

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI):** Mr. Gupta, I know that the Government has . . .

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** I know the Government. This is an insult not only to an individual, a respected individual, but to us all.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI):** Shri Rabi Ray.

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

**श्री रबी राय (उड़ीसा) :** उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, हम सब को मालूम है कि आज गांधी जी की मृत्यु वार्षिकी है, डेथ एनीवर्सरी है। जब हम राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण पर बहस कर रहे हैं तो हम सब को अन्तर्मुखी होना चाहिए। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में से एक वाक्य मैं आपकी खिदमत में पढ़ कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ—

“A healthy and functioning parliamentary democracy proceeds according to well laid down rules of the game.”

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, एक बात मैं आपकी खिदमत में रखना चाहता हूँ। इस प्रजातंत्र को मजबूत करने के लिए इस देश में जो जनता और लोकदल की सरकारें थीं उन्होंने दो तीन परम्पराएँ स्थापित की थीं। मैं इन परम्पराओं की स्थापना के लिए अपने लायक दोस्त श्री आडवाणी जी को धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ। वे परम्पराएँ यह थीं कि जब कोई ब्राडकास्ट प्रधान मंत्री करता है तो उस ब्राडकास्ट के बाद विरोधी दल का नेता ब्राडकास्ट करता है। आप जानते हैं इस बार इस परम्परा का उल्लंघन हुआ। यह उल्लंघन यह बाहना दिखा कर किया गया कि कोई आफिशियल लीडर आफ दी अपोजीशन नहीं है। मैं आपको कहना चाहता हूँ, मैंने पहले यह वाक्य कहा कि हमको अन्तर्मुखी होना चाहिए। क्या प्रधान मंत्री का यह कर्तव्य नहीं था कि जो तीन मुख्य विरोधी दल

हैं उनके साथ सलाह मशविरा किया जाता, लेकिन नहीं किया गया। उसी तरह से लोक सभा में जो डिपुटी स्पीकर का पद है यह भूतपूर्व सरकार ने परम्परा कायम की थी कि यह विरोधी दल को दिया जाए, लेकिन वर्तमान सरकार ने इस विषय में विरोधी दलों के साथ इस बार कोई सलाह मशविरा तक नहीं किया।

श्रीमन्, यह आपको मैं तथ्य बता रहा हूँ। कल विरोधी दल के नेता का जो भाषण हुआ टेलीविजन ने उस सारे भाषण का बायकाट किया। मैंने आपकी खिदमत में इन तथ्यों को इसलिये रखा कि यह स्वस्थ परम्पराएँ हैं और इस बात से मेरे लायक दोस्त लीडर आफ दी हाउस जो यहां बैठे हैं इन्कार नहीं कर सकते। लेकिन इस बारे में सरकार खामोश रही और इन स्वस्थ परम्पराओं को समाप्त किया। यह चीज मैं आपके सामने रखना चाहता हूँ। आज सुबह मुझे अखबार देख कर तकलफ हुई कि प्रेस परिषद् को करीब-करीब खत्म कर दिया गया। जो गोस्वामी कमीशन बनाया गया था उसको भी करीब-करीब खत्म कर दिया गया। मैं यह भी आगाह कर देना चाहता हूँ कि यह टर्म्स ऑफ दि रेफ़रेंस भी बदलने वाले हैं। मैं आपके द्वारा सारे सदन को और देशवासियों को कहना चाहता हूँ, यहां पर इस समय ब्राडकास्टिंग मंत्री नहीं हैं, ब्राडकास्टिंग मंत्री ने जब कार्य भार सम्भाला उस दिन जो बयान उन्होंने दिया उससे लोगों के मन में शंका हुई थी इकोनॉमिक टाइम्स, जनवरी 22 का जो सम्पादकीय है उसमें सम्पादकीय टिप्पणी में फरमाते हैं :—

“If the Press is really to be free, then it can't be partisan”, said Mr. Vasant Sathe, within hours of assuming office as minister for information and broadcasting. Does he imply that if the Press becomes

[श्री रबी राय]

"partisan" in the eyes of the government, its freedom will be liable to be curtailed? One must hope not. But if the first task of a minister who holds that portfolio in a government headed by a Prime Minister, who not very long ago imposed censorship on the Press, should be to reassure that press, Mr. Sathe's observations can only have the opposite effect. Doubtless, Mr. Sathe categorically stated, "there is no question of imposing censorship on the Press. Indeed, you can censor the word 'censor'. This is most reassuring. Unfortunately, he proceeded to dilate on the theme of restoring "objectivity" to the media in a manner which cannot but cause disquiet."

