकी निगरानी कर रहा है? आपका वित्त मंत्रालय कितनी निगरानी कर रहा है? थोड़ी सी जगहों पर चकाचौंध आ गई है, लेकिन सच यह है कि उस चकाचौंध की वजह से देश की अपार गरीबी बढ़ गई है। बहुत पहले, एक बार पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने कहा था कि समाजवादी, हिंदुस्तान में है क्या बांटने को? सब जगह तो गरीबी है, तो उस समय हमारे नेता डा० लोहिया ने कहा कि गरीबी ही बराबर-बराबर बांट दो। गरीबी का भी बंटवारा होता है। अब तो आप 9 सैकड़ा दिखा रहे हैं, फॉरेन एक्सचेंज दिखा रहे हैं। अगर यह बंटवारा बराबर-बराबर नहीं हुआ, तो मुश्किल से एक करोड़ लोगों के पास देश की दौलत का 50 फीसदी होगा और बाकी 99 करोड़ उसी गरीबी के दलदल में रहेंगे। इतना बेईमान बंटवारा हो रहा है।

सर, यह बजट होता क्या है? बजट होता है कि समुद्र में पानी है, सूरज अपनी किरण से उसको खींचता है, मौका पाता है, मौसम पाता है, तो वह पानी, जो भाप होता है, वह बादल बन जाता है, कहीं टकरा जाता है और टकराने के बाद वह बरसने लगता है, तो वही बजट कहलाता है। साल भर आप हमसे टैक्स लेते हैं। हम कपड़ा खरीदें तो, दवाई खरीदें तो, तेल खरीदें तो, हर रोज समुद्र से पानी आपके खजाने में आ रहा है। साल में एक बार बरसात होती है और बरसात भी थोड़े से बड़े लोगों के घर में ज्यादा हो जाए और गरीब के घर में एक बूंद भी न पड़े, तो अकाल पड़ जाता है। यह तो प्रकृति का नियम है। कपिल सिब्बल जी यहां पर एक बार प्रकृति का वह नियम समझा रहे थे कि समुद्र से सूरज खींचता है, जबकि वह भी 60 सैकड़ा पानी समुद्र में चला जाता है। कभी कहते हैं कि इसको रोक दो, न जाने पाए, जिस दिन समुद्र सूख जाएगा, उस दिन दुनिया प्रलय की हालत में चली जाएगी, इसलिए उसको चुपचाप जाने देना है। वह पानी आपका नहीं है। आज तो पीने का पानी भी नहीं मिल रहा है। पीने का पानी तो छोड़ दीजिए, मैं इलाहाबाद का हूँ। इलाहाबाद

में संगम पर एक मेला लगता है, गंगा-यमुना के संगम पर। लगातार दो महीने से हल्ला मचता रहा कि गंगा का पानी लाल हो गया है। हम भी एक दिन देखने गए। गंगा उत्तर प्रदेश की नदी नहीं है, गंगा हिन्दुस्तान की नदी है। उसका पानी लाल हो गया है। जल्दी इंतजाम करो, जल्दी इंतजाम करो, इसको ठीक करना चाहिए। उपसभापति महोदय, गंगा का पानी कभी गंदा नहीं होता। हम उस पानी की हिफाजत नहीं कर पा रहे हैं, जो हमारी जमीन पर बह रहा है। जो हमारी जमीन के नीचे है, उसका दोहन इतना करते जा रहे हैं कि थोड़े दिनों के बाद लगता है कि यह जमीन धंस न जाए। इसके बारे में आपके बजट में या कहीं भी कोई योजना नहीं है, क्योंकि आप किसानों को नहीं देखते हैं।

इधर आपको अच्छा लगा है सड़क बनाने में। बढ़िया-बढ़िया सड़कें, 4 लेन की सड़कें, 4 करोड़ में एक किलोमीटर तैयार होने वाली सड़कें। उसमें कितना खाया जाता है। इंजीनियर से, कितना ठेकेदार से, यह बहस मैं नहीं करता, लेकिन आपने जोड़ा है कि हिन्दुस्तान में गरीब आदमी, जिसके घर में छप्पड़ नहीं है, उसके लिए भी कितना खर्च हो रहा है। सड़कों पर खर्च ज्यादा है और गरीब के छप्पड़ पर खर्च कम, अगर यही बजट है, तो उपसभापति महोदय, यह बंटवारा ठीक से नहीं माना जाएगा।

आप तो बड़े कृपालु हैं। अभी विदर्भ में किसान मर रहे थे, अकाल की हालत थी, आपने जाकर एक पैकेज दे दिया। हम लोग उम्मीद करते थे कि अब किसानों की जान बच जाएगी, वे खुदकुशी नहीं करेंगे। लेकिन अभी-अभी महाराष्ट्र की सरकार ने वहां के किसानों को बचाने के लिए अपने खजाने से कुछ रुपया दिया। इस पर किसी ने पब्लिक लिटिगेशन दायर कर दिया और वहां के हाई कोर्ट में मुकदमा आया, तो महाराष्ट्र की सरकार ने यह affidavit दिया कि केन्द्र सरकार ने यह पैकेज भेजने की घोषणा की है, अभी वह नहीं आया है, इसलिए हम दूसरे मद से काट कर और इन सबों की जान-बचाने के लिए पैसा भेज रहे हैं। कैसा पैकेज, कितने दिनों तक हवा में उड़ता है? यह बयान हाई कोर्ट में दिया गया है। यह पैकेज का केस हाई कोर्ट तक चला गया। इंसान की जिन्दगी बचाने के लिए भी मदद करने में आपकी मुट्टियां इतनी धीरे-धीरे खुलेंगे, इस बात की मैं कल्पना नहीं कर रहा था। वहां के सरकार ने जब affidavit दिया, तो मुझे बौखलाहट हुई। हां, सर...(व्यवधान)...

**THE PRIME MINISTER (DR. MANMOHAN SINGH):** Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I have great regard and respect for hon. Janeshwar Mishraji. The statement that he has made is not based on facts. The Maharashtra Government has written to me that they have corrected what they had stated in the affidavit. It is not true that the Central Government has not delivered what was promised to the Government of Maharashtra. And, I

state with full responsibility, I have a letter from the Chief Minister. The Chief Secretary has also confirmed that this was a mistake which they have corrected.

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र: उपसभापति महोदय, यह दो सरकारों के बीच पत्राचार की बातें हैं। हम लोग तो जो अखबारों में पढ़ेंगे, उसी से राय बनाएंगे। यह छपा था और हम चाहेंगे कि अगर मुख्य मंत्री ने अपना एफीडेविट या अपनी बात को सुधार लिया तो यह कांग्रेस पार्टी के घर का मामला है और इस पर मुझे बहुत ज्यादा नहीं कहना है। महोदय, मैं बात कर रहा था कि अगर मुठियां खोले तो खुलकर खोलो। वे कोई भीख नहीं मांग रहे थे, वे जान दे रहे थे। जो वक्त का मुकाबला नहीं करके जान दिया करता है, मैं उसको दिलेर नहीं मानता हूँ और जो वक्त का मुकाबला करने के लिए मुठियां खोलने में कोताही करता है, उस को मैं उस से भी ज्यादा बुजदिल मानता हूँ। महोदय, मुझे इतना ही कहना था।

महोदय, मैं बता रहा था कि किसान की क्या हालत हो रही है, वह किस दुर्दशा में पहुंच गया है। उसकी बहुत आफत की हालत है। एक तरफ तो वायदा है, उस में हमारी दाल-चीनी चली गयी है, दूसरी तरफ हम जान दे रहे हैं, कालाहांडी में किसान भुखमरी का शिकार हो रहा है। यह देश की तस्वीर है। क्या किसान को बजट में कभी ठीक से तवज्जो नहीं दी जाएगी? महोदय, मैं पैकेज नहीं चाहता बल्कि मुस्तकिल तवज्जो चाहता हूँ। क्या हिंदुस्तान के खजाने में कभी इतना दमखम नहीं रहेगा कि अगर किसी कोने में आदमी मरता हुआ दिखायी दे तो उसकी जिंदगी बचा ली जाए? उसका अलग से कोई इंतजाम नहीं हो सकता क्योंकि हमारे लिए सब से जरूरी इंसान की जिंदगी है और नंबर दो पर देश की सरहद है। मैंने सरहद का खतरा बता दिया है और इंसान की जिंदगी का खतरा भी बता दिया। आप को सरकार चलाते दो-ढाई साल हो गए, आप ने कौन सी तरक्की की? हम लोग आप के समर्थक थे। क्या इसी तरह सरकार चला करती है?

महोदय, हमने बजट में पढ़ा कि हमारे खाद्यान्न पर उत्पाद शुल्क पिछले साल के मुकाबले ढाई सैकड़ा घटाया गया है और कुत्ते-बिल्ली के खाद्यान्न के लिए दस सैकड़ा घटाया गया है। आप उसे पढ़ लीजिए। यहां कुत्ते-बिल्ली की जिंदगी हमारी जिंदगी से कीमती होने लगी है। यह सच है कि दिल्ली में बंदर बहुत हैं, बड़े लोगों के पास कुत्ते भी हैं, लेकिन उन का उत्पाद शुल्क दस सैकड़ा घटाया जाता है और हमारे खाद्यान्न का उत्पाद शुल्क ढाई सैकड़ा घटाया जाता है। मैं अपनी तरफ से नहीं, विपक्ष की तरफ से नहीं बल्कि आप लोगों की तरफ से भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि क्या हम लोग कुत्ते-बिल्ली से भी हल्के हो गए हैं? आप हम को कहां पटक देना चाहते हैं, कहां से जाकर फेंक देना चाहते हैं? हम ने आप के एक मंत्री को सुना है जो कि नए मंत्री हैं। मैं नाम नहीं लूंगा। उन का कहा, मैंने अखबार में पढ़ा है जिस में उन्होंने कह दिया है कि अगर इंसान का राशन नहीं मिलता तो कुत्ते-बिल्ली का खाओ। वह भी स्वादिष्ट होता है। उन्हें ऐसा नहीं

बोलना चाहिए। यह मैंने अखबार में पढ़ा है और वह अखबार में लाकर रख सकता हूँ। महोदय, वह नए मंत्री हैं। वह हमारे मित्र तो बहुत नहीं हैं, लेकिन मंत्री होने के पहले भी हमारी उन की मुलाकात ठीक से होती थी। हम उन्हें काबिल आदमी मानते हैं, इसलिए नाम नहीं लूंगा। अगर जरूरत पड़ी तो हम झगड़ा कर लेंगे, इस से हमें बचा लीजिए। महोदय, मैं यह काम नहीं करता, लेकिन उन्हें यह नहीं कहना चाहिए था।

