

REFERENCE TO THE THREAT OF CLOSURE OF THE BARAUNI OIL REFINERY DUE TO NON-SUPPLY OF CRUDE OIL

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा (बिहार) : सभापति जी, मैं आपके जरिए इस सदन और इस सरकार का ध्यान बरोनी आयल रिफाइनरी की बिगड़ती हालत की ओर खींचना चाहता हूँ। बरोनी आयल रिफाइनरी के लिए क्रूड आयल जो कि आसाम से आता है और जिसको लेकर रिफाइनरी चलती है, उसकी सप्लाई नहीं हो रही है। अब वह रिफाइनरी बन्द होने की स्थिति में है। सभापति महोदय, आप जानते हैं, बिहार एक पिछड़ा हुआ इलाका है। इस सरकार द्वारा पिछले 30 सालों में इसको प्लांड रूप में पिछड़ा हुआ बनाया गया है। बिहार चाहे पर केपिटा इनकम हो, चाहे इंडस्ट्रियल डवलपमेंट हो, पिछड़ा हुआ है। कुछ उद्योग जब प्लानिंग के जरिए वहाँ पर बड़े किए गये तो उनको भी ठीक से नहीं चलने दिया जाता है। दरभंगा में एक पेपर मिल है उसकी भी हालत बिगड़ी हुई है। उसी तरह से यह आयल रिफायनरी जिसको पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू माडर्न टेम्पल कहा करते थे बनाई गई। यह बहुत अच्छी बात थी। लेकिन इस सरकार का ध्यान उस ओर नहीं जाता है कि किस तरह से यह रिफाइनरी ठीक से चले। अभी आप कह सकते हैं कि आसाम की हालत खराब है जिसकी वजह से क्रूड आयल ठीक समय पर नहीं आ रहा है। यह बात मैं मान सकता हूँ। उस दिन यह बात उठी थी और प्रधान मंत्री जी से पूछा गया था कि वह कब एयर डेज या हेली-काप्टर डेज वहाँ पर करने जा रही है। आसाम की स्थिति को सुधारने के लिए तो उनको अभी समय नहीं है। अभी जैसे कि कहा गया वे डिफेक्शन में व्यस्त हैं, राज्य सरकारों को कैसे गिराये, इसमें व्यस्त हैं। आसाम जाने के लिए उनके पास फुर्सत

नहीं है। राज्य सरकारों को गिराने के लिए उनके पास फुर्सत है। मेरा निवेदन यह है कि सरकार आसाम की परिस्थिति को कंट्रोल करे जिससे यह रिफाइनरी बन्द न होने पाए। यदि यह बन्द हो गई तो बहुत से लोग बेकार हो जायेंगे तथा आर्थिक व्यवस्था बिगड़ जाएगी। क्रूड आयल सप्लाई करने के लिए सरकार को वार फुटिंग पर, पैकेज प्रोग्राम कहें, इमरजेंसी प्रोग्राम कहें, बनाना चाहिये। अतः मैं सरकार से निवेदन करता हूँ कि बरोनी आयल रिफायनरी को क्रूड आयल की लगातार सप्लाई के लिए वह कोई योजना बना दे ताकि वह बन्द न होने पाए, लोग बेकार न हों और उत्तरी बिहार की हालत जो बिगड़ गई है वह और न बिगड़े। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं आपका और इस सदन का ध्यान खींचना चाहता हूँ।

MOTION OF THANKS ON THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now there will be Motion of Thanks on the President's Address. There are only five minutes left. I would request Mr. Antulay to move his resolution now and to speak on it at 2 o'clock.

SHRI A. R. ANTULAY (Maharashtra): Sir, I move:

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

"That the Member of the Rajya Sabha assembled in this Session are deeply grateful to the President for the Address which he has been pleased to deliver to both Houses of Parliament assembled together on the 23rd January, 1980."

So, I think we better start with...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think we better adjourn now and resume at 2 o'clock when you can make your speech and the Motion can be seconded. Thank you very much.

The House is adjourned to 2 o'clock.

The House then adjourned for lunch at fifty-six minutes past twelve of the clock.

2 P.M.

The House reassembled after lunch at three minutes past two of the clock, Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair.

SHRI A. R. ANTULAY: Mr. Chairman, Sir,

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): 'I have come to bury Ceaser, not to praise him.' Start.

SHRI A. R. ANTULAY: It gives me indeed very great pleasure to extend heart-felt thanks to the President of India for having delivered the Address. But while thanking the President, Mr. Deputy Chairman, we may also—all the hon. Members of this House—make a little introspection...

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा (बिहार) : जोर से बोलिए, आवाज सुनाई नहीं दे रही है।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Come nearer. We can't hear.

SHRI A. R. ANTULAY:

तपते तपते तपेसा सूरज ।

आंसू है यह हंसी नहीं ॥

So, Mr. Deputy Chairman, the introspection to which I was referring is the one as to why the Parliament of India—thereby I mean the Lok Sabha—had to be dissolved before it ran out its natural constitutional term. Has there been a single occasion during the past 32 years of independence when even during less

than three years a new Parliament is sitting to hear the President of India give an Address to a new Parliament, namely the Seventh Parliament? There have been many novelties and firsts. I will challenge if anyone were to produce one shred of evidence to me where an outgoing Government, a democratically elected Government, a democratically defeated Government, was subjected to the sort of persecution, harassment, humiliation, in any part of the democratic world. Indeed if one Government goes out, the outgoing Government becomes the Opposition and it becomes the Opposition, it becomes an equally inalienable part of the machinery of the political apparatus necessary to run a democratic set-up. And if there has not been a single instance, then why did India have to witness it during the past 2½ to 3 years? It is not a very easy question nor is it a very happy poser. We have adopted parliamentary system of democracy. We are not born with it nor can we claim unconsciously to live with it. We have to adapt it to the genius of our soil. We are experimenting a very difficult endeavour. Can there be a parliamentary democracy without sovereignty of Parliament? Not to my knowledge, during all the limited reading that I have made. Whereas British parliamentary democracy enjoys a Parliament which is sovereign, our democracy enjoys a Parliament which is not sovereign. If a piece of legislation passed by Parliament is liable to be struck down by a court of law, it is the sovereignty that is struck and therefore in a true sense of the term nobody can say, in the true conception of Dicey who wrote a brilliant piece on constitution, parliamentary democracy, rule of law, federalism and other salient features, that we are a sovereign parliament. We are not a presidential system of government either. Under the U.S. Constitution President is unlimited within the sphere of his powers. The U.S. President is not

removable by Parliament. Here the executive is removable by Parliament which Parliament is not sovereign. Therefore, we have tried to unnaturally man within our constitutional framework the two systems: federalism—the so-called, because I find many notices of amendments on federalism, unfortunately without understanding the true concept of federalism ...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We do understand.

SHRI A. R. ANTULAY: So we are trying to be federal without a presidential system of government within the concept called Parliamentary Democracy which cannot be federal inherently. There is inherent limitation in this concept. There can be one sovereign and that sovereign body can be the sovereign Parliament. But within the federation there can be Assemblies which are equally sovereign and under our Constitution they have the same powers and privileges as the Lok Sabha or the Rajya Sabha has. Where then is the sovereignty? The sovereignty of Parliament negatives, in my view, the federal concept. It is the jurists who have conceived this and generations have experimented with it. Some say we are a federation. Some call it a quasi-federation ...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You are tempting me to interrupt you ...

SHRI A. R. ANTULAY: My friends who know what federation means ...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I do know. Mr. Antulay ...

SHRI A. R. ANTULAY: I am not yielding, Mr. Deputy Chairman. He will have his say. I do not like people to postulate with their half-baked knowledge. They should first have a profound knowledge of the

subject and fundamentals before they speak. Therefore, they wake up to the situation that we are a federation. Okay. We are a federation, for the sake of argument. When was this federation born? Was it born when the Congress(I), ably, dynamically and benevolently led by the leader of the nation, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, was led to victory? Or, was it already there on the 23rd March, 1977, when the Janata Party was—let us say—voted to power? If it is a federation—I am not saying whether it is or it is not, at the moment—I will show the contradiction. Half the federal units of this country have not voted them to power in March 1971, and half the federal units did. At the time when they were voted to power in March 1977, half the federal units of this country, in the shape of the electorate of the South, had not voted for them, whereas the electorate of the North had. Can you say there is a federation in the North and there is lack of federation in the South? But now, the length and breadth of the country, from one end to the other, have acclaimed Mrs. Gandhi as the leader of the people of this country, as the symbol of national integration, as the symbol of national integrity, as the symbol of the aspirations of the common people, the underdogs, the Scheduled Castes, the Scheduled Tribes and the minorities.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, no system in the world can work without individuals, without groups of individuals and without political parties. In a Parliamentary system of Government, a leader is needed. A leader—as used to be said by the Conservatives—is never elected, but acclaimed. Mrs. Gandhi is the acclaimed leader of the country. She was voted accordingly by a massive mandate of the people of India.

Now, shall we go through the two and half years of our recent history? Can we remain a nation, if there are

[Shri A. R. Antulay]

disparities in the economic sphere? Disparities in geographical spheres; disparities in linguistic spheres, and disparities, more importantly, in the religious sphere. This country can never remain a nation, let me warn all of you, if democracy in this country does not lay the foundations of secularism. Democracy in this country has no use for religious minorities if they cannot find a place for themselves in the democratic set-up. That they can only do if democracy is secular and religious minorities can enjoy the fruits of Socialism. Those fruits of Socialism are to be distributed, looking to the persons bearing the names of religious denominations. And if the hands are to be withheld, the hand that distributes on the basis of religious denominator and denomination, who can say that real Socialism can prosper or even take roots? So, Mr. Deputy Chairman, ours is a totally different democracy—call it parliamentary democracy, call it ordinary democracy. No country in the world has the type of population that India has, not only in its magnitude and volume but because of its diversity. Pt. Nehru was right when during all his life he said: There is unity in diversity. And that unifying force is only that Secularism. Foresake it and you are cut as under into pieces, not woven into a single whole, because no one would like to be treated as less than a citizen simply because he goes to the temple or the mosque or the church for his private, personal prayers. But what did we witness during the past two and a half years? There were communal riots in the past. Nobody would say, 'No'. It will be atrocious to say 'No'. But there were reports of the Members on that side, who were in the ruling party, engineering the riots, Mr. Deputy Chairman. And the riots continued not for days, not for weeks but for months on end. So the secular foundations were shaken—not only eroded as they say it. Secular foundations were uprooted or

attempted to be uprooted. They would have been uprooted if the experiment had continued for a period little longer. I must say here that it is the unseen hand of God over this nation—that is my belief—which comes to the rescue of the people of this country which enjoys the ancient culture and civilisation and which shows light to those so-called progressive nations of the world today which are groping in the dark. So the unseen hand of God has shown that this nation must survive. Therefore, the attempts that were being made with regard to the axing of secular foundations—those hands had to be withdrawn because of the unseen hand of God. What about the linguistic or what about regional considerations? Has there been a single instance during the past thirty years and during the General Elections? Almost the whole State could not go to the polls. It has not happened immediately in the wake of the Partition in 1947 when the First General Elections in 1952 were held. It was not so in 1957, 1967, 1971 and in 1977. An entire region has threatened and some unpatriotic and anti-national forces have connived at it. Supported by foreign powers, they are supporting the movement of secessionism, that is to say, seceding certain territory from this country. Mrs. Indira Gandhi, during her last regime, solved the Kashmir problem which was hanging fire for almost 30 years. None in the world talk about it any more except some political lunatics. She sealed the border of Sikkim so that the nation could be safe and secure and takes steps to prosper in its own individual right. But the Prime Minister of the country who assumed power in 1977 March unfortunately said—and immediately rushed to amend that it was his personal opinion—that the merger of Sikkim ought not to have taken place. The Indian people took two years to throw him. In any other country, people would have thrown him out in a few hours after utterances of this kind.

It is because the Indian people are tolerant, forbearing, indulgent, magnanimous and generous. When Mrs. Gandhi sealed that border, she became the creator of geography as one of the hon. Members had said in the Central Hall of Parliament. On the creation of Bangladesh and at the ceremony when Bharat Ratna was conferred on that great leader of the people of the country, some of the friends from that side who are still in the Lok Sabha and who adorned the Treasury Benches only a few months ago, said, "Here is Durga gifted by God to the people of India". All that was washed away in a moment and the moment they assumed power, they said that the first declaration they were going to make was about the appointments of the commissions of inquiry. Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I challenge them to show me a single instance where the commissions of inquiry were appointed to humiliate and harass and persecute the ex-Prime Minister of the country. Can an iota of evidence be produced in this august House by anyone to show that the appointees of the Government by an ordinary law, not by the Constitution, were there to go into the actions of the Government? I am not saying that it is a good example to be followed. My leader has said that we are not going to be vindictive. But, Mr. Deputy Chairman, if an ordinary commission of inquiry is appointed, what could not be found during the Prime Ministership of Mrs. Indira Gandhi during the last eleven long years can be found during the 28 or so meagre months when they were in power. Mr. Deputy Chairman, this is a tribute to the democratic set up and the leadership of Mrs. Indira Gandhi that the commissions of inquiry could not find anything in spite of the fact that the people were sent abroad and with what they came back I think you know better and they know much better. And the reports were not revealed even though they went at the cost of the exchequer. So,

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the two and a half years of history of this country is a sordid tale, a sad commentary on the democratic functioning of any country including even the country whom we do not call democratic though some of our friends sitting here think it to be democratic. The persecution that takes place even in an autocracy or under the dictatorships pale into significance before what had happened here during the past two and a half years. Therefore, the secular foundation, the only unifying force of welling the various types of people together into a nation, the geographical unifying force, that is the Indian nationhood, also got weakened not only because of the utterances and actions of that Government but also because of their doings and non-doings. In the North-Eastern region, which has throughout been more sensitive, the geographical bond got weakened. The religious unifying force got loosened, and the country was unfortunately on the threshold of not only disintegration geographically but also disintegration even as a nation from man to man. Then came this Government. If the Morarji Government was non-performing as his own Minister had declared, the succeeding Government of Mr. Charan Singh was a non-Government. It could not govern. The law and order situation had gone bad. Sir, I am amused to find some notices of amendments pointing out that the law and order situation got out of control during the care-taker Government. It was not so. The Chopra son and the Chopra daughter were murdered when they were going to school in the evening for a function, and this was not during the regime of the care-taker Government. We do not have anything to distinguish between the Janata Government and the off-shoot of the Janata in the name of Lok Dal or any other name that you may call it. It was the people of India who suffered. Mr. Morarji Desai may blame Mr. Charan

[Shri A. R. Antulay]

Singh and Mr. Charan Singh may blame Mr. Jagjivan Ram. But the people of India were not interested as to who was blaming whom. The people of India were interested in getting the right type of Government, the right type of polity which, unfortunately, the people did not get and could not get. And as a result, when this Government came into power by a massive mandate, Morarjibhai said that it was a personal triumph of Smt. Indira Gandhi. I think, no tribute can be bigger and better to Smt. Indira Gandhi than this one from a person who almost hated her and who gloated and took pride in the fact that he was the person to expel her from the Parliament by moving a resolution and imprison her in a jail called the Tihar Jail. So, Sir, it was a censure against Mr. Morarji Desai and his Government when people said, "We elected her from Chikmagalore, you turned her out; now we are electing her not alone but we are electing her with a vast majority and that she should lead the country in a manner she wants so that the goods are delivered to the people of India". If Mr. Morarji Desai chooses to say that it was a personal victory and a personal triumph of Smt. Indira Gandhi, yes, it is and it was and we are proud that we have got such a leader. After all, in a democratic set-up, it is the leader who leads. It is not the collective leadership of the sort we have seen either of that Congress and the Lok Dal or of the Janata Party during the past two and a half years. That has opened our eyes. It has to be a leader in a democratic set up, in a parliamentary system of democracy. In England many books have come out saying it is the Prime-Ministerial system of Government and the Cabinet system of Government. Change it there. Then try to change what we have adopted here. As I have said in the beginning, we are undergoing a tremendous experience and an endeavour where we are not even enjoying

the powers that their parliamentary democracy enjoys and yet for 30 long years this country has sustained the democratic fibre. So, Mr. Deputy Chairman, when I find the Leader of the Opposition and till recently the Leader of the House saying that destabilisation of the States should not take place, where did the concept of federalism go when the then Home Minister, Mr. Charan Singh, fired a letter to the Chief Ministers of the States who were enjoying more than two-thirds majority all over? Was that concept thrown to the wind? Yes, Mrs. Indira Gandhi did say it was undemocratic. But when the Supreme Court put its seal of approval, Mrs. Gandhi did not say anything thereafter. We bowed before what the judicial decision was. But today, surprisingly, all the hon. Members from the other side have given notices of amendments more than two-thirds of which are dealing with dissolution and defection. Defection? Mr. Morarji Desai was the Prime Minister and Mr. Chandrasekhar was the President, as he today is, have not only encouraged but made Mr. Sharad Pawar to defect and stab the Congress in the back. They lured him away and even gave him the political chocolate, called the Chief Ministership of Maharashtra.

AN HON. MEMBER: Lolly pop.

SHRI A. R. ANTULAY: Now, Mr. Deputy Chairman, have they the right to speak anything with regard to engineering defections when they acclaimed Mr. Sharad Pawar as the leader who is out to fight authoritarianism? Let alone authoritarianism, even the legitimate authority that the Constitution vested in you, you could not exercise. I think Mr. Charan Singh was more right, or who was more right I do not know, when he called them a pack of impotents. I am not thereby absolving him or all the blame and sins, but if you were determined to prove that Mr. Charan Singh was right in calling you impotents, who can help it. And, if

Mr. Sharad Pawar could defect with his supporters by giving them the lure of office of Ministerial posts, are you today moving the amendments to say that defection should not take place? Has there been a single instance in this country when a Bill on defection was moved in the Lok Sabha and because of shouts and cries and dissenting note and also the opposition voiced by the important member called the General Secretary of the ruling party, the Bill was withdrawn and are you saying that you have not given any assurance with regard to Bill on Defection?

Mr. Deputy Chairman, I do not want to waste the time of the House. One has only got to go through these amendments to see what an irony of fate it is. I thought that people had given them enough beating, politically. People have punished them enough. But if they are also wanting to punish themselves again at their own hands by giving notices of such amendments, who can help it? Shakespeare said—perhaps Dr. Sahib can help me there—that when Gods want to destroy, first they turn them mad.

Now these amendments are moved. This party has been in power during the past 2-3 years and anybody glancing over these amendments, will first for a moment think: 'Till a week ago you were in power and we have had no time yet to settle, and yet you think of the document that you presented through the President of India when he addressed the first joint session, see thing with hatred, bursting with venom against Mrs. Gandhi and her party, and you see this document now. Show a single word which is not befitting an honourable party, a responsible leader and a responsible party. We have not given promises. Many points that are there have been copied verbatim from our manifesto. I am not going into that. Anybody can see that it is Congress-I manifesto, whether it is Mr. Shahabuddin speaking about Urdu or Mr. Sankar Ghose talking about many other things; it is verbatim from the manifesto.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN (Bihar): I would like to know, Sir, whether it is proper on the part of Mr. Antulay to answer the amendments which have not yet been moved. They are not on the Table of the House.

SHRI A. R. ANTULAY: Mr. Deputy Chairman, he is a new Member. I can understand the hon. Member being uncomfortable. He is a new Member. (Interruptions) I am not going to yield the floor.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: Sir, he is almost replying to all the amendments.

SHRI A. R. ANTULAY: Mr. Deputy Chairman, the amendments are in my possession. They have been circulated to the Members. Anybody can refer to them. So, Mr. Deputy Chairman, let the hon. Member take some lessons about the sittings and business of the House. So, whether the hon. Member, Mr. Shahabuddin talking about Urdu or the hon. Member talking about the Muslim cause...

AN HON. MEMBER: Ask him to sit down, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member has raised a point of order that the hon. Member who is moving the Motion, should not refer to the amendments because they have not yet been moved. I think the point of order is not well-taken because the amendments are so broad and they cover so many subjects that if you were not to do so, I think there would not be much left in the speech. Secondly, these are just broad ideas which would be formally presented in the form of amendments. I do not think the hon. Member is debarred from referring to them even as direct amendments.

SHRI A. R. ANTULAY: So, all these things are promises given in our manifesto, to be done during the next five years. This shows that the manifesto and the Address of the President

[Shri A. R. Antulay]

are being mistaken for each other and confused which should not be a fact for those who have really many years to go in this House or who have been for many years in this House as Members.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, I will only touch upon a couple of points before I resume my seat. Very interesting in this is by Mr. Jha who says that as the largest single party, Mr. Jagjivan Ram should have been invited to form the Government. After the massive mandate by the people and, Mr. Deputy Chairman, after a complete rout, I really do not know what comment to make, if at all anything is warranted.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is he mentally fit?

SHRI A. R. ANTULAY: So, Mr. Deputy Chairman, these are the types of amendments that have come, simply because they cannot find any fault with this Presidential Address which speaks of secularism which to me is dearer than democracy, dearer than the rule of law, dearer than anything else as a person belonging to the minority. It speaks of secularism, it speaks of socialism, it speaks of democracy, it speaks of self-reliance, it speaks of non-alignment, it speaks of self-respect as a nation. I think, Mr. Deputy Chairman, not only I formally move a vote of thanks to the President, but I really admire the President for giving in brief an Address which is full of meaning and import.

Finally, I would only say a couplet passed on to me by my friend here before I resume:

वो जो कहते थे कि हम पर मौत है छाई हुई,
देख लें कैसे आज हम है मौत पर छाए हुए।

श्री कल्प नाथ राय (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
उपसभापति महोदय, राष्ट्रपति जी के अभि-
भाषण पर जो धन्यवाद का प्रस्ताव प्रस्तुत

किया गया है, मैं उसका समर्थन करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ। ईश्वर को धन्यवाद कि उन्होंने इस देश को बचा लिया। उपसभापति महोदय, जब जनता सरकार (Interruptions) मैं दोबारा कहना चाहता हूँ कि ईश्वर को धन्यवाद कि उन्होंने इस देश को खूनी भेड़ियों के पंजों से बचा लिया। 1977 में जनता सरकार का निर्माण हुआ और राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण पर मैंने 6 अप्रैल, 1977 को इसी सदन में कहा था कि जनता सरकार का दिल टूटा हुआ है, जनता सरकार के विचार टूटे हुए हैं, जनता सरकार का मन टूटा हुआ है। इसलिए यह जनता सरकार एक साल चले, दो साल चले, मगर इसके बाद हिन्दुस्तान की 60 करोड़ जनता, जनता सरकार को उखाड़ फेंकेगी और आने वाले जमाने में श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी और उसके महान कार्यों की चर्चा करेगी, जो बात मैंने अप्रैल, 1977 में इसी सदन में कही थी आज वह बात अक्षरशः सिद्ध हुई है। पिछले 3 वर्षों में जनता सरकार ने क्या किया वह आज देश के सामने है। जब हमारी सरकार सत्ता में आई तो देश की नहीं बल्कि विश्व की महान नेता श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी ने पहले कहा :

“Indira Gandhi today appealed to the people to unite in a common effort to solve complex economic and social problems which have been aggravated by the interlude of non-concern and non-governance. We have only one adversary, social and economic justice. We have only one goal to build up, a strong and self-confident, self-reliant independent India.”