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, तो मैं आपके जरिये कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो फोर्थ स्टेज है, जो प्रेस है वह प्रजातन्त्र का एक महत्वपूर्ण खम्बा है, One of the most important pillars of democracy.

लेकिन जिस तरीके से सरकार ने और साठे साहब ने प्रेस कमिशन को पूरा खत्म किया इससे मुझे शंका होती है और आप के मन में भी शंका होती होगी कि इस प्रेस कमिशन का भविष्य अन्धकारमय है...

(Interruptions). यह जो प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर है फिर मैं भी प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर रज करूँगा।

मैं आपके जरिये कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज हम लोग क्या देख रहे हैं। एक तरफ तो भिंडर साहब को यहाँ कमिशनर बनाया गया है। आपको मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार ने रूत्स और प्रोसीजर को खत्म किया है। क्योंकि कौन कमिशनर बनता है, जो सीनियर मोस्ट डी० आई० जी० होता है, वह बनता है। हमको यह जानकारी मिली है कि भिंडर साहब को एक सौ से ज्यादा आफिसरों

को सुपरसीड करके बनाया गया है। बे सीनियर डी० आई० जी० नहीं हैं। इस का मतलब इमरजेंसी के दरम्यान He was under cloud उनको जानबूझकर कमिशनर बनाया गया। फिर आप आज अखबार में देखें होंगे कि कोहली साहब का इस्तीफा मंजूर कर लिया गया है और उनकी जगह पर श्री जगमोहन जी जो डी० डी० ए० के उपाध्यक्ष थे जिनके खिलाफ मिनिमल केसेज हैं, यह कहा जाता है कि उनको गवर्नर बनाया जा रहा है। दूसरी तरफ किस्ता कुर्सी का केस आपको मालूम है। आज एक अखबार लिखता है :

"The Government is also examining the future of several officers who have been under cloud with Mrs. Gandhi returning to power. Among these are Mr. P. R. Rajagopal, Director General CRPF, Mr. Mantosh Sondhi, Steel and Mines Secretary, Mr. T. C. A. Srinivasavaradan, Home Secretary, Mr. K. N. Prasad, Additional Home Secretary, and Mr. Maheswar Prasad, Secretary, Department of Personnel. These bureaucrats were involved in one way or the other in the processing of cases against the Prime Minister and others of the ruling party or had appeared as witnesses before the Shah Commission and other Commissions appointed by the Janata government."

मैं प्रणव बाबू से कहूँगा कि मेरी जो शंका है, अखबार में जो शंका व्यक्त की गयी है वह निराधार हो। लेकिन इस सरकार का जो रवैया देख रहे हैं उससे आप चिंतित हुए होंगे, सारे देश-व्याप्ती चिंतित हैं, सारे ईमानदार सरकारी नौकर चिंतित हैं। कोई कुछ बोलता नहीं है और मैं आपको कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिस तरीके से 18 दिनों में ये सारी चीजें हुई हैं उससे प्रजातन्त्र का भविष्य अन्धकारमय है। मैं आप को कहना चाहता हूँ कि आर्थिक क्षेत्र में आप जानते