महोदय, फ्रेंच रिवोल्यूशन हुआ। प्रधान मंत्री जी, आप याद कर लीजिए। वहां का बादशाह सड़क पर निकला। उस के साथ रानी थी। उसने पूछा कि ये सब क्या चिल्ला रहे हैं, तो लोगों ने कहा कि रोटी मांग रहे हैं। तब उसने पूछा कि क्यों नहीं देते, तो कहा कि रोटी नहीं है, मैडम। तब उसने कहा कि बिस्किट दे दो, केक दे दो। इसी जुबान पर वहां एक क्रांति हो गई, जिसने दुनिया को संदेश दिया। Equality, Liberty और fraternity उसी क्रांति से उपजी हुई चीजें हैं। जिस दिन कुत्ते और बिल्ली वाला यह राशन खाने लगे—हिन्दुस्तान के लोग सब्र वाले लोग हैं, धीरज वाले लोग हैं। हमको कुत्ता भी कह देते हैं, तो बर्दाश्त कर लेते हैं, लेकिन जिस दिन यह गुस्सा भड़केगा, उस दिन के लिए आपको तैयार हो जाना चाहिए। लगता है कि आम जनता का गुस्सा रोज-रोज भड़कता नहीं। फ्रांस में भी नहीं भड़का। कभी-कभी भड़कता है। रूस में भी नहीं भड़का। यहां भी एक-दो बार हल्का-फुल्का भड़का है। रोज-रोज लोग अपना काम करेंगे, अपने बाल-बच्चों को पढ़ाएंगे या सड़क पर उतर कर हल्ला मचाएंगे? यहां का आदमी जरा ज्यादा शांत होता है, वरना इस बोली के बाद जो गरमी आनी चाहिए थी, उसकी आप कल्पना नहीं कर सकते। भयानक किस्म की गरमी आती है। आप अपने मंत्री लोगों को कहिए, नए मंत्री लोगों को कहिए, थोड़ा सलाह दीजिए कि प्रेस से बोलना न आए तो टल कर के चले जाया करो। हम लोग भी जब नए-नए मंत्री हुए थे, तब मोरारजी भाई कहते थे कि तुम्हें बोलना नहीं आता है तो गोल-मटोल बोल दो, ताकि पकड़ में न आया करो।...(व्यवधान)... यह सिखाया जाता है। तो बता देना चाहिए गोल-मटोल बोलना। सारी काबिलियत दिखाना कोई जरूरी नहीं होता है। उन लोगों को सिखाइए। यह बहुत जरूरी है। वे हमारे मित्र हैं, सर। सीख के काबिल बनेंगे, तो हमको भी खुशी होगी। आपकी टीम में भी काबिल आदमी बनेगा। मान लीजिए हम विरोधी भी रहेंगे, तो उससे लड़ने में हमको जितना मजा आएगा, अगर आपकी टीम में सब मूर्ख ही रहेंगे, तो लड़ने में वह मजा नहीं आएगा। इसलिए हम चाहेंगे कि उनको प्रधान मंत्री जी जरूर सिखाइए कि ऐसे नहीं बोला जाता है। ऐसा मन में भी आ जाए तो टल देना चाहिए।

बहरहाल, मैं तो बेमतलब के विषय पर आ गया, सर। यह समय बहुत दुर्दशा का है। सर, 10-12 मिनट रह जाए तो हमें टोक दीजिएगा।...(व्यवधान)...

श्री अमर सिंह (उत्तर प्रदेश): नहीं, नहीं। आप बोलिए।...(व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति: वह आपको समय दे रहे हैं। उनका समय आपको देने वाले हैं।  
...(व्यवधान)...

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र: अभी टाइम है। मैं केवल दो बातें कह कर खत्म करूंगा। एक निवेदन है।

हिन्दुस्तान में दो ही गांधी हुए थे। एक महात्मा गांधी और एक खान अब्दुल गफ्फार खान, सरहदी गांधी, जिनके आचरण, जिनकी बोली, जिनके रहन-सहन, जिनकी मुस्कान और जिनके खान-पान से सिद्धांत टपकता था, कर्म टपकता था। सुभाष चंद्र बोस के आचरण से केवल कर्म टपकता था। जवाहर लाल जी के आचरण से डिजायर बहुत टपकती थी। 1962 में प्रस्ताव लिखा गया था—"The House affirms the firm desire and resolve of the Indian people." अगर नेहरू जी की जगह सुभाष प्रधान मंत्री होते तो साफ लिखते कि, "The House affirms the determination of the Indian people."

एक शब्द से वाक्य और प्रस्ताव के माने बदल जाया करते हैं। कौम के खून की गरमी बदल जाया करती है, लेकिन जब उन्होंने resolve लिख दिया, तभी हम समझ गए। हम लोग बच्चे थे। उन दिनों यूनिवर्सिटी छोड़ रहे थे। हम लोग बहुत बहस करते थे। जवाहर लाल जी हमसे बहुत बड़े थे। हम उनकी इज्जत भी करते थे। वे विद्वान तो बहुत ही बड़े थे। वे इलाहाबाद के थे। इस तरह यह वाक्य पढ़ने के बाद हमने मान लिया कि अब तो कुछ नहीं बढ़ते-बढ़ते उसने आकर हमारी मां की बांह पकड़ ली और कहा कि यह तो हमारा है। आपको जवाब देना पड़ेगा। जवाब कड़ाई से देना पड़ेगा कि खबरदार, मेरी मां की तरफ अगर किसी ने गलत निगाह उठाई, तो वे आंखें फोड़ दी जाएंगी। इससे कम पर नहीं चला करते थे।

सर, मैं जानता हूँ कि इतना हो नहीं पाएगा, लेकिन दो निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ। जैसे Gandhi Peace Foundation है, वैसे सरहदी गांधी Peace Foundation हो। सरहदी गांधी के नाम पर peace नहीं चलेगा। गांधी के नाम पर peace चली, तो सरहदी गांधी के नाम पर unity चलेगी। अगर गांधी को, इधर हमारे भाई लोग नहीं हैं, वरना बड़ा हल्ला मचाते हैं, जब मैं आरएसएस का नाम लेता हूँ, लेकिन आरएसएस और उसकी सोच के लोगों ने यहां गांधी को मार डाला, तो उधर मुस्लिम लीग और उसकी सोच के लोगों ने खान अब्दुल गफ्फार खान को मार डाला। ये लोग केवल राष्ट्र की धरोहर नहीं थे, ये सारी दुनिया की धरोहर थे। विचार एक दिन में नहीं निकलते, नारे एक दिन में नहीं गढ़े जाते। अगर फ्रेंच रिवोल्युशन से नारे निकले थे, तो उन नारों में से लिबर्टी को अमरीका वालों ने चुरा लिया, बाकी यूरोप वालों ने ले लिया, इक्विलिटी को रूस वालों ने ले लिया और मार्क्स के जरिए इक्विलिटी की थीसिस बन गई। उसमें थोड़ा बहुत गांधी जी ने ले लिया और गांधी जी के आंदोलन से जो प्रेम और अहिंसा के पाठ निकले, जो सारी दुनिया को दूसरी तरफ ले गए। एक तरफ आईस्टीन का खोजा हुआ एटम बम,

तो दूसरी तरफ गांधी का खोजा हुआ अहिंसा का हथियार और इन दोनों में से कौन आगे बढ़ता, मैं नहीं जानता, लेकिन मैं चाहता हूँ, प्रधान मंत्री जी, कि खान अब्दुल गफ्फार खान के नाम पर कोई यूनिट सेंटर और बड़ा सेंटर आप बनाएं, ताकि अपने देश के लोग ही नहीं बल्कि बंगल के देश के लोग, जो कड़वाहट के रोज-रोज शिकार हो रहे हैं, थोड़ा-बहुत उसको देखकर प्रभावित हो सकें।

दूसरी बात, उपसभापति जी, मैं लालू जी से कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो नाच-गाने की फोटो वगैरह रेल में लटकाते हैं, क्या ऐसा नहीं हो सकता कि रेल के डिब्बे में कहीं गांधी की फोटो, कहीं जवाहर लाल की फोटो, कहीं जय प्रकाश की फोटो, कहीं पटेल की फोटो, कहीं लोहिया की फोटो, कहीं चन्द्रशेखर आजाद की फोटो, कहीं भगत सिंह की फोटो आप लटका दें? इससे जब बच्चे रेल में कहीं जाएंगे तो देखेंगे और समझेंगे कि वह कौन हैं, क्या हैं, क्योंकि सबसे ज्यादा घूमने वाली चीज यह रेल है।

अंत में, महोदय, मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी से अपने उत्तर प्रदेश के बारे में कहना चाहूंगा कि उसे आप कितना सताओगे? इतना बदनसीब मुख्यमंत्री कोई नहीं होगा, जो अपने तीन साल के शासन के दौरान असेम्बली में 14 बार कांफीडेंस या नो-कांफीडेंस से गुजरा हो। कितना सताओगे? कितनी दूर तक? और, अब सीबीआई। पहले हम यह मानते थे कि सीबीआई एक स्वतंत्र संस्था है, लेकिन जब से क्वात्रोची का केस हुआ है, जबसे झारखंड वालों का केस हो गया, उसके बाद माना यह जाता है कि वह कांग्रेस के पालतू लोगों की संस्था है। उसको लेकर आप जनता की चुनी हुई सरकार, जिसने अभी दस दिन पहले ही जनता की अदालत से, असेंबली से कांफीडेंस लिया है, उसको आप डांवाडोल कर देना चाहते हो? आप क्या समझ रहे हो कि प्रदेश की जनता, देश की जनता इसको नहीं देखती है? आप वहां के गवर्नर को देखिए, क्या करते हैं? संस्कृत यूनिवर्सिटी, बनारस में गए और वहां जाकर के उन्होंने बोला कि तुम लोग संस्कृत क्यों पढ़ते हो, यह तो कथा-वाचकों की भाषा है, भीखमंगों की भाषा है। इसको सुनकर लड़कों ने उसे वहां से खदेड़ा। गवर्नर का यह हाल है। यह बात मैं इसलिए कह रहा हूँ कि उस समय यह कहा गया था कि उत्तर प्रदेश जैसे सूबे का गवर्नर वह नहीं हो सकता। वह सरकारी अधिकारी रहा, पुलिस विभाग में काम करता था और उसकी रोज-रोज बातें खुलने लगीं। इधर आपने 15 दिनों तक माहौल बनाया कि राष्ट्रपति शासन लगेगा, शासन वहां चल नहीं पाया, लेकिन उसी बीच में आपको महसूस हो गया कि आप नहीं लगा सकते। अगर बंगाल से बुद्धदेव भट्टाचार्य, यहां से कारत, येचुरी, किसी कोने से जॉर्ज फर्नांडीज, किसी तरफ से चौटला, किसी तरफ से बादल, किसी तरफ से फारूक अब्दुल्ला, किसी तरफ से जय ललिता, किसी तरफ से चन्द्रबाबू नायडू, किसी तरफ से नवीन पटनायक और किसी तरफ से नीतिश कुमार। जब एक साथ सबकी

आवाज उठने लगी, तब हमको डर लगने लगा कि इस राष्ट्रपति शासन के नाम पर तो देश टूट जाएगा। आपमें भी घबराहट हुई और 356 के मुद्दे पर आधा देश मुलायम सिंह जी के साथ हो गया था। मैं आपसे चाहूंगा कि जब कभी भी आप इस तरह का हल्ला मचाइए, तो जरा देश के नक्शे की तरफ देख लीजिए कि वह आपको पसंद करता भी है कि नहीं। अगर सम्पत्ति की जांच ही करवानी है तो मैं मुलायम सिंह की सारी सम्पत्ति के बारे में जानता हूँ, जब वे बच्चे थे, तब से उनके घर आता-जाता हूँ। अगर आप हमसे पूछ लेंगे तो हम बता देंगे, लेकिन सीबीआई से नहीं...(व्यवधान)

डा० प्रभा ठाकुर (राजस्थान): तब फिर डर किस बात का है?