उपसभापति महोदय, जब जनता सरकार सत्ता में आई तो उसका एक ही लक्ष्य था कि इंदिरा गांधी को मिटाओ और एक ही लक्ष्य था कि श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी को हिन्दुस्तान के राजनीतिक के नक्शे से सदा

के लिए समाप्त कर दो। श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी को पिछले तीन वर्षों में लगातार एक नहीं अनेक मुकदमों में फंसाने, उनकी चरित्र हत्या करने, नेहरू परिवार को भिड़ाने की कोशिश जनता सरकार और लोक दल सरकार ने की। उपसभापति महोदय, आज यही कारण है कि जनता सरकार ने इन सड़ी हुई नीतियों के कारण जनता ने उस सरकार को समुद्र में फेंक दिया और कांग्रेस सरकार को सत्ता में कायम किया है।

उपसभापति महोदय, मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज चौधरी चरण सिंह और मोरारजी देसाई, ये लोग हिन्दुस्तान की बात करते हैं। इंदिरा जी ने कहा कि हमारी कोई दुश्मनी नहीं है। हम सत्ता में आये हैं लेकिन हमारी कोई दुश्मनी नहीं है। हमारी दुश्मन है गरीबी, हमारी दुश्मन है बेकारी, हमारी दुश्मन है सामाजिक उत्पीड़न, हमारी दुश्मन है आर्थिक उत्पीड़न, हमारा सपना है शक्तिशाली हिन्दुस्तान का निर्माण, हमारा सपना है आत्म निर्भर हिन्दुस्तान का निर्माण, हमारा सपना है भारत को शक्तिशाली बनाना। एक तरफ देश की नेता जिसके खून की प्यासी जनता सरकार और लोक दल की सरकार थी, वे जब सत्ता में आती हैं दो सारी उन पुरानी बातों को भूल कर, उन सारी बदले की भावना से ओत प्रोत जनता सरकार के लोगों की बातों को भूल कर, उनका लक्ष्य रह जाता है, जनता की भलाई, राष्ट्र की भलाई, देश का निर्माण, मुल्क का निर्माण। उस नेता का लक्ष्य यह नहीं है कि जनता पार्टी बुरी है या लोक दल बुरा है। चौधरी चरण सिंह बुरे हैं या मोरारजी देसाई बुरे हैं। मगर मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इंदिरा गांधी के सपने का भारत जो वे बनाना चाहती हैं उस सपने के भारत के निर्माण के लिए आज सहयोग की भावना

इस देश के अन्दर होनी चाहिये, विरोधी दल के अन्दर होनी चाहिये, परन्तु उसका अनाव उनके अन्दर नजर आता है।

उपसभापति महोदय, आज प्रजातंत्र का बात उठायी जाती है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जनता सरकार का निर्माण जब हुआ तब पहली कैबिनेट मीटिंग में गृह मंत्री चौधरी चरण सिंह ने विधान सभाओं को भंग करने का प्रस्ताव लिया सर्व सम्मति से नौ विधान सभाओं को भंग करने का कैबिनेट ने अनुमोदन किया। चौधरी चरण सिंह ने उत्तर भारत के मुख्य मंत्रियों को पत्र लिखा कि आप अपने मन से विधान सभाओं को भंग कर दें। जब किसी मुख्य मंत्री ने विधान सभा को भंग नहीं किया तो बिना गवर्नर की रिपोर्ट को लिए चौधरी चरण सिंह ने जनतंत्र का गला काट कर 9 विधान सभाओं को भंग किया था। उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार में बिना गवर्नर महोदय की रिपोर्ट के भंग किया था। दो वर्ष ही उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार और बिहार की सरकार को काम किये हुये थे कि उनको भंग किया गया। उड़ीसा की विधान सभा को भंग किया। उपसभापति महोदय, आज प्रजातंत्र की बात आती है दूसरी तरफ बनारसी दास की सरकार, राम सुन्दर दास की सरकार, उड़ीसा की सरकार, सारे उत्तर भारत की सरकारें केन्द्र की सरकार से कांफ्रंटेशन की स्थिति पैदा करना चाहती हैं। बनारसी दास ने बयान दिया है कि चूंकि जनता ने कांग्रेस को वोट दिया है इसलिए डीजल नहीं मिल रहा है, मिट्टी का तेल नहीं मिल रहा है। एक तरफ जनता सरकारें, लोक दल की सरकारें केन्द्र से कांफ्रंटेशन की स्थिति पैदा करना चाहती हैं और दूसरी तरफ प्रजातंत्र का सबक सिखला रही हैं। मैं साफ तरीके से कहना चाहता हूँ, उपसभापति महोदय, यदि हिन्दुस्तान में समाजवादी समाज के,

[श्री कल्प नाथ राय]

न राण के सपने को पूरा करना है, अगर हिन्दुस्तान में केन्द्र और राज्यों के अन्दर एक सम्यक सामंजस्य स्थापित करना है, अगर मुल्क की जनता को 20 सूची कार्यक्रम के अन्तर्गत जन राहत दिलानी है तो देश की नेता का यह कर्तव्य है कि वह देश की जनता की मनोभावनाओं को मद्दे-नजर रखते हुये उन विधान सभाओं को भंग करें जो हिन्दुस्तान की केन्द्रीय सरकार को कांफ्रंटेशन की स्थिति पैदा करना चाहती हैं। मैं मांग करता हूँ कि उत्तर प्रदेश की, बिहार की, पंजाब की, हरियाणा की जो विधान सभाएँ हैं जहाँ कि जनता और लोक दल का सफाया हो चुका है, वे भंग की जायें और वहाँ पुनः चुनाव कराये जायें ताकि केन्द्र और राज्यों के बीच सामंजस्य स्थापित हो और देश के अन्दर एक नए वातावरण में देश की जनता का कार्य हो सके।

उपसभापति महोदय, प्रजातन्त्र की बात की जाती है। आदरणीय चौधरी चरण सिंह ने प्रजातन्त्र की बात की है। मैं आपसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि पिछले चुनाव में क्या हुआ? उपसभापति महोदय, मैं आपके सामने पश्चिमी उत्तर प्रदेश का एक आंकड़ा प्रस्तुत करना चाहता हूँ। पश्चिमी उत्तर प्रदेश में चुनाव हुआ। कैराना लोक सभा क्षेत्र जहाँ चौधरी चरण सिंह की पत्नी श्रीमती गायत्री देवी चुनाव लड़ीं, वहाँ हमारी पार्टी के उम्मीदवार को मावदाखेड़ी स्टेशन पर से एक वोट मिलता है और उनकी पत्नी को 9 सौ वोट मिलते हैं। कैराना पोलिंग स्टेशन पर उनको 634 मिलता है और कांग्रेस को जीरो मिलता है। विधान सभा क्षेत्र थाना भवन, विधान सभा क्षेत्र कामला, विधान सभा क्षेत्र कैराना, इन सारी विधान सभाओं में लाठी के बल पर सारे पोलिंग बूथों को कलेक्टर और सुपरिण्डेंडेंट पुलिस

से मिल कर रातों-रात सारे पोलिंग बूथों पर कब्जा किया जाता है। कांग्रेस के उम्मीदवार को एकसौ और लोक दल के उम्मीदवार को 1100 वोट मिलता है। इस पूरे पश्चिमी और पूर्वी उत्तर प्रदेश में नौकरशाही का इस्तेमाल करके, जिलाधीश का गलत इस्तेमाल करके, पुलिस सुपरिण्डेंडेंट का इस्तेमाल करके पोलिंग बूथ पर कब्जा करके, लाठी और बन्दूक के सहारे यह तीस-चालीस सीट जीत के आये हैं।

यह लोग प्रजातन्त्र की बात करते हैं। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान की जनता का प्रजातन्त्र में कैसे विश्वास होगा? चौधरी चरण सिंह के खिलाफ कोई व्यक्ति चुनाव नहीं लड़ सकता है। ग्यारह हरिजनों की हत्या कर दी गई। गांधी जी का नाम लेना और हरिजनों को वोट का मुंह नहीं देखने देना। इस लाठी दल ने जो पूरे उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार में किया, मैं कहना चाहता हूँ हिन्दुस्तान में तीस-बत्तीस वर्ष के इतिहास में कभी ऐसा काम नहीं हुआ है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि विरोधी दल के लोग जो प्रजातन्त्र की बात करते हैं, वे छारीली क्षेत्र से लेकर कैराना—जहाँ लोक दल ने चुनाव जीते हैं, उसकी इन्क्वायरी कराएँ, जांच कराएँ कि क्या वहाँ पर कोई वोटिंग हुआ है। रातों-रात बक्से भर दिए गये पुलिस के बल पर। कलेक्टर से कह कर पुलिस अफसरों की नियुक्ति कराई गई और सारे उम्मीदवारों के बक्से पर कब्जा कर बन्दूक के बल पर वोट डले गये। इस तरह से इनकी विजय हुई। यह प्रजातन्त्र की बात करते हैं।

यह देश गांधी जी और जवाहरलाल की कुर्बानियों से जो हिन्दुस्तान आजाद हुआ, यह देश की किस्मत है कि हमारा देश किसी तरह बच गया और हमारे देश में श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी के नेतृत्व में एक स्थिर सरकार आई।

चौधरी चरण सिंह ने अभी लोक सभा में कहा है कि पिछले तीस वर्षों में कांग्रेस पार्टी ने क्या किया है। उन्होंने कहा है कि अगर मेरी नीयत खराब होती तो श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी की हालत बड़ी खराब होती। यह उन्होंने अगोपनीयता में कहा है विरोधी दल के नेता चरण सिंह कहते हैं कि हमने कमीशन केवल बिठाये। हमने उनके ऊपर केवल ओवर कमीशन, रेड्डी कमीशन, गुप्ता कमीशन, शाह कमीशन—प्रनेको कमीशन बिठाए, हमने उनको केवल जेल में डाला। अगर हमारी नीयत खराब होती तो हम क्या कर डालते।

मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इस सदन के माध्यम से, कि चौधरी चरण सिंह की नीयत क्या थी और नीयत खराब होने का मतलब क्या होता है? छोटी बातें करना चौधरी चरण सिंह—यह पार्लियामेंट इस बात का गवाह है कि चरण सिंह के भ्रष्टाचार के खिलाफ मैंने इसी सदन के अन्दर काशीपुर लैण्ड डील का मामला उठाया था। आठ दिन उस पर बहस चली। चौधरी चरण सिंह सदन को छोड़ कर भाग गये। सदन में जवाब नहीं दे पाये। आप तो सदन में भ्रष्टाचार को मिटाने की बात, बड़ी ऊंची बात किया करते थे, पर जब उनके दामादों, उनके रिश्तेदारों और उनकी बेटी पर प्रश्न आये तो सदन को छोड़कर भाग गये। मैंने पार्लियामेंट के बारे में उसके खिलाफ प्रेस कांफ्रेंस की, उनके खिलाफ सूर्य में इन्टरव्यू दिया। तो उन्होंने पत्र लिखा कि क्या आपने इन्टरव्यू दिया है? और यदि दिया है तो इन आरोपों को वापिस कीजिए, माफी मांगिए, नहीं तब हम आपके खिलाफ मान-हानि का दावा पहली मई को करेंगे। मैंने उनको पत्र लिखा कि मैं चाहता हूँ चौधरी साहब कि आप मेरे ऊपर मान-

हानि का दावा करें ताकि मैं भारत की जनता के बीच साबित कर सकूँ कि एक कंगाल परिवार कैसे करोड़पति बना और करोड़पति इन्दिरा गांधी का परिवार कैसे कंगाल बना और यह भारत की जनता को मालूम हो कि कौन ईमानदार है और कौन बेईमान है। इस बात पर छोड़ कर भाग गये। कहां गया मानहानि का दावा? जो लोग नैतिकता की बात करते हैं, चरित्र की बात करते हैं, ईमानदारी की बात करते हैं, वे पार्लियामेंट और सदन को छोड़ कर भाग जाया करते हैं। अध्यक्ष महोदय, उन्होंने नीयत की बातें की कि अगर हमारी नीयत खराब होती तो हम यह काम करते। जनता सरकार के समय में इस मुल्क की नौकरशाही को डिमारलाइज किया गया इस मुल्क की पुलिस को डिमारलाइज किया गया। इस मुल्क के लोगों को खत्म करने की कोशिश की गयी, गरीबों को नष्ट करने का प्रयास किया गया।

उपसभापति महोदय, कौन नहीं जानता है कि सुन्दर डकैत जो 22 कल और 70 डकैतियों का मुखजिम था और जिसे भागते हुए पुलिस के डो आई जो भिन्डर ने गोली मारी थी जब जनता सरकार आयी तो पहला पुलिस का डो आई जो वही मुखजिम किया गया। उस के ऊपर कमीशन आफ इन्क्वायरी बैठाया गया। सुन्दर डकैत, जिस ने 22 कल किये और 70 डकैतियां डालीं, पुलिस के साथ एनकाउन्टर में मारा गया। चौधरी चरण सिंह ने अपने गृह मंत्री के काल में हजारों डकैतों को एनकाउन्टर में मरवाया है, हजारों को उत्तर प्रदेश में मरवाया है, लेकिन जब 22 कल का मुखजिम मारा जाता है तो उसके लिए अजग से कमीशन आफ इन्क्वायरी गृह मंत्री बैठते हैं।

[श्री कल्प नाथ राय]

मैं जानना चाहता हूँ सदन के माध्यम से कि इस कातिल की रक्षा करने के लिए कौन सी उम्मीद थी ? मैं जानता हूँ कि सुन्दर डकेत को इन्दिरा गांधी और संजय गांधी का कत्ल करने के लिए ओम पाल मेहरा के माध्यम से प्रेरित किया गया था। यह इतिहास है जिसे कोई बदल नहीं सकता। लेकिन इन्दिरा गांधी कितनी महान है।

जो तुझ को कांटा बोय ताहि बोय

तू फूल

तुझ को फूल का फूल है, वाको है तिरमूल।

इस कहानी का प्रतिबिम्ब श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी हैं। जनता सरकार के लोगों ने लेसन नहीं लिया। हिन्दुस्तान का इतिहास इस बात का सबूत है कि जब-जब नारी का अपमान हुआ है तब-तब नारियों का अपमान करने वालों का नाश हुआ है। रावण ने सीता का अपमान करने की कोशिश की उस का नाश हुआ, कौरवों ने द्रौपदी की इज्जत लूटने की कोशिश की उन का सर्वनाश हो गया और इन्दिरा गांधी की इज्जत, नेहरू परिवार की चरित्र-हत्या करने की कोशिश आपने की आप का सर्वनाश हो गया। ये इतिहास के लेसन हैं।

चौधरी चरण ने कहा है कि तीस वर्षों में कांग्रेस ने क्या किया। मैं कहता हूँ कि जब हिन्दुस्तान आजाद हुआ तो भूखा-नंगा, कगाल हिन्दुस्तान था, लेकिन जब इन्दिरा गांधी ने हिन्दुस्तान को जनता सरकार के सुपुर्द किया तो यह शक्ति-

शाली हिन्दुस्तान था। मैं पूछता हूँ कि क्या इन्दिरा गांधी से पहले हिन्दुस्तान इतना शक्तिशाली था ? क्या हिन्दुस्तान इन्दिरा गांधी से पहले आर्थिक दृष्टि से तकनीकी दृष्टि से औद्योगिक दृष्टि से इतना शक्तिशाली था ? क्या हिन्दुस्तान इन्दिरा गांधी से पहले खाद्यान्न के मामले में आत्मनिर्भर था ? क्या हिन्दुस्तान इन्दिरा गांधी से पहले दुनिया के इतिहास में इतना शक्तिशाली था ? क्या हिन्दुस्तान ने इन्दिरा गांधी से पहले दुनिया की विरादरी में इतना ऊंचा स्थान प्राप्त किया था ? ये सवाल हैं। इन सवालों का जवाब हर हिन्दुस्तानी को देना होगा। मैंने पूछा कि क्या इन्दिरा गांधी से पहले हिन्दुस्तान इतिहास में दुनिया की विरादरी में इतना गौरवशाली देश था। क्या हिन्दुस्तान दो हजार वर्ष के इतिहास में विदेशी हमलावरों के सामने विजय प्राप्त कर सका था ? मैं पूछता हूँ कि क्या हिन्दुस्तान दुनिया का चौथा फटिलाइजर-नोहाउ देश नहीं बना ? क्या तीस वर्षों में हिन्दुस्तान दुनिया का आठवां इंडस्ट्रियल पावर नहीं बना ? क्या हिन्दुस्तान तीस वर्षों में छठा एटामिक पावर नहीं बना ? क्या हिन्दुस्तान बंगला देश की जंग जीतने के बाद एक शक्तिशाली राष्ट्र नहीं बना ? क्या हिन्दुस्तान इन्दिरा गांधी के तीस वर्षों में दुनिया का तीसरा टेक्नीकल नोहाउ देश नहीं हुआ ? क्या हिन्दुस्तान आठवां इंडस्ट्रियल पावर और छठा एग्रीकल्चरल पावर नहीं बना ? क्या 20 मिलियन टन बफर स्टॉक हिन्दुस्तान के पास नहीं रहा क्या 500 करोड़ रु० का सोना हिन्दुस्तान के खजाने में नहीं था ? क्या हिन्दुस्तान के पास 500 करोड़ रु० का फारेन एक्सचेंज नहीं था ? एक शक्तिशाली हिन्दुस्तान, एकताबद्ध हिन्दुस्तान, ताकतवर हिन्दुस्तान, खाद्यान्न में आत्मनिर्भर हिन्दुस्तान, इन्दिरा गांधी ने जनता पार्टी को दिया था, लेकिन जनता पार्टी ने ऐसा, हिन्दुस्तान

पाकर भी विकास की दिशा में कोई कदम नहीं उठाया क्योंकि उनके विचार टूटे हुए थे। उपसभापति महोदय, श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी के नेतृत्व में बीस-सूत्री कार्यक्रम समाजवाद की दिशा में कदम था। बीस-सूत्री कार्यक्रम के अन्तर्गत भूमिहीनों को भूमि दी गयी। अकेले उत्तर प्रदेश

3 P.M. में 15 लाख भूमिहीनों पर जनता सरकारने मुकदमा कायम किया। उपसभापति महोदय, 30 मार्च, 1976 को हिन्दुस्तान के इतिहास में पहली बार एक कानून बना कि लैंडलेस के लिये लैंड, भूमिहीन के लिये भूमि, बिना घरवालों के लिये मकान, बिना जमीन वालों के लिये जमीन और जमीन का मालिकाना हक, राइट टु प्रापर्टी होगा। पहली बार 30 मार्च 1976 को इन्दिरा गांधी की कलम की एक नोक से हिन्दुस्तान के करोड़ों लोगों के दिलों में एक चिराग जला और उसी 20-सूत्री कार्यक्रम की भावनाओं के खिलाफ जनता और लोक दल की सरकारों ने काम किया। मैं हरिजन सदस्यों और देश की कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के नेताओं और वामपन्थी ताकतों से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या 20 सूत्री कार्यक्रम समाजवाद की दिशा में एक कदम नहीं था अगर उसके खिलाफ काम करने वाली सरकारों को आप के द्वारा समर्थन नहीं दिया गया था? हिन्दुस्तान का माडर्न इकोनामिक इंफ्रा स्ट्रक्चर पं० जवाहर लाल नेहरू की अध्यक्षता में विल्ड-अप हुआ था, लेकिन आप तीन वर्षों में ही सीमेंट और लोहा बाहर से मंगाने लगे कोयला बाहर से मंगाने लगे। जिन चीजों में हिन्दुस्तान आत्मनिर्भर था उन चीजों को भी हम बाहर से मंगाने लगे। देश के प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा कि झगड़ा है ग्रामीण बनाम शहर का। शहर और गांवों के बीच लड़ाई है। किसान और गैर किसान के बीच, धनी और गरीब के बीच, पिछड़े

और अगड़े के बीच लड़ाई है। भारत के टुकड़े टुकड़े करना, देश में जातिवाद और प्रान्तवाद और उसके द्वारा राष्ट्रीय एकता को नष्ट करने का प्रयास जनता सरकार और लोकदल की सरकारों ने किया। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जो हिन्दुस्तान स्टील के मामले में आत्मनिर्भर हो गया था, जो कोयले के मामले में आत्मनिर्भर हो गया था, जो हिन्दुस्तान सीमेंट के मामले में आत्मनिर्भर हो गया था, उन को ही हमने इंपोर्ट करना शुरू किया और प्राइवेट सेक्टर इकोनामी को कुचलकर प्राइवेट सेक्टर इकोनामी को प्राथमिकता देने का कुचक्र जनता और लोकदल की सरकारों द्वारा किया गया। मैं चौधरी चरण सिंह जी से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि गांव का विकास कैसे होगा? क्या बिना सीमेंट के गांवों का विकास होगा? क्या बिना लोहे के गांवों का विकास होगा? क्या गांवों का विकास बिना नहरों के होगा? क्या गांवों का विकास बिना खेती के होगा? क्या गांवों का विकास बिना ट्यूब वेल के होगा? क्या गांवों का विकास बिना सड़क के होगा? क्या गांवों का विकास बिना उद्योग धंधों के होगा? क्या गांवों का विकास इंडस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट और एग्रीकल्चरल डेवलपमेंट के बिना हो सकता है? यह दोनों तो सप्लीमेंटरी और काम्प्लीमेंटरी है टू ईच अदर? औद्योगिक विकास पर ही निर्भर करता है खेती का विकास और खेती के विकास पर ही औद्योगिक विकास निर्भर करता है। इस मोटी सी बात का स्वप्न पं० जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने देखा हिन्दुस्तान में और उसके अनुरूप ही काम करने का प्रयत्न किया गया, लेकिन उन सारे मुद्दों को नष्ट करने का प्रयास जनता सरकार ने किया। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि खेती की तरक्की कैसे होगी? खेती की तरक्की के लिये उपसभापति महोदय, फर्टिलाइजर चाहिए। खेती की तरक्की के लिए पानी

[श्री कल्प नाथ राय]

चाहिए, खेती की तरक्की के लिए इंसेक्टसाइड और पेस्टीसाइड चाहिए। खेती की तरक्की के लिए अच्छे बीज चाहिए। खेती की तरक्की के लिए ट्रैक्टर चाहिए। तो खेती की तरक्की के लिये इन सब चीजों की जरूरत है। जब हिन्दुस्तान आजाद हुआ था तो इस देश में एक छटांक भी फर्टिलाइजर नहीं था। इस देश में एक टन लोहा भी पब्लिक सेक्टर में नहीं था। इस देश में एक भी हवी इलेक्ट्रिकल का कारखाना नहीं था। इस देश में एक भी ट्रैक्टर का कारखाना नहीं था। इस देश में एक भी फर्टिलाइजर का कारखाना नहीं था और देश में कोई कारखाना बनाने के लिये किसी प्रकार का इन्फ्रा स्ट्रक्चर नहीं था। इन सारी चीजों की बुनियाद किस ने डाली? मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि अगर खेती के विकास के लिये फर्टिलाइजर चाहिए तो फर्टिलाइजर कैसे बनेगा। उसे पैदा करने के लिये तो हम को लोहे की जरूरत होगी और लोहे के लिये हम को रूरकेला और भिलाई के कारखाने बनाने पड़ेंगे और जब लोहे का स्ट्रक्चर तैयार हो जायेगा तो उस लोहे के कारखाने के लिये टरबाइन मशीनें चाहिए, टरबाइन मशीनों के लिये हमें हेवी एलक्ट्रिकल कारखाने चाहिए और उस के लिये हमें नो-हाऊ चाहिए और उसके लिये अच्छे इंजीनियर चाहिए। इंजीनियर्स हमारे यहां पैदा हो जायेंगे तो हमें नेफथा चाहिए। समुद्र में छपा मारकर नेफथा पैदा करना होगा। जब हम तेल पैदा करेंगे तो नेफथा होगा, जब नेफथा होगा तब फर्टिलाइजर बनेगा। जब फर्टिलाइजर बनेगी, तब खाद बनेगी तो किसानों के खेतों में जाएगी। खेतों में जब खाद जाएगी तो उसमें पानी के लिए हमें ट्यूबवैल चाहिए, ट्यूबवैल के लिए हमें बिजली

चाहिए। बिजली के लिए हमें बिजली पैदा करने की बड़े कारखाने चाहिए। इसके लिए हमें इंजीनियरिंग कालेजों की आवश्यकता होगी। पिछले 30 वर्षों के अन्दर कांग्रेस पार्टी और कांग्रेस की सरकार ने हिन्दुस्तान के बुनियाद की नींव डाली जिसके कारण हमारे देश में गल्ला 6 करोड़ टन से बढ़कर 13 करोड़ टन हुआ जिसके कारण हम हिन्दुस्तान का निर्माण कर सके।

उपसभापति महोदय, मेरा कहना है कि इस देश की नेता श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी ने इस देश को समाजवाद का नारा दिया है। अगर हुकूमत हमारे हाथ में होगी तो हमें इसको लाना चाहिये। There must be political stability. If there is no political stability, there cannot be any economic development. If there is no economic development, we cannot stop chaos and confusion in the country.