हैं, —खुद कांग्रेस (आई) के सम्मानित सदस्य श्याम लाल यादव जी जानते हैं कि इन्दिरा जी कहती हैं कि हम स्टेबिलिटी देंगे। स्टेबिलिटी का मतलब क्या है? आपको मैं बताऊँ। इन्दिरा जी के शासन में 1966 से 1975-76 तक जो 20 बड़े पूंजीपति घराने हैं वे 2,335 करोड़ से बढ़ कर 5,111 करोड़ रुपये तक पहुँच गये थे। मैं श्याम लाल जी से कहना चाहता हूँ कि 72 से 77 तक बिड़ला जी की पूंजी 81.6 प्रतिशत बढ़ी, टाटा की 66.6, सिहानिया की 120.1, आयल इंडिया की 92.2, भिवांडीवाला की 312.6, लार्सन एण्ड टोबरो की 135.3, मैक्नील एण्ड मैंगोर की 104.6, महिन्द्रा एण्ड महिन्द्रा की 114.5 प्रतिशत पूंजी बढ़ी। इस तरह से पांच सालों में 72 और 77 के दरम्यान पूंजीपतियों की बड़ोत्तरी हुई। परन्तु किसानों का क्या हुआ किसानों का दस साल के दरम्यान इंदिरा गांधी जब प्रधान मंत्री थी, आप खुद एक किसान के घर पैदा हुए हैं, 61 में जो किसानों की संख्या 51 थी वह 10 साल के दरम्यान घट कर 41 परसेंट हो गयी। यादव जी सुनिये, खेतियार मजदूरों का प्रतिशत 17 से बढ़ कर 26 हो गया। मैंने यह आंकड़े इसलिये दिये कि देखिए किस तरह से सरकार की नीतियां पूंजी-पति परस्त हैं, किस तरह से पूंजीपतियों और बड़े जमींदारों को, बड़े काश्तकारों को, बड़े लोगों को बढ़ावा दिया गया।

इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि हम लोग जो विरोधी दल वाले हैं वे रोटी की लड़ाई और शहरो आजादी की लड़ाई लड़ते रहेंगे। मैं सरकार से कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिस तरह से ये राज्य सरकारों को खत्म करना चाहते हैं जिस तरीके से सारे राष्ट्र को एक ऐसे रास्ते पर ले जाना चाहती हैं जहां मनुष्य के मानवीय अधिकारों को जानबूझ कर खत्म

किया जाय, मैं यादव जी से कहना चाहता हूँ उनसे दरखास्त करना चाहता हूँ कि जिस तरीके से डिक्टेटरशिप का स्टीम रोलर चलता है वहां पार्टीबाजी सामने नहीं रहती। मेरी शंका है और जब आप लोग भी सारी आजादी के हित में नहीं लड़ाये तो डिक्टेटरशिप का स्टीम रोलर आपको भी नहीं छोड़ेगा।

तो मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूँ कि समय आ गया है और पिछले अठारह दिन के दरम्यान श्रीमती गांधी की सरकार का जो रवैया रहा उसमें कथनी और करनी में कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है। इसलिये मैं आपको कहना चाहता हूँ कि असल में एक संविधान है, कुछ रूल्स आफ प्रोसीजर हैं। सरकार के जो अफसर हैं जो हमारे सिविल सर्वेन्ट्स हैं, उनके मन में जान-बूझ कर भय पैदा करो, जो ईमानदारी से काम करना चाहते हैं, उनके मन में भय पैदा करो ताकि वे कमिटेड सिविल सर्वेन्ट्स हो जाएं, कमिटेड ज्यूडिशरी—यह सब आचुका है और प्रधान मंत्री क्या कहती हैं कि हम लोग एक ऐसी सरकार बनायेंगे “टैटवक्स” और फिर कहती हैं कि लॉ एण्ड आर्डर यह एक बहुत महत्वपूर्ण सवाल है। यह दोनों जो कनसेप्ट्स हैं उन पर विचार करना चाहिये कि वे क्या हैं? कनसेप्ट क्या है कि गवर्नमेंट टैट वक्स? मैं यादव जी से कहना चाहता हूँ कि वे समता आदर्श को मानने वाले हैं। यह तो कहना चाहिये कि किस वर्ग के लिये? यह जो टाटा, बिड़ला, मफतलाल हैं, इस वर्ग के लिये और फिर जो शोषित वर्ग हैं, गांव में और शहर में, उनके लिये।

मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जवाहरलाल ने अठारह साल राज्य किया और उनकी लड़की ने ग्यारह साल राज्य किया और अब फिर कर रही हैं और उस दरम्यान क्या हुआ? देश द्रिस्ता की रेखा के नीचे गया। गांव में 47 प्रतिशत और शहर में 40 प्रतिशत दरिद्रता देखा के नीचे गया, दिल्ली शहर में 26

[श्री रवी राय :]

प्रतिशत दरिद्रता की सीमा की रेखा के नीचे लोग हैं। तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि कोई कार्यक्रम, सिवाए इसके कि बीस-सूत्री कार्यक्रम की आरती उतारना और क्या है ?