श्री उपसभापति: आप उन्हें बोलने दीजिए।

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र: डर यह है कि सीबीआई जो होती है, वह जब लालू प्रसाद जी के ... (व्यवधान) मैडम आप पहले सुन लीजिए ... (व्यवधान) जब वह लालू प्रसाद जी के घर जांच करने गई थी तो यह बोलती थी कि यह सोफा सेट! यह सोफा सेट तो 90 लाख का होगा। सीबीआई ऐसा बोलती है, रुपया बढ़ाने के लिए। सीबीआई क्या-क्या करती है, यह मैं जानता हूँ, इसलिए सीबीआई नहीं, आप अपनी संसदीय समिति बैठा लीजिए, कोई न्यायिक जांच करवा लीजिए, लेकिन अगर यह बात चल गई तो बहुत बुरा हो जाएगा।

[उपसभाध्यक्ष (प्रो० पी० जे० कुरियन) पीठसीन हुए]

आज सीबीआई आपकी नौकरी कर रही है, कल को हमारी करेगी और अगर हम आपके पीछे उसे लगा देंगे तो बहुत मुश्किल हो जाएगी। हम आपको धन्यवाद देते हैं और अपनी बात भी समाप्त करते हैं। बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): Now, Shri Sitaram Yechury.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY (West Bengal): Thank you very much, Sir. I rise here to broadly support the Address given by the President of India, but with a very serious caveat. I think, the Address, which is a customary Address of his Government, and what the Government has done, and what it intends to do in the coming year, has a very serious omission in our opinion, which actually under mines the very basis which led to the formation of the UPA Government, and this omission is both, a dangerous omission and a significant omission, and this refers to the communal situation in our country. The last few months have seen the outbreak of communal violence in various parts of the country, and parts



3.00 P.M

of the country, which hitherto have not been plagued by such communal violence. I refer to the various cities in the State of Karnataka which have suddenly seen the outbreak of this communal violence. We have seen this violence being reported from various parts of Madhya Pradesh. We have seen the recent violent clashes that have taken place in various important cities of Uttar Pradesh and all this is happening not sporadically, but, we believe, it is happening on the basis of a certain political planning, which is a dangerous situation that is emerging in this country, and not recognising this or ignoring this reality, will pose a very grave danger to this Government, and this Government will suffer. Thus, not only for the Government's sake, but also for the sake of the people and for the sake of the country this must be recognised. Why I am saying this is because there is a concerted effort to try and whip up communal passions and communal polarization as the means or method for garnering political support or regaining certain political space. The very formation of this UPA Government was based on this fact that the country needed to be protected from such an assault, and there is a need to actually preserve and strengthen our secular, democratic foundation, and that is why, the UPA was born. This is the ground reality which I would request the Government and the Ruling Coalition also to consider. There was a time when the leading political party at that point of time won only 195 seats under the leadership of late Shri Rajiv Gandhi, but did not stake a claim to form the Government. Even if they had done, they would not have mustered the majority. But today, with only 145 MPs, they are leading a Coalition that we are supporting from the outside, and that is the ground reality, a shift, that must be understood. People who have opposed the Congress, continue to oppose the congress, continue to fight against them and win elections, like us, in Bengal or Kerala, but are willing to support this Coalition because we want to preserve the secular, democratic character of India and strengthen this secular, democratic character, and it is this reality that must be kept in mind. And only by carrying together all the secular forces in the county, can we meet this objective. In this background if this proper lesson is not learnt, and in this background, if this omission in the President's Address is not corrected, I think, we are doing a grave injustice to the present realities in our country. I would warn this Government, particularly in a situation where these efforts are being

made, that every political party in the country has the right to propagate its ideology, but we have to decide which we support and which we oppose on the basis of our political positions. All of us do that. I may have grave objection to the entire usage of the term "Prakhar Hindutava" to be the political mascot of a political party for its electoral gains, but they have their right. I respect that right. But I have the right to oppose it, which is what they all have to respect. But in this process, to ignore this reality, I think, is a grave peril for the country and its future, and this correction will have to be made in the President's Address. And I hope that the Government will accept this point, and realise that this has happened in 2007. The Government has itself announced the 150th anniversary celebrations of 1857. I am drawing the attention to the 1857 struggle because it is that big struggle of the people at that point of time, which was characterised as the First War of Independence, which saw the broad-based unity, for the first time, amongst all our religions, all our nationalities, all our languages etc. And I remember, Sir, there was a British chronicler called Mr. Alexander Lowe. He was lamenting, as he was chronicling the upsurge what did he say? I quote:

"The bigoted Rajput, the fanatical Brahmin, the cow worshipper and the cow eater, the pig hater and the pig eater, have all come together against the empire, and this is something we can't allow if the British wishes to continue its rule."

Thus followed the famous or the infamous 'divide and rule policy', which the British perfected. Today, when you are observing 1857's 150th anniversary, it is this unity of the Indian people that needs to be not only cherished but also preserved and strengthened. And in that background, such a glaring omission that comes in the President's Address, I think, is a very grave error. That needs to be corrected, and I hope that the Government will accept this and, then, do the necessary correction.

But, Sir, the main content of the President's Address dealt with the economic situation in our country. The Budget has been presented since, and, I am sure, we will have a longer discussion on the Budget. But see the direction in which the President of India presented a shift contained in long paragraphs, from number one to number 23, which, in fact, are all linked together to project the work of the Government in consolidating the process of strengthening the economic fundamentals in our country and

leading up to the Eleventh Plan with ambitious targets. I have no dispute with the targets that they have set up. But what is the overall claim that the President of India has made in his entire Address? The thrust which we are told, and the country is told, is to have a trajectory of high economic growth, which is, both, inclusive and non-inflationary. This is the twin objective that has been stated in the President's Address. But this twin objective must also be seen in the backdrop of the Common Minimum Programme which this Government has adopted as a National Common Minimum Programme, where we have promised, where the Government has promised, which we have supported, and continue to support, that we will work to see a shift in the focus of economic reforms in our country, a shift from being solely pre-occupied with corporate profits towards improving people's welfare. This is the objective from what we can understand, and it is this objective which, unfortunately, is not articulated in the way it ought to in the President's Address, and since hon. Prime Minister is here, I draw his attention also to the fact that he himself has commented a number of times that we should have the liberalisation process and the reform process with a human face. It is that human face, Sir, that I have been searching in the President's long Address to actually try and see where that human face is and what is the character of that human face or what is the status of that human face.

If you look at our own Government's submitted Economic Survey, what does it say? The shift has to be towards people's welfare. The suicides by farmers is continuing. Janeshwarji, with all the experience at his command, has drawn our attention to the actual status of the real India and the real Indian people today. I don't want to repeat that. But if you look at the overall thrust in the economy, we have promised in the Common Minimum Programme that health, education and basic questions of food security, all those should be addressed. It is a shocking fact that today the *per capita* availability of foodgrains is lower than what it was during the period of the Second World War. Today the *per capita* availability of foodgrains is lower than what it was following the Bengal famine. Now, this is a situation which needs to be seriously corrected. With the decline in your agricultural growth rates—in recent years many a time it was negative—the entire thrust ought to have been towards actually strengthening public investment in agriculture so that we can feed ourselves and we can ensure our food security. But what do we see

in this Budget? The increase in the allocation for agriculture comes to 15 per cent, given the Budget's own calculations, with a nominal growth rate—a nominal growth rate means the real growth rate—projected at 9.2 per cent and inflation rate projected at a little over six per cent. With a nominal growth rate of 15 per cent or 16 per cent, the allocation increases only by 15 per cent, which means that there is no extra allocation to agriculture at all. The allocations for agriculture will grow according to the growth of the economy. If that is the case, what is the thrust that we are giving in order to ensure that there is food security in our country? In a situation, if this is not immediately tackled, I think the economic fundamentals and the foundations that the President talked about in his Address, all these ambitious schemes that we want to achieve in the Eleventh Plan, neither we can achieve them, leave alone achieving them, nor can we sustain levels of economic growth that we have for the last couple of years or so. So, there is a belief that this is actually undermining the very process of the shift in the focus of the economic reforms that we spoke of. That is not happening and this needs to be seriously corrected. If you look at the Economic Survey figures that they have given us on the various issues that the President has touched, it is really appalling. The total expenditure on the social sector, as a percentage of GDP, declined from 28.26 per cent in 2001-02 to 27.19 per cent in the Budget Estimates of 2006-07. As far as the thrust is concerned, when you are talking about the *aam admi*, when you are talking in terms of improving the welfare of the people, what we find in actual allocations is the opposite that is happening. What is worse is that, in recent years, the actual expenditures have been far below the Budget Estimates. Now, when the actual figures for this year's Budget really come out, maybe, the actual spending may be much less than the allocations which are already lower. It is in this background that we are very concerned and we want the Government to note this and correct this. We promised six per cent of the GDP on education from 2.79 per cent that this Government inherited. It has now grown up to 2.87 per cent and that is again, as my hon. colleague has mentioned, after the cess. The Common Minimum Programme has promised to increase health expenditure to, at least, three per cent of the GDP from 1.26 per cent that it has inherited. In 2006-07, according to the Budget documents, it is a mere 1.39 per cent. An allocation of 1.39 per cent to public health, not only to public health but also to the entire health expenditure, including research, etc., for

100 crore plus population is abysmal. You can't really think of building an India which needs to take off into a trajectory of higher growth with the base of the pyramid being so unhealthy. If this is the status of the health of the pyramid at the bottom, then we can well imagine what is the take-off that we are talking about. So, in all these sectors the allocations are really not matching with the declaration of intent that this Government and the Common Minimum Programme has made and we don't think that this serious mismatch is a product of some errors in calculations that have been done. But there seems to be a mindset which has agreed that the Common Minimum Programme will be the national policy, but in implementation we will not adhere to it. I don't want the country to come to such a conclusion because I hold the Prime Minister personally and the others in very high respect. The Common Minimum Programme was useful for the Government to be formed; but once the Government is formed, it is no longer a document that needs to be implemented. This will be a very sorry state of affairs if that were to happen. I think this is the impression that the Government will have to correct.

The other issue concerning the intention conveyed by the President of India was with regard to the status of employment. It is very good that the National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme is in operation and the declaration of intent is to increase it from 200 to 330 districts; and the allocation for that has unfortunately increased from Rs. 11,300 crores to Rs. 12,000 crores only. But the Finance Minister has assured us that in case there is greater demand, more money will be released. I don't know from where he will find that money. Anyway, we hope this allocation will be increased. If we are sincere that we want to expand the scheme, allocations have to be revised and increased so that we can make it effective in these districts. Overall, what is the actual employment situation in our country? The Economic Survey tells us that between 1994 and 2004, in the organised sector, the growth of employment was minus 0.38 per cent. The 61st round of the National Sample Survey, which the Economic Survey quotes, tells us that except for one category, that too in urban India, in all other categories the rate of unemployment has grown very sharply. The worst is women unemployment which is a clear vindication of the fact that as the reforms have been leading to jobless growth or job loss growth, as I would like to say, the first victims have been women and they are the ones who are losing their jobs and their unemployment rate, according to the National

Sample Survey, is 9.1 per cent. So, if this is the actual condition of the people, this is where, I think, we have to understand, and particularly this Government, that India today has been given a historic opportunity because of our demographic composition. Today we have what even the United Nations World Development Report has characterised as a fantastic demographic opportunity to utilise our strength which is our youth. Fifty-four per cent of India's population is below the age of 25 and this is our future. Give them good education, give them good health, give them good skills; it is they who are taking India into a high growth trajectory. But if you are not going to invest there, it is this very youth, instead of being your advantage, can turn to be your biggest disadvantage and also turn to be your biggest menace because if the energies of the youth are not constructively used, the channels in which they will find expression, whether it be in terrorism, whether it be in extremism, whether it be in all unhealthy attitudes, will be a danger and it is this danger that will preoccupy the entire working and functioning of the Government in future if you don't invest now.

There was a debate, Sir, way back in 1830's in the United States of America. I remember, Thomas Jefferson, with the farsightedness of the rising bourgeois at that point of time, just in case you accuse me why I am quoting him, had brought in a Bill called "Bill for the More General Diffusion of Knowledge." The American Congress rejected that. But, then, in those elections, there was one Reverend Washington—not the Washington, another Washington—who was contesting from Buffalo, one of the constituencies. The whole content of the election campaign was on whom should be spent more, on educating the youth or on sergeants or policemen. That is the choice in the society. Either you give them education, skills and make them productively useful or you push them into crime, you push them into anarchy, and in order to control them you eventually spend more. So, while we would not, at any point of time, argue to lower the guard on our internal security or external security, for heaven's sake, don't neglect spending on the social sectors because they are India's future. This is where we want this Government and the Budget to focus. I must say, we are very much disappointed. We will discuss those details later. My colleagues will speak on that. But we are very much disappointed that the actual allocations that were made in these sectors are not matching the aspirations of the Indian people. And

what is worse is that this has happened in a year where it was possible for you to increase the allocation. We think that it is a criminal wasting of an opportunity that the Budget did not do that this year and this I am saying because you had a phenomenal growth in your Governmental revenues-- I congratulate the Government on that--of 27 per cent or something in that range. Your revenues have increased. But your overall increase in expenditure in the social sector of the entire economy is projected only at 16 per cent. Out of 27 per cent of your earnings, 16 per cent is what you want to spend. Okay; I can understand the concern of the Government for fiscal prudence. But in expressing concern for fiscal prudence, the Government should not be a victim of fiscal fundamentalism. We are supporting this Government against religious fundamentalism. But we do not want the Government to be a victim of fiscal fundamentalism. In the name of fiscal reform or fiscal prudence, for God's sake, please do not cut back on social expenditures because that will be disastrous for the economy and for the country.