उपसभापति महोदय, राष्ट्र को एक झंझावात के बाद एक पोलिटिकल स्टेबिलिटी मिली है। पोलिटिकल स्टेबिलिटी श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी के नेतृत्व में देश में कायम हुई है। उस पोलिटिकल स्टेबिलिटी के साथ समाजवाद की दिशा में देश की नेता कदम उठाएंगी। देश की समस्याएँ बड़ी हैं, गम्भीर हैं, स्थिति नाजुक है, परिस्थितियाँ गम्भीर हैं। इनको हल करने के लिए केवल भावनाओं में नहीं बहा जा सकता। एक शक्तिशाली हिन्दुस्तान के निर्माण के लिए, एक समाजवादी हिन्दुस्तान के निर्माण के लिए, समाजवाद की दिशा में कदम उठाने होंगे। उस कदम के लिए जब तक हिन्दुस्तान की समाजवादी ताकतें इस सरकार का समर्थन नहीं करती तब तक

इस मुल्क में लोकतंत्र कभी मजबूत नहीं हो सकेगा और समाजवाद कभी मजबूत नहीं हो सकेगा ।

आज दुनिया के मुल्कों में एक ऐक्सपेरिमेंट चल रहा है । जिन मुल्कों में समाजवाद है वहां डेमोक्रेसी नहीं है, जहां डेमोक्रेसी है वहां समाजवाद नहीं है हिन्दुस्तान में महात्मा गांधी, जवाहरलाल नेहरू और श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी के नेतृत्व में डेमोक्रेटिक सोशलिज्म कायम करने का कदम उठाया गया है और समाजवाद के साथ डेमोक्रेसी का समावेश कर एक जनतांत्रिक समाजवाद की स्थापना का संकल्प हमारी आजादी के सेनानियों ने किया था ताकि मन की आजादी के साथ, पेट की आजादी भी आ सके । ताकि अतीत को सामने रखकर अपने भविष्य का हम निर्माण कर सकें । जो अरमान गांधी और नेहरू के थे वही अरमान श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी के हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान एक शक्तिशाली राष्ट्र बने जिसमें न कोई भूखा हो, न कोई गंगा हो, न कोई दवा हो, न शोषित हो, न पीड़ित हो, न कोई तबाह हो । इस नये हिन्दुस्तान को नेहरू और गांधी के सपनों को साकार करना है ताकि आने वाले जमाने में हिन्दुस्तान एशिया और अफ्रीका के मुल्कों का भी नेतृत्व कर सके, नये विश्व का निर्माण कर सके, एक शक्तिशाली दुनिया राष्ट्रों की बन सके ।...

(Time bell rings)

उपसभापति महोदय आज दुनिया दो हिस्सों में बंटी है । एक का नेतृत्व पूंजीवादी अमरीका कर रहा है और दूसरे का नेतृत्व समाजवादी रूस कर रहा है । तीसरे जो डेवलपिंग कंट्रीज हैं उनका नेतृत्व, एशिया और अफ्रीका के मुल्कों का नेतृत्व हिन्दुस्तान की नेता

श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी को करना है, भारत को करना है ताकि दुनिया के राष्ट्रों की लूट न हो, नव-स्वतंत्र और विकासशील देशों को विकास मिल सके और हिन्दुस्तान के साथ-साथ इन देशों में भी समाजवाद आ सके । एशिया और अफ्रीका के मुल्क भी हिन्दुस्तान के रास्ते पर चलें ताकि पीड़ित मानवता दुनिया के समृद्धिशाली राष्ट्रों, साम्राज्यवादियों की लूट से बच सके और हिन्दुस्तान प्रतीक बनकर उनका नेतृत्व कर सके । धन्यवाद ।

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

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

"That the Members of the Rajya Sabha assembled in this Session are deeply grateful to the President for the Address which he has been pleased to deliver to both Houses of Parliament assembled together on the 23rd January, 1980."

There are 141 amendments to this Motion which may be moved now at this stage. I will call the hon. Members in whose names the amendments stand and they may please indicate if they want to move them.

Dr. Bhai Mahavir. Not here.

Shri V. B. Raju.

SHRI V. B. RAJU (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, I move:

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

'but regret that the Address makes no mention of the growing unemployment among the educated youth.'

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

'but regret that the Address does not give any assurance to the States that the State Assemblies

[Shri V. B. Raju]

would not be dissolved and the democratic functioning of the legislatures in the federal frame would not be interfered with by the Union Government.”

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I move:

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

‘but regret that the Address has failed to provide any assurance to the people of India that their rights and privileges provided in the Constitution will not in any manner be curtailed or circumscribed as was done in and after May 1975.’”

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

‘but regret that the Address has failed to assure that the All India Radio and Doordarshan would be changed into an independent corporation as suggested by the Chanda Committee followed by the recommendations of the Verghese Committee.’”

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Tamil Nadu): Sir, I move:

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

‘but regret that the Address does not mention about the machinations of U.S.A. to create tension in the Indian sub-continent by giving massive arms aid to Pakistan.’”

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

‘but regret that the Address makes no mention of the increasing American Naval power in the Indian Ocean which endangers the security of littoral States in this area.’”

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

‘but regret that the Address does not mention the steps to be

taken for strengthening the federal character of the polity in the changed political situation.’”

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

‘but regret that the Address does not mention about giving recognition to Kampuchian Government headed by Heng Samarin.’”

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

‘but regret that the Address does not mention about the hectic activities of C.I.A. and other foreign agencies in the North Eastern States in fomenting linguistic strife.’”

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

‘but regret that the Address does not mention about the continued firing by Bangladesh Armed Forces on the Tripura border, and the steps proposed to be taken to stop the same.’”

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

‘but regret that the Address does not mention about the withdrawal of American forces from South Korea, which are a continuous danger to the security of the region.’”

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

‘but regret that the Address does not mention about the acute shortage of essential commodities in Tripura due to disruption of road-transport in Assam-Meghalaya areas as a result of continuous agitation there.’”

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

‘but regret that the Address does not mention about bringing down the prices of essential commodities and their supply to the

people at reasonable prices through fair price shops throughout the country.'"

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

'but regret that the Address does not mention about the failure of the Government to nationalise foreign banks, monopoly houses and branches of multinationals.'"

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

'but regret that the Address does not mention about the payment of bonus to Government employees and employees in Departmental Undertakings as referred wage.'"

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

'but regret that the Address does not mention about giving need-based wage to workers and employees.'"

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

'but regret that the Address does not mention about full neutralisation of the rise in cost of price index.'"

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

'but regret that the Address does not mention about the failure of the Government to provide jobs to the unemployed in the country.'"

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

'but regret that the Address does not mention about the precipitate fall in the prices of agricultural products leading to the ruination of the peasantry.'"

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

'but regret that the Address does not mention about giving

allowance to the unemployed persons in the country.'"

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

'but regret that the Address does not mention about introduction of free education upto the Secondary level throughout the country.'"

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

'but regret that the Address does not mention about the inclusion of Nepali language in the Eighth Schedule to the Constitution of India.'"

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

'but regret that the Address does not mention about curbing the monopolies.'"

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

'but regret that the Address does not mention about the abolition of contract labour system in the country.'"

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

'but regret that the Address does not mention about the danger to the Indian economy due to increasing concessions being given to foreign monopolists.'"

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

'but regret that the Address does not mention about the failure of the Government to give credit facilities to the lowest strata of the society such as agricultural labourers, poor peasants, unorganised workers, etc.'"

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

'but regret that the Address does not mention about any radical measures for land reforms.'"

[Shri P. Ramamurti]

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

'but regret that the Address does not mention about the failure of the Government to curb the increasing crimes in Delhi.'"

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

'but regret that the Address does not mention about fixing the minimum wage for agricultural labourers.'"

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

'but regret that the Address does not mention about the "Food For Work Programmes" in various States, particularly in West Bengal and Tripura.'"

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

'but regret that the Address does not mention about the severe crisis being faced by the traditional industries of Kerala, which has affected the livelihood of several lakhs of workers in Kerala.'"

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

'but regret that the Address does not mention about the inclusion of the Right to Work as a Fundamental Right in the Constitution of India.'"

(Amendment Nos. 11 to 38 also stood in the names of Shri Harkishan Singh Surjeet, Shri Pattiam Rajan, Shrimati Kanak Mukherjee, Shri Vishwanatha Menon and Shri Syed Shahedullah).

SHRI HARI SHANKAR BHABHRA (Rajasthan): Sir, I move:

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

'but regret that the Address does not mention about the need

for imposing a legal ban on political defection so as to stop their recurrence which was responsible for the dissolution of the Sixth Lok Sabha before time and which created unstable conditions at the Centre.'"

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

'but regret that the Address does not make any mention that Government proposes to maintain the Federal character of the Constitution.'"

SHRI KALRAJ MISHRA (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I move:

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

'but regret that the Address does not mention about the need to change the present election system which involves incurring of heavy expenditure, provides encouragement to corrupt practices in elections and is incapable of ensuring proper representation to the political parties in proportion to the votes polled by them.'"

SHRI SHIVA CHANDRA JHA: Sir, I move:

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

'but regret that the Address does not mention that the Sixth Lok Sabha was dissolved because the largest party under the leadership of Shri Jagjivan Ram was not given the opportunity to form the Government.'"

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

'but regret that the Address does not clearly state that the uncertainty in the country has been resolved.'"

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

'but regret that the Address does not mention that the present

Government has won only by 42.6 per cent of the votes polled.'"

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

'but regret that the Address does not mention that the prices rose specially under the Caretaker Government headed by the former Prime Minister, Shri Charan Singh.'"

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

'but regret that the Address does not mention anything about the Sixth Five-Year Plan.'"

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

'but regret that the Address does not mention about the minimum programme of the Sixth Five Year Plan.'"

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

'but regret that the Address does not mention about the development of the Press through the "Planned Press and Party Press Process".'"

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

'but regret that the Address does not mention about the Russian armed intervention in Afghanistan.'"

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

'but regret that the Address does not protest against the American supply of arms to Pakistan.'"

SHRI SANKAR GHOSE (West Bengal): Sir, I move:

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

'but regret that the Address does not mention about Government's intention to ensure that at

least one adult member per family is employed at a socially acceptable wage level within a time-bound programme.'"

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

'but regret that the Address does not mention about setting up a special peace-keeping force composed of persons drawn from minority communities, scheduled castes and scheduled tribes in order to control communal disturbances.'"

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

'but regret that the Address does not mention about the recognition of Heng Samarin regime in Kampuchea.'"

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

'but regret that the Address does not envisage the setting up of a Commission for Relief from Natural Disasters with an adequate fund corpus to attend to such disasters expeditiously and for affording immediate relief to those affected.'"

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

'but regret that the Address fails to declare the Government's intention to provide clean drinking water to all needy villages in five years.'"

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

'but regret that the Address fails to mention anything about the revised or continuance of the scheme for the grant of pension for freedom fighters.'"

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

'but regret that the Address does not state that the School Health Programme and the mid-

[Shri Shankar Ghose]

day meal programme will be expanded and strengthened so as to cover all children within a period of five years.'"

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

'but regret that the Address does not envisage the setting up of a National Commission on Teachers to consider all aspects relevant to the teaching community, including their emoluments, with a view to according them their due status and for enabling them to play their legitimate role in the educational process more effectively.'"

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Manubhai Patel, not here. Shrimati Leela Damodara Menon, not here. Shri Ajit Kumar Sharma, not here. Shri Surendra Mohanty, not here. Shri Buddha Priya Maurya, not here. Shri A. G. Kulkarni.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra): Sir, I move:

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

'but regret that the Address does not contain an assurance that the State Assemblies will not be dissolved by the President, on the advice of the Government, thus putting an end to the persistent inspired statements emanating from sources close to Government, about Government's efforts to subvert the democratic process either by dissolution or by defection.'"

(The Amendment also stood in the names of Shri K. V. Raghunatha Reddy, Shri S. W. Dhabe, Shri Narasingha Prasad Nanda, Shrimati Ambika Soni, Shrimati Margaret Alva, Shri Jaharlal Banerjee, Shri Sankar Ghosh and Shri V. B. Raju).

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: Sir, I move:

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

'but regret that the Address does not make any reference to the implementation of the Sixth Five Year Plan.'"

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

'but regret that the Address makes no reference to the place of Urdu in administration, education and mass media.'"

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

'but regret that the Address gives no indication whether the Government propose to take any steps to curb the frequency of and intensity of communal violence.'"

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

'but regret that the Address does not address itself to the problem of unemployment, specially among the educated and the skilled youth.'"

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

'but regret that the Address does not indicate a clear perception of the threat posed by the U.S.S.R's occupation of Afghanistan to the security of the sub-continent as a whole and of the need to evolve a collective response of the States in the region to this threat.'"

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

'but regret that the Address gives an incorrect impression about our non-existent relations with the ASEAN.'"

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

'but regret that the Address makes no reference to the continuing struggle against South-

Africa and its policies of apartheid, economic exploitation and armed intervention.'"

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

'but regret that the Address makes no reference to the escalation of great power-rivalry in the Indian Ocean and specially to the expansion of the Diego Garcia base.'"

SHRI SADASHIV BAGAITKAR (Maharashtra): Sir, I move:

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

'but regret that the Address not not categorically assure that taking into account the federal structure of our Constitution, the new Government will not disturb the duly elected Vidhan Sabhas either by dissolving them or by engineering defections.'"

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

'but regret that the Address does not mention about establishing price-parity between agricultural and industrial goods.'"

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

'but regret that the Address does not mention that Government would immediately undertake the electoral reforms including State financial assistance to political parties.'"

SHRI S. W. DHABE (Maharashtra): Sir, I move:

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

'but regret that the Address does not contain any reference to the important problems like workers' participation in management bonus for all employees including

Central Government servants, plan to remove and eradicate the large-scale unemployment, comprehensive legislation for service conditions of rural labour, distribution of surplus land to landless and national public distribution system.'"

(The Amendment also stood in the name of Shrimati Ambika Soni).

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I move:

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

'but regret that there is not even a hint in the Address that there will be any radical structural reform or socio-economic changes without which the problems causing havoc on the life of the toiling masses can never be solved.'"

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

'but regret that the Address is not only uninspiring and colourless but is one that holds out the bleak prospect of the continuation of the discredited policies in the interests of the monopolists and other exploiters.'"

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

'but regret that there is no convincing indication in the Address of any change in the economic policy to bring down prices or even to arrest the growth of unemployment.'"

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

'but regret that the Address completely ignores the monopolists and similar other exploiters, not to speak of taking any effective measure to curb them or to prevent the concentration of economic power.'"

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

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

'but regret that the Address does not take any serious note of the fall in prices of agricultural commodities nor does it propose any concrete measure to ensure remunerative prices to farmers.' "

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

'but regret that the Address does not propose, any effective measures for distributing essential commodities at fair prices to the poor people.' "

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

'but regret that the Address does not mention the plight of the millions of Indian women due to their inequal social and economic status ever-increasing burden of dowry, almost total lack of employment opportunities, utter lack of education and the existence of terrible rate of illiteracy and steps to improve their lot, despite the fact that the International Women's Decade is still continuing.' "

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

'but regret that the Address does not promise inclusion of Nepali and Manipuri languages in the Eighth Schedule to the Constitution.' "

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

'but regret that while the Address fails to mention that the stability, the nation today needs, can never be brought about without improving the living conditions of the masses and ensuring them a better life and social justice.' "

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

'but regret that the Address does not take serious note of the

moves of the ruling party at the Centre to engineer defections in the States on a large scale and even to arbitrarily dissolve the elected State Assemblies.' "

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

'but regret that the Address is totally silent on the need for radical electoral reforms, notably the replacement of the present electoral system by a system of proportional representation.' "

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

'but regret that the Address does not show any concern over the unprecedented play of money power in elections and otherwise also in the political life of the country.' "

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

'but regret that while touching on the Centre-State relations the Address makes no promise whatsoever to grant greater autonomy to the States or to increase their economic powers or provide them with greater resources or their developmental and other nation-building activities.' "

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

'but regret that while the Address speaks of the law and order situation it does not take note even of the fact that the crime in the capital city itself has gone up after the new Government has been formed thereby belying the ruling party's tall electioneering pledges.' "

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

'but regret that the Address totally fails to assess in the correct perspective the grave threat to the security of our region and

indeed to the world peace resulting from the counter-offensive and aggressive moves including arms race of the U.S. imperialists and their allies in collusion with the Chinese rulers.”

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

‘but regret that the Address does not identify and come out sharply against the imperialist threat to our region including the open armed attacks organised by these forces against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and does not state that in fact, what India is faced with is a calculated offensive by U.S.A. which is not only abetted by other imperialist powers and the Chinese rulers, but which is also mobilising the internal forces of counter-revolution and other reactionaries as is, for example witnessed in Afghanistan.’”

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

‘but regret that the Address fails to mention that U.S. imperialists are rushing arms aid to Pakistan and are on a global offensive against world peace, independence and security of nations.’”

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

‘but regret that the Address fails to take a forthright anti-imperialist stand, which alone can give meaning and content to India’s policy of peace and non-alignment.’”

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

‘but regret that the Address does not take notice of the disturbing attempts to engineer defections on a large scale in the Assemblies in the States under the non-Congress(I) governments and

even to arbitrarily dissolve such assemblies in flagrant violation of all federal principles, nor does it give any assurance that the Government will not in any manner encourage, directly or indirectly, such attempts at subverting the Constitution and flouting democratic norms and standards.’”

(The Amendment No. 104 also stood in the names of Shri A. G. Kulkarni, Shri P. Ramamurti, Shri Lal K. Advani, Shri Rabi Ray, Dr. (Shrimati) Sathiaivani Muthu and Shri Buddha Priya Maurya).

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

‘but regret that the Address does not indicate that the police and the civil armed forces will be reorganised to give adequate representations to the members of the Muslim minority community.’”

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

‘but regret that the Address does not give any warning against any return to the style and ways of the Government and administration during the Emergency.’”

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

‘but regret that the Address does not give a clear and firm assurance that there would be no encouragement to the trends that gave rise to the excesses committed during the Emergency, or to the forces, official or otherwise, involved in the commission of excesses.’”

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

‘but regret that the Address rather loosely talks about ‘a period of stable government at the Centre’ overlooking the fact that such stability cannot be achieved in the interest of the toiling masses and of democracy

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

without radical socio-economic transformations, ensuring social justice to the exploited and the oppressed, without improving the living conditions of the masses which alone provide a solid basis even for a Governmental stability."

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

'but regret that while referring to the "deterioration in the law and order sector" the Address does not show any awareness that at the root of this deterioration there is frustration, unemployment and growing discontent among the youths."

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

'but regret that while referring to the 20-point programme, the Address does not indicate that the Government have drawn the correct lesson from the failure in the implementation of this programme, despite the unlimited powers in the hands of the administration."

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

'but regret that while assuring the 'Freedom of the Press' the Address does not see the need for ending the control of the Big Money over the press, nor does it give any assurance that there would not be any covert attempt to influence the press and to make it fall in line with the Government."

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

'but regret that while stating that 'A healthy and functioning parliamentary democracy, proceeds according to well laid down rules of the game, the Address does not take any note of the fact that these 'grounds rules' are already being disregarded or violat-

ed in the attempts to organise defections of the legislatures or in the moves to arbitrarily dissolve some State Assemblies."

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

'but regret that the Address does not share the public concern that some high officials, guilty of the emergency excesses, are being brought back to keep positions and in some cases, even promoted."

SHRI ALEXANDER WARJRI (Meghalaya): Sir, I move:

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

'but regret that the Address does not mention about the final political settlement in Nagaland with special reference to the Shillong Accord signed between the Naga underground representatives and the Governor of Nagaland—representing Government of India."

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

'but regret that the Address does not mention about the steps to be taken by the Central Government regarding peace talks with the Miz rebets—particularly the M.N.F. leader Mr. Laldenga."

(The Amendment Nos. 105 and 106 also stood in the name of Shri Khyomo Lotha).

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

'but regret that the Address does not mention specifically about the danger from inclusion of large-scale foreign nationals in the electoral rolls of the States of North-Eastern Region and the steps taken to delete their names from rolls."

(The Amendment No. 107 also stood in the names of Shri Khyomo Lotha,

Shri Sriman Prafulla Goswami and Shri Ajit Kumar Sharma).

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

'but regret that the Address does not mention about the solution of the boundary disputes between different States in North-East.'

(The Amendment No. 109 also stood in the names of Shri Khyomo Lotna and Shri Scato Swu).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, Shri Harekrushna Mallick, not here. Prof. Sourendra Bhattacharjee, not here. Then Shri Advani.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI (Gujarat):
Sir, I move:

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

'but regret that the Address does not make any mention about the steps to be taken to avert destabilizing State Governments.'

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

'but regret that no mention has been made in the Address to following due process of law and fair and expeditious trials to maintain rule of law.'

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

'but regret that no mention has been made in the Address to review the existing constitutional provisions relating to the powers of the President and State Governments, the imposition of President's rule and the extent of, and limitations on, the powers of caretaker Government.'

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

'but regret that no mention has been made in the Address to reform the present electoral system.'

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

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address to lower the voting age to 18.'

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

'but regret that the Address does not make any mention about any steps to stop defections by introducing appropriate legislation to ban defections.'

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

'but regret that the Address does not mention about the steps to control prices and to prevent erosion of real income.'

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

'but regret that the Address makes no mention to ensure the primacy of agriculture and rural development in planning for country's development.'

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

'but regret that the Address makes no mention for the continuation of the 'Food for Work' programmes initiated by the previous Government.'

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

'but regret that no effective measures have been outlined in

[Shri Lal K. Advani]

the Address to stop arson, loot and murder that are being periodically unleashed in Delhi."

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

'but regret that there is no mention in the Address of interference by the Centre to topple non-Congress Governments in the States.'"

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

'but regret that the Address makes no mention about the steps to be taken to prevent corruption in public life and to re-introduce the Lok Pal Bill introduced by the previous Government.'"

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

'but regret that the Address makes no mention to amend the Constitution to provide explicit protection to the freedom of the Press.'"

The questions were proposed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The motion and the amendments are now open for discussion.

As honourable Members are aware, three days, that is, twelve hours, have been allotted for this debate. And obviously when Members speak, they speak in their party's time. But as the debate proceeds only very few Members are adjusted and some party Members who are at the bottom of the list and who are naturally keen to participate in the debate, are not able to do so. So the honourable Members who speak will please keep that in mind; otherwise, they would be depriving their colleagues in the same party of participating in the debate. Now, these twelve hours are to be distributed over three days. Tomorrow

we may have to adjourn at about 4, a little earlier, because many Members want to witness Beating of the Retreat, which means today we have to sit longer. So I will seek your cooperation in this. We can sit a little longer today, maybe, 6 or beyond if the House so wishes, so that as many Members as possible could be accommodated. Once again I would request honourable Members to keep the time-limit in mind so that more of them could take part in the debate.

Now, Shri Advani.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I rise formally to associate myself with the Motion of Thanks moved from the Treasury Benches though I must express my deep disappointment with the contents of the Address. In fact, the numerous amendments that have been moved from this side of the House reflect the measure of disappointment that has been felt by most of us here with the Address. I look at the Address in two parts. The first part refers to the state of the economy. In that course an attempt has been made to run down the achievements of the last Governments and to say that the difficult economic situation the country is faced with today is a result of what the last three years of governance have brought to the country. It is a matter of facts. It is not a matter of impressions. I would have no hesitation in conceding that the result of the last election has been a vote against the outgoing Governments. It reflected the people's disappointment with the Janata Government and the Lok Dal Government. But that disappointment should be viewed in a proper perspective. I will deal with it later. But I would not expect the President's Address to be wrong on facts. My preliminary objection to the Address is that in so far as economic facts are concerned, the first part is wrong on facts. The President has been made to say that agricultural production has gone down, that industrial production

has been stagnating and that exports have gone down. Similar speeches are being made outside the country and speeches have been made in the course of the elections also. These have no relevance whatsoever to facts.

I would briefly sum up the facts and then let the Treasury Benches decide whether it was proper for them to frame the Address in this manner. As far as agricultural production is concerned, I am sure that everybody on the other side also is aware that 1977-78, and 1978-79 have been years when the production has been going up and up. At least for the first two years of Janata rule, 1977-78 and 1978-79, the total production of food-grains was 256 million tonnes which was 24 million tonnes more than the total production of the best two years in the preceding one decade, the dynamic decade.

SHR KALYAN ROY (West Bengal): Sir, none of the Cabinet Ministers is here in the House. When the Leader of the Opposition is speaking, at least one Cabinet Minister should be here to listen to him.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA): Shri A. P. Sharma is supposed to be here. He has gone for some work. He will come now.

DR. RAMKRIPAL SINHA (Bihar): At least courtesy demands that he should be here when the Leader of the Opposition speaks.

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA: He was here. He has just gone for some work.

SHRI ERA SEZHIYAN (Tamil Nadu): He says the Cabinet Minister has gone for some work. Is this not his work?

DR. RAMKRIPAL SINHA: Sir, they should send for a Cabinet Minister, or till then you can adjourn the House.

SHRI HARI SHANKAR BHABHRA: They should listen to the speech patiently, without moving here and there.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Mr. Deputy Chairman, again coming to industrial production, it is wrong to say that industrial production has stagnated during the preceding three years. It is true that the voter outside made no distinction between the Janata Government and the Lok Dal Government. But people here should be able to make a difference and say that this happened during this period and this happened during a different period. Particularly when the Address comes from the President, on point of fact it should be precise and correct. For the President to say that industrial production has gone down, agricultural production has gone down, exports have gone down or that all the gold reserves have been sold, this was being said during the election campaigns, is not proper. Statistics are available on exports during the first two years.