यह सरकार किस वर्ग की है, किस वर्ग को बिलांग करती है ? तो मेरे मन में कोई शंका नहीं है, सदन के माननीय सदस्यों के दिमाग में कोई शंका नहीं रहनी चाहिये कि यह सरकार सारी आजादी को खत्म करने के साथ-साथ गरीबों को वोट और पूजिपतियों का रुपया, यह जो गरीबों से वोट ले और पूजिपतियों से रुपया ले, तो यह जो नीति चला दी है, हो सकता है, जो कि नहीं है कि श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी को मैजिस्ट्री सीट मिली है। लेकिन जो अतीत में लोगों ने देखा है कि यह जब अत्याचार के रास्ते पर चलेगी तो हिन्दुस्तान की गरीब जनता, किसान, खेतिहर, मजदूर, नौजवान, मध्यवर्गीय लोग इस चीज को बर्दाश्त नहीं करेंगे।

इसलिये मैं अन्त में कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस देश का इतिहास पांच हजार साल का इतिहास है और इस पांच हजार साल के इतिहास के दरम्यान इस देश की जो मौलिक वैल्यू है, मूल्य है, वह बरकरार रहा है। इन्दिरा गांधी की या जो सभी सरकार आए, उन मौलिक मूल्यों को खत्म नहीं कर सकती। इसलिये यह देश पांच हजार साल से चला आ रहा है और दस हजार साल चलेगा। लेकिन मान लीजिये कि कोई सरकार डिकटेटर बनना चाहेगी, फासिज्म के रास्ते पर जायेगी और सोचेगी तो फिर लोग और जनता और इस देश के नौजवान कभी माफ नहीं करेंगे।

इतना ही कह करके मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि राष्ट्रपति का अभिभाषण बहुत ही निराशाजनक रहा है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): Mr. Alexander Warjri.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): I want to speak.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): You want to speak? All right, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. You have got 30 minutes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I have had the privilege of listening to many addresses of the President. This is one of the most colourless Presidential Addresses that I have come across. It is lack-lustre in its presentation, barren of any bold policy statement full of platitudes and pious wishes and certain declarations which are not backed by any clear indication as to what the new Government is going to do. Sir, of course, this has necessarily to be brief. But even in a brief statement sometimes bold things can be said, as was done in some ways in 1971 after the mid-term poll. Here you will find that this President's Address does not even echo what was said under the same rule, under the rule of Mrs. Indira Gandhi in 1971. This is not accidental however, because the Prime Minister and her Government are no doubt aware that we are facing formidable problems and the solution of such problems could not be secured without radical changes in some aspects of the policies, indeed without radical socio-economic changes. There is not even the remotest suggestion that Mrs. Indira Gandhi and her Government propose to bring about any radical changes. As we know, the *garibi hatao* slogan was given up during the election. There was no such thing said; not a word was said against monopolists, big traders and businessmen, for obvious reasons—they were calling the tune of the party which was to be ruling party in 1980. I have gone through this election manifesto. It has some good utterances. I do not deny. Whether these utterances are more attractive or the picture on the front page of Mrs. Indira Gandhi carrying a flag is more attractive, is a matter of choice. But it does contain some good statements, as always happens in an election, when

an election manifesto is issued. I just want to point out to you one statement in the election manifesto of Congress-I, on the last page—"... recognise the new revolutionary government of Kampuchea...."—a very categorical statement. In the President's Address however there is no suggestion that Kampuchea would be recognised. On the contrary we find a mysterious statement, quite different from what has been said in the election manifesto: "We stand for a Kampuchea able to seek its own destiny free of outside pressure." That is not said in the election manifesto. The issue was whether Kampuchea should be recognised or not, the new Kampuchean Government. That answer was there in the election manifesto, yes. The Prime Minister in her election speech said, yes, we are going to recognise it. But in the President's Address something else is said. It is customary with all bourgeois: double talk is their life-style. And it has happened not only this, in all the President's Addresses in one degree or another.