The next aspect, Sir, is, (1), if the inclusive growth is to be the objective. then, these expenditures will have to increase drastically. If the other objective is to have this high growth trajectory without inflation, we are happy that now the Government has belatedly accepted some of our suggestions. But if they had accepted them when we suggested them, I think, the election results might have been slightly different. The day after Punjab cast its vote, you reduced the prices of petrol and diesel. The day after the election results in Uttaranchal came, then, you banned the future trading in wheat and rice...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (PROF. P.J. KURIEN): That means that there is no politics in economics.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: It essentially makes a bad political economy. If only these were done earlier! Anyway, that is a different point. But the fact that they have done this is good. But this, by itself, is not sufficient unless all the essential commodities are removed from the futures market. Just as Janeswarji has told us, the way the value has shot up in the futures market in the last three years, any economist, worth his name, can tell you that futures trading can be allowed only in those commodities where there is abundant supply and not in those where shortage is known to exist. And this is an elementary common sense. On the basis of this common sense, you know where there is a potential for shortage, you

don't allow those commodities to enter the futures market. But that is exactly what has happened. I will give you one example. In Gaurgum, the total open interest was ten times more than the overall production in the country. In the case of chilli, the total stock in godown was 1500 tonnes, whereas the open interest was more than 15,000 tonnes in December, 2006. If this won't push up prices, then, what will? Again, in the open market, if you look at it, on the day of the Budget, when the Finance Minister was announcing that futures trading would be stopped in wheat, what was the situation? The trading was allowed by the Exchange on that day, and the price of wheat increased by Rs. 17 per quintal. This happens on the 28th of February, when the Government was announcing the ban of future trading in the case of wheat. So what we want from this Government now is (a) to enlarge and bring in all essential commodities under this ban; (b) to also tell us whether in the month of April,—there are now contracts existing for the months of April, May and June—these contracts will be allowed or not. They should not be allowed. If the Government has announced its policy position, they cannot allow these contracts to be honoured. Therefore, the Government will have to make a positive assurance to this House. But again while saying that, I only want to draw the attention of the Government, through you, Sir, that the entire analysis of why inflation is taking place in our country at this rate, we think, is faulty. It is actually barking up the wrong tree. We are told that inflation is taking place because there is a greater liquidity in the economy. In other words, we are told that the purchasing power in the hands of the people has increased, the supply is not matching and, hence, there is inflation. This is a cruel joke, Sir. People are dying of starvation; people are committing suicides, and you are giving a theory that money supply has increased. Yes, it may have increased for a certain section. I am not disputing that. Definitely, it has increased for a certain section. But, then the cause for this inflationary spiral is not really the excessive demand and unmatched supply. But the cause is, this inflation is being led by the rise in prices of essential commodities, and it is the rise in prices of essential commodities that has to be curbed. And it that has to be curbed, we want this futures trading in all essential commodities should be banned and the Public Distribution System should be strengthened so that these commodities can reach the people in order not only to save them from their misery but also to make sure that the pressure on prices is not continued.



Having said this, there are other issues in the field of economics which the hon. President has spoken of, and one of them is specifically concerning the Special Economic Zones. In paragraph 19, the President talks of a new rehabilitation policy. Very good. But, on this issue, since also references have been alluded to us by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, I believe, earlier or even otherwise in the media exists a campaign that there is one stand that we take in Bengal and another stand we take in the rest of the country, and I think that has to be put to rest. Let me try to put it to rest in this way. I am recollecting a joke, Sir, please take it as only a joke and do not allude to it other things. Hon. Mr. Jairam Ramesh is here. He has heard me telling this joke earlier. So, I would ask him not to laugh before I finish the joke. ...*(Interruptions)*... Sir, I believe, at one point of time the venerable Pope decided to send a Bishop on a goodwill mission to the United States. So, before sending the Bishop-- what Janeshwarji has said just now-- the Pope warned the Bishop to be very careful of the media, they are very notorious in the United States. Therefore, he told him to fudge the questions, like you were advising. He said, "Don't be direct. Don't answer it back." The Bishop took this advice and went. As soon as he landed at the airport, a barrage of media people came and one mischievous person asked, "Hon. Bishop, does your itinerary in New York include a visit to a night club?" The Bishop was scandalized, naturally. But, he remembered the Pope's advice. Then he asked, somehow to avoid the question,-- he thought he did a very clever thing-- "Are there any night clubs in New York?" and he walked off. The next day, in the newspapers the heading comes up, upon landing, the first question the Bishop asked, "Are there any night clubs in New York?" So, Sir, please, therefore, don't distort our position in Bengal and our position in the rest of the country on the basis of such distortions of our positions or misreporting. Sir, as far as the Special Economic Zones are concerned, and as far as what we would want to practise and within the constitutional limitations that we want to practise in Bengal or anywhere else where the CPM is heading the Governments, it is the following. The first thing that we would suggest is, we are now having a land acquisition policy, a law that was drafted way back in 1894. Today in 2007, land is being acquired on the basis of a piece of legislation of 1894! That needs to be reviewed, a new law has to be brought into place which will incorporate legally the status of the land-owners who will not only be given a rehabilitation package but also

probably a stake in the future of that land for whatever purpose that it may be acquired for. Now, this is something which must be seriously undertaken by the Government. This is a long-term issue.

The immediate issues, as far as the SEZs are concerned, are this. First is the issue of rehabilitation and the compensation that we have given to the land-owners. In West Bengal, Sir, let me tell you, the compensation is one-and-a-half times of the current market value of the land. The compensation ought to be given, like we are giving there in West Bengal not only to the land-owners but to all those dependent on land for their livelihood, like sharecroppers, agriculture labour. And, unless you include them in the package, you will be doing a great degree of disservice to that section.

Secondly, Sir, once this compensation issue has been resolved in this fashion, as far as the current SEZ law is concerned, we think, there is a very serious problem on the entire pattern of land use for the SEZ that has been announced. According to the law today, Sir, only 25 per cent of the land in an SEZ needs to be used for production. The rest of the 75 per cent can be used for development; what it really means is, for real estate speculation and development. This, we think, is a very wrong policy and it has to be changed. At least 50 per cent of the land has to be used for production and of the remaining 50 per cent, 25 per cent of the land must be used for providing infrastructure like schools, colleges, hospitals, etc., and only 25 per cent of the land may be allowed to be developed as residential and commercial places. This change has to be brought.

Thirdly, Sir, the tax concessions that have been announced. With no offence meant to any particular corporate or entity, this august House must give proper attention and consideration to the fact that we all are very proud of India's IT sector growing very well and rapidly, that has been our pride in the last few years, the IT industry now has a tax holiday till 2009. They are enjoying the tax holiday today. For the country and the people, a sector that is growing so rapidly and so well, should it not contribute to the Government, to the revenues to be used for others? They are already having a tax holiday. Now, you are allowing them to have IT SEZs. That means, from 2009, for another fifteen years, they will have another tax holiday! Does it make any sense, Sir? You are talking in terms of improving people's welfare. You are talking in terms of

*aam aadmi*. Are you not going to collect what is legitimately due to the Government and the people from a sector that is doing very well? But, instead, the tax concessions that have been offered now, have reached and absurd level where a builder can build in the SEZ, and buy raw materials from the market without paying any duties on the raw materials! The cess has been increased by 1 per cent on the tax, apart from the 2 per cent that was here earlier; they do not have to pay that also, for instance! They do not have to pay any duties. No duty on cement, no duty on steel, but they can construct these SEZs. If that is the case, then why would any industrialisation take place in any place other than the SEZ? You are creating a serious distortion in the country where all the progress of industrialisation will be confined to only these areas. That is why such a scramble from the States. Because, people realise, there is not going to be any focused investment outside the SEZs. And, you are going to worsen the geographic economic inequalities in the country; and remember, Sir, geographic-economic inequalities are the source that feeds a lot of fissiparous movements and tendencies in our country. A lot of separatist tendencies in our country are fed by these regional economic imbalances.

So, the SEZ policy cannot promote regional economic imbalance in such a massive way. These tax concessions will have to be reconsidered and reviewed. Therefore, we want the Government to seriously consider this in the light of the President's own reference in para 19 of his Speech.

Finally, Sir, as far as the SEZs are concerned, there is one concern that you have to decide upon right now and have a ceiling on these SEZs. Please, for heaven's sake, do not say that so and so country is doing so well, why are you opposing it over here. We are talking as Indians in India and we are talking about India. We will join issue on that score as well, but I do not think time will permit. But every SEZ in the country that is being talked about—I am talking about China, all of them often hurl this back at us, 'if China can do it, why you are stopping India from doing it'—all SEZs in China are Government-owned. Well, do it! You own them. You develop the infrastructure, let the Government develop the infrastructure, let the Government run them and then invite corporate entities to come and start production. But here, you are handing over the land, you are handing over your assets, and giving them tax concessions. And, this is not really a

prudent policy for industrialisation. And, it will create tremendous distortions in our country which we cannot afford, and we want the Government to seriously rethink about this.

Then, Sir, the President spoke seriously about the infrastructure condition in our country. Yes, hydro potential has been talked about. I remember, hon. Prime Minister was also present at that point of time when we discussed the Indo-U.S. nuclear deal and we talked of the untapped hydro-electric potential in our country, something to the tune of 50,000 MW, which is still there. And we talked of our friendly country, Nepal, our neighbour, which has a potential of 80,000 MW. If you add these two together, 1,25,000 MW or more! If that potential is there, Sir, we should put our effort on that and not let our energies be wasted in the direction of wanting to cement this Indo-U.S. nuclear deal and shift towards nuclear energy production, which, by far, is the most expensive.

So, this is something that has to be seriously considered. The President has talked of the civil aviation sector in para 31 and he spoke of the efforts being made to modernise the sector. But, Sir, I would only want to ask, through you, the Government that the decision to modernise our metro airports and our 35 non-metro airports was taken by the Government and announced publicly some six months ago by the Group of Ministers, which I believe the hon. Prime Minister himself heads. And this decision till now has not seen the light of day. And that is why our suspicion till now has not seen the light of day. And that is why our suspicion grows whether there is any effort to try and bypass what has already been decided by the Government. Now, what is that force that is not allowing the Government to implement its own decisions? If you have decided six months ago that the Airports Authority will modernise all your non-metro airports, they why is it that no movement is taking place on that and somewhere that file is struck? And who is this authority that is holding back the decisions that the Government is taking? And if they are holding back, which is the interest that they are protecting? This is a serious point. You cannot have a Government which takes a decision, the Group of Ministers takes a decision, but that is not being allowed to be implemented. We think immediately this situation has to be rectified. Sir, today you go to any of our airports, particularly our metro airports. The congestion is such that it is somehow miraculous that you do not have mishaps. And I do not want these mishaps to happen. But why is it

so? Sir, three days ago I was in a plane where the Captain announced that we were 21 in the sequence to takeoff. 21, Sir! And there are landings also! ... (*Interruptions*)... Definitely, you have congestion to such an extent that for an hour or so you are in the air. And imagine 21 planes at a distance of 1000 ft. from each other, all of them flying around. If one pilot makes one error, like a pack of cards, we will all collapse. We are playing seriously with lives. Therefore, please, this modernisation plan, which was decided by the Government, I want this to be immediately implemented.