According to these statistics the exports during these two years were worth Rs. 11095 crores. This figure represents Rs. 2,000 crores more than even during the two years of the emergency period, which are being projected as the best period from the point of view of economic development. Similarly, industrial production in 1977-78 and 1978-79 rose by an average of 5.9 per cent per annum as compared to the average rise of 4.8 per cent per annum during the earlier six years. These are statistics. These are hard facts. And when an Address is framed, at least these facts cannot be ignored. So my first complaint is against the first part which, in an attempt to run down the earlier regimes, does not even care for facts. While comparing the 1977 Address with the

[Shri Lal K. Advani]

1980 Address my friend, Shri Antulay, said that that Address spouted venom, while this is a very sober document. Frankly, if you were to assess and analyse objectively and condemn us, I would not demur. It the Government had gone wrong—the Janata Government or the Lok Dal Government—and you criticize that Government in order to enable the country to move forward in the right manner; I would not object to it. But I would certainly object to it when you talk of reconciliation, when you talk about not having any vindictiveness or vendetta, and at the same time, going about and seeing to it that the whole country is destabilised seeing to it that emergency people are brought back, despite everything.

Many a time, I feel that while we in the Government said what we believed in, did accordingly, here is a Government which says something but does something else. After all, the two speeches just now made have in a way served a notice on the country that "we are going to dissolve the State Assemblies": it is a notice before the House. And they take recourse to what the Janata Government had been doing earlier—not that what we are doing is the right thing to do but because the Janata Government did the same thing in 1977 and therefore, we do propose to dissolve the legislatures. That was the sum and substances of the two speeches made. I will come to that later, and particularly to the judgment that has been referred to by Mr. Antulay on the basis of which it was decided to do that or to think in that direction.

In the second part of the Address I was looking forward to some direction in which the Government want to go. I would not expect the substance, because Mr. Antulay is very right when he says that we have just come into office; it is merely a fortnight. I would not expect substance

in that Address. But I would certainly seek a direction. I am sorry to say that the Address lacks even direction. There is no direction, it is just a string of pious platitudes and generalities. I do not see what enlightenment it gives to say that this Government will do its utmost to put down lawlessness. Every Government has to do that. No doubt about it. It was made a major public issue here during the elections in Delhi that under the Janata regime, chains snatching was going on and women were not safe in the streets. But what has happened during the last fortnight? It is now your Government. What has been happening? I do not say that it is because of you that all these crimes are taking place. I do not say that. I am not one of those who try to use every issue for political ends. I merely say that in a city like Delhi if there is crime, that crime should be tackled firmly, administratively; if there are shortcomings and weaknesses in the police administration, they should be corrected. But do not try to politicalise everything. If you try to do that, then there will be people who will come with facts during the last 14 days. There have been numerous dacoities and murders. In fact never before during the Janata regime have so many crimes taken place in so short a duration. I would only plead that there are issues which should be kept outside the pale of party politics. But, unfortunately, you have been doing just that.

Then, you have said: "stringent action will be taken against anti-social elements such as smugglers hoarders and black-marketeers." A very good statement! I would have no objection if you bring a stringent law against blackmarketeers we will support you. But I am surprised to find that here is a party which was in the Opposition opposed such a law when the Lok Dal Government promulgated an ordinance providing for preventive detention of black-marketeers and hoarders.

My party opposed it and your party also opposed it. Several other parties also opposed it. But the moment you come into office, you say that you are going to convert this ordinance into a Bill. Sudden somersault. I cannot understand it. As the leader of the opposition, I feel that it is the responsibility of this House to see that this Bill is not passed. I would seek the cooperation of all political groups.

We know from experience that in the past when MISA was enacted, it was said that it was not going to be used for political purposes. A written commitment was given to Shri Morarji Desai by the then Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi. Shri Uma Shankar Dikshit had stated that MISA would not be used for political purposes. It was said that it would be used only against anti-national elements and against those who were a danger to the security of the country. But we have seen before our eyes as to what happened. (Interruptions). जिस मीसा के लिए अपने

वावदा किया था उसी मीसा के तहत

हम 19 कहीने जेल में रहे हैं।

Do you expect this country to be taken for another ride and allow you to make this ordinance a permanent Act on the Statute Book and give you power to use it against political opponents and to use it for ulterior things? We are not going to do that.

THE MINISTER OF SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT (SHRI A. P. SHARMA): Mr. Advani brought this ordinance. The same thing is being done today.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: I did not bring it. Those colleagues too who brought it know your Government well. Your Government has given everyone a taste of what you are capable of doing. Therefore, I cited the example of MISA.

श्री हरिसिंह भगुवावा महिडा
(गुजर.त) : मध्य प्रदेश में क्या हुआ ?

श्री लाल कृष्ण अडवणी : मध्य प्रदेश की सरकार ने जिस समय आर्डिनेंस लाया तो जनता पार्टी की सेंट्रल हार्ड कमान ने कह दिया था कि इसको वापिस ले लो। मध्य प्रदेश का जिक्र मत करो। जो बात गलत होती है उसको मैं गलत कहता हूँ। मध्य प्रदेश के चीफ मिनिस्टर भी इसकी गवाही देते। मैं उनमें से था जिन्होंने इस आर्डिनेंस के लिए जाने का विरोध किया था।

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA:
You did it even without that.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: So far as I am concerned, I am proud to be a follower of that great illustrious parliamentarian, Dr. Shyama Prashad Mukherjee and I recall that one of the best speeches that has been made in parliamentary history is the speech that he delivered in respect of preventive detention. I cannot compromise with preventive detention. The second part of the Address contains generalities and platitudes. "The role of science and technology will be strengthened." "The Government reiterates its commitment to the freedom of the press". I was looking forward to something more. I do not object to these sentences. To say that "we are committed to the freedom of the press", by itself, does not mean much. Although, the moment a journalist reads "reiterates its commitment to the freedom of the press" and this reiteration coming from a Government headed by Mrs Gandhi, he is bound to be disturbed. When this Government says "I reiterate our commitment to the freedom of the press", does it mean the same kind of commitment in action which it had shown? Only this morning I was reading an interesting article written by a journalist from Chandigarh, Mr. Prem Bhatia. He has commented on

[Shri Lal K. Advani]

how the press is reacting to the new situation, Mr. Bhatia writes: "During these two weeks, there are distinct signs of caution among editorial writers and political columnists. Everyone has his hand on his heart about what is going to happen. They seem anxious. No one in the press is really looking for trouble. The gentlemen and ladies of the press are feeling their ground." He concludes with something which echoes what I had said earlier. He says: "Let us see how long it takes our once brave journalists to start crawling again." This is something which reflects what the press feels about your Government, Mr. Sathe is not here. I would not blame him until I know something very specific. But the situation is such that the press feels that the moment they do something, they criticise the Government, they criticise the present Prime Minister particularly, then God knows what will happen.

SHRI A. P. SHARMA: How to remove it?

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: I will tell you as to how to remove it.

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI (Uttar Pradesh): I want to ask you one thing. You have quoted from the article of Mr. Prem Bhatia. I should like to know whether it is a reflection on the press or it is a reflection on the Government's attitude towards the press.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: It is essentially a reflection on the press but it is also a reflection on the press's view of your Government, what the press thinks of your Government. That is also true.

SHRI A. P. SHARMA: That is your interpretation.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Sir, I am speaking within the constraints of time. Otherwise, on a subject like this, I can give numerous instances. I shall give one example. I remember that when our Government was

swearing in, at the first swearing in, our colleague, Jagjivan Ramji, at the beginning had certain reservation. He did not turn up for the swearing in. That became front-page banner headline news, understandably and rightly so. This time, when the swearing in ceremony is held of a new Government, who are there with a 'massive mandate' as they describe it—I do not agree and I will come to that later on—and at that solemn swearing in ceremony where the Ministers who are to be sworn in have been invited by the President, one of those who has to be sworn in as a Minister walked out of the meeting. This happened for the first time in 30 years. As a journalist, it was front-page banner headline news for me. But none of the newspapers in Delhi put it on the front page. Only a couple of newspapers reported it, that too in a corner. I began to wonder as to what is happening. Mr. Dwivedi would say that this is a reflection on the press, this is not a reflection on the Government. This is certainly a reflection on the press and the press's view as to what is going to happen now. But more than that it is an expression of the apprehensions in their minds, and it is for you, because of your record, because of your past, because of the emergency, to see that these apprehensions are completely erased. The responsibility lies on you.

Sir, I read a statement this morning made by Mr. Sathe. I wish he were here now because I was intrigued by his statement. I do not quite understand the meaning of this. He was addressing the meeting of the All-India Newspaper Editors' Conference yesterday and there he said that the terms of reference of the Press Commission will be made more comprehensive. Well, I would not quarrel much with that though I do not regard that as either proper or necessary. "Those members who had left will be replaced by others." The moment I read this, I started making enquiries as to who have left. A

member of the Press Commission met me day before yesterday and I had enquired from him about the Commission. He had told me nothing about anyone leaving. When I enquired this morning, I am told that because the Press Commission was appointed by Mr. Advani by the Janata Government, when the Lok Dal Government came in, all of them immediately tendered their resignation, including the Chairman, to the then Government. The then Government, however, asked them to continue, and they continued. Similarly, when a new Government came in, the Chairman as well as the other members, following the formality which was observed earlier, tendered their resignations. It is entirely for the new Government to do what it wants. Now what Mr. Sathe said is that "those of them who have left will be replaced by others." I thought that perhaps one or two have left and so they are going to be replaced. I would have no objection to that. The Press Commission has resigned which is a formality, which involved a propriety, and they are entitled to do it. Now, the Government, it seems, is going to have a fresh Press Commission. Or, as I apprehended what is going to be done is that the Press Commission is going to be packed with people who are regarded as conformists and those who are regarded as being against the emergency or against the measures taken against the press during the emergency are going to be shunted out.

SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA: Do you reflect on what you did? You replaced all of them by R.S.S. people. You are reflecting the same people.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Yes, Mr. Nikhil Chakravarti was there, Mr. Abu Abraham was there. They are all R.S.S. people. Do not throw them out.

श्री अरविन्द गणेश 'कुलकर्णी' :
मकवाणा जी आप अभी मिनिस्टर बन गये
हैं, आप जरा ... (Interruptions)

SHRI S. W. DHABE: He has forgotten the hegemony.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: I would urge upon you, not to touch the Press Commission. The Press Commission was about to complete the work in December. I know the valuable work they have been doing. I know how much exertions they have undertaken. I do not know what their conclusions, what their findings and what their recommendations are. But I know that they have been taking a lot of pains in doing their work and it would be improper for any Government to try to meddle with it at this juncture when they are about to submit their report and try to change the composition of the Commission.

Sir, in the same context, I would also like to say that in this House and in the other House I felt very happy when it was decided that the Bill to convert the AIR and the Doordarshan into an autonomous corporation shall be referred to a Joint Select Committee. There was wide agreement that a broadcasting organisation like the Akashvani or Doordarshan can best serve the people and can best perform its role of educating, informing and entertaining the people, if it is freed from Governmental and administrative shackles or bureaucratic shackles and made autonomous. There was a demand from all sides that it should be made more autonomous than the Prasar Bharati Bill contemplates and I am very happy to say that in the Joint Select Committee also I found a measure of consensus emerging on the broad provisions of the Bill. I wonder how the Government feels about it today. The new Information and Broadcasting Minister has expressed somewhere that he would look at the matter with an open mind. I would be very happy and personally also very happy because I have been pursuing this matter for the last many years, if even now this Prasar

[Shri Lal K. Advani]

Bharati Bill, as we contemplated it, or as you think would be better, is brought before the House at the earliest. It is, therefore, that I have given notice of an amendment expressing regrets that there is no mention of the question of AIR autonomy.

Sir, Mr. Antulay has said that they have got a massive mandate. This has become a cliché somewhat. It was said in 1971. It was repeated in 1977 about the Janata Party. It has been said once again this time in 1980. First Mrs. Gandhi's Congress, undivided Congress or rather Congress (R), then the Janata Party in 1977 and then the Congress (I) in 1980 have said that they got massive mandates from the people. It would be right to say that the Janata Party in 1977 or the Congress (I) now had a massive majority in the Lok Sabha. But in terms of popular support it has not got a massive mandate. What to speak of a massive mandate? It has not even a majority mandate. This is a gift, this is an illusion given to all of us over and over again because of this majority system of elections that we have. It is a quirk of this system that by a 5 per cent shift in the voting or a 10 per cent shift in the voting there is the illusion of a landslide victory as if all others have been wiped out and that party only represents the whole people.

SHRI KALP NATH RAI: This is the second independence.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Yes, because so many people who have been behind the bars, including Shri Jayaprakash Narayan, have been released.

DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA (Maharashtra): You also called it a massive mandate. You were equally in the minority. That is the parliamentary system.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: I said the phrase was used in 1971 and 1977 and the phrase was again used in 1980.

As a person who has been taking a lot of interest in the electoral systems, I feel that this is not a correct description.

DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA: What about proportional representation?

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Yes, yes, I am coming to that. Why be impatient about it?

SHRI KALP NATH RAI: We have mature people.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Yes, people of India are no doubt mature people. You got a massive majority in the Lok Sabha in 1971 but when you betrayed their trust, the people voted against you; they voted you out absolutely. Again, they voted us into power with a massive majority in the Lok Sabha . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: And they voted you out.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Yes, we let them down. I do not blame the people at all. We let them down by our infighting and squabbles. When they found that leaders in this party kept on fighting all the while. However, I would not accept it and I would not agree to it that the Janata Government did not perform well. The Janata Government performed well but it behaved badly. Because it behaved badly, therefore, the people reacted and the people said that this kind of infighting and squabbling is not the right way in which we should be governed and, therefore, they told us: You go to the opposition. So, here we are, in the opposition. But what I am saying is that it should be realised and recognised by all of us, whether we are on this side or that side that after all, 57 per cent of the people are not with you if they are not positively against you. Forty-three per cent vote means, forty-three per cent of those who voted are with you and 57 per cent of the people who voted are either against you or not with you. That is the reality

that we have to take into account. If we do that, then there would be a measure of humility in our approach.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is true of all governments.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Yes, that is true of all governments in this particular system, not in the world. It is true of countries which have the majority system of elections, which I am sure Mr. Antulay knows, is confined to the Anglo-Saxon countries and the countries of the Commonwealth which for historical reasons have been associated with England. In Europe, you do not have this. In most countries of Europe, you have some form of list system; you have some form of proportional representation. The other day my friend Mr. Khobragade said that at one time, the opposition often used to talk about proportional representation and now they do not talk. As a member of the Government I could not give my personal views but I have been pleading over and over again that elections ought not to be reduced to a gamble as they are. Today they are a gamble. After all, a five per cent shift this way or that way makes all the difference. In 1962, there were five seats of Lok Sabha from Delhi. There was no Janata party then. In Delhi, it was the Jana Sangh. The main parties used to be Congress and Jana Sangh, and the Congress then got all the five seats and Jana Sangh got zero. In 1967, out of seven seats—because by that time, the number had been increased—Jana Sangh got six and Congress got one. Again in 1971, Congress got all the seven and the Jana Sangh got zero. Again in 1977, the Janata Party got all the seven and the Congress got zero. This time, Congress got six and Janata Party got one. Now, in all these elections, except in 1977 when the gulf was wide between Janata and Congress, in all other elections right from 1962 till today the gulf has always been just about ten per cent; may be the votes of

the two parties would be 40 per cent and 50 per cent; may be 38 per cent and 48 per cent, that kind of difference has been there always. Just with a 6 per cent swing this way or that way, one party is deprived of all the seats. And it is, therefore, that the liberal critics of the majority system of elections in England have very picturesquely said that the Englishman has an instinctive weakness for betting, for gambling, for horse-racing and this weakness of the Englishman finds a reflection even in his electoral system.

Shri Khobragadeji referred the other day to the need of proportional representation system. I do not agree with it. I am of the view that in a country like India where actual constituents are to be attended to, actual developmental needs of the constituents are to be attended to, we must have a kind of admixture of the list system as well as the majority system. Something like that. Something like what West Germany has today. For the last 30 years, for the last three decades it has been experimenting with it and it has been very successfully tried. If we have something like this system in our country, we will have stable politics which today swinging like a pendulum, from one party to another. Whichever party comes into power has the illusion of being the sole representative of the whole country. (Interruptions). Because all addi not rupee, this could not be done. It needs a consensus, a broad consensus. Many people are not familiar with the mechanics of the whole system also. When I suggested the list system, they said what is the list system. So, it takes time. I wanted to point out that when we were in the Government, the Janata Government did start a process and had come to certain conclusions in respect of electoral reforms. For example, we had taken a decision for public financing of elections. There is the decision that the voting age should be redu-

[Shri Lal K. Advani]

ced from 21 to 18. Several such decisions were taken. We had decided that we will first discuss them with the opposition before initiating legislation. The work is done there. It is there in the files. You have only to go into that, the kind of work that we have done and if you follow it up credit comes to you, it will be fine. But the electoral system badly needs to be reformed. There is the need also to curb the influence of money power in elections. During the last elections money has been spent like anything. It is fantastic. If you can do something in that regard, you will have made really a worthwhile contribution to the cleansing of the politics.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Gujarat): What do you think? Will they do it?

SHRI KALP NATH RAI: Do you want presidential system. Mr. Advani, like America?

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: No, I am not in favour of that. Our friends in the CPI and the CPM are also in favour of some proportional representation system. I am sure, they would be conscious that if we have had some such system, the results that are there today in Kerala would not have been there. The results would have been entirely different.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: It would be different over the rest of India also (*Interruptions*).

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Yes, yes everywhere. That is why I was saying that this is also true that there is an illusion today in Kerala that it is the left front that has swept the polls. But that is not the fact. I was looking at the figures and I find that the left democratic front obtained 50.6 per cent of the popular vote, whereas the united democratic front on the other side got 49.4 per cent of the vote. There is hardly a difference of 1.2 per cent extra vote and this has made all the difference.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: Despite that they want the proportional representation system.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: We are also in favour of that.

SHRI JAGJIT SINGH ANAND (Punjab): It is not a matter of convenience, it is a matter of principle for us.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Of course, you were the first, you had told us so.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would like to refer to one or two points more. The one is in respect of Afghanistan. I remember I was on an election campaign, touring the country when these happenings took place in Afghanistan. The first reaction that came from the then Government, the Lok Dal Government, or my party, the Janata Party or Mrs. Gandhi, there was not much difference. By and large the reaction was reflective of national opinion in the country, that a country so close to us and friendly with us, if there were any foreign troops on that soil, we did not approve of it, they should not be there. Anyone could see that all the three parties had reacted similarly, identically, absolutely identically. It is only after some time that the changes started taking place. Some changes in expressions I can understand between what the ruling party says or what the Opposition parties say. They are understandable. Perhaps, it would apply to me also if I were on the Treasury Benches. But there are limits; there are constraints. One should not somersault over and over again, as the ruling party presently has been seeming to do. After all how can I reconcile this.

SHRI JAGJIT SINGH ANAND: You highlighted the so-called national consensus, I remember.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: The Hindustan Times reports Mrs. Gandhi's interview with the American correspondents before the elections and the words used are very categoric. It says:

"There is no excuse for Soviet troops going in. And the more direct intervention, the more we are against it, specially bringing in troops."

Now this is absolutely unequivocal.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: Before the elections, she also said that this cannot be seen in isolation.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Yes, yes, I would not see it in isolation. I am coming to that. The people of India understandably are more concerned with Americans arming Pakistan, with America extending massive arms aid to Pakistan.

SHRI KALYAN ROY: They were aiding rebels from April 1978.

SHRI JAGJIT SINGH ANAND: Americans and Chinese both.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: I would like to plead with the Government that this is a matter in which apart from other things we should take into account the sentiments and feelings and aspirations of the people of Afghanistan also. We should never ignore that. Indeed, I was very much distressed when I read a longish despatch in the Statesman on the 17th or 18th of January. It was from their special representative, Mr. M. L. Kotru, who had gone to Afghanistan, whose opening remarks are very significant. He writes:

"To be an Indian in Afghanistan is no longer the fun it was a bare four days ago. Then an Afghan would warmly grab your hand, wish you well and pour his heart out to you. Now the same Afghan is seething with anger. He no longer tries to be helpful. He is very correct in his dealings with you but if it is the old warmth, you are looking for, it just is not there."

The transformation took place the day the official Afghan media highlighted the Indian delegate's address in the U. N. General Assembly".

This is from Kabul. A person who senses the feeling of the people there reports where we erred and how we went wrong. I would say that it is not proper for us to try to justify the presence of foreign troops in any other country on any ground. In fact it was there that our delegate said that because the Soviet troops went into Afghanistan at the invitation of the Afghan Government, therefore it was justified.

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI: He has not said that. You are distorting. Mr. Brijesh Mishra has said that we are opposed to the presence of foreign troops in any country. Mr. Brijesh Mishra has said this; the Prime Minister has said that; and the Foreign Minister has said that. We do not condone their presence. Time and again, you are distorting. I am sorry to say that you are distorting Government of India's position, Mrs. Indira Gandhi's position, External Affairs Minister's position and Mr. Brijesh Mishra's position.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Anyway I have quoted what Mrs. Gandhi said before the elections and I have just cited what the reaction is to the Indian delegate's speech in the United Nations on the Afghanistan issue. That is the Afghan people's reaction. I would say that to bring in the argument of Afghan Government's invitations was totally unwarranted because on that basis I do not know where we will go. We have known in the past what happened in Vietnam, Czechoslovakia and Hungary. The mere fact that the Government in office at a particular point of time issues an invitation should never be regarded as justification for the presence of foreign troops.

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI: When Mr. Brijesh Mishra made that statement, Mrs. Gandhi was not the Prime Minister. Lok Dal was still in the Government.

SHRI PILOO MODY: This is the difference between real non-alignment and your non-alignment.

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI: What is the trouble with you?

SHRI PILOO MODY: This is the difference between your non-alignment and real non-alignment.

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI: What happened to genuine non-alignment?

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: I would say, just as the Government of India is unequivocal and unambiguous in respect of American arms aid to Pakistan and we say that this is destabilising, similarly there is no reason why we should be ambiguous or why we should hesitate in maintaining a very correct stand in respect of foreign troops in Afghanistan.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI): Our stand is very correct.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: I wish our delegate at the UN had been very correct and very precise and clear about it. It is that speech that has caused a lot of confusion.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: The confusion has been cleared up in everybody's mind except yours.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: This morning my friends, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta and Mr. A. G. Kulkarni raised an issue which has been agitating the minds of the people all over the country. During the last one fortnight a very systematic campaign has been going on to destabilise various States by various means, if possible by defections and if that is not possible, then, taking recourse to dissolution of the State Governments.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: You showed the way.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: So we are being followed in that regard?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I am not saying we are following you.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: That is very good. At least we have it from you saying of this talk about no confrontation with the States. That has exposed what is this.

(Interruptions).

SHRI PILOO MODY: She was part of a resolution that condemned it.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: That has been said in the morning.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Did you mean it then or not?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Mean what?

SHRI PILOO MODY: That you were part of a resolution that condemned it then.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: I wish even that judgment that has been cited by Mr. Antulay was gone into carefully because that judgment speaks about a complete alienation between the Government and public opinion and I see that, as far as popular vote is concerned, in most of these States which are sought to be dissolved, against all these States the popular vote received by the Congress(I) is much less than 50 per cent. In places like U. P. and Bihar it is 35 per cent and 36 per cent. So, it is only because of a division of votes between Lok Dal and Janata Party that the party has happened to get majority. (Interruptions) ... I can understand in certain cases. So far as Gujarat is concerned, its term is over. But it should never be forgotten that in most of the States that were dissolved in 1977, the tenure of those Governments had come to an end. It was a five-year term.... (Interruptions).

SHRI DEVENDRA NATH DWIVEDI: U. P. and Bihar?

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: These two States only. Therefore, I said "In most of the States." You are going to take advantage of that. But I would

say, the judgment in this regard should be a clear guide and if the Government has that intention, well and good. We will face it. But certainly it would be as undemocratic as you said. It would be much more undemocratic to do anything of that sort.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Unconscionable. (*Interruptions*).

श्री लाल कृष्ण अडवाणी : बूथ कैपचरिंग आप लोगों से सीखी; बूथ कैपचरिंग नहीं होनी चाहिये थी ।

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: The Congress has never captured booths.

श्री कल्प नाथ राय : किसने सिखाई ?