Having said it I come to some of the other things. It is understandable for my friends to be elated. After all the electoral utterances under the present system they have won a spectacular victory, spectacular not because of the votes they have got or the seats they have won. Such a thing has happened in the past also. It is spectacular because of the manner in which the Janata Party which had run the country in an incompetent manner, has been brought down. We are naturally glad that the RSS-Jan Sangh elements have been defeated. I wish we could also be equally glad for what has come into existence. The paradox of it is in 1977 the emergency regime was done away with. It was a good thing the people did. But then they installed in power the Janata conglomerate which went down under the weight of its own sins. In this election also better alternative could not be found because the left and democratic forces were not united and as strong as in West Bengal, in Kerala

or Tripura. Had that been so, today the country would have had here in the Treasury Benches a Government based on the unity of the left and democratic forces. But then what has happened in Kerala, West Bengal and Tripura is a pointer to the march of history, the inexorable march of history. People rally around what is rising and not what is falling. The bourgeois rule and the capitalist type of development are continuing. These can end only when we break away from the path of capitalism and monopoly of bourgeois power of which Shrimati Indira Gandhi is the standard bearer.

Now, as far as my friends are concerned, they are very happy. Let them be happy. Now that the elections are over try to assess the situation. I find that in all the elections in the past the Congress had won—it was the ruling party in those days—with a higher percentage of votes than this time, except in 1967 . . .

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE  
(SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE): Not in 1971 also.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I will give you the figures. In all those elections, except in 1967 the Congress Party won even higher percentage of seats in the Lok Sabha compared to the total number of seats. In 1952 the Congress polled 44.99 per cent of the votes and got 363 seats out of 489 seats. In 1957 the Congress polled 47.78 per cent votes and won 371 seats out of 494 seats. In 1962 the Congress polled 44.73 per cent votes and got 361 out of 494 seats. In 1967 they polled less votes, namely, 40.73 per cent votes and got 283 out of 520 seats. In 1971 the Congress polled 43.06 per cent votes and won 350 seats out of 515 seats in the Lok Sabha. This time, in 1980, Congress(I) polled 42.58 per cent votes and got 351 seats out of 525 seats contested. This will only show that in terms of votes or seats nothing very surprising has taken place. But the manner in which the former Janata Party and the Alliance Party Government were defeated gives importance to this

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

election. This should be taken note of. In fact the votes of the Congress has increased only by 8 per cent compared to the 1977 poll. But this time, Pranab Babu is very happy because the seats have gone up by 133 per cent.

**SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE:** Would you give the figures of votes polled by the leftist parties? In West Bengal 77 lakh votes and 37 seats for them; 73 lakh votes and 4 seats for the Congress.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** At least for once Pranab Babu is taking consolation. You should do that.

**SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE:** Kerala is another consolation.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** But leftist parties do not celebrate in the way you have been doing. I know what the former leader of the Lok Sabha Congress (I) Party, Mr. C.M. Stephen said at the first Parliamentary Congress(I) Party meeting, after the election. There were many old people sitting there. Shri Kamlapathi Tripathi was there. After praising Shrimati Indira Gandhi, M. Stephen said: I salute my younger brother. Younger brother should be saluted? I do not mind showing affection for the younger brother. Not salute for the younger brother. I felt sorry for Shri Kamlapathi Tripathi. At least some courtesy should have been shown to the old people who were sitting there. If, for instance, Pranab Babu gets up and says: Salute to my younger brother, I will be sorry for him and all of us. Why say this? Such meetings are always held after the election. I did not see after Pandit Nehru's victory in any of these general elections, somebody like Shri Kailash Nath Katju or Shri Govind Ballabh Pant or Maulana Abul Kalam Azad standing up at the first meeting to elect the leader of the Congress Party in the Parliament and saying: I salute my younger sister. And there was a 'sister' at that time—may be