Sir, there are other issues which the hon. President has taken up which I would want to touch upon. And in three long paragraphs, he has talked about the recommendation of the Sachar Committee Report, the plan for the minorities. The Budget has also announced some measures. The adequacies of that we will discuss subsequently. But on this issue, Sir, what I would want the Government to please take into account is that for the minorities, for the Muslim minorities and for the other minorities, there ought to be a sub-plan on the lines of the Tribal sub-plan in our country that we have. That is, out of all developmental expenditures that are undertaken in the country, a proportion of that, according to the population proportion, must be devoted for those areas where the minorities live. We have already this for tribals and I think for minorities as well this is the manner in which, I think, we should go about on the basis of all the other details we have. Then I come to the four essential areas where we think attention must be paid. One is the question of their economic development, the second is about employment and income generation, the third and the very important area is the question of education and the fourth, a concern which is life and death question for them, is the question of security. Now in these four areas, there are concrete suggestions that my party has. When that discussion is slated to come certainly, we will participate in that and give those suggestions, which will also be conveyed to the Government. But the sub-plan for the minorities, that should be the perspective in which the Government should move and I hope that they will be taken up. Well, Sir, before I come to the final point regarding the foreign policy direction, there are some other important issues which have not been referred to or referred to in such a way that we are not really very happy with the manner in which the proposals to carry them forward have been made by the hon. President.

One is concerning the fact that there is no mention about Women's Reservation Bill. Now, this is something we have been talking about, the country has been talking about. For ten years we have all been talking about it and the Common Minimum Programme is committed to saying that we will bring the Bill. We urge the Government to bring the Bill as it stands, let us decide who is for it and who is not for it. We understand the predicament of the Government. We fully share and sympathise—in fact, I am using the word 'sympathise' deliberately—with the Prime Minister's predicament. He does not want a situation; very correctly, we support him on that that there should not be any Cabinet colleagues opposing it. But, whatever, be that situation let it come to the House and let the country see the white and black of the whole situation.

Then, on the National Judicial Commission, Sir. The hon. President of India has noted it but, Sir, the Constitution of the National Judicial Commission must be comprising of representatives from the judiciary, from the executive, from the legislature and the Bar. This has to be done Sir, for appointment, transfer of judges and for judicial accountability. It cannot be only one wing of our democracy. All the three wings and the Bar, all four of them must be involved in this process and we hope that will be done Sir. Finally, one of our colleagues, Mr. Arjun Kumar Sengupta is here. He headed a Committee for the unorganised labour, for the protection of the unorganised sector in our country and a draft was prepared on the Social Security Bill. I do not know what has happened to that draft, what is being discussed about it. But why is it not coming before the House? Social security in the unorganised sector is an important issue and this must be brought in. Finally, Sir, on the foreign policy, at the outset, I would like to compliment the Government on many of the positive initiatives that they have taken. I think, your Look East policy; the question of consolidating South Asian relations with our neighbours, your SAARC Summit that is going to be held here, all this is fine, which is good, we compliment the Government. But on the larger picture the vision which ought to determine the nature of our foreign policy, which ought to be and the Prime Minister has himself taken this initiative and it is a very good initiative of the IBSA *i.e.* India, Brazil, South Africa, and at the other level these talks that are going on between India, China and Russia is also important and very good positive development. We would wish the Government would work actively towards

merging these two processes, that is IBSA and Indo-China, Russia. Merge them together and transform IBSA into the BRICS. By BRICS, I mean, Sir, Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa. These are the bricks of a modern new world. These bricks are the foundation of a multi-polar world that we want. These are the bricks for opposing uni-polarity, for opposing any imposition of hegemony and it is these bricks that have to be strengthened for India to contribute in the evolution of a multi-polar world and it is these bricks that need to be strengthened. I urge the Government to move in this direction and implicit in this urging of the Government to move in this direction, Sir, is the fact that we should not again be a victim of arm twisting by the country which claims to be the only super power in the world. We have had long discussion on the Indo-US Nuclear Deal. Our apprehensions have been heard. They have been replied by the Prime Minister and all of us are waiting to see that we do not get into any sort of a situation where a carrot and stick policy is put before us, where we only see the carrot but we feel the stick. That sort of a pressure by US imperialism on us cannot be accepted and that is a danger that the Government should avoid for the sake of India's future. So finally, Sir, the conclusion which the President of India has urged all of us and I quote from his speech, he says, "I hope you will", you meaning all of us, the Members of Parliament, this is the President saying and I quote, Sir, "I hope you will put to good use the power at your disposal in the interest of our people and our nation." It is that Sir, I want to make good use of by telling this Government to please heed to these points that we have raised and to please rise to the occasion. Two years that are left today, let them be used for improving the welfare of the people and strengthening our economic fundamentals. Sir, this is also the year when the centenary of the Satyagraha is being celebrated. Now, Gandhiji is often referred to and very correctly referred to but remember once when he told all of us that his final objective would be to wipe the last tear from the last eye of the last Indian who is crying. It is that tear that has to be wiped and it is that situation that has to be created where tears need not be generated. It is important to tackle all the areas that are cause for tears today, whether it is the question of internal security, whether it is the question of our fight against terrorism, whether it is the question of economic security of our people, whether it is the question of preventing suicides of our farmers, whether it is a question of malnutrition in our children. It is appalling that we have a situation where 80 per cent

of our women are anaemic, where 40 per cent or more of our children suffer from malnutrition. Unless we are able to correct all these ills for which we have the opportunity we cannot become a developed country. We have a 9+ per cent growth rate, you have 27 per cent increase in your revenue. So, please, for heaven's sake, as I said earlier, let us not be victims of fiscal fundamentalism. You maintain your fiscal prudence. But, you have the opportunity. Spend this money so that we can, actually, create a new India. Sir, 250 years down the line from the Battle of Plassey, 150 years down the line from 1857, 60 years down the line from 947, all three occasions converge this year. Let there be a shift in the focus of the reforms that the Government is following. Let there be a shift in the focus of the policies that the Government is following. A shift which will ensure a better livelihood for our people and it is this shift that is important if we want to prevent further the growing hiatus between the shining India and the suffering India. The gap between the shining India and the suffering India is widening and this gap has to be bridged and the real India has to be built and for that we have the opportunity. Please make use of that opportunity and build that and that, I think, is the right spirit with which this Motion of Thanks to the President is being addressed by us. Thank you.

SHRI P.G. NARAYANAN (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I thank the hon. President for his Address to the Joint Session of Parliament. During the President's Address the Government tried to present a rosy picture of the economy. But the real situation is totally different. Sir, this only shows that this Government is cut off from *aam aadmi* i.e., common man on whose name the Government was formed. The prices of essential commodities have gone up manifold after the Government assumed its office. But the hon. Finance Minister managed to keep inflation at 6.5 per cent. There is every reason to believe that there is a manipulation in arriving at the figure. That is why I have been demanding for the past two years that there should be a White Paper on the methodology devised by the Finance Ministry to assess the inflation rate. The prices of pulses, edible oils, vegetables, particularly onion, wheat and rice, are skyrocketing. Ever since the hon. Finance Minister announced the duty concession to *idli* mix powder, the *idli* has become beyond the reach of the common man. Sir, *Urad daal*, which goes into making of *idli*, is priced between Rs. 70 and Rs. 80 per K.g. The farmers are committing suicides everyday, because



they are unable to bear the debt burden. Police and army, who are supposed to maintain the law and order, are involved in committing fake encounters in Kashmir Valley. Thousands of youth, innocent men and women are being killed in these encounters. The elected Governments are sought to be destabilized by using the Office of the Governor, despite the SC's strictures. An IB official is made Governor of U.P., and the dances to the tune of the Central Government. Whenever the Union Home Minister wants a report, the governor says that the constitutional machinery has failed in U.P. He is acting as the handmaiden of the Central Government, and the Congress Party wants the world to believe that there will be free and fair polls in U.P. only under Governor's rule. But this is not true. The fact of the matter is otherwise.

(MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair)

The Central Government want only allowed Italian businessman Quattrocchi to defreeze his bank accounts in London, last year. I demand a JPC probe into the role of the Government of India and the CBI in this episode. Concrete steps should be taken to extradite Quattrocchi to India and try him in courts of law. I know the UPA Government will not do it because the Congress Party has lot of things to hide in the Bofors deal. Quattrocchi was arrested by the Argentina Government on 6th February. But the Government of India suppressed this information about Quattrocchi's arrest for full 17 days. I want to know who the Government is trying to shield. The whole country knows the links between Quattrocchi and the UPA Chairman.

The Congress Party has been voted out of power in Punjab and Uttaranchal. People are going to reject Congress in UP elections also. That will be the starting point for the fall of the UPA Government in Delhi.

My speech will not be complete without a mention about the discrimination of Tamil Nadu by successive Congress Governments at the Centre. The Congress Party did not constitute the tribunal on the Cauvery issue for more than 20 years. Now, the final award of the Cauvery Tribunal has come on 5th February. As per law, this final award has to be notified in the official gazette of the Government within stipulated time. The Tribunal also directed to establish the Cauvery Management Board and the Cauvery Water Regulation Committee for implementing this award. This Government

have not taken any steps to establish these two bodies. We are not fully satisfied with the final award of the Tribunal because it is more beneficial to Karnataka than Tamil Nadu. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI B.K. HARIPRASAD (Karnataka): Sir, he is misleading the House. *(Interruptions)*.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Hariprasad, let there be a friendly discussion. *(Interruptions)* Let there be a proper and friendly discussion.

SHRI B.K. HARIPRASAD: Please allow me to speak. *(Interruptions)* Please yield for a minute. *(Interruptions)* Sir, I have no objection. Let him demand to gazette whatever the outcome of the Tribunal is. But he should not say that it has done more justice to Karnataka. It is gross injustice to Karnataka.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That you can point out when you speak. *(Interruptions)* Mr. Narayanan, please proceed. *(Interruptions)* Mr. Hariprasad, you will also get an opportunity to speak. *(Interruptions)* You will definitely get an opportunity. *(Interruptions)* Mr. Poojary, please sit down. You can say whatever you want to say when your turn comes. Mr. Narayanan can say whatever he wants to say, but within the limits. You will also be provided an opportunity when your turn comes. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY (Karnataka): Sir, what has happened to the Short Duration Notice? *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is a different issue. We are now on the Motion of Thanks. *(Interruptions)* No; no. Please sit down. *(Interruptions)* Mr. Hariprasad, please sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI B.K. HARIPRASAD: Sir, this is a very sensitive issue. ...*(Interruptions)*... Let them not provoke us. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No; no. There is no question on provoking. ...*(Interruptions)*... Don't get provoked. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI B.K. HARIPRASAD: We are not getting provoked. ...*(Interruptions)*... They are trying to provoke us. ...*(Interruptions)*... This is not the way. This is very sensitive issue.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. He is within his right to

say that. ...*(Interruptions)*... Mr. Hariprasad, please sit down. ...*(Interruptions)*... Mr. Narayanan, please continue. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI P.G. NARAYANAN: Till the injustice meted out to Tamil Nadu is rectified by the Tribunal and the Supreme Court, we are entitled to get water according to the Tribunal Award. So, I demand that the final Award should be notified in the official Gazette of the Government at once to facilitate implementation of this Award. I have my grave doubts whether this Government will notify the final order and implement it because the Congress has more political stakes in Karnataka than in Tamil Nadu.

Sir, I would also like to take serious exception to the Railway Ministry's decision to deny freight corridor to Chennai. A separate railway freight corridor is being constructed from Delhi to Mumbai and Delhi to Kolkata at the cost of Rs. 30,000/- crores. But, Chennai will not be in the priority of the Government. Sir, my State has been given a raw deal. My State is always given a step-motherly treatment insofar as railway projects are concerned. Sir, Rs. 31,000 crores have been earmarked as outlay for the current year on several railway projects. Out of this, Tamil Nadu is getting only Rs. 700 crores.