श्री पीलू मोदी : सब आप लोगों ने सिखाई है ।

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Why did not you complain then? Never was such a complaint brought before us, not once in all these thirty years.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Many many complaints never reach you, Madam.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Not one complaint was brought.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Why look for excuses only if you want to dissolve? Therefore, you are going to create law and order problems in the States. Four days back, a Youth Congress rally was held in Lucknow only to create a law and order problem and in order to create an excuse.

4 P.M.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Mr. Deputy. Chairman, Sir, may I say something? I want to state very categorically that there was no law and order problem at all until the police very brutally beat up some of our people who are now in hospital—two of them in a serious condition. Not one of our people tried to enter the Assembly or to indulge in any kind of

violence. I say this with the fullest authority.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: It is difficult for me at this particular moment to rely on the Central Government's or the State Government's version of the situation. It is not my party Government there.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: If you don't know anything about it, why do you mention it?

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: What I know tells me that a deliberate attempt was made....

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Not at all.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: ... to create a law and order problem there in the State only to provide an excuse to the Central Government to dissolve the Assembly because there is no other excuse. Thirty-five per cent votes...

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: There are plenty of excuse; and the best excuse, if one is wanted, is the condition of the Harijans. If you come and sit in my house just for 12 hours, you will see how many people are coming with their heads broken and with other injuries. Your workers have cut off the hand of one of our workers. If you say it is only pretending, then you don't know what nonsense you are talking.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: The kind of incidents in Delhi cannot be taken..

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MA-
THUR: Sir, 'nonsense' is an unparliamentary word. She should withdraw it. (*Interruptions*). The Prime Minister should withdraw her words.

श्री कलराज मिश्र : श्रीमन् विरोधी दल के नेता बोल रहे हैं । प्रधान मंत्री को उनकी बात सुननी चाहिए ...

(*Interruptions*)

श्री कल्प नाथ राय : श्रीमन्, मैं कना चाहता हूँ कि

(*Interruptions*)

**SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MA-
THUR:** I seek your protection, Sir.
The Prime Minister has uttered a very
unparliamentary word viz. 'nonsense'.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI:
If you think it is unparliamentary, I
withdraw it.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: So he has
withdrawn it.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: No;
I said, if it is unparliamentary. In
which Parliament of the world is it
unparliamentary? Certainly not here.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Mr. Deputy
Chairman, Sir, I wish the Prime Min-
ister had maintained greater cool than
this exhibition of anger. Using words
like nonsense, merely saying that
hands are being chopped off, does not
solve the problem.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI:
It was brought and put on Stephen's
table.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: But, who
has done it? Are you accusing the
State Government of doing it?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI:
I am accusing a particular party here
in Delhi.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: I do not
know what the incident is that is being
referred to. I do know however that
two or three days back there was a
mushaira in the Red Fort in connec-
tion with the Republic Day celebra-
tions where it was made impossible
for the Chief Executive Councillor to
preside over it. Not only that. His
wife, Mrs. Sahani and Mrs. Khurshid
Kidwai had to take refuge somewhere.
This kind of lawlessness that is taking
place in Delhi is not the responsibility
of the Chief Executive Councillor. It
is the responsibility of the Union Gov-
ernment and the Lt. Governor. (*Inter-
ruptions*) I did not want to bring it up,

but when you started accusing the
Opposition, I was forced to refer to
this; otherwise, I would not have done
it, at all. We are discussing a solemn
subject, namely, the President's Add-
ress. It is a solemn occasion. I am
sorry the Prime Minister should have
indulged in this kind of exhibition of
anger.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: With
the manner of atrocities that I am
hearing about, I am certainly angry.
These are matters which should make
everybody angry. If you are not
angry, then you must be quite in-
human.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Mr. Deputy
Chairman, Sir, the atrocities make
everyone sad. Those who are guilty
of these atrocities must be punished.
But the political manner in which she
is trying to accuse me or bring it up
against me or my party or others in
the Opposition is not very proper.
Punish those who are guilty, but I
wish this issue of Harijan atrocities is
not made a political issue or an issue
against my party. My party has been
very particular about this matter.
What I am pointing out is that....

(*Interruptions*)....against the back-
ground of a senior spokesman of the
ruling party speaking in respect of
various State Governments, against a
very systematic attempt that is going
on to seduce, to bribe, to browbeat
MLAs into defecting to Congress (I),
how am I accept this statement?

(*Interruptions*) This is what happened
in Haryana. We did not seduce, we
did not do any such kind of thing.
Against this background, to say that
"mutual respect is to be shown by the
Government and the Opposition for
each other" or that "harmonising of
differing points of view in a spirit of
accommodation and conciliation rather
than conflict and confrontation which
is a necessary condition of democratic
functioning." I would think that these
statements, these words, sound hollow
and hypocritical against this back-
ground.

Sir, one of the biggest boons of these two elections—I would say two, not one—1977 and 1980, is that the average voter in the country feels very confident. He has acquired immense confidence that he can throw out any Government which misbehaves and does not conduct itself well, howsoever powerful it may be. Mrs. Gandhi's Government in 1977 was very powerful; similarly, so far as the Janata Government or the Lok Dal Government, in terms of numerical majority in the Lok Sabha, were very powerful—could be thrown out by the people absolutely, and this, I regard, as the biggest gain of democracy in the country. Despite the Emergency laws and despite the fact that for 19 months all the opposition parties had been completely paralysed, nothing of that kind happened at least during the two-and-a-half years.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Not at all! Only people were removed from their jobs.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Not at all. In fact, there was a complaint against me that I was allowing the radio to give publicity to Mrs. Gandhi and her activities. I was asked why the Radio should do it. I asked them why it should not be done, if it was newsworthy. It was a news covered by the Radio. I said that I would not use the Radio for partisan ends. The Janata Government never used it.

SHRI KALP NATH RAI: You tried to do character assassination through the Radio.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: What is happening now? A major dacoity took place in Lajpat Nagar at 12 o'clock noon the other day. In the evening, neither the Radio nor the Television covered them. It is non-news for them. That is why people are apprehensive that they will get what happened during the Emergency.

Sir, I would like to plead with this Government that it should realise that the people in the country are the masters and not those who happen to come to power with a massive majority in the Lok Sabha by the quirk of this kind of majority system of election. If this humility is there, then I am sure that something good will come out of this.

I would wait for a while because as I have said, so far as this Address is concerned, it gives me only generalities and platitudes. The Address asks us to bear with the Government for a while. It says:

"...the new Government has taken charge just over a week ago. The Budget will be presented in the next Session when the socio-economic measures proposed to be adopted in the furtherance of Government's broad objectives will be spelt out."

I am willing to wait till then, and let me see what kind of socio-economic objectives are going to be spelt out. Till then, I would certainly say that this kind of deliberate attempt at creating a condition of instability in the whole country should be stopped immediately.

I have referred to the issue of defections earlier. I remember one of the statements made by Mrs. Gandhi shortly after her victory. When a question was put to her about defections, she said that in the past they had tried to bring in an anti-defection law but that there was no consensus and that, therefore, it could not be brought forward. I would say that now you have clear majority in the Lok Sabha. I am sure that within...

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: At that time also we had the majority.

SHRI LAL ADVANI: ... six months or one year some internal problems in your party will arise, and

[Shri Lal K. Advani]

then in my party there will be a temptation to seduce people from your side and bring them to our side. (Interruptions) Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, what I am suggesting is for the good of her party.

SHRI PILOO MODY: They are suggesting that there are too many seducible people there.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: It would be in the interest of the country's political health.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE (Maharashtra): Take care of yourselves.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: It would be in the interest of the country's political health, no less than for the security of your own party that an anti-defection law is brought forward in Parliament at the earliest. You do not have a majority here. But I will try to persuade all my colleagues in the other parties to see that an anti-defection law is passed at the earliest in this country.

SHRI HARISINH BHAGUBAVA MAHIDA: Why didn't you persuade them in the past?

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Mr. Antulay gloated over the fact that the Bill that we brought was withdrawn because my own party colleague, Mr. Madhu Limaye, opposed it. I would say that it was not merely he who opposed it. It is the Opposition also that opposed it. Therefore, we had to withdraw it. Otherwise there was no question of withdrawing it because Mr. Madhu Limaye opposed it. Now at least when you are in the Government, bring forward a law against defection. And I am sure then you would have done a great service to the country's political health. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI PILOO MODY: Bring a rational law, unlike the last one that you brought.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri V. B. Raju.

SHRI V. B. RAJU: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the Motion of Thanks moved by a Member of the ruling party is under discussion, and I have moved two amendments. One relates to the fact that the President had made no reference to the unemployment problem among the educated youth, and the second relates to the climate that is created today for dissolving the States' Assemblies. Sir, this is a motion of thanks to the President. I do not know why I should join in thanking the President.

SHRI A. R. ANTULAY: Nobody is inviting you.

SHRI V. B. RAJU: In fact, the ruling party should be very thankful to the President and it is very relevant that they should be thankful. I would not have touched on the subject but for para 2 of the President's Address which said:

"The Sixth Lok Sabha was elected in March 1977. But it could not last its full term and had to be dissolved less than half-way through."

Sir, I would not like to go into the controversies that arose at that time. It is not my purpose now. But I can say that the dissolution of the Lok Sabha could have been avoided at that time, and by the dissolution the beneficiary is the Congress (I) and the worst sufferer is my party. Sir, I do not blame the President for this, because in politics, I believe there is only suicide, no murder. Politicians or political parties commit mistakes and liquidate themselves. In retrospect, I must say—and this is an occasion to go in for that searching, critical analysis—that my party had committed two mistakes. Even though my party members had been opposing

our entry into the Government at that time, my leaders had taken that decision. I will not say it was a mistake; it was a blunder to get into the Government because we were not voted to go into the Government. The people gave a verdict that the Janata Party should rule for five years and the Congress should be in opposition for five years. The electorate have a vested interest in the continuance of the opposition in the House. A strong opposition is a pre-requisite for a successful functioning of democracy. And by getting into the Government we carried on our shoulders all the dirt that was created by the earlier rule. But the second mistake, which is more serious, which my leaders committed was that, without a mandate, they were party to a resolution recommending to the President that the Lok Sabha should be dissolved. In fact, my colleagues had entered the Government only to save the Lok Sabha. But they became a party to the recommendation for the dissolution of the Lok Sabha. I knew the pulse of the Members; I had occasion to know the feelings of the Members of the Lok Sabha at that time. The majority of the Members were not in favour of the dissolution because it did not complete even half of its term. Anyhow the result has been that the beneficiary is the Congress (I). Now every political party in this country must really make an introspection and must analyse correctly what has happened and what is happening in this country...

SHRI RAMANAND YADAV (Bihar): Party forum is the best place for such introspection.

SHRI V. B. RAJU: What forum are you talking about?

From 75 we came down to 12 in the Lok Sabha. One thing is universally accepted, that the great mass of this electorate have demonstrated a capacity for a mature decision; whichever party it was, in all the seven elections they have returned the majority party to the Centre... (Interruption) I

think Mr. Mody has still to maintain his contact with the masses of the country...

SHRI PILOO MODY: You come with me and I will show you what mass contact means.

SHRI V. B. RAJU: I do not want to enter into a dialogue with an individual now.

I am saying a thing without fear of contradiction that even the Janata Party was returned in a majority even though it was not a party at the time of election, not a well-structured party. But still the people had chosen to return it. This is one observation that we could make about our electorate and I am happy that democracy has taken roots in this country.

The second observation of mine is some friends unwittingly put in juxtaposition freedom and discipline. They said either this or that. But we should make a study of the past and accept this. What was the vote for in 1971? I just recall the period between 1967 and 1971. The year 1967 was a watershed year. For the first twenty years, for two decades, the Congress had a monopoly rule. In 1967 the Congress had lost in ten States in the Assembly elections which were conducted along with those to the Lok Sabha. That is what I would call an erosion of the Congress monopoly. From there started as we came to 1970 a new philosophy in the name of *aya ram, gaya ram* to which a reference has been made, and Haryana should take the credit for it. And even today Haryana stands at the top for *en masse* defections. I think the agility, the virility, the dynamism of Haryana is reflected in all these things. By 1971 the people had a feeling that national discipline was eroded. And when Mrs. Gandhi came forward saying, with the slogan of *garibi hatao* I will maintain discipline, the people voted for her. I do recall those days when the whole nation was feeling very much embittered that things were moving in a wrong direction and there was no national discipline at all:

[Shri V. B. Raju]

offices were not working, means of transport were not functioning on time and everybody for himself, and political opportunism came to the zenith and everywhere every political party was looked at with suspicion. That was the period and one year before the Lok Sabha had completed its term, elections were called and my reading of that vote was that the people wanted more discipline. But what happened in 1977? My reading was this: When the people felt that discipline became more harsh, they wanted more freedom. That was how the Janata Party came. No second revolution, nothing of that type. Many claims were made with which I did not agree at that time. Therefore, the people have demonstrated their urge for both freedom and discipline. And what happened in 1979? Again the people wanted more discipline. This is how the electorate is responding to the situations. If between 1975 and 1977 that nation suffered from the excesses of Emergency, between 1977 and 1979 the country suffered from the excesses of democracy. This is a thing which we have to learn. How to behave in the name of democracy? Freedom became licence. It was here on the floor of this House when three Ministers made three different approaches to the same issue and I had to advise them to decide the matter in their Cabinet and then come here and speak with one voice. There was practically no political discipline, there was no party discipline; and there was no administrative discipline and naturally law and order failed. Therefore, I could hear the voice of the people demanding more discipline. Then came this opportunity for Shrimati Gandhi. Mind you this is not a vote for you, not for your party, nor even for your candidates. It is a personal vote for Mrs. Gandhi. I can say this without any fear of contradiction. I can show this if she wants to come with me. I do not want to take the name of any body. One of the senior members of your party went to his constituency during the last elections. The

people were angry with him. They told him: After two and half years, you come here for the first time. Have you come for our votes, they asked him. They did not allow him to speak. He bore everything patiently. They got exhausted and when silence was established, he told them: "Yes, it is true, I did not come here earlier. Nor did I serve you to the best of my ability. I have now come here not to ask for votes for me. If you want Mrs. Gandhi as Prime Minister, then you should vote for me." The is the political education you gave to the people. Otherwise, what are your speeches? Only when you brought in Shrimati Gandhi's name, you got votes. You are banking too much upon her personal capacity. It is good for you presently. But in the long run, it is not good for the country. Failure of the political party system in the country has made the electorate to look to a dominant individual. This happens everywhere with the failure of democratic parties. I blame the Congress (U). I blame the Lok Dal. I blame the Janata Party. I blame all democratic parties for this. What we need is a cadre-based party. The Marxist Party, for instance, has been able to resist the influence of individuals. It is not my opinion or impression. It is the truth; it is the fact. Therefore, this country needs cadre-based parties. What happened in the past few years is the disintegration and liquidation of the political party system, particularly democratic parties and the middle of the road parties. I am sure, in the long run, if the middle of the road parties do not take a lesson from this experience, there will be political polarisation.

Sir, this actually is an occasion for the major sections of the opposition here for introspection and to read and assess the situation correctly. So far so good.

Sir, there is a threat to democracy in this country. This threat can come from three situations. First, if issues

are dragged in to the streets and if decisions are taken in the streets, democracy will not survive because then it becomes mobocracy. I would warn the ruling party not to encourage street demonstrations on major issues. This will boomerang. The second threat arises from the erosion of the sanctity of Parliamentary institutions. Behaviour in the Parliament should be dignified. In fact, I would like the opposition to give a lead in the matter to the ruling party. Knowing the composition of the present opposition, I can assure the ruling party that we will at all costs protect the dignity of the Rajya Sabha and I expect to get positive response from the ruling party. The strength of the ruling party should not become a threat, not here so much, but in the other House where I was told that they did not allow an opposition Member to speak. Where is democracy then? You are making tall promises. Therefore, the sanctity and the proper functioning of democratic institutions must be guaranteed. The third threat to democracy will be when there are too frequent elections. A political scientist has put it that elections are like the heart-beats of the body. There must be elections. But if there are too frequent elections, the heart beats too fast and the body politic is damaged. We have been having too frequent elections. We should see that as far as possible the elections come periodically as determined. We must give the ruling party—I wish the party which has been returned will complete its full term and will place its record before the people. I do not want any defections. Mr. Advani said that there may be defections. I do not want defections. There is no question of defections here. Nothing of the type. I would request the ruling party to respect federalism also. Sir, gradually Centralism is developing and we have experienced this in the first five weeks of the Janata Government. When Mr. Charan Singh was the Home Minister I had made a statement on the floor of the House that you are destroying the non-Congress Governments and he

had not even the Governor's Report. The earlier Government had the Governors' reports, but the Janata Government had not even the Governor's report before it. In Article 356, on account of only the word 'otherwise', the Congress Governments were destroyed. I said that you are going against your own election manifesto. You promised in your manifesto that you would not use Article 356 for political purposes, but you are destroying the Opposition. This is the beginning of the destruction of your own party. If there is no strong, healthy Opposition outside, the rumblings in the ruling party will come to the surface and it will break up. It has come true. The same thing will happen if the ruling party will not respect actually the Opposition—its integrity, its health. It will boomerang.

Sir, we have a federal character in our polity. It seems Mr. Antulay was very vociferous and there were Press reports that the Assemblies should be dissolved. Is it Mughal rule? Are you going to behave in the same way as the Janata Party did? You say that the Janata Party did not allow their democratic functioning. It was very bad. You were one with us when you were in the Opposition to decry the Janata Party. You yourself have said in your speeches that ours is a multi-lingual, multi-religious and multi-cultural society. Let there be scope for different expression and articulation. If different parties actually are there. Let them articulate. The rules of the game are the same—democratic form of Government. Nothing wrong would happen if the AIDMK is there in Madras. When the Janata rule was there, we had still the CONG-I Government in Andhra Pradesh. Nothing wrong has happened from the Centre. And why are they having this urge of dissolution? In fact, you are interfering with the democratic rights of the State people, in choosing the type of Government. And do not think that the Assembly election will be of

[Shri V. B. Raju]

the same type as the Lok Sabha elections. You will taste it. You will experience it.

SHRI SHYAM LAL YADAV (Uttar Pradesh): Let us see.

SHRI V. B. RAJU: The people have become wise enough as to distinguish what is actually Parliament and what is Assembly and what the local elections are. Do not adopt the Janata philosophy that it is the same. No. The interests differ, the situation differs. They act in a different manner. Therefore, please for Heaven's sake, do not be tempted because of the brute majority you have that you can do whatever you like. I am sorry to say, Sir, that the Janata Government depended upon the doctrine of dissolution, the Congress-I seems to be depending upon an improved application of it, that is, defection-oriented dissolution. You defect the people, get the majority and advise the Governor to dissolve. The Centre need not come into the picture. No. These tactics would not do. This is very bad.

The present Government has three stupendous problems. We have the problem of Afghanistan, the problems of Assam and the problem of derailed economy. Mr. Advani said that the economy was good for the first two years. I do not say that the Janata Government did everything bad. They have done something good. But whatever good was done had been spoiled by their quarrels. Now, the year 1979-80 is a very difficult year. There is galloping inflation of 22 per cent. The budget deficit is going to be twice of what it was estimated. It may be 2700 crores of rupees. There is negative rate of industrial growth. We have one of the worst droughts. We have increasing unemployment. Then, we have adverse balance of trade. The year 1980 is a very difficult year and the present Government is faced with great difficulties. They need the co-

operation of the opposition and the State Governments. They should not get into power politics. Let us solve the problems which are before the nation. We need not quarrel all the five years. We can quarrel once in five years. After the elections are over, let us settle down. I would request the present Government not to indulge in political gimmicks. With these words, I would say that my amendment should be accepted because no reference has been made to the employment situation in the Address.

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपसभापति महोदय, कुछ परेशानी दिखाई दे रही है असेम्बली के डिजोल्यूशन के ऊपर। मेरा अपना ख्याल है कि जिस तरह से जनता सरकार ने डिजोल्यूशन किया था अगर वही आधार डिजोल्यूशन का बनाया जाय तो फिर कोई एतराज नहीं होना चाहिए और उसके बावजूद अगर उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार में डिजोल्यूशन किया जाता है तो डिजोल्यूशन का फैसला करते समय प्रधान मंत्री जी को यह एलान करना चाहिए कि अगर कांग्रेस आई पार्टी उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार में हार गयी तो लोक सभा के फिर से चुनाव होंगे।

श्री श्याम लाल यादव : यह किस आधार पर होगा ? यह कैसे होगा ?

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : मैंनेट के आधार पर।

श्री कल्प नाथ राय : क्या यू० पी० और बिहार इंडिया है ?

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : यह बात तो आप ठीक कह रहे हैं कि यू० पी० और बिहार इंडिया नहीं हैं आप ने आंध्र प्रदेश में स्वीप किया है,

कर्नाटक में स्वीप किया है, उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार में आप की शक्ति 35, 36 परसेंट है। उसके आधार पर क्या आप डिजोल्गेशन चाहते हैं? अगर चाहते हैं तो हमें कोई एतराज नहीं है और मैं आप के इस चैलेंज को स्वीकार करता हूँ। आप वहाँ की असेम्बलियों को फरवरी में डिजाल्व कर दें और मार्च में चुनाव करा लें और अगर उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार में आप की पार्टी हार जाती है तो अगर पूरे नहीं तो कम से कम उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार के लोग सभा के सदस्यों को आप कह दें कि वे अपने इस्तीफे दे कर हट जायें और वहाँ फिर चुनाव हो जायें। (Interruptions) अगर आप में यह हिम्मत नहीं है तो आप को कोई नैतिक आधार नहीं है उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार में असेम्बलियों को डिजाल्व करने का। आप इस को स्वीकार कर लें, हम आप के चैलेंज को स्वीकार करते हैं। श्रीमन्, मैं इस समय जो पूरे मुल्क की समस्या है उसकी ओर आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। पूरे समय देश को चुनाव बंधन में बांध देना देश के हित में नहीं है। बारहों महीने देश में केवल चुनाव की हवा हो, यह देश के हित में नहीं है। इस समय देश में महत्वपूर्ण विषय हैं पाकिस्तान अमरीका का आर्सेनल बनने जा रहा है, हवाई सेना का अड्डा बनने जा रहा है, नौसैनिक अड्डा और भूमि सेना का अड्डा बनने जा रहा है। इस बात का साफ़ साफ़ ऐलान अमरीकी सरकार के विशेष लोगों ने कर दिया है। भूतपूर्व विदेश मंत्री श्री किर्सिंगर साहब ने भी अमरीका सरकार को यह सलाह दी है कि पाकिस्तान को हथियारी मदद देने से ही पाकिस्तान की रक्षा नहीं हो सकती बल्कि पाकिस्तान को अमरीकी सेना का अड्डा बनाना चाहिए और वहाँ पर अमरीकी समुद्री सेना, हवाई सेना दोनों रहनी

चाहिए। इतना ही नहीं, उनको इतने से ही सन्तोष नहीं हुआ बल्कि इस समय इस्लामावाद में दुनिया के इस्लामी देशों के विदेश मंत्रियों का सम्मेलन चल रहा है और उस सम्मेलन में वहाँ के राष्ट्रपति ने काश्मीर के मामले को उठाया है। एक तरफ़ उन्होंने फ़ैलेस्टीन के मामले को उठाया है विचार के लिए और दूसरी तरफ़ उन्होंने काश्मीर के मामले को उठाया है। वह हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ़ इस्लामी जेहाद का नारा दे रहे हैं। उनका यह पैतरा कितना सफल होगा वह देखने की चीज है। लेकिन श्रीमन्, अपने देश की सरहद पर अमरीकी सेना, अमरीकी ताकत पूरी तरह से आ गई है।

हमें भूलना नहीं चाहिए कि सन् 1971 के युद्ध के समय अमरीका का सातवाँ बड़ा बहुत दूर से उतर पड़ा था पाकिस्तान की मदद में, अब जब कि उनकी सेना पाकिस्तान में मौजूद रहेगी, उस समय वह क्या करेगी इसकी कल्पना आसानी से की जा सकती है।

श्रीमन्, इसके लिए अमरीका ने बहाना बनाया है अफ़गानिस्तान में रूसी सेनाओं के आने का। अफ़गानिस्तान में रूसी सेनायें आयें तो वहाँ अमरीका अपनी सेनायें नहीं भेज रहा है बल्कि वह पाकिस्तान में अपनी सेना और अपने हथियार भेज रहा है। इसका मकसद साफ़ है कि अमरीका इस क्षेत्र को पश्चिम एशिया के देशों को, हिन्द महाद्वीप को युद्ध का क्षेत्र बनाना चाहता है। यूरोप के देशों में जहाँ शीत-युद्ध शान्त है, उस को खिसका करके उसको एशिया के देशों में ला दिया है। अगर वह रूस के आक्रामक ख को रोकना चाहता है तो उसको अपनी सेनायें यूरोप में भेजनी चाहिए, उसको पश्चिम जर्मनी में, फ्रांस में, इन देशों में अपने अड्डे बनाने चाहिए,

[श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही]

वहां रूस की ताकत को कमजोर करने की कोशिश करनी चाहिए। वहां वह ऐसा न करके अपनी सेनायें इधर भेज रहा है। इससे भारत को जो खतरा पैदा हो रहा है उसके बारे में अब हल्के-फुल्के ढंग से राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण में जिक्र है। देश इस मसले पर बहुत ही चिंतित है और यह सरकार से जाना चाहता है कि सरकार अमेरिकी सरकार के इस आक्रामक रुख की और कौन सी नीति अख्तियार कर रही है। क्योंकि इसके साथ-साथ देश के अन्दर रूनी मामले में भी लगे हुए हैं इसलिये मैं सफ़ाई के साथ कह देना चाहता हूँ कि अपने देश में भी ओट की सरकार है और माइनोरिटी की ओट का बहुत ही प्रमुख असर होता है। अपने देश में माइनोरिटी की ओट देखते हुए हमारा रवैया पाकिस्तान के इस सैनिक तैयारी की ओर मुलायम नहीं होगा ऐसी हम आशा करते हैं। क्योंकि पाकिस्तान के शासक हर बार कश्मीर की चर्चा करते हैं, वह कोई मौका नहीं छोड़ते जब कि कश्मीर की चर्चा न करते हों। अपने देश में जो नीति विभिन्न दल अख्तियार करते हैं उसका असर हमारे पाकिस्तान से संबंध का नहीं होना चाहिये।

एक दूसरी बात जिसको श्री श्याम लाल जी चाहते हैं, कहना चाहता हूँ।

श्री श्याम लाल यादव : क्या ?