not in Parliament; but the 'sister' was equally attractive and certainly had some grit. But nobody saluated her. I see that this massive vote has caused sychophancy again. We are apprehensive of that sychophancy, because we are almost being driven back to the days when 'Indira was India and India was Indira.' What has happened? Yesterday I was not here. An officer, DIG of the CBI, has been arrested, taken away, by a DSP of Haryana. The privilege motion will say—I do not know. But, Sir, he was taken from here. I am a little apprehensive, if you do not stop that thing, there is danger some day of a Deputy Minister from Meghalaya coming and taking away the Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi. What will happen to the country? . . . (Interruptions). I do not know. It may or may not happen. But it looks like that. A DSP gets hold of a DIG without the authority of the Centre, takes him to Haryana and sends him back. All illegal, unconstitutional and shocking. The thought came to my mind what will happen in a situation if a Meghalaya Deputy Minister, a stranger, comes to Delhi, takes away the Prime Minister for interrogation, and then returns her. Well, I do not say more than that. I think that point will be understood. Sir, I demand a thorough inquiry by a Committee of this House in the manner in which a DSP could come from Haryana and take him away. It is not a question of privilege only. It is a question of inquiry by the Parliament. And Parliament was sitting. What temerity; What audacity; What an insolence on the part of the Haryana authority to deal with this officer in this manner: I should like to know. Has Haryana jurisdiction over Delhi? Have we changed the Constitution? Have we changed the delineation of authority between the Union Territory and a neighbouring State? I should like to know, Sir. It is said that the Prime Minister intervened before the arrest took place.

**SHRI RABI RAY:** That is for public consumption.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That is for public. It seems the Prime Minister's writ does not run in Haryana even within thirty days of her assumption of power. Either it is a lie, deliberately uttered or the Prime Minister did not. . . (Interruptions). Arrest has taken place. Somebody disregarded her advice or direction. She should explain here. Sir, I demand an inquiry. We should table a motion just as we did in the case of Mr. Morarji Desai and Mr. Charan Singh, get it passed in this House that we in this House shall go into this question to find out as to how that incident took place . . . (Interruptions). No. applause is necessary. What is necessary is a Resolution to be pushed through and passed in this House and to call upon this Government to honour that Resolution. . . (Interruptions).

Now, let me come to the other point. Our democracy is in a crisis. On dissolutions I won't say much. Demonstration are taking place, and so on, obviously keeping in view the coming Rajya Sabha elections. Sir, if they have the courage, let them keep Parliament going and then dissolve the Assemblies. Don't send us home, prorogue the House and then dissolve the Assemblies, according to your plans, on the 5th or 6th of February. This appears to be the plan. Let it be left to the States as to how they should deal with their State Governments. We opposed even the President's rule. When the Constitutional amendment regarding its provisions was discussed, we opposed it. We opposed Shri Charan Singh's dissolution of 9 Assemblies in 1977. It is so despite the fact that some of the State Governments are unwanted by us and unpalatable to the cause of democracy and the interests of the people. We would not like such arbitrary methods to be used by invoking Article 356 of the Constitution in order to gain upper hand in the Rajya Sabha. Apart from that, we are against defections. We learn that