Sir, I now come to power projects. Ultra mega power projects of 4000 megawatts capacity are being implemented in Madhya Pradesh and Gujarat. NTPC has created 30,000 megawatt power plants in the whole country, mostly in Northern and Western India. Sir, not even a single mega power project has been created in Tamil Nadu. The same is the case with NHPC. Sir, the ultra mega power projects will never be taken up in Tamil Nadu. Sir, the Government is worried only about the energy security in Northern India and Western India. It is a well-known fact that Northern India has large deposits of coal. So, thermal power capacity can be created out of this. The perennial rivers of Gangetic plain have immense potential for hydel power. Despite this, the natural gas discovered in Bombay High was taken to Northern India during Late Shri Rajiv Gandhi's regime. Now, a large gas find has been discovered off Kakinada coast in Southern Andhra Pradesh. I am told that the Kakinada gas find is bigger than the Bombay High. But, this Government has allowed the gas from Kakinada to be taken to Gujarat, Maharashtra and Uttar Pradesh.

I would warn the Government of discrimination against Southern India.

The Government should give up the move to set up a pipeline to transfer Kakinada gas to Maharashtra, Gujarat and Uttar Pradesh and instead put up 10000 megawatt shore based power project in Kakinada and power should be supplied to electrically starved Southern grid. This is my demand.

Sir, the Supreme Court had ordered the Vajpayee Government to link the Himalayan rivers with peninsular rivers to end the recurring problem of floods in Northern India and drought in Southern India. But I am sorry to state that both the national Parties, BJP and Congress, are opposed to these projects. These projects will promote national unity.

Sir, Vajpayee Government, instead of implementing the directions of the Supreme Court, this is, river-linking project, conceived another project at a cost of 40,000 crores to link Ken and Betwa rivers to benefit Gwalior regions. Ken and Betwa are not Himalayan rivers. According to the Supreme Court direction, Himalayan rivers should be linked to peninsular rivers, but what did Vajpayee do? He conceived another project, that is, 'Ken Betwa Project' which are not Himalayan rivers. And, Sir, the same Ken Betwa project is now being implemented by this Government also. This means both, the Congress and the BJP, are averse to river linking scheme. I would urge upon the Congress, the BJP and the CPM to spell out their stand on linking of Himalayan rivers with that of Peninsular rivers. China has implemented several such river linking schemes; that is why, that country is prospering. It is these projects which can end farmers' death in Vidarbha, Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka and rest of the country. But, unfortunately, the so-called national Parties have a limited vision and they do not care about the well being of the people in Southern India.

Sir, I have been drawing the attention of the House to these acts of discrimination by the Central Government during the last six years of my tenure in Rajya Sabha. My leader late lamented Anna during his tenure from 1962-67 and my Party Supremo Dr. Puratchithalaivi Amma had raised these river-linking projects in Rajya Sabha, but things have not changed.

Coming to reservation of weaker sections of society, this Government is not sincere in improving the lot of Other Backward Classes. Congress kept the Mandal Commission Report for 20 years and the BJP started the temple movement so that Mandal Commission Report is put on the

4.00 P.M.

backburner. Both the national parties seek to seve the interests of the particular sections of the society. The 27 per cent reservation for OBCs in higher educational institutions should be implemented without any further delay. The AIADMK will not tolerate any attempt to tamper with 69 per cent reservations for Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and Other Backward Classes in Tamil Nadu.

Sir, while agreeing to the concern expressed by our President in para 39 of his speech, I would like to say that there has been a growing concern that many talented any bright young persons in the country do not opt for a carreer in science. In my opinion, answer to this problem is to select the brightest students at school level and provide them support through scholarship till they complete their Ph.D and then guarantee a job to them.

It is my strong conviction that sustainable economic growth in future requires increased funding of basic research. While directed basic research should be encouraged, self-directed basic research should also receive substantially increased support. I also feel that in our country, the percentage of R&D to GDP is much less in comparison to other Asian giants like China, Japan and Korea. The Government should, therefore, concentrate to increase the percentage ratio of R&D to GDP, particularly, in science sector.

Since there is a crisis in human resource management in science and technology system, efforts should be made to elicit support and financial resources from private sector as well. Sir, time has come when industry needs to join hand with Government to enhance the image of the country internationally in the field of science and technology. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI R.K. DHAWAN: Thank you, Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, for having given me this opportunity.

I rise to support the Motion of Thanks to the hon. President for his Address to both Houses of Parliament. Sir, before I say anything on the Address or express my views on the President's Address, I would like to say that I have listened to the speech of the Leader of the Opposition with great attention. Sir, he is a very experienced, educated and well-articulated leader, but I am sorry to say that his speech is devoid of any heart or

conviction. Probably, he had his party's compulsion for this. Sir, there is no doubt that for a healthy parliamentary functioning, the need of having an opposition cannot be under estimated. But that does not mean that it should see dark cloud in every silver lining.

Sir, I do not know whether the Leader of the Opposition would like to subscribe to the quotation of Ernest John Benn when he said and I quote, "Politics is the art of looking for trouble, finding it whether it exists or not, diagnosing it incorrectly, and applying the wrong remedy." I don't know whether he would like to subscribe to this or not. Sir, his speech also reminds me of a quotation by the British Prime Minister Lord Roseberry which he said about his friend and opponent, Lord Randolph Churchill. And what did the Prime Minister say? I quote, "The ambitious man, who can watch without sourness the rise of a contemporary, is much rarer than a black swan." This is the quotation of the British Prime Minister.

Sir, I have also listened to the speech of Janeshwar Mishraji. He is also a very seasoned, senior leader, has been a Minister, has been in politics for a number of years. Sir, I think, he forgot that he was speaking on the President's Address. He was speaking only on the Budget, and so is the case with my friend, Mr. Yechury. He is also a very learned historian, intellectual and an economist, but his speech was also not entirely on the President's Address. Probably, this is his first term in this House. I do not know, I wonder how did he expect the President to deal with all these subjects in his Address because the President's Address always mentions broadly the state of the nation and the direction by the Government and the policies to be followed. It cannot go into the details which Janeshwar Mishraji or Yechuriji or what my friend from AIADMK were mentioning.

Sir, reverting to the Address by the hon. President, it is a Constitutional requirement. We all know that it is a policy statement of the Government. But, Sir, its roots go back to the British Convention. We all know—perhaps some of us who may not have read the history may not be knowing—that one of the charges against Prince Charles-I who was tried, convicted and executed, was that he had entered the House of Commons. In order to overcome this problem, a convention was established in Britain enabling the King to enter the House of Commons and establish that he is part of the Parliament. This convention was recognized by the framers of our

Constitution and they provided the same when they enacted Article 79. Article 79 of the constitution provides, and I quote, "There shall be a Parliament for the Union which shall consist of the President and the two Houses, known respectively as the Council of States and the House of the People". This is behind the institution of Address by the President to both the Houses of Parliament.

Sir, it is in consonance with this provision and established principle that I rise to support the Motion of Thanks to the hon. President. Before I say something more on the Address and the points mentioned therein, I would like to say a few words about the *coalition dharma* adopted by the Congress Party. When this UPA was formed, there were scores of questions, queries and conjectures as to whether this coalition would last or not. Questions were raised about the constituents of UPA. Great apprehensions were expressed as to whether the Congress Party, which does not have any experience of coalition, would be able to hold all these parties together, and I think they were hoping against hope that this Government would fall sooner than later. Probably they have not yet recovered from the defeat they had got at the hands of the public in 2004. Many astrologers also came to their rescue, many predictions were made, that the Congress will not be able to hold the coalition together and they would perhaps come back to power again. But, unfortunately, Congress belied their expectations and the functioning of UPA during the last three years has shown that it has the capacity to run the coalition Government, not only to run, but run in a better fashion than any other party. The leadership of the Congress Party, their vision, their tact, deserves congratulations because they were able to keep the UPA united. Sir, it was also the vision, the direction and advice of the Chairperson of the UPA that helped the coalition to run efficiently.

Sir, as I had said before, the Address by the President is a policy document of the Government. If somebody asks me, what is the major contribution, the main achievement, of the Government, I would say with due respect to my friends, especially Mr. Yechury, who spoke at length about secularism, that the biggest achievement of the UPA Government has been the regeneration of the national spirit of secularism which is the fabric of national unity and which our friends opposite did not spare any opportunity to destroy.

Sir, secularism is now free from the clutches of such elements and it is this spirit of secularism which has permeated to every institution of the nation and restored in the Indian polity values of India's ancient civilization which has assimilated diverse cultures and religions for centuries. Sir, if there is any country in the world, who can legitimately take pride for being in the vanguard of nations for inclusive and secular culture, I am proud to say, it is India. Sir, in getting the country back from the brink of divisiveness and ultimate disintegration, infusing new life into the secular fabric of the nation and consolidating the forces of secularism in this ancient land, history shall always remain beholden to the vision, the tireless efforts and the fighting spirit of the UPA Chairperson, Shrimati Sonia Gandhi. It is she who was the spirit behind to keep the secularism intact because she realises that the greatest danger to the country comes from communal forces and they may be defeated if India was to survive. She believes in what Abraham Joshua said. I quote him. He said, "Racism is the greatest threat to man, the maximum of hatred for a minimum of reasons." Sir, it was she who travelled across the country, towns, streets, lanes, cities and villages. Sir, she is the stellar force who was able to keep different political parties together irrespective of their different ideologies and different programmes. Sir, coming to the Address by the hon. President, even the briefest glance at the Address shows ubiquity and visibility more now than any time since 1991. Since May, 2004, the UPA has successfully translated the mandate of people into a new agenda of governance aimed at providing a responsible, responsive and inclusive Government. Sir, the UPA Government pledged itself to preserve, protect and promote social harmony among the different sections of people. Sir, the Government express its commitment to ensure that the economy grows at 7 to 8 per cent in sustained manner and in a manner that creates employment. Sir, the Government, as the hon. President has said in his Address, has been not only able to maintain this, but this economic rise is likely to be up to 9 per cent. Sir, in a country where labour power is the only economic asset for the millions of people, gainful employment opportunities becomes the only channel for the fulfilment of the other basic rights—the right to work, the right to food and the right to education.

Sir, when the UPA Government was formed, it was aware of the hardships, the problems, the difficulties being faced by the farmers and



their worsening economic situation, the lack of remunerative prices, the lack of supply of electricity, lack of seeds, fertilisers, pesticides and basically, the lack of credit facilities. Sir, the UPA Government, when it took office, committed itself to enhance the welfare of the farmers, the farm workers and farm labour and assure a secure future for their families. Sir, why the situation arose is also a big question. There are many other facts which need attention, but, at the same time, we should not ignore the basic fact that explosion of population has created tremendous strain on the agricultural produce. Sir, as we also know, there is no immediate solution to the population problem or to check it, we have to live with it for years. In order to check the prices, uplift the plight of farmers who constitute majority of the Indian population, to fight the poverty at the grass root level, massive investment in the latest technological advancement in the agricultural field coupled with amelioration of plight of farmers and provision of credible incentives to them to increase production has become most imperative in the present circumstances. What we need at the moment is the second Green Revolution in agriculture about which hon. President has referred to in his Address. I just want to remind the House that when Mrs. Gandhi took over the Prime Ministership, she brought about the Green Revolution, and in less than a decade, she turned the starving and hopelessly dependent India on the doles of the United States into a massive surplus food producing country. Sir, tremendous agricultural development was maintained by Shri Rajiv Gandhi. But, as the years passed by, the momentum of increased production was lost. Sir, it is heartening to note that the hon. President, in his Address, has outlined the commitment of the Government to increase the rate of investment in agriculture and take credible measures to increase farmers' income and welfare, including bringing new technologies and farming systems, improving marketing channels, better management facilities and generation of better returns to the farmers and unleashing the second Green Revolution. Ushering in of the second Green Revolution needs to be accorded top priority, to which the Government is committed, as mentioned by the hon. President in his speech. Sir, needless to say that next to agriculture comes the need of having a revolutionary development in infrastructure. We can neither develop agriculture nor industry until and unless we develop power. We cannot make India into a modern and a leading industrial country unless we develop our seaports, our airports, our highways, our rail and road

network. We cannot integrate North-East culturally and politically with the rest of India unless we integrate it geographically and this is possible only if we build rail, roads and national highways across the North-East having connectivity with the rest of India. Sir, in his Address, the hon. President has dwelt with all these aspects and enumerated the measures contemplated in this regard.