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : आप को मंत्री बनाने के लिये। पूरे देश में नारा लगाया गया : जात पर न पात पर, मोहर लगेगी इन्दिरा जी के हाथ पर। चौधरी साहब को बदनाम करने की

कोशिश की गई। यह कहा गया कि पूरे देश में जात-पात फैला रहे हैं।

श्री कल्प नाथ राय : चौधरी साहब जात-पात के खिलाफ़ हैं या नहीं ?

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : मैं श्याम लाल जी के पक्ष में कहना चाहता हूँ, क्योंकि उन्होंने मुझ से कहा था। मुझे उन्होंने बताया है कि जो कैबिनेट दिल्ली में 15 मंत्रियों की बनी है उसमें सात सदस्य एक जाति के हैं।

श्री रामानन्द यादव : मैंने कब बताया। असत्य बात मत कहिये।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : यह नारा लगाया गया था कि 'जात पर न पात पर, मोहर लगेगी हाथ पर।'

आज हम को जात-पात की सारी चीजें दिखाई दे रही हैं नीचे से ऊपर तक। विश्वम्भर नाथ पांडे जी को दाद देता हूँ कि उन्होंने यह कहा कि पिछली सरकार ने हाई कोर्ट में जो जजेज की नियुक्ति की उसमें जातिवाद की महक आ रही है। यह सही बात है कि जाति का नाम लेकर बहुत से जजेज अपाएंट किये गये। यह बहाना करते हैं कि हम तो जजेज अपाएंट करते हैं चीफ़ जस्टिस और वहां की राज्य सरकार के रिक्मेन्डेशन पर। यह कहने की बात है। दिल्ली की सरकार जो चाहती है, दिल्ली के मिनिस्टर जो चाहते हैं वह राज्य सरकारों की रिक्मेन्डेशन से आ जाता है। यह बात थी। मैं चाहता हूँ कि आज देश की राजनीति और देश का प्रशासन जो जातिवाद से भरा पड़ा है, चाहे कोई पार्टी हो मैं किसी एक पार्टी की बात नहीं करता, चाहे कोई पार्टी सरकार चलाये मैं यह कहता हूँ यह समाप्त होना चाहिये। देश धर्म के नाम पर बटा। देश धर्म के नाम पर टुकड़े-टुकड़े हो गया और

अगर जाति के आधार पर बटेगा तो देश नहीं रह सकता, नहीं बच सकता। इसलिये जातिवाद पर ध्यान जाना चाहिये, इस पर अंकुश लगना चाहिये। (Interruptions)

श्री रामानन्द यादव : शाही जी, मैं आपसे यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि आप किस पार्टी से संबंध रखते हैं और श्री राजनारायण के कहने से आपने कितनी पार्टियाँ बदली हैं ?

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : आप बैठ जाइये। बिहार में गरीबों की क्या हालत है, उसको देखिये।

श्रीमन्, मेरा कहना यह है कि राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में इस बात का जिक्र है कि एन्टी सोशियल एलीमेन्ट्स के साथ सरकार की तरफ से सख्ती की जाएगी। मगर एन्टी सोशियल एलीमेन्ट्स जो कांग्रेस आई में भरे हुए हैं उनके खिलाफ आप कब सख्ती करना शुरू कर रहे हैं, यह भी बताइये। इन एन्टी सोशियल एलीमेन्ट्स के कारण हरिजन वस्त्र हो रहे हैं, गरीब वस्त्र हो रहे हैं, माईनोरिटीज वस्त्र हो रहे हैं। उनके खिलाफ आप एक्शन कब लेंगे ? उदाहरण के तौर पर मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि जिस दिन यहां सरकार बनी उसके दूसरे ही दिन यू० पी० निवास में उत्तर प्रदेश के चीफ मिनिस्टर को कांग्रेस आई के लोगों ने पीटा ... (Interruptions)

श्री श्याम लाल यादव : मैं आपसे यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप बिल्कुल गलत बातें और बिल्कुल असत्य बातें बना-बना कर क्यों कह रहे हैं ?

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : आपके पक्ष में कह रहा हूँ। दिल्ली के अन्दर यह घटना हुई है यू० पी० निवास में श्री बनारसी दास को एन्टीसोशियल एलीमेन्ट्स ने बुरी तरह से पीटा जिससे उनका कोट भी फट गया।

श्री रामानन्द यादव : वे सब आर० एस० एस० के और लोक दल के लोग थे, आपकी तरफ के लोग थे।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : श्रीमन्, मैं बहुत कम समय में अब खत्म कर रहा हूँ। आप जानते हैं कि लोक सभा के लिए पांच बाई इलेक्शन 24 फरवरी को हो रहे हैं। जिस समय यह बाई-इलेक्शन का नोटिफिकेशन हुआ है उसी समय एसेम्बलीज की सीटें भी खाली हो गई थी। उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार में एसेम्बलीज के जो सदस्य थे उनमें से बहुत से लोक सभा में आ गये हैं और उन्होंने एसेम्बलीज की अपनी सीटों से इस्तीफे दे दिये हैं। उनके स्थान रिक्त हो गये थे, लेकिन उनके लिए नोटिफिकेशन नहीं हुआ है। आप जानते हैं कि इट इज ए मेटर आफ जनरल पालिसी। जो सीटें रिक्त हुई हैं उनका नोटिफिकेशन भी साथ-साथ होना चाहिए था। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह इस बात का संकेत है कि इन स्थानों के लिए उप चुनाव इसलिए नहीं हो रहे हैं क्योंकि वहां जनरल इलेक्शन होने हैं। आपके दिमाग में यह बात है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि आपकी तरफ से यह बात साफ होनी चाहिए।

श्री श्याम लाल यादव : आपको सही स्थिति की जानकारी नहीं है। जब विधान सभाओं की सीटें खाली होती हैं तो चीफ मिनिस्टर इलेक्शन कमीशन को लिखते हैं कि इन सीटों के लिए इलेक्शन करवाये जायें। आप पहले प्रोसीजर जान लीजिये।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : मैं समझता हूँ कि यह इस बात का द्योतक है कि इन लोगों के दिमाग में एसेम्बलीज के इलेक्शन हैं, एसेम्बलीज का डिज्योल्यूशन इनके दिमाग में है और इसीलिए एसेम्बलीज की खाली सीटों के इलेक्शन डिक्लेयर नहीं किये गये हैं। अगर इनके अन्दर ईमानदारी होती तो इन सीटों के लिए उप-चुनाव करवाये जा सकते थे।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं निवेदन करता हूँ कि राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में जो बातें साफ

[श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही]

नहीं हुई हैं और जिन के संबंध में सफाई से बात करने की आवश्यकता है उनकी सफाई होनी चाहिए और जो विषय मैंने उठाये हैं उनकी भी सफाई होनी चाहिए और श्री श्याम लाल यादव को मिनिस्टर बना दें।

श्री श्याम लाल यादव : आप इस प्रकार से क्यों असत्य बात कहते हैं और बार-बार मेरा नाम क्यों लेते हैं।

DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Advani, who has been an experienced parliamentarian, with a short spell in the Government, criticised the President's Address on the basis that it bristles with generalities and platitudes. I was rather surprised at this observation because when I went through—after the observation that he made—the Address that the Janata Party Government of which he was a member had presented to both the Houses of Parliament, I found that it contained more generalities and platitudes. In fact, as a matter of parliamentary practice, the President's Address only gives directions and shows the way in which Government proposes to go ahead with its programme. In this Address, Sir, it has been made clear that as far as the socio-economic measures were concerned, it is during the Budget Session that the Government will come forward with the specific measures. But the Address contains directions which are not only a departure from what the last Government did or the Janata Government did, but also how the Government proposes to implement many of the promises that it had made during the election campaign.

Now, Sir, the first reference in the Address is, regret for the absence of representatives from the North-Eastern States. I do not want to take much time as far as the situation in

that region is concerned, particularly, in Assam, but I would like to plead with the Government as well as the people in Assam that the situation can create complications in other parts of the country if it is not viewed in its correct perspective. I am happy that the Prime Minister has made it clear that the question of who are foreigners will have to be gone into in depth, studied properly and she has gone even a step further and assured that even those people whom the Assamese may consider as foreigners would have to be rehabilitated elsewhere. Sir, there is, unfortunately, a communal angle to this question. I do not want to say anything which will aggravate the situation, but even when I discussed this question with some of my friends from Assam who feel very much agitated, they admitted that the problem is something with which almost 80 to 90 per cent of the Muslims are concerned. And it is from the point of view that we will have to be extremely careful because the very fabric of our secularism **may be in danger** if passions are allowed to have swayed in the solution of this problem.

Next, Sir, there is a reference—when I said that there are specific directions, I was coming to them—to the communal and other divisive forces who have reared their ugly heads in different parts of the country causing serious prejudice to our ideals of national integration and national unity; and the confidence of linguistic and other minorities, Harijans and weaker sections of society has been seriously eroded. Sir, it has been admitted on all sides now that one of the decisive factors in the massive mandate that the Congress (I) has obtained has been the overwhelming support received from the Harijans and the Muslims. It was not a negative vote in the sense that they not only reacted to the non-performance of the Government, but what happened was that the little hope that they might have entertained in 1977 was so dashed to the pieces, by what happened to them in the last two and a

half years, that they were almost frightened. They did not know whether their future was at all secure in this country and it was at that time that Mrs. Gandhi's leadership gave them a ray of hope. When the manifesto was published, specific measures to restore this confidence among the Harijans and the minorities were given. It is true, Sir, that in the Address these measures are not spelt out. But, perhaps, the Address had to be brief and, therefore, as I said, a general direction could only be given. I do not think that at any time in the history of free India, any political party, including the Congress Party in the past, had given such specific assurances, both to the Harijans and the minorities, in particular to the Muslims, as has been done in the Congress election manifesto and I would like to read some of these assurances that have been given.

One is, "it will safeguard the rights of the minorities". That is all right. Then it says: "The effective and timely control of communal disturbances shall rest squarely on the district administration and any failure on their part will promptly entail suitable action. Special measures will be taken to bring offenders to book speedily and deterrently". I would like the Prime Minister, if it is possible, to spell out how this terrible communal problem which erupts every now and again and which under the Janata rule had made the lives of the Harijans and Muslims almost intolerable is going to be controlled.

Then, Sir, there is another assurance given in the manifesto, "Special peace-keeping force will be created to prevent and suppress communal violence which will be composed of people drawn from minority communities, scheduled castes and scheduled tribes and others", Sir, in this connection, when Mr. Morarji Desai was the Prime Minister and was for some time in charge of the Home portfolio, I had repeatedly asked for some such specific assurance on the floor of the House and I am sorry to say that

none was given. Our party in its manifesto has given this categorical assurance to the minority communities and the scheduled castes and the scheduled tribes.

Then, Sir, there is also the assurance about the Minorities Commission being made statutory. But more important than that is the assurance as far as the employment opportunities to the members of the minority communities are concerned. And therein, Sir, I would like to read to you the specific commitment in the manifesto: "So far as the economic condition of minorities, scheduled castes, scheduled tribes and other weaker sections of the society is concerned, a thorough examination is needed to ascertain if the benefits of various fiscal policies of Government, both Union and State, had really reached them. It is learnt that incentives, facilities and other encouragements, entitlements like licences, quotas, loans etc. are not being fully availed of. A high-powered panel including members belonging to the minorities, scheduled castes and scheduled tribes and weaker sections will be appointed to go into the whole question and make recommendations". Sir, this is an assurance which I am quite sure will for the first time give us a clear perception of what the economic conditions of the minorities, in particular the Muslims and the Christians, are. If this panel is appointed 5 P.M. quickly, I am sure we will be in a position to tackle the problem in the right manner. In this connection, Sir, I am also happy that there is this assurance that as far as employment in Government services is concerned, the words are very significant and I would like to quote them because they are part of the hope for the fulfilment of the grievances of the minorities:—

"Equitable employment opportunities to the minorities will be ensured in Government services including the law and order and security personnel."

[Dr. Rafiq Zakaria]

Then, Sir, it further goes and elaborates:—

"It has always been the policy of the Congress to give adequate representation to minorities including Muslims and Christians both in the organisational and parliamentary wings. We feel that in every field of national activity as also in the affairs of the Government the totality of the population shall be properly and effectively reflected and represented in the interest of national integration."

Again, Sir, a kind of unequivocal declaration which was never made before. That is why, when we went to the Muslims during the election campaign, we found for the first time that they realised that apart from the leadership that Mrs. Gandhi has provided and the assurances that the Congress (I) has given that their future would be secure, what is required is that steps and measures have to be taken as quickly as possible.

Mr. Advani talked of this Government being a minority Government.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: I did not say that.

DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA: Yes, yes, you said that the vote is a minority vote, that the Government has been appointed on the basis of a popular minority vote.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: That has always been there.

DR. RAFIQ ZAKARIA: It has always been there. But I would also like to remind him that if we have to go on with the parliamentary system of Government and if he were to study the electoral results even in the United Kingdom and other countries, the same anomaly is bound to recur. Therefore, the question of the list system or of proportional representation is not going to solve as far as stability of the

Government is concerned because under a list system or under a proportional representation system, there is also the danger that no particular party may get a majority. You again get the same kind of disequilibrium against which there has been no answer and, therefore, it is not such a simple solution as Mr. Advani has advanced.

Now, Mr. Advani has been a little unkind to the present Minister of Information and Broadcasting when he said that he proposed to reorganise the Press Commission. I do not know what he has said or what he has not said but, surely, Mr. Advani will agree with me that all the appointments that the previous Government made were of a partisan nature, that many people were blacklisted on flimsy grounds, that we have had discussions in this House also as far as personnel and composition of such commissions or panels are concerned and, therefore, if a new Government has come to power and if it wants to implement its promises and assurances and its programmes of action, then, surely Mr. Advani, under a democratic system of Government cannot expect that such instruments which may not have faith in the philosophy and approach of this Government should be continued. I am not saying this as far as the Press Commission is concerned, but the approach should be quite clear. Most of the appointments were of a political nature. And if they were of a political nature, then certainly we will have to change these appointees. This is exactly what is done in the United Kingdom and even in the United States of America. In fact, in the USA, with every change of the President, thousands of appointees are overnight changed. In this country at least there is some kind of continuity. I do not want that any injustice should be done to any one of them, but surely if our manifesto and the assurances and the commitments made in the manifesto are to be implemented, then certainly we will have to choose our own instruments for fulfilling those assurances.

Then, Sir, there is a reference in the Address to the deteriorating economic situation. Mr. Advani was very aggressive in asserting that there has been no deterioration in the economic situation. Well, let me assure Mr. Advani that if his presumption were to be right, his party would not have met the fate it did. In fact, the very newspapers which he has quoted have been at pains to point out that one of the factors which wiped out the Janata Party in the recent elections has been the price of onions. It is only symbolic. It is true that the way inflation went up, the way the prices went up, the way commodities became scarce, there was no hope for the common man. It is because of all these factors that the poor and the downtrodden—and the minorities and the Harijans are the worst of the poor and the downtrodden—were so affected that they voted *en masse* for the Congress Party and which resulted in this massive mandate.

Then, Sir, in the Address itself, as Mr. Advani admitted, there is a clear indication that as far as the socio-economic measures are concerned, in the Budget session they will be spelt out; but he cannot say that the directions in which the Government proposes to go ahead have not been given in the Address. They are there in paragraphs after paragraphs. For instance, it is indicated what is to be done so far as the energy crisis is concerned. A national plan is being worked out. The very fact that an assurance on these lines has been given should indicate that the necessary preparation to meet this grave situation is being made.

Sir, I have only one or two more points to make before I end my speech. One is about the fear that Mr. Advani said has been generated as a result of the massive victory of the Congress (I) in certain sections of the people. I am rather surprised at this observation. Let me tell him from my personal experience that it was the Janata

victory which really created the fear among those who were on the other side. The various inquiry commissions, the probes and the raids created a psychology under which hundreds of thousands of people suffered and because the press was all through pro-Janata, it never got reflected. The press even now has a soft corner for the Janata Party. That is why it is a fact, and, therefore, Mr. Advani should realise that had there been any kind of such psychosis created despite the categorical assurance given by the Prime Minister that there shall be no prosecutions, that there shall be no political vendetta, that there will be no victimisation and that ours will be a policy of reconciliation and national consensus, this kind of atmosphere wherein even this massive victory of the Congress (I) has not created really any kind of psychology which the Janata Party victory had created in 1977 among large sections of the people particularly the Congress rank and file, would not have been there. It is the biggest hope for the success of democracy. It is on the basis of our understanding that if one party goes out and another party comes in, it should not result in our instituting commissions of enquiries or having raids and all kinds of harassments to the people who might not have been with us or even who attacked us or criticised us, that proper democratic functioning is possible. It is in that spirit that I appeal to Mr. Advani and my friends on the other side to co-operate with the Government because we are at a very critical stage at this stage. With the international situation pregnant with all kinds of dangers, if we are once again going to indulge in a policy of confrontation in a spirit of conflicts, then, I am afraid we will ill-serve our people. What this election should teach us is that we have to keep the national interests in the forefront and that even if we have suffered political defeats and even if it has resulted in the loss of power by some people, it should not, as a result of it, create a climate of

[Dr. Rafiq Zakaria]

non-cooperation and of fear of insecurity which again may generate such forces which will disintegrate the unity of the country.

With these few words, I would like to thank you for the time given to me.

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri U. K. Lakshmana Gowda) in the Chair.]

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir as I rise to make my maiden speech in the House at the fag end of the day, may I beg you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, and through you, my esteemed colleagues here to grant me their indulgence as a junior colleague?

At the outset, Mr. Vice-Chairman, with your permission, I would like to touch upon some of the points that have been made by my esteemed colleague, Shri Antulay, who moved the Motion of Thanks. He is a constitutional expert, I know and, I have been a student of Constitutional law myself. But personally I do not see the conflict that he appears to see between parliamentary democracy on the one hand and federalism on the other. Indeed, the two refer to two totally different levels of operation—parliamentary democracy is a system of Government, federalism is a constitutional structure—and the two may go together and the two may not go together. But the point that he wanted to derive at was indeed very interesting. He wanted to justify the process of destabilisation that has been let loose in the country on the ground of this premise that true parliamentary democracy in this country means elimination of federalism. I submit, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that it is not a premise that we who are the Members of this House, can accept even for a moment.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Shri Antulay spoke of secularism as dearer to him than the rule of law and dearer than democracy. The Constitution describes secularism as one of the fundamental principles of the Constitution,

of our polity, and indeed all of us are committed to the principle of secularism. But I do not understand this effort to monopolise the secular outlook, this propaganda that only the ruling party, represented here by Shri Antulay and his friends, is the defender of true secularism. I reject this presumptuous approach. Dr. Zakaria has in his intervention spoken of the massive mandate from the Muslim voters. I just saw, perhaps today or a few days ago, a computer analysis of 62 constituencies in which the Muslim votes range from 20 to 50 per cent. These 62 constituencies have the highest proportion of Muslim voters in the country. And you will be surprised to know, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that in those constituencies the votes secured by the Congress (I) are 7 per cent lower than the 43 per cent votes received by the Congress (I) in the country. That shows that obviously the Muslim masses have not reposed their confidence in the Congress (I).

श्री रामानन्द यादव : और दूसरी दूसरी पार्टियों को उन कांस्टिट्यूंसीज में कितने परसेंट मिला है यह भी तो बतलाइये

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: I am sorry, I do not have the figures, Mr. Deputy Chairman. I am only referring to an analysis made...

(Interruption)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Mr. Yadav, let him finish.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN:.... and the conclusions drawn by some computer analysts from those particular figures.

श्री रामानन्द यादव : उस में दूसरी पार्टियों का परसेंटेज भी दिया है ।

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: Mr. Vice Chairman, Sir, Mr. Antulay said that the two-and-a-half years that the Janata Party was in power is a sordid tale and a sad commentary. Strong words, indeed, Mr. Vice Chairman, but strong words do not change history, do not change facts. He has spoken of this period as worse than

dictatorship. I wish he knew what dictatorship was. I wish he were on our side when the Emergency was imposed on the country. Then he would have known what dictatorship means and what authoritarianism signifies.

We established Commissions of inquiry. Yes. We did not punish people right away. We did not presume that they were guilty. We established commissions of inquiry according to law because we believe in the rule of law. And it is not a crime to enquire into allegations. We know that the reports that have come out of these commissions of inquiry are very valuable and indeed contain a lot of material which will serve as a guide to the growth of democracy in our country.

Mr. Vice Chairman, the point has already been made that even in the country as a whole, the ruling party did not secure a massive mandate. Yes, they have a massive majority in the Lok Sabha. But about the massive mandate, let me go one step further. They have secured 43 per cent of the votes cast, and the votes cast were only 55 per cent of the total electorate. Mr. Vice Chairman, if you multiply these two figures, you will come to the astounding conclusion that the present Government is ruling the country with less than 25 per cent of the electorate behind them. It is not just a matter of the votes cast. Of course, it is all due to the vagaries of our electoral system to which I shall come a little later. So let there not be too much jubilation or excessive rejoicing merely on the presumption that the entire country is behind the present ruling party.

Mr. Vice Chairman, we have been told that collective leadership is bad and one-man leadership or one-woman leadership is good. Well, we know what personality cult means. Do we wish to introduce in this country the cult of personality? Do we

wish to take the inevitable path towards totalitarianism which this personality cult would signify? I think in our country we have not yet risen above the feudal syndrome. I think we have not gone beyond the Kingship psychosis. And it is this which perhaps permeates the thinking of the treasury benches when they talk of one leader and one party for the country.

Mr. Vice Chairman, Mr. Kalp Nath Rai sang a long paean of praise and a long hymn of homage to "the leader" whom he described as the world leader. A few sentences later he demoted her to "the leader of the non-aligned group and the developing countries". Well, he should make up his mind whether Mrs. Gandhi is "the world leader" or just "the leader of the non-aligned and developing countries". May I point out to Mr. Kalp Nath Rai through you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that the isolation of India on the question of Afghanistan is symptomatic of the fact that we are not leaders of the non-aligned group today and we are not leaders of the developing countries today. We are not even leaders of our own region of the world in South Asia, thanks to the policy followed by the present Government on Afghanistan, on which I shall have something more to say later.

SHRI KALP NATH RAI: Your people have destroyed the image of India during these three years.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: Mr. Kalp Nath Rai is an esteemed colleague and I do not blame him. I know he is in the waiting list and he has got to make his point. But I would like to suggest that if our workers had the same lung power and similarly strong vocal cords, perhaps we would have won the election and not his party.