defections are being organised. We have an amendment on this. We hope to deal with that amendment when it comes. As far as the other things are concerned or Afghanistan is concerned, I am surprised that some sections of the press have raised an uproar against the Soviet Union. They should know what is happening in the world today. America is launching a big counter offensive with the collusion of the Peking rulers as well as other imperialists who are their allies. The American budget has been raised to 143 billion dollars, an increase of nearly 14 billion, not million, dollars. A decision has been taken by them to deploy a new type of missile weapons in the West European countries. Besides, there is a plan to add 46000 troops to the contingency force of America of 110,000 in order to be used in Asia, Africa and Latin America. Here I have got Carter's "State of the Union Message". In this address, he has spelt out a plan for offensive not only against the regions of West Asia and our sub-Continent, but against all the peace-loving countries. We are hearing about the framework or cooperative framework of security and all that. Sir, these are not new words. We have gone back to the cold war days and Mr. Carter is trying to involve the countries in this region in what he calls "a cooperative security framework". What is happening in Afghanistan is a part of it. They want to take away peace-loving Afghanistan from the family of peace-loving and non-aligned nations to the orbit of imperialism in order to use Afghanistan as a base for attack against the countries of this region. That is why they are trying to destroy Afghanistan's revolution and the independence and sovereignty of Afghanistan. Pakistan is being shamelessly used by Mr. Carter and the Chinese and others with the co-operation of military dictatorship of Zia-ul-Haq to launch attack and to send insurgents against the Afghanistan Democratic Republic. They are being equipped with weapons. They are being financed. They are being

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

trained in the so-called camps within the Pakistan territory. The C.I.A. is active there. Some reports have come. Some photos have appeared in American and other journals. This is the armed intervention. We find, in this Address, the President talking about big power rivalry. Who is the rival? The Soviet Union is defending the independence and sovereignty of the friendly Afghanistan Democratic Republic. It is the Americans who are having an unprecedented concentration of naval units in the Persian Gulf, in the Arabian Sea and in the Indian Ocean region. They are responsible for the tension in the area. Again, Sir, who want to punish the Iranian people for the revolution that they carried out? Who want to destroy the Afghan independence and sovereignty? And who are arming Pakistan today? Sir, Zia-ul-Haq has demanded that even the 1969 treaty should be revised in order that there is no difficulty in the deployment of the American troops in Pakistan against our country. You have seen in today's newspapers that the so-called Islamic countries' conference has concluded in Islamabad. There, Zia-ul-Haq even talked about occupation of Kashmir. And arms are coming from China through the Karakoram Pass. And arms are being supplied to China by the Americans so that they could be diverted to Pakistan. This is what is happening. Sir, we want a forthright stand of India's place as an anti-imperialist, peace-loving nation, and there must not be any prevarication. Charan Singh's line was absolutely wrong. He never understood what foreign policy is. I do not blame him because he is totally ignorant about it. But this Government should not be ignorant. Many in this Government have grown in the tradition of a policy of peace, non-alignment and anti-imperialism. And, I think the stand should be even more forthright than it is in condemning the United States and in supporting the Afghan Democratic Republic. Sir, I understand from the morning's newspapers that

Mr. Clifford, the representative of President Carter is coming. Tell him where to get off. This is what I would like. Sir, all our support goes to the cause of the Afghan revolution and this is in line with our tradition, the tradition of friendship, the tradition of understanding, the tradition of sympathy and support to noble causes.

Sir, as far as internal things are concerned, as far as the economic policy is concerned, what shall I say? Nothing is there in the Address. But it is interesting and we are benefited by it in a way when the Congress(I) blames the Janata and the Janata blames the Congress(I), between them, they give us a lot of truths. I do not say everybody is telling everything false. But, now that the elections are over, we should assess the situation a little more seriously. During Mrs. Indira Gandhi's rule also bad things happened. Janata rule was a carry-forward business. They went in some respects, one on Mrs. Indira Gandhi's Government, the previous Government, in so far as the anti-people, anti-democratic policies are concerned. Take the case of unemployment. When Smt. Indira Gandhi assumed office in January, 1966—I was here then—on the live registers of the employment exchanges, there were 40 lakh unemployed. In March, 1977, the number has gone up to 1,10,00,000. When she took-over, the total assets of the Tatas and the Birlas were Rs. 1000 crores. When she left after 11 years, their assets amounted to Rs. 2,000 crores. From Rs. 1000 crores, they went up to Rs. 2,000 crores. Similarly, the assets of all other monopoly houses increased. When Smt. Indira Gandhi came to power, there were the revised ceiling laws. During 11 years, only 12 lakh acres of land were distributed roughly one lakh a year on an average, and not a very great performance. During her regime of 11 years, 3,000 communal incidents took place, according to