Sir, the UPA and its supporters are striving hard to stand by the commitment to unleash the creative energies of our entrepreneurs, scientists, engineers for promotion of public-private enterprises in various fields, and, other professionals so that they become the productive forces of our society to make the Government transparent and accountable.

Sir, if I may say so, the UPA Government has assiduously worked to create a massive inclusive society, a caring polity and a more equitable economy, and, is adhering to the principle that growth, stability and equality are mutually reinforcing objectives.

Sir, the hon. President has declared in his Address, and, I quote, "My Government has decided that the goal of the Eleventh Plan would be to ensure that economic growth is just not faster but also more inclusive and equitable."

Sir, the fundamental task of the UPA Government is to generate good feelings in those they lead and is keeping in mind that the Government is any agency to execute the wishes of the people. Sir, as far as my knowledge goes, there is apparent agreement among the political parties that the women as a collective unity are the worst victims of economic and political marginalisation. Sir, the UPA Government expressed its commitment to empower women politically, economically and legally to provide equality of opportunities. Sir, under the UPA Government, the women have acquired their immediately required rights in the economic field through the amended Succession Act, and, in the social field through the Domestic Violence Act.

Sir, in the political field, providing a reservation in legislative bodies will give them adequate powers and positions in the country. Sir, the reservation system will provide impetus to women for political participation; political participation will turn into political emancipation of women which will help to uplift women at social level because sharing of power will give them

opportunities and choices that will certainly help to reduce all sorts of ill-treatment and problems of under-privileged.

Sir, difference of opinion relating to methods of empowerment cannot defeat the intent of doing so. Sir, under the able leadership of Shrimati Sonia Gandhi, the Chairperson of the UPA, the Congress Party has taken a vow to fulfil it. Sir, apart from implementing the various initiatives listed in the National Common Minimum Programme, the Government has also launched various other schemes such as Bharat Nirman. These initiatives have the potential to transform India.

Sir, an important contribution of the UPA to the life of the citizens, which can neither be listed as a programme or policy, nor can be quantified in statistical terms, is the sense of security and well being of the weaker sections of the society, especially the Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, women, children and minorities.

Sir, a question was also raised as to how the Government will acquire the financial resources. Sir, I have a very strong feeling that continued economic growth and prudent fiscal management will enable the Government to mobilise the required resources, to finance the many initiative taken during the year, especially the Employment Guarantee Scheme and the new investment in education, health and rural infrastructure.

Sir, as mentioned by the Hon. President in his Address, the Government will be pursuing a number of measures for judicial reforms with a view to reducing number of pending cases and the time taken for deciding cases. Sir, accountability and strengthening of the mechanism and introduction of a Local Courts Bill are being put in to solve the problem being faced by many people.

Sir, if we examine the initiatives and strengthening of on-going programmes dispassionately and may not be laid down or guided by political considerations, we will unhesitatingly come to the conclusion that the suggested measures will promote development and make our society more inclusive and equitable, make our economy more efficient and competitive, increase employment opportunities, empower Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes, Other Backward Classes, minorities, women and children and restore to our country its due place in the Comity of Nations.

Sir, the UPA Government has proved, to the dismay of my friends sitting opposite, I can understand their anguish and desperation, that it has delivered substantially on its commitments. Never before has a Government fulfilled so many commitments of its programmes in such a short time. Sir, my colleagues will speak at length about other various issues, initiatives, new programmes of the Government, covering different strata of society, and I would not like to take the time of the House to repeat those. The Bills passed by the Government, by this august House, have already been circulated by the Secretariat. However, there are certain areas such as Panchayati Raj, Defence and Foreign Policy on which I want to share my views in this august House.

Sir, the President has referred in his Address to the Government's commitment to deepening the Panchayati Raj. Coming to it, it was Shri Rajiv Gandhi, the then Prime Minister of India, who was inspired by the vision of involving the people in the social and economic field at the grass-root level. It was Shri Rajiv Gandhi who realised that if India was to progress, a revolutionary thrust had to be given to the devolution of the power to the people at grass-root level by means of strengthening the organs of local Government. Sir, his dream and vision ultimately became a Constitutional reality when the Constitution of India was amended and the Panchayati Raj Institution was established. However, although the Constitution amendment established Panchayats, no powers or authority were conferred upon them. The Constitution Amendment provided that the Panchayats would exercise such powers as are conferred upon them by the State Legislature. Sir, the Panchayati Raj Institution, therefore, Constitutional Institution without any power and when the Legislatures of the States became tardy, Constitution of India was of no help to these Panchayati Raj Institutions. It is high time that Parliament takes notice on this and rectify this Constitutional anomaly and for this is not necessary that the Constitution has to be amended. Parliament is fully empowered under the Constitution to confer power of social and economic planning on the Panchayats through ordinary law.

So far as social and economic planning in India is concerned, Sir, the Congress Party leaders had long emphasised the importance of planning as well as their belief that it should be among the Union's powers. That was their dream. Sir, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and others had preached the virtues of planning during the 1920's. The Congress established a

National Planning Committee under the Chairmanship of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in 1937. Sir, as brought out by Austin in his famous book on Panchayat, three times during the negotiations during the Cabinet Mission, the Congress leadership made it clear that the Central Government under any constitutional scheme must bear the responsibility for national planning. This was their vision that the social and economic planning should remain under the charge of the Central Government.

Sir, the Members of the Mission, if any of my senior members know, could not agree to this. However, although the final report of the Union's Powers Committee merely expressed the hope the planning would, by agreement, be included within the scope of Union's powers, the second Union's Powers Committee Report provided, after the announcement of partition, "economic and social planning" as an item on the Concurrent List. It remained in the draft Constitution which was finally adopted by the Constituent Assembly.

Now the subject of 'economic and social planning' figures, as many of us know, at Entry No. 20 in the Concurrent List of the Constitution of India.

Sir, the question, therefore, is this. Having ensured the democratic establishment of Panchayati Raj, why should not such powers of social and economic planning be conferred on it by Parliament when it is already covered under the Concurrent List (Entry No. 20)?

Sir, in my opinion, this goal can be achieved only by a simple amendment, by an appropriate law passed by Parliament. It does not need a constitutional amendment.

Sir, the scope of this Entry also came up for interpretation before the Supreme Court of India in the case of *Maneklal vs. M.G. Makwara* reported in AIR 1967 SC page 1373.

Sir, the Supreme Court referred it to the various authorities for expounding the scope of this Entry and came to the conclusion that this could be conferred upon the panchayats as per the Entry No. 20 in the Concurrent List.

Sir, I, therefore, suggest that Parliament may make law conferring authority on or delegating its function of social and economic planning to

the aforesaid local bodies or such committees thereof as may be prescribed by the said law or the rules framed by the Central Government.

Sir, the law so made by Parliament can be called 'Town and Country Act' as it is called in the United Kingdom. This will be a Central Act. This will be uniformly applicable to all the local institutions throughout the country.

Sir, the President in his Address has emphasised the unshakable commitment of the Government towards the defence of the country and has outlined the proposed measures such as to maintain focus on strengthening the defence of the country, investment in modernisation of the Armed Forces, and of our indigenous defence industry. This is what he has focused in his address.

Sir, as far as my knowledge goes, a lot of work is being done in this field. The Leader of the Opposition devoted a lot of time on defence, but he really forgot to go through what the President said.

If I may say so, Sir, and if my knowledge is correct, the Government is going towards comprehensive capability creation in the defence services in consonance with force levels of our potential adversaries as well as the current state of defence technologies and the long timeframes for upgrades, etc.

Sir, the formal approvals for the same will be issued well in advance so that the next defence planning framework, spanning the next five years is started before the commencement of the Plan. Sir, this alone would guarantee that the modernisation effort of the service takes place in a well-synchronised, focussed and prioritised manner.

Sir, the real transformation in the defence sector can come about only when the domestic private industrial base starts contributing substantially to the modernization and maintenance needs of the three Services. Sir, it is heartening to note that the Government has taken specific measures in this regard to encourage private participation in defence requirements.

Sir, the empowering of the defence industrial capabilities also holds enormous potential for export of defence goods and services to a larger number of countries. Sir, this, however, would be feasible only through sustained encouragement and a truly level-playing field for the blossoming

of the Indian private sector with the impending sizeable investment inflows through the defence offsets route. Sir, the Government is taking necessary action in this regard.

Sir, it is also necessary that Defence R&D must become a truly joint endeavour among DRDO, Defence public sector, ordnance factories, India private sector and other Governmental agencies and scientific institutions. Sir, the Leader of Opposition has referred to separate efforts of Army, Air Force and Navy. But, he has forgotten that the significant benefits which accrue from the pursuit of comprehensive jointness among the three Services spanning the areas of doctrine, planning, operations, training and maintenance infrastructure. Sir, as mentioned by the Leader of Opposition, if separate roles are assigned to the three wings of the Armed Forces, then, this will not be possible to achieve. Sir, we have taken....(*Interruptions*)... I know he wanted to speak, but, I also have to go somewhere.

Sir, our colleagues and senior leaders also referred to the Foreign Policy. Sir, the President has dealt at length with his Government's Foreign Policy. Sir, I must confess, I do not claim to have deep understanding or knowledge of international affairs of Foreign Policy. But having watched from close quarters for almost 40 years, framing of the Foreign Policy and a bit study of history in this regard, I can claim that I too have acquired some knowledge. Based on this, I would like to share my views with this august House.

Sir, at the outset, I would like to say that if we keep our eyes open, their vision will make us realise that the UPA Government has strengthened India's external profile and improved India's standing in the world. Our relations with our neighbours, with all major powers and with all our economic partners have improved in the last two years. This is a matter of fact and a matter of record. Sir, international as well as regional environment is more hospitable and is more conducive to our economic development and national security.

Sir, the supreme consideration, which must govern the foreign policy of a nation, is the interest of her national security. The chequered policy history of post independence India bears eloquent testimony to this dictum. Whenever a country has shaped its foreign policy on the basis of any principle or ideology or any other consideration, ignoring the interest of her national security, it has suffered. Sir, this is a matter of record. History

tells us that for centuries, Britain conducted her foreign policy on the principle of balance of power, for Britain had realized that it was contrary to her national security and vital national interests that any other country should become more powerful than her. In one of his books, Winston Churchill wrote, I quote: "This Sinister, Soviet country which I tried to strangle at its birth...." As we all know, he was an impeccable foe of the Soviet Union. It is a matter of history. Sir, when the Nazi danger started looming across the horizon of Europe, it was Churchill who was the first conservative leader in England to raise his voice that she must come to terms with the Soviet Union. His advice was ignored by Chamberlain and other diehard conservatives, who did not realize that Hitler's Germany posed a threat to England and remained stuck in their ideological revulsion against the Soviet Union, and for this folly, England had to pay a very heavy price. So, Stalin was left with no choice but to conclude a pact with Hitler, and the latter, having ensured German security on the eastern front, plunged the world into the Second World War.

In fact, Stalin's pact with Hitler is the classic example in history of sacrifice of ideology by a nation for the sake of its security in the field of foreign policy.

From the point of view of India's national security, one of the greatest achievements of India's foreign policy was her deep and abiding friendship with the Soviet Union. For the course which the USA adopted in striking military alliance and creating military blocks with Pakistan and inducting massive military aid to that country in early fifties, had created a dangerous situation for India in her neighbourhood in view of the bitter hostility which existed between India and Pakistan in the context of Kashmir and the blatant intent of Pakistan to grab Kashmir by force.