May I now come to the Presidents Address? I have moved certain amendments to the President's Ad-

[Shri Syed Shahabuddin]

dress. When I read through the opening paragraph, paragraph 2, I felt a bit sad. It is natural that there is a degree of self-glorification. It is natural to have a bit of backslapping when you come with such a massive majority to the Lok Sabha. But is it in consonance with the conventions of democracy, is it in keeping with the democratic spirit, to malign everybody else, to tar all the other parties which the same black brush and castigate them obliquely for their 'philosophies' based on regional, linguistic, sectoral and other differences? Was it necessary to have included this sentence, this unfair criticism, this undemocratic criticism of the Opposition parties as a whole, in their totality? I personally feel, as my leader Mr. Advani has pointed out, that there should be some humility, and as my friend, Mr. Antulay, has said, let there be some introspection; introspection with humility would perhaps inject sense in the ruling side.

May I now refer to para 5 in which the economic situation has been described as a matter of grave concern and anxiety? Much has already been said on this point. I would like to bring to your attention the intervention of the present Finance Minister, Mr. Venkataraman, when he was participating in the Budget Discussion last year on March 12, 1979. He said in the Lok Sabha—and I quote—"The Finance Minister has said in the Budget Speech that the performance of the Indian economy during the year is a matter of greatest satisfaction, a statement with which subject to some clarifications I will agree. It is true that agriculture has maintained the record production reached last year of 126 million tonnes, industry showed signs of recovery and may achieve a 7 to 8 per cent growth. There is a relative price stability in respect of wholesale prices, thanks particularly to the 20 million tonnes of foodgrains and Rs. 8,000 crores of

foreign exchange which have held down the wholesale price". This is the verdict of the present Finance Minister when he was in the Opposition last year. May I, of course, in this connection refer to the price of onions to which Mr. Zakaria referred? Yes, some commentators have called this election an onion election. Well. I would like to point out that during the two years that the Janata Party was in power, 1977-79, two full financial years, the wholesale price index in this country rose by only 3.4 index points. Of course, there was an increase of 20 index points in the nine months between April, 1979 and December, 1979, and that was perhaps due to the fact that the Caretaker Government had its limitations and did not quite come to grips with the situation. But for that to discredit the entire period between 1977 and 1979 on a period of economic chaos is not fair. I think there is a bit of exaggeration in that.

Then may I refer to para 9 because I have an amendment there? There it is said, "The Government would like to re-affirm its commitment to planning as an essential tool for engineering social and economic change". I quite agree with the sentiments, but I fail to see here the necessary corollary. I find no mention at all of the Five-Year Plan which has been formulated and which is under implementation, no mention at all of the priorities; of course, the present Government has the right even to change the priorities. But let there be a mention of it. Are we going to lose another two years in formulating another Five-Year Plan and let the country's economy stagnate during that period? Or, are we going to start from the stage where the opposition had left off and build a stronger economy?

Mr Vice-Chairman, may I refer now to paragraph 20 of the President's Address? And here, I would like to speak at some length, because this

paragraph refers to the problems of the minorities. It says:

"The Government is committed fully to secularism" etc.

In the end it speaks of legislation for assuring the minority character of the Aligarh Muslim University. But there are more important matters than these, which concern the minority community. And there is no mention at all of these. I am referring to the promises and assurances given by the Congress (I) Party in its election manifesto on Urdu and on the question of communal violence I refer to communal violence because it has already been introduced in the debate by my esteemed friend, Dr. Zakaria.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, communal violence is a shame for the country. That it should go on for thirty-two years after Independence is indeed a matter of regret and for which we should all bow down our heads in shame. For thirty years of these 32 years—to be exact for 29 years—the Congress was in power. If the virus still persists in our body politics, can we not say that it is because of the wrong policies—I am not saying anti-secular policies because 'secularism' is perhaps defined by many people in their own ways—followed by those in power? Our friends on the Treasury Benches now talk of communal violence. They forget that in one of the very, very publicised statements just before the elections. Prime Minister Mrs. Gandhi claimed that during her eleven years of rule there had been no communal riots at all. Mr. Vice-Chairman, if this is not falsification of history, I do not know what is. We know, and the Government of India's own records and statistics bear out, that on an average there were 303 communal riots every year during those eleven years of Mrs. Gandhi's rule. On this point we are equally ashamed because communal riots also took place while Janata Party was in power. But we have not beaten Mrs. Gandhi's record because during this time there were only 204 communal riots per year. But the casualties were much

lower. It was not comparable at all to the average casualty figure during those eleven years of Mrs. Gandhi's rule. This is a major issue concerning the minority community. But there is no reference to it in this. I say this because I am also a Muslim...

SHRI RAMANAND YADAV: On a point of information . . .

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: I am not yielding. You can reply to that.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I was saying that no reference has been made to this most important question how to control the frequency and intensity of communal violence. The Government should have spelt out the measures or controlling communal violence.

The second question is about Urdu. Many a time promises have been made by the party which is now in power both at the State level and the Central and national level that Urdu shall be given its due place and that Urdu shall be recognised in some States as a second official language. No indication has been given in this Address about the place in administration in the media and in education which the present Government proposes to give to Urdu which is one of our finest languages and which is a language which is dear to us.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I now come to some aspects of foreign affairs.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): How much more time you are going to take?

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: Another five minutes, if I am not interrupted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): You carry on.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: Mr. Vice-Chairman, paragraph 23 of this Address makes a reference to the recent developments in Afghanistan

[Shri Syed Shahabuddin]

which highlight the re-emergence of the cold war. I am afraid this is not an adequate diagnosis of the situation. This shows a remarkable degree of insensitivity to the very grim and grave threat that has arisen on our borders. If the 5,000 years of our history is any guide, any power which has established itself on the plateau of Afghanistan has done it only with one purpose, namely to enter into the Indo-Gangetic plane. Mr. Vice-Chairman, history cannot be an infallible guide, but it does repeat itself, through not with absolute precision. Therefore, I am rather amazed that there is no perception at all in this Address, of this long-term threat which may even become imminent to the security of the entire sub-continent. There is no mention at all of this aspect. We have taken such an ambivalent and such an ambiguous stand, just expressing concern, that we are really puzzled as to what concrete steps the Government of India propose to take. If the intervention of our Permanent Representatives in the United Nations is any guide, this ambivalence is carried to extreme absurdity. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the Government of India should have tried to evolve a collective, sub-continental response to this threat by taking all the countries of the South-East Asia into confidence, by consultations with them, by convening a conference of South Asian States in order to secure the withdrawal of the Russians from Afghanistan and also to refuse or to deny the foothold to the Americans and the Chinese in Pakistan. Mr. Vice-Chairman, the two go together. We do not trust any of the super powers. We treat them equally. Their presence is a threat and danger to our security. We want to deal with them. We live in an inter-dependent world. But we want to keep them at arm's length. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, if the clatter of cavalry of the olden times has now been replaced by the rattle of tanks, it should not make us deaf to the threat that is knocking at our door. On this, Pakistan has already—I would

say, a group, has already pre-empted action which should have been taken by us. We see today in Islamabad the spectacle of an Islamic Conference on this development. Mr. Vice-Chairman, I regard Afghanistan case as the rape of a small nation by a great power, as the occupation and an attack on the sovereignty of one of the non-aligned and friendly nations, one of our closest friends who helped us during our freedom struggle. Our first provisional government was formed in Kabul. It consistently befriended us after independence. It shows our Government is insensitive to the fate of small nations, it is insensitive to the people who are our friends, to the fate of people who are today forced to struggle against foreign occupation and it does not care about South Asia. It does not care about the fate of this region.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would also like to refer to the Indian Ocean which instead of becoming a zone of peace, has become a zone of confrontation and which has not even been mentioned. We, who were the foremost proponents of the proposal for the establishment of a zone of peace in the Indian Ocean, do not even care to give it any priority in our scheme of things, in our scheme of external relations. I think it is high time that the Government of India should take note of the growing militarisation, of the growing escalation of military forces in the Indian Ocean. If this trouble reaches the Gulf, our economic development will come to a halt; our economic machine cannot run without petroleum. If it is threatened either by the presence of conflicting forces in the Indian Ocean or by the march of the Russians, we shall be affected and our economic development will be affected.

On South-East Asia, I find that a patently inaccurate—in fact, a wrong—statement has been made. The statement here is about relations with ASEAN. I am aware of the plea made by the Government of India two years

ago for a dialogue with the ASEAN for co-operation. I am amazed that it says that we intend to improve our relations with ASEAN, while India has no relation at all with the ASEAN.

About Africa. only one sentence, because I find that South Africa today is the main bulwark of colonialism and imperialism in that part of the world. It is not the White Minority in Zimbabwe which is obstructing the dawn of freedom and democracy in that part of the world. It is the White Racist apartheid regime in South Africa which, through its alliance with international monopoly capital, exploits the natural resources which really belong to the African people, and which intervenes in the affairs of the neighbouring African States and launches aggression against them persistently. And we who were the pioneers of anti-apartheid movement do not care to mention South Africa in the President's Address. I have nothing more to say. I would appeal once again to our friends on the Treasury Benches that they should act with humility and tolerance. Mr. Vice-Chairman, the system is being questioned today. The politicians, all of them without exception, to whichever party they may belong, are being questioned. Their integrity, their usefulness and their relevance is being questioned and whatever we do in this House, the common man outside is watching us. Let us not fail him. Thank you.

SHRI A. P. JANARDHANAM (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the previous speaker said that the common man is watching us. He has been watching us for the last 30 years in the name of parliamentary democracy. Parliamentary democracy has been reduced in India, in the words of Mr. Galbraith, to a functioning anarchy. We have seen so many things. I cannot go on repeating those things and waste my time. So many things have come to us in the guise of parliamentary democracy. We should

realise that if a politician can rise in moments of crisis above party politics, then only he belongs to the people. I compliment Mrs. Indira Gandhi on her reentr. We can always depend on her in handling the foreign affairs and I am sure she will rise to the occasion. I am enthused by President's reference to the Twenty Point Programme to revitalise our economy and to give meaningful life to the toiling masses. Hungry bellies have been our lot so far. Even among the under-developed countries we are going down and down and down. The world would respect us only if we cease to exploit each other internally. We are adulterators in foodstuffs. We produce Belchis and Willipurams. We have to put a stop to all these things. The President has spoken about harmonious Centre-State relations. But, Sir, a very powerful Centre and a very weak State cannot go together. Our great leader Anna was for a sound State-Centre relationship. I belong to a party which is advocating sound Centre-State relationship and which has projected so many things like State autonomy and other things for the rights of the States. I may reiterate that we shall not be hesitant to give our loyalty to the Central Government in all their constructive endeavours. But let not the States be crushed under the juggernaut wheels of this or that. Every region has its aspirations. Every region has its own culture. Every region has its own language. Let all those things be respected. National integration should blossom from our hearts. It should not be a forced one. In the name of national integration, if we throttle one section, the resentment will be there. In Madras we used to address meetings and lakhs and lakhs of people used to come to our meetings and our great leader Anna used to shake them and to make them follow him. The land is for the Dravidians for the next 30 or 40 years. The Dravidians will be winning there. That is our confidence. We are there to cooperate with the Centre in all its constructive endeavours. We were the first to receive

*[Shri A. P. Janardhanan]

the Twenty Point Programme enthusiastically. We were the first to support the family planning. We were the forerunners in our State. We were the educators. We spread many ideas and Tamil Nadu has been a fertile ground for many progressive plans and other dynamic measures. We will take pride that we have been the firebrand champions of the underdog, we were the first to fraternise them through our journals; through our lectures and through all our groups. We have lots of young lions among us. They all thunder on platforms. They write well. That is all. We never go underground. We never believe in violence. In fact, we were the first to introduce Karl Marx in Tamil Nadu. We were the first to introduce Lenin to Tamil Nadu. We were the first to introduce the radicals. But still we fought one thing—monopoly by birth. Monopoly by birth is very worse in India. That has been proved everywhere. And especially, so many people now venerate Periyar Ramaswamy, our founder. Some have agreed that Periyar is required in every State. We come from that rugged stuff. Periyar was our Gandhi. He brought us high standards. Anna was big-hearted. He adorned this Rajya Sabha and by the Niagara eloquence, he converted one and all, and by his magnetic touches of statesmanship, human element and all that, he impressed the great Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and others. We were all moulded by them. We are ready to co-operate with the Centre in all its constructive measures. And we will always stand by and persevere all our endeavours to uplift the down-trodden. But, for States' rights, we will remain firm. We respect the Marxists because they are dedicated and they will fix the hangman's noose. But one thing that in our soil, violence is never productive, violence is never endemic, violence will never pay dividends. Otherwise, they are dedicated people. Karl Marx advocated the overthrow of exploitation, we advocated the overthrow of all brands. Those who speak of the left and the

right, as Harold Laski, rightly put it should remember the flight of the bird. It goes straight. So also, we shall march straight. For too long, India has wasted its opportunities. For too long, India has relied on this and that. In India, politics are personalities. The personalities should bear in mind that they have very heavy responsibilities. Mrs. Indira Gandhi declared that she will not be vindictive. Mrs. Indira Gandhi has declared that she will not have vendetta. I take her at her words, I hope that a chastened Indira Gandhi will lead India and we will, shoulder to shoulder, give her all strength, give her all support. Thank you, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Mrs. Ambika Soni—not here; Shri Sankar—those—not here; Shri Kulkarni—not here. Now Shri Dhabe.

SHRI S. W. DHABE: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, this President's Address in which some policy declaration has been made is really very disappointing. Sir, it was expected that at least in the field of industrial relations, the policy which was declared in the manifesto will find some place in this Address.

Sir, in paragraph 5 of the Address, it has been stated that there is a lack of effective management, the balance of trade is seriously in deficit, and that there has been a worsening of industrial relations and a loss of morale in the entire industrial sector. And only platitudes have been mentioned in para 14 that through better utilisation of existing capacity and improved labour relations and better managements, we can have rapid increase in industrial production. Sir, this is a thesis which has been reproduced in para 14. It was expected that the Government will enunciate some policy or indicate what they want to do in this matter. Sir, as you know, it has been our experience that the number of strikes and lockouts has been increasing day by day. The question about the recognition of trade unions has not

been solved at all. The Industrial Relations Bill the draft of which was produced before the last Lok Sabha, did not see the light of the day as it was opposed by all the trade unions in our country. Therefore, Sir, if any progress is to be achieved in industrial peace, the Government must form a policy on industrial relations. In our country national policies are formed only on matters like health, education and some such other matters. In the matter of industrial relations, I must say with regret no national trade union policy has been formulated up till now. Sir, the trade union movement is growing and a large number of trade union centres are coming up but there is no attempt on the part of the Government to form a policy. Only when a strike takes place or production falls does the Government generally blame the workng class or the trade unions. No attempt has at all been made to associate trade unions and their leaders with the planning process right from the beginning. Sir, I plead with the Government that if at all they want industrial peace and increased production, the active co-operation of trade unions and working class is a must. It is for this reason, Sir, that I have said in my amendment that workers' participation in management is a *sine qua non* and is very essential for better industrial relations and better economic prosperity. Therefore, Sir, it is high time that the Government formulates a national trade union policy which emotionally and actively associates the workers right from the beginning in the economic planning processes. The absence of such a policy is one of the reasons for our failures as a result of which the trade unions, the Government and the managements are following different paths and we are lagging behind in developing our country. As we cannot afford to suffer in production, we are in the mess in which we find ourselves today. I, therefore, plead with the Government to come forward with a national policy in respect of trade unions and better industrial relations.

Otherwise, with the growing crisis, I am certain the number of strikes and lockouts will also grow.

The streamlining of the public distribution system is very essential because the prices are going up and up every day. In respect of bonus also the Government must come out with a clear cut policy. All the Central Government employees, everybody who is working, must get bonus. The principle that for 12 months work the worker must get 13 months wages is accepted in other countries. This principle should be accepted as a wage policy in our country also. Therefore, Sir, it is essential that a national trade union policy is evolved and, at the same time, there is a national policy in respect of bonus, wages and public distribution system, which is clearly enunciated and spelt out by the Government.

You are aware, Sir, that the agricultural labour trade unions' were demanding a comprehensive legislation for fixing the service conditions of agricultural and rural labour. It is only in Kerala that some such legislation is there. I plead, through you, with the Government that they must bring forward suitable legislation for prescribing the service conditions of rural labour and other welfare amenities for them.

Sir, another question which is facing us and with which we all are concerned is the future of our democracy. In this whole Address there is no guarantee given that our democratic institutions will be properly looked after and that democratic norms will not be violated and that democratic conventions will be evolved. What is it that is happening today: What have we been seeing for the last one year. It is a shame on our democracy. The defection is at a premium. Those who defect are given places of advantage not only within the party but also outside.

SHRI KALP NATH RAI: Who is Mr. Sharad Pawar?

SHRI S. W. DHABE: Sir, my friend is asking about Mr. Sharad Pawar. I am not speaking about him. I am speaking about the problem in our country.

SHRI K. K. MADHAVAN (Kerala): Who is Dr. Rafiq Zakaria?

SHRI S. W. DHABE: My friend will be happy to know what I am going to say. It is also a wrong policy . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): We all know who they are.

SHRI S. W. DHABE: It is democracy by the people, of the people and for the people. It is not democracy of the few persons. In Democracy it must be seen that not only a large number of persons of a party are elected but the people elected are of good quality and proper persons are put at proper places. Is it proper that a person who is defeated at the polls is made the Leader of the House? You know that he is member of the Rajya Sabha from the West Bengal Assembly. Those who were not defeated are put on the waiting list.

SHRI KALP NATH RAI: This is the prerogative of the Prime Minister. Don't talk like that.

SHRI S. W. DHABE: I am not saying about the prerogative. I am saying about the system. Prerogative has to be used judiciously.

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE): Where was your conscience, Mr. Dhabe, when Mr. K. C. Pant was made the Leader of the House?

SHRI S. W. DHABE: Two wrong things do not make a right one, even assuming what you say is correct. But that was a different thing.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Did you protest at that time? If you see the press reports of that time, you would know what was my stand.

SHRI S. W. DHABE: Sir, I have got great regard for my friend Mr. Pranab Mukherjee. What I am saying is that in a democratic system certain norms will have to be followed.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Then according to you, a Lok Sabha Member has to be made the Leader of the House.

SHRI KALP NATH RAI: He was the Deputy Leader of my party long ago. When Panditji went to the Lok Sabha, he was made the Leader. Why do you talk like this?

SHRI S. W. DHABE: I am sorry that a person like Mr. Kalp Nath Rai should be annoyed over it. What I am suggesting is that the democratic system requires some norms. Take the case of state Assemblies and see what is happening. Justice Bhagwati's judgment in state of Rajasthan's case of Supreme Court of the year 1977 in para 147 says: Mere victory in the Lok Sabha elections is no ground for toppling of State Assemblies. Sir, what is going on today? Would it be proper for a ruling party which enjoys such a massive majority to send emissaries to all the State Assemblies to get defection or topple the Governments there? My submission is that this is negation of democracy, this is negation of the federal structure, this is negation of the principles you talked about. When you say that you do not want confrontation between the Centre and the State Governments, is it proper to send emissaries and create this situation? This question of defections is very serious in our democracy. People who are getting advantage may be happy about it but when it boomerangs it will destroy the whole system. Those who are rejoicing today, will be sorry tomorrow. My submission is that the parliamentary democracy which we are having suffers from two or three kinds of infirmities, the most important of which is defection. The other one is about the election expenses. You know that

when it comes to the question of expenses, a parliamentary election costs Rs. 5 lakhs to Rs. 10 lakhs per candidate, directly or indirectly. No ordinary citizen of this country can stand for the Lok Sabha elections unless he is financed. And we know who pays for the elections. It is the industry, the big business houses from which the money comes and the elections are fought. This is not going to help our democracy. If money comes from somebody else, it is going to have strings attached with it. The party will not be able freely to have a political will to decide and lay down the policy. That is why we are finding so many contradictions. One of the items of expenses in the elections is with regard to the writing of cards, and sending those cards to each one of the voters. Five or six lakhs of voters are to be sent cards by each candidate. The total expense for all the candidates put together is very enormous. Therefore public financing of elections is very essential for sustenance of democracy, as is done in Germany and other countries. All the expenditure which a candidate is required to make should be financed by the Government and it should be seen that elections become inexpensive so that it becomes a real democracy.

Lastly, I would only like to say that the foundation of the democratic system is the growth of proper political parties and, therefore, a policy will have to be evolved—whether this Government likes it or not—and people will have to take an active interest in the matter to see that a proper political system is formulated so that our democracy and democratic institutions are safe in this land.

With these words, I would ask the Government to accept my amendment.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Anybody from the Lok Dal?

SHRI KALP NATH RAI: The Lok Dal is liquidated.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): I cannot accept that statement, but anyway they are not present here. Yes, Mr. Gopalsamy.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I extend my heartiest thanks to you for having given me this opportunity to take part in the discussion on the President's Address. On behalf of the DMK party to which I have the honour to belong, I express my thanks to the hon. President of India for his address before the Joint Session of both the Houses of Parliament.

Hon. President has been pleased to mention that the uncertainty of the last few months has been resolved happily, that the mandate for the new Government is not only massive but national in the sense that it is from all parts of the country and from all sections of the population and that it will lead to a period of stable Government at the Centre.

Sir, this reference by the hon. President is of great significance in the present political context of our nation because the mandate secured by our Prime Minister truly reflects the ambitions and aspirations of all sections of our people. The mandate is the result of the desire of the masses to recall our P.M. to govern the country. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I lay special emphasis on the word 'govern' because for about two and a half years we have experienced the philosophy and practice of 'non-governance' in the country. I take pride in the fact that it was our party, the DMK and our party's leader Dr. Karunanidhi, who first gave a call to our Prime Minister on behalf of the people and also to call on her with the slogan "Nehruvin maghle varuga nilayana atchiyaitharuga" translated into English it will mean "Come Nehru's Daughter, give us stable Government".

[Shri V. Gopalsamy]

This call echoed throughout the State of Tamil Nadu and resounded from all parts of the country, resulting in the huge mandate. Sir, I am glad for it and I am sure we will have a stable Government as prescribed by the Constitution and that this Government would cherish the mandate and serve all sections of our people.

I want to draw the attention of this House to the reference made by the hon. President to the law and order situation in the country, with a particular emphasis about the lack of confidence of linguistic and other minorities, Harijans and weaker sections of the society. It is a tragedy that after 32 years of Independence the Harijans who constitute about 20 per cent of our population are still insecure. The root cause of this problem is the caste system in our country. Basically, it is the attitude of the human mind. The average Indian mind is psychologically conditioned by the Varnashrama, the theory that gives religious sanction to the caste system. Law alone cannot change this mentality. It requires several Mahatmas, Periyars and Annas. Nothing would change for the better unless the Indian mind is emancipated from the dangerous concept of Varnashrama. We should bow our heads in shame to admit the fact that these Harijans seek safety in their motherland. I will only cite one glaring example of the atrocities committed on the Harijans and the breakdown of law and order machinery completely. The Honourable member Mr. Janardhanam also cited example of Vellupuram and I am sure Members could not have forgotten the incidents at Vellupuram in our State of Tamil Nadu about one and a half years ago. There in one day nine Harijans were killed and thrown into a lake. Arson and looting continued unabated for more than five days. This is not an isolated case. Such incidents have taken place on several occasions during the past 2½ years. With all earnestness 6 P.M. and in all sincerity, I would urge the Government to turn

its attention urgently to this problem of protection of our Harijans.

What I say for the Harijans will equally apply to the linguistic minorities inasmuch as confidence must be restored in them. In this context, I welcome whole-heartedly the Government's decision to bring forward legislation in the next Session for assuring the minority character of the Aligarh Muslim University.

While on the subject of law and order situation in the country over the past 2½ years, I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Members of the House to the strange phenomenon that the law-enforcing machinery itself became a victim of the lawless situation created by both the Central Government and the Janata-ruled State Governments and also the Tamilnadu Government. In Tamilnadu...

SHRI NARASINGHA PRASAD NANDA (Orissa): He can continue tomorrow. The debate will continue for three days.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: The House is going to sit beyond 6 P.M. Tomorrow the House will sit upto 4 P.M. Members want to witness the "Beating of the Retreat".

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Mr. Nanda let him speak. Let us finish as much as possible. Go on Mr. Gopalsamy. But please be brief

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: The Tamilnadu Government, while allowing the police people to have their own organised unions, interfered with their right to elect their own union leaders and sought to impose the Government's puppets and dummies as union leaders. When this outrageous attempt on the part of the State Government was resisted, the Government treated the police people like petty criminals and unleashed violence on them. The Tamilnadu Government in its own high-handed manner has dismissed from service hundreds of policemen

and mercilessly sought to evict them with their families from their living quarters. Now what is going on in Tamil Nadu is that the policemen are driven to the law courts to secure shelter for themselves and to regain their jobs. I want to place it on record in this context that unless the problems facing the policemen of Tamilnadu are solved peacefully and justly, the law and order situation in Tamil Nadu will not improve. I hope the Central Government will take this aspect of the problem into serious consideration.