It was Shri Jawaharlal Nehru who publically declared that the USA could no longer be treated as neutral in Kashmir. When Soviet Union invaded Hungary in 1950's, despite strong disapproval by Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, India did not condemn her and did not succumb to the pressure of bitter sarcasm by the West. For Shri Jawaharlal Nehru was conscious that it was not in the interest of India and her friendship with the Soviet Union which was so vital to her national security that India should have strained her relations with the Soviet Union. Sir, there is another example. When Shrimati Indira Gandhi realized that the events in Bangladesh might impel



Pakistan to thrust war upon India, she concluded the Indo-Soviet friendship treaty. This was all being done by keeping national security in mind. By one stroke, she assured the security of Sino-Indian frontier and neutralized the temptation which other powers might have had to embroil themselves in the possible Indo-Pakistan conflict.

Sir, the policy of non-alignment which Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru shaped was no less dictated by her national interests, which were also in the interest of the third world and the erstwhile colonial countries. Sir, in the last 20 years, the world has changed, and so also the imperatives of India's foreign policy. This is the point which I want to highlight. It has changed because the events have changed. So, the imperatives of Indian foreign policy have also changed.

Sir, the Soviet Union, as we all know, has disintegrated. Military blocks, of which Pakistan was a member, have disappeared.

Sir, it is also a matter of fact, whether we accept it or not, whether my friends outside, and on the opposite especially, just opposite, accept it or not, that the USA has also acquired awesome power of influence in areas of conflict in any part of the world. The role which the USA played during the Kargil War is the telling reminder of the power of the USA to influence the course of events in the Indian Sub-Continent and the radical change which has taken place in her relations with India and Pakistan.

Sir, the USA is also deeply, directly or indirectly, involved in the affairs of Pakistan in her fight against terrorism. But, Sir, the point worth noting is that the USA is no longer aligned with Pakistan insofar as India and her national interests are concerned. That is the basic thing which has surfaced now.

It was, Sir, President Musharraf who realised immediately after the destruction of the World Trade Centre in 1972 and 2001 that it was in the interest of Pakistan and the security of Pakistan to cooperate with the USA. He took, Sir, no time to reverse the old policy of Pakistan of support to Talibans in Afghanistan. The projected himself as the strong supporter of the USA in her fight against terrorism and fundamentalism. He was astute enough, Sir, to realise that Pakistan's national security and her national interests lay in aligning himself with the USA.

Sir, the basis of alignment of Pakistan with USA today is, however, entirely different from what it was when the Soviet Union was in existence. That is entirely different.

So far as India is concerned, her biggest security problem, at present, is cross-border terrorism from Pakistan.

Sir, as we all know, despite repeated promises and declarations, Pakistan has failed to fulfil its commitment to dismantle the infrastructure of terrorism.

Sir, terrorism is the calculated policy which Pakistan launched against India more than a decade ago in order to tire and bleed her for wresting control of Kashmir.

Now, there are ominous signs that insidious attempts are being made by some fundamental elements in Pakistan which are hostile to India to spread terrorism to different parts of the country.

Such attempts point to an agenda which is destructive of India's stability and integrity. In the fight against terrorism, India's national interests coincide with those of the USA.

Sir, with the people of Pakistan, India shares common culture, common history and common language. It is only through increased interaction between the people of Pakistan and the people of the India that peace between the two countries can be secured and their problems can be mutually resolved with amity.

Sir, the peace bus from Srinagar to Muzafarabad was a big step forward in this direction. The encounters between the two countries in the field of cricket have also played a significant role. And in the course of conversation, Sir,—history tells us—President Nixon, during his visit to China, Mao Tse Tung had stated:

"But rather than deciding that we struck with our own stand that without settling major issues there is nothing to do with the smaller issues. I myself persisted in that position. Later on, I saw that you were right and we played table tennis."

Similar transformation has taken place over the years in the approach of President Musharraf and that augurs well for peace in the Indian sub-continent.

If the age old hostilities between France and Germany could vanish through establishment of the European Union there is no reason why India and Pakistan cannot come together to restore the common destiny of their people hallowed by centuries of shared history.

Establishment of SAARC Parliament will be a big step forward in the unfolding Indo-Pakistan peace process.

But the present reality cannot be ignored. If there was no threat to her national security, India would not be spending billions of rupees annually on her defence preparedness.

It is, therefore, in the interest of national security of India, her integrity and stability that India must expand the frontiers of friendship and cooperation with the USA, much to the dislike of some friends sitting opposite, notwithstanding her continuing, abiding and vital friendship with Russia.

It is not in the interest of India to act in a manner that is likely to jeopardize the process of expansion of those frontiers with the USA.

The proposed agreement to resume civil nuclear energy cooperation between the two countries is a tremendous step forward in this direction. This was followed by the signing of the new frame work for Indo-US Defence Relationship in June, 2005.

Commonality of approach with the USA on issues which relate to their national security does not and cannot, I want to assure the hon. House, mean subservience to the interests and policies of the USA.

Support of the USA on the issue of nuclear non-proliferation in Iran is, therefore, the national imperative of India's foreign policy.

Any stand to the contrary would have been at the peril of India's national security. One must not forget that. Cooperation between India and the USA, economic cooperation between the two countries has become indispensable and integral part of India's foreign policy *vis-a-vis* the United States, as, in fact, any other country in the modern day world.

If the Congress led Government allows the foreign policy of India to be communalised under threats of a 'Third Front' with other political parties who are bent upon exploiting some religious sentiments and playing the

card of communal vote bank, it will be the most grievous blow to India's national security and her secular fabric.

I would just like to say that our Prime Minister is not a natural born politician. He has been chosen by providence to do greater things and to serve the country and this is a key factor in his drive. His nationalism is deeply felt and well articulated. He is not the one who needs to be prodded.

Before concluding, I would like to quote what James Freeman Clarke said, "The difference between a politician and a statesman is: a politician thinks of the next election and a statesman thinks of the next generation." Our Prime Minister is a statesman who is thinking of the next generation. Thank you.

श्री उपसभापति: श्री श्रीगोपाल व्यास।

श्री सुरेन्द्र लाठ (उड़ीसा): सर, व्यास जी कल बोलेंगे।

श्री उपसभापति: आप शुरू कीजिए।

श्री श्रीगोपाल व्यास (छत्तीसगढ़): पांच मिनट में कैसे होगा?

श्री उपसभापति: आपका टाइम है, आप शुरू कीजिए।

श्री श्रीगोपाल व्यास (छत्तीसगढ़): धन्यवाद उपसभापति महोदय, बड़ी कश्मकश के बीच में आपको मुझे समय देने की विवशता आई है। मेरा दुर्भाग्य ही ऐसा है कि जब मैं खड़ा होता हूँ तो आप और मुझे मिलाकर बहुत कम लोग ही यहां सुनने के लिए रहते हैं। जो भी हो, अभी-अभी हमारे एक बहुत वरिष्ठ सांसद ने, जिनका बहुत पुराना अनुभव है, प्रधानमंत्री जी की स्थिति पर टिप्पणी की थी। मैं प्रधानमंत्री जी को एक बहुत बड़ा अर्थशास्त्री मानता हूँ और उनकी बहुत इज्जत करता हूँ। किन्तु चूंकि वे कुछ फ्रेज दूँढ रहे थे, मुझे भी एक फ्रेज याद आ गया है। आपकी अनुमति हो तो मैं कहूँगा-उसका संबंध प्रधानमंत्री जी से नहीं है। "There are some who are born great. There are some who have become great. But there are some on whom greatness is thrust." I do not want to relate it to the Prime Minister. But I am just recalling this. वह क्या कहना चाह रहे थे, मुझ नहीं मालूम है। वह कह रहे थे कि भगवान की कृपा से वे बन गए। मैं समझता हूँ कि उनमें काफी दक्षता और योग्यता है। कृपा भगवान की हुई है या और किसी की हुई है, यह तो और कोई तय करेगा, मुझे नहीं मालूम है। मैं ऐसे नामोच्चारण नहीं करना चाहता हूँ, सारी दुनिया जानती है, किन्तु मुझे कुछ बिन्दु राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण के संदर्भ में कहने हैं। इसके पहले कि हमारे मित्र और विद्वान सांसद सीताराम येचुरी जी चले जाएं...(व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति: आप जल्दी बोल दीजिए, वे सुन रहे हैं।

श्री श्रीगोपाल व्यास: मैं उनको आदरपूर्वक धन्यवाद देता हूँ, उनके समान व्यक्ति ने भी धर्म और पंथ के बारे में खुले आम चर्चा की है। वैसे तो मैं समझता हूँ कि वे अर्थशास्त्री हैं और आज जब उनके बीच में और प्रधानमंत्री जी, जो स्वयं अर्थशास्त्री हैं - कितनी दूर तक सरकार ने आर्थिक बातों को पूरा किया है, किन मामलों में सरकार अपर्याप्त रही है, इसके बारे में मुझे कहने की आवश्यकता नहीं है - मैं सीताराम जी को धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि उन्होंने बहुत सारी बातें, जो सरकार नहीं कर सकी, जिनका अभिभाषण में उल्लेख होना चाहिए था, उनकी चर्चा उन्होंने की। परन्तु जो बात आपसे संबंधित है या आम तौर पर है - आपसे नहीं है, बुरा नहीं मानिएगा - जहां तक मैं समझता हूँ, "सेक्युलरिज्म" शब्द इस देश में आपातकाल से आया, उसके पहले नहीं था। उसको प्रीएंबल में डाला गया है। यह देश हमेशा ही पंथ-निरपेक्ष रहा है। उसको धर्मनिरपेक्ष कहने का पता नहीं क्यों किसी का कितना आग्रह है? मुझे आश्चर्य है, एक और वरिष्ठ सांसद ने कहा, हो सकता है, सीताराम येचुरी जी ने नहीं कहा होगा कि इसमें तो आरएसएस की घुसपैठ हो गयी है। बहुत ही आश्चर्य होता है। यह देश दुनिया के प्राचीनतम देशों में से है और पंथनिरपेक्षता इसका स्वभाव है। वह किसी और के कारण नहीं है। अभी कुछ दिन पहले दिल्ली के एक मौलाना ने कहा था कि भारत में यदि मुसलमानों की रक्षा हो रही है तो वह हिन्दुओं के कारण है। यह सोचने का विषय है। हिन्दुओं को इस देश में सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने 'A way of life.' कहा है। यह कोई पंथ नहीं है। इसलिए ऐसी बातों की ओर ध्यान खींचना अच्छा रहेगा। मान्यवर, मैंने भाषण में जिस सबसे महत्वपूर्ण बात की चर्चा करना अनुभव किया है, उसको मैं यहां अभिव्यक्त करना चाहता हूँ। इस देश में विदेश नीति और आंतरिक सुरक्षा, इन दो विषयों पर हर समय परम्परा रही है कि आपस में विचार-विमर्श करके, जिसको विपक्ष कहा जाता है, उनके साथ बातचीत और सलाह मशवरे के बाद इन विषयों पर निर्णय लिया जाता है। मुझे खेद है कि जब यहां आकर भी, साथ काम करने वाले दल भी यहां पर सुझाव देते हैं तो लगता है कि आपस में विचार-विमर्श नहीं होता है। जहां तक विदेश नीति का प्रश्न है, इस देश की परंपरा रही है कि हर समय विपक्ष के लोगों के साथ.....(व्यवधान).....

श्री उपसभापति: आप कल continue कीजिएगा।

श्री श्रीगोपाल व्यास: आप कल अवसर देंगे, तब बोलूंगा, धन्यवाद।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House is adjourned to meet tomorrow at 11.00 a.m.

The House then adjourned at five of the clock  
till eleven of the clock on Wednesday the 7th March, 2007.