I am glad that the Government has recognised that the economic situation in our country has deteriorated and that it is a matter of grave concern and anxiety for the present Government. It is shocking that in the past year alone, the prices registered an increase of about 20 per cent. The loss in industrial production has been heavy. No constructive effort has been made in the past years to strengthen the infrastructure of industrial production. The non-availability of steel, cement and power has struck at the very roots of our industrial might. Imports have increased alarmingly with dwindling foreign exchange reserves.

I am glad that the Government has given an assurance to the people that it will act with determination and speed to arrest the deterioration on the economic front.

I will fail in my duty if I do not draw the attention of the Members of the House and also of the Government to the agrarian problem. Sir, the farmers in this country have been suffering for a long time for want of adequate finances, for want of power and for want of proper distribution of items of inputs like seeds, fertilisers and pesticides. The main problem that plagues the farmer is indebtedness. A scientific analysis of the problem of indebtedness of the farmer will reveal that the root cause of this indebtedness is the difference between the enormous increase in the cost of

agricultural production and the price which the farmer gets. While the prices of all the inputs used by a farmer have gone up manifold, the market price available to the farmer for his produce is very meagre. It is not adequate to cover the expenditure involved in agricultural production. As a result, the farmer having no other alternative but to continue agriculture, takes recourse to borrowing. Such borrowings over a period become too much of a burden for him and so he almost becomes a pauper.

Sir, I am sure Members are aware of the farmers' agitation in the State of Tamil Nadu. They have been agitating for almost a year seeking relief mainly from indebtedness. Both the Central and State Governments failed and neglected to find an equitable solution to the problems of the farmers in Tamil Nadu. On the contrary, Sir, coercive measures were adopted in Tamil Nadu. The farmers were harshly treated. The measures adopted by the Tamil Nadu Government were injurious to the dignity and self-respect of the farmers. To add insult to injury, the Government foisted false cases on the farmers and launched even criminal prosecution, particularly against their leaders.

Sir, I would like to draw the attention of the Government to the problems not only of the farmers of Tamil Nadu but of farmers throughout the country and appeal that they must be looked into and solved. I would request the Government to consider the suggestion that essential inputs like seeds, fertilisers, pesticides and diesel should be supplied at highly subsidised rates to enable the farmers to make a reasonable profit. At the same time I would request the Government to take note of the fact of absence of debt-repaying capacity of the farmer and evolve a national policy for relieving the farmers from the clutches of indebtedness.

Sir, today in Tamil Nadu the farmers are left in the streets with empty cans. For what? They are not

[Shri V. Gopalsamy]

able to get diesel. When industrialists and businessmen get diesel, these farmers are not in a position to get diesel. They have to stand in queues and then they have to return home empty-handed. On the other hand, the present Government of Tamil Nadu tries to shift the blame on the Central Government. I would like to say that the distribution system now prevailing in Tamil Nadu is very poor. That is why the agriculturists in Tamil Nadu are not in a position to get it. So, this is a serious problem. I would request the Central Government also to see that the farmers not only of Tamil Nadu but throughout the country are in a position to get diesel to feed their oil engines.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Mr. Gopalsamy, you will have to wind up now.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: I will just conclude, Sir. Just as the Government's mandate is big, its problems and responsibilities are huge. The late lamented Jawaharlal Nehru was ever conscious of the global responsibilities and he constantly kept before him the famous lines of Robert Frost:

"The woods are dark, lovely and deep

*But I have promises to keep
And miles to go before I sleep."*

Sir, while the problems facing the nation are many and the solutions demanded are difficult, I hope and I am sure this Government will fulfil the promises, all the promises, which have been made by our hon. President in his Address.

Thank you, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Thank you, Mr. Mishra.

SHRI NARASINGHA PRASAD NANDA: Let it be tomorrow.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Now we

have finished with the other speakers. Anyway, let him speak. I have called him and he is ready to speak. He has already got on his legs. Let him speak.

SHRI NARASINGHA PRASAD NANDA: Mr. Mishra, you won't get publicity if you speak today.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Mr. Nanda, why don't you sit down and listen to what he says?

SHRI NARASINGHA PRASAD NANDA: He is my friend. I know he will agree to what I say.

श्री महेन्द्र मोहन मिश्र (बिहार) :

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण पर माननीय सदस्य श्री अन्तुले ने धन्यज्ञापन का जो प्रस्ताव रखा है मैं उसका समर्थन करता हूँ। राजनैतिक और सामाजिक कुव्यवस्था कुछ वर्षों से, लगभग 3 वर्षों से देश में चल रही थी उसका खात्मा हुआ। हमारी जो मान्यताएँ थीं उस पर निरन्तर तीन वर्षों से जनता पार्टी हो या लोक दल हो, निरन्तर आघात किया। जिन मान्यताओं को लेकर निरन्तर 30 वर्षों से कांग्रेस चल रही थी, हमारी मान्यताएँ थीं— लोकतंत्र, समाजवाद, धर्मनिरपेक्षता और आत्मनिर्भरता, इन सब के बारे में हमारा जो वृत्त संकल्प था उस ओर निरन्तर जो हम अग्रसर हो रहे थे उस पर पिछले 28 महीनों के अन्दर जनता पार्टी की सरकार हो या लोक द की सरकार हो निरन्तर आघात किया राष्ट्रीय स्तर पर और अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय स्तर पर हमारे देश की जितनी गिरावट हुई उसको कहीं मिसाल नहीं।

अभी 1980 के चुनाव हुए। इससे पूर्व 1977 के चुनाव हुए। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि 1977 के चुनावों में क्या हालात थे। 1977 के चुनाव में जनता पार्टी के ऐसे नेता थे जिन्होंने किसानों को गुमराह किया यह कहकर कि तुम्हें उपज की सही कीमत मिलेगी, विद्यार्थियों को गुमराह किया गया कि तुम्हारी अच्छी पढ़ाई होगी, और रहने की व्यवस्था अच्छी होगी, व्यापारियों को गुमराह किया गया कि सेल्स टैक्स माफ़ कर दिया जाएगा और बेतन भोगियों को कहा गया कि तुम्हारी सर्विस कंडीशन अच्छी होगी। हमारी जितनी भी उपलब्धियाँ थीं उन सब की ओर ध्यान न देकर आमक प्रचारकारके लोगों को गुमराह किया गया और 1977 में सत्ता संभाली। इनकी नीयत साफ नहीं थी। जनहित कार्य का इनका कोई कार्यक्रम नहीं था। हमने क्या देखा कि इलेक्शन की एक मीटिंग में एक विपक्षी ने मुझसे पूछा कि जब मैं भाषण दे रहा था कि कांग्रेस की उपलब्धियाँ क्या हैं। मैंने कहा कि उपलब्धियों के आंकड़े, मैं अभी नहीं देना चाहता लेकिन मैं इतना कह देना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी उपलब्धियाँ इतनी थीं कि हमने 30 साल तक शासन किया और तुम्हारी उपलब्धियाँ इतनी हैं कि ढाई साल में तुम रोड पर आ गये हो। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण, जीवन बीमा का राष्ट्रीयकरण, राजा, महाराजाओं का प्रिवीपर्स लेना क्या यह समाजवादी कार्यक्रम नहीं थे। इन्दिरा जी चाहती थी कि देश में गरीबी हटे, देश में खुशहाली हो, गरीबी तबके का ऊंचा उठाया जाए। यह सब इन्दिरा जी चाहती थीं लेकिन क्या हुआ जनता पार्टी और इस देश की जो पूँजीपति शक्तियाँ हैं, अपने देश की और विदेशियों की शक्तियों ने मिलकर इन्दिरा जी के खिलाफ एक ऐसा अभियान चलाया जिससे हमारे जो मुल्क में समाजवादी कार्यक्रम थे, उनका खात्मा हो गया। हम लोग शिकार हो गये और पिछले इलेक्शन में

हमारी हार हुई। लेकिन कुछ ही दिनों के बाद जनता इनको पहचान गई। हमारी इन्दिरा जी ने 16 मई, 1979 को कहा था कि जनता पार्टी अपने बोझ से गिरेगी। वह गिर गई। उसको हमने नहीं गिराया, अपने आप गिर गई। लेकिन चिन्ता इस बात की है कि आज देश की हालत क्या हो गई है। आज मुल्क किस स्थिति में पहुँच गया है। हमारी आर्थिक हालत औद्योगिक हालत और सामाजिक स्थिति क्या है प्रश्न यह उठता है। लेकिन राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण से कुछ ऐसा लगता है कि जो हमारी मान्यताएँ थीं जिनकी ओर हम निरन्तर आगे बढ़ रहे थे, उसीको आगे बढ़ाने की बात है। इस देश को विशाल बनाने की बात हम इस अभिभाषण में सोच रहे हैं। राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में जिन बातों का जिक्र किया गया है उनसे मैं सहमत हूँ। हमारी सरकार का यह साफ़ इरादा है कि हमें इस मुल्क को लोकतन्त्र और समाजवाद की तरफ़ ले जाना है और हम उस दिशा में जा रहे हैं। जनता पार्टी के 30 महीनों के शासन के अन्दर मुल्क की क्या हालत हुई और हरिजनों पर जिस प्रकार से अत्याचार किये गये उसके उदाहरण इतिहास में बहुत कम मिलते हैं। हमारे मित्र श्री शाहबुद्दीन साहब ने अल्पसंख्यकों पर अत्याचार की बात वहीं और कहा कि श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी के 11 साल के शासन में इन लोगों पर जितने अत्याचार हुए और जितने दंगे-फ़साद हुए उससे कम जनता पार्टी के राज में हुए। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जनता पार्टी के राज में माइनोरिटीज की जो स्थिति रही और अलीगढ़ का जो नक्शा बना रहा और जिस प्रकार से हिन्दू मुस्लिम दंगे हुए और जिस प्रकार से वहाँ पर अभी भी स्थिति चल रही है उसकी मिसाल कहीं नहीं मिलती है। 11 महीनों तक अलीगढ़ में बड़ी भयानक स्थिति रही। मैं समझता हूँ कि जिस तरह से जनता पार्टी के रिजिम में दंगे-फ़साद हुए उनकी मिसाल दुनिया के इतिहास में नहीं है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या कारण

[श्री महेन्द्र मोहन मिश्र]

हैं कि ये अल्पसंख्यक जो सन् 1977 में आपके साथ थे, आज आपसे क्यों हट गये हैं ? वे अब समझ गये हैं कि हम लोगों की रक्षा, हिन्दुस्तान के नागरिकों की रक्षा तभी हो सकती है जब इन्दिरा जी के हाथ में नेतृत्व आये और यही कारण है कि पिछले चुनावों में इन लोगों ने आपका साथ नहीं दिया, बल्कि इन्दिरा जी को अपना पूरा समर्थन दिया।

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, दूसरी बात मैं यह कह देना चाहता हूँ कि राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में बहुत से मुद्दों को तरफ इशारा किया गया है। हमारी सरकार का यह इरादा है और मुझे इस बात की खुशी है कि राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में ला एण्ड आर्डर, कानून और व्यवस्था की स्थिति और महंगाई का जिक्र किया गया है। हमारी सरकार ने इन समस्याओं की ओर सर्व प्रथम ध्यान देने की बात कही है। सरकार को यह धारणा है कि इन मुद्दों पर जब तक पूरी तरह से ध्यान नहीं दिया जाएगा तब तक हमारा देश सही रास्ते पर नहीं चल सकता है। इसलिए राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण में ला एण्ड आर्डर की तरफ और महंगाई की तरफ जो इशारा किया गया है, उसका मैं स्वागत करता हूँ लेकिन मैं एक बात की तरफ ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ और यह हमारा सुझाव भी है कि राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण में एक चीज का जिक्र नहीं किया गया है और वह परिवार नियोजन का विषय है। परिवार नियोजन का इस अभिभाषण में जिक्र नहीं किया गया है। मैं नवम्बर के महीने में कामनवैलथ पार्लियामेन्टरी डेलीगेशन के साथ न्यूजीलैण्ड गया था। हमारे मित्र श्री शिव चन्द्र झा भी, जो कल श्री जगजीवन राम जी की बहुत दुहाई दे रहे थे, वे भी हमारे साथ थे। वहाँ पर जितने भी विभिन्न देशों के सदस्य आए थे वे हमसे पूछ रहे थे कि किस हालात में जनता पार्टी की सरकार हिन्दुस्तान में गिर गई ? वे समझ गये थे कि ये लोग सरकार नहीं चला के

ये लोग निष्काम हैं, इनको सरकार चलाना नहीं आता है। हमारे जनता पार्टी के साथियों के पास कोई जबाब नहीं था। वे लोग यह भी कहते थे कि सन् 1980 के चुनावों में कांग्रेस आई ही जीत कर देश का संचालन कर सकती है। वे लोग हम से यह भी बहते थे कि हमारे देश में खुशहाली तभी आ सकती है जब हमारे देश में आबादी पर नियंत्रण किया जाये। ऐसी गम्भीर समस्या की तरफ राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में जिक्र नहीं किया गया है। इस संदर्भ में मैं यह भी कह देना चाहता हूँ कि श्री संजय गांधी जी ने परिवार नियोजन का जो कार्यक्रम चलाया और जिसके बारे में जनता पार्टी के लोगों ने भ्रामक प्रचार करके हम लोगों को परेशान किया, उसकी तरफ विशेष रूप से ध्यान देने की आवश्यकता है। सही माने में हमारे मुल्क में खुशहाली आबादी पर नियंत्रण या कर ही आ सकती है। मैं श्री संजय गांधी जी को इसके लिए धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ कि उन्होंने शासन का ध्यान आबादी को रोकने की तरफ दिलाया और हमारे देश में परिवार नियोजन का कार्यक्रम चलाया। अब हमारी सरकार को इस ओर ध्यान देना चाहिए। मैं बिहार से आता हूँ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): I think you have to wind up now.

SHRI NARASINGHA PRASAD NANDA: He can continue tomorrow.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Let him finish.

श्री महेन्द्र मोहन मिश्र : हमारे राज्य में डिजिटल यूनियन का सवाल है। हमारे नेता ने इस संबंध में चिन्ता प्रकट की है और कहा है कि हम डेमोक्रेटिक ढंग से काम करना चाहते हैं। मैं इन लोगों से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि सन् 1980 के लोक सभा के चुनावों में हमारे देश के लोगों ने आप को वोट क्यों नहीं दिया, इस पर आप विचार करें। आपने कहा, जनता पार्टी ने कहा कि हम श्री जगजीवन

राम को प्रधान मंत्री बनाना चाहते और हैं लोक दल ने कहा कि हम श्री चरण सिंह को प्रधान मंत्री बनाना चाहते हैं। लेकिन हमारे देश की जनता ने कहा कि इस मुल्क में श्री जगजीवन राम की जरूरत नहीं है, इस देश में श्री चरण सिंह की जरूरत नहीं है, हमें तो इस देश का नेतृत्व कांग्रेस-आई की नेता श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी को देना है। इसीलिये देश की जनता ने देश को चलाने के लिये इंदिरा जी को बहुमत दिया। आज राज्यों की स्थिति क्या है? राष्ट्रपति महोदय के भाषण में जिक्र है कि हम चाहते हैं कि राज्यों से हमारा तालमेल अच्छा हो। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि बिहार की स्थिति क्या है? बिहार में 1979-80 में 350 करोड़ रुपया उन्हें मिला था उसमें से अभी तक केवल 50 करोड़ रुपया खर्च किया। सिचाई की मद में 120 करोड़ रुपया दिया गया था उसमें से केवल 15 करोड़ रुपया खर्च किया। 37 जिलों में से 22 जिलों को अकाल क्षेत्र घोषित किया गया है, लेकिन अकाल क्षेत्र घोषित हो जाने के बाद सरकार की यह ड्यूटी हो जाती है कि ऐसे क्षेत्रों में अपने कार्यक्रमों को तेजी से लागू करे ताकि लोगों को राहत मिले। लेकिन अकाल क्षेत्र डिक्लेयर करने के बावजूद इन क्षेत्रों में काम नहीं चल रहा है। इसी तरह ला एण्ड आर्डर का सवाल है। समस्तीपुर में जहां से श्रीमती तारकेश्वरी सिन्हा खड़ी थीं उस क्षेत्र में एक सरायरंजन ब्लाक है। वहां सीताराम झा जो कि ब्लाक प्रमुख हैं, वे 19 जनवरी, 1980 को दिन के 1 बजे ब्लाक हैडक्वार्टर में बैठे चाय पी रहे थे। कुछ विपक्षी दलों के लोगों ने तलवार उसकी गर्दन पर चलाई। वे अभी तक हास्पिटल में पड़े हुए हैं और मरने-जीने के प्रश्न में झूल रहे हैं। अभी तक मजूरियों को नहीं पकड़ा गया है। हमारे यहां बिहार में ला एण्ड आर्डर नाम की कोई चीज नहीं रह गई है। डीजल के वितरण की कोई सुचारु व्यवस्था नहीं है। वहां पर एक ऐसी परिस्थिति पैदा की जा रही है ताकि लोगों में यह भावना हो क्योंकि दिल्ली में इंदिरा गांधी की सरकार बन गई है, इसलिये

उनके राज में अमन चैन नहीं है और इसी के कारण महंगाई है। इसलिये हमारा दायित्व हो जाता है कि अगर वहां की सरकार अपने मन से चलना चाहती है और केन्द्र के साथ तालमेल रखने को तैयार नहीं है तो ऐसी स्थिति में केन्द्रीय सरकार को उस सरकार को भंग करने का अधिकार है। जनता पार्टी के लोग जो दलीलें पेश कर रहे हैं इस तरह की दलीलें देने का उन्हें कोई हक नहीं है क्योंकि उन्होंने ही इसके लिये मार्ग प्रशस्त किया है। उन लोगों ने बहुमत मिलने पर इस अधिकार का दुरुपयोग किया था। मैं दुरुपयोग करने की बात नहीं कर रहा हूं। आज सारे राज्य में जहां कांग्रेस का राज नहीं है वहां की सरकारें वहां के कार्य को चलाने के लिये सक्षम नहीं हैं। इसलिये मैं अर्ज करूंगा कि जिन राज्यों में हमारी सरकार नहीं है उन राज्यों की विधान सभाओं को भंग किया जाय और वहां चुनाव कराये जाय। कांग्रेस (आई) को जनता ने जो बहुमत दिया है, उसके जो कार्यक्रम हैं, उन कार्यक्रमों का पालन करने में हम सक्षम तभी हो सकते हैं जब कि राज्यों में हमारे मन की सरकारें हों। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं यह जो प्रस्ताव है इसका समर्थन करता हूं

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Mr. Goswami, you want to speak?

SHRI SRIMAN PRAFULLA GOSWAMI (Assam): Yes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): You better start now. Then we will adjourn and you may continue tomorrow.

SHRI SRIMAN PRAFULLA GOSWAMI: I thank you, Sir, for the opportunity given to me . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Can you finish in five minutes?

SHRI SRIMAN PRAFULLA GOSWAMI: No, Sir. Ten minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): You start now . . .

SHRI S. W. DHABE: He has started.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): and then we will adjourn because everybody wants the House to be adjourned.

SHRI SRIMAN PRAFULLA GOSWAMI: Sir, I have started. I have thanked you. I also welcome the President's Address. I welcome the new Government which has come with a massive mandate. In 1977 I welcomed the Janata Government also. But the Janata Government could not complete its term because of their split and all kinds of things. And they have brought an unprecedented tradition in India—that is, a Government was voted to power with a massive mandate and it could not continue even for its full term. Anyway I need not criticise them, when they are out. I also most heartily congratulate Mrs. Indira Gandhi who has again come back as our Prime Minister. This is a very critical period not only in our country but in the whole world. At this critical period she has come. I do not belong to any party, as you know. I retired from the Congress on 2nd February, in 1978 when I found the Congress split. I did not join any of the group. I became independent and did not join any party and today also I am remaining an independent because politics has become so much dirty. I fear to act against my conscience. Once you join a party you cannot speak with conscience; it is very difficult when its whip comes. Of course, all through my life I had been a Congressman. In 1978 I only retired and I did not join any party, but I am a follower of the basic policy of the Congress. I was also once a follower of Mrs. Gandhi when I was in Congress. Today I am not a follower of anybody, any party, any person. But still I am a friend to Mrs. Gandhi and not enemy. I was a friend

to Mr. Desai also when he became Prime Minister—although I was never his follower. I warned him, "Don't continue for more than one term as Prime Minister. So, Sir, when I stand here—I am retiring after two months—I am speaking here with a heavy heart and with all sincerity on the present situation of Assam. I am feeling helpless. I am alone, I come from Assam which is in turmoil now and I come from that area, North Kamrup, Nalbari, which was declared a disturbed area, where curfew was imposed. So I look at what has happened with a heavy heart. I congratulate the students of Assam for the movement they have started. I am happy in this President's Address, there is a mention about north-eastern States, north-eastern region, but the main issue is expulsion of foreign nationals and large-scale inclusion of their names in the Voters' List. It was a genuine demand, but that was not conceded. And this demand was not communal. Many people have painted it with many prejudices. Actually this movement was not against any Indian citizen. It was not against the Biharis; it was not against the Punjabis; it was not against the Bengalis nor was it against any particular Hindu or Mussalman. It was against foreign nationals, whether he was a Hindu, whether he was a Muslim or whether he was a Nepali. Last year through a Calling Attention we raised the issue of influx of foreign nationals into Assam and we took active part in the debate. I participated in it, my friend, Mr. Warjri participated in it, Mr. Dinesh Goswami spoke in it, Mr. Ajit Sharma spoke in it. We all drew the attention of the then Minister of External Affairs, Mr. Vajpayee and Mr. Vajpayee assured us and accepted some of our suggestions. I suggested to him to call a conference of all Chief Ministers of the north-eastern region with the Home Minister to discuss this issue so that the volcano would not erupt. But the volcano has erupted. Mr. Vajpayee and all others were busy, quarrelling among them-

selves; they were all busy with elections, this and that. Nothing was discussed; everything was forgotten. Naturally then the volcano erupted. Even on the November 29th, 1979 the Lok Dal Home Minister, Mr. Chavan, called us all Members of the Rajya Sabha—because the Lok Sabha was dissolved—and representatives of many parties of Assam. At that time also I requested him and told him, the movement was a peaceful movement, the movement was a non-violent movement, in Assam not only students but women and children, everyone, including government officers participated in the movement, there was only the government but no administration. I told him that the question of foreign nationals was a live issue; so as a gesture to the movement, please postpone it and start some kind of dialogue with the students and try to correct the electoral rolls. But he did not listen to our voice. I told him if he did not listen to the voice of the people, if he did not take urgent steps, the situation would go out of control and election could not be held. But Lok Dal has not done anything. I am happy today that Mrs. Indira Gandhi has called the students and they have accepted to come. Mrs. Gandhi has issued a statement. I would have been more happy if in the President's Address the question of foreign nationals and about the peaceful movement had been mentioned.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, shall I continue tomorrow?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): No, you can take another five minutes and conclude the speech.

SHRI SRIMAN PRAFULLA GOSWAMI: No, I need another ten minutes at least.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Then in that case you continue for another two minutes and we will adjourn at 6.30. You can continue tomorrow.

SHRI SRIMAN PRAFULLA GOSWAMI: So the Lok Dal Home Minister, Mr. Chavan, did not listen. Now it is very heartening that Mrs. Gandhi has taken note of the situation in Assam and called the students leaders and shown a gesture to the movement. The students will be coming and let us hope a solution will come out now. But one thing why I am depressed is this, why I am feeling helpless is this. I was freedom fighter. We fought for independence. After independence I have seen what is happening in my own area, North Kamroop. In the district a whole subdivision was handed over to the military. There was not so much violence. There was sporadic arson, some trouble, in some two or three villages. The death of a student Shri Khargeswar Talukdar, who became the victim of military action created mass discontent all over Assam. In another instance there another young student Shri Dilip Hurmi of a village was killed by another section of people. It was not due to police firing in this case. So two incidents took place. After these incidents curfew was imposed in Nalbari subdivision and that the local administrator, the young S.D.O, handed over the administration to the military. That is why I feel I should retire from politics now, when I as an M.P. could not be helpful to the victims of atrocities.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Mr. Goswami, you can take another five minutes tomorrow. The House now stands adjourned till 11.00 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at thirty minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 29th January, 1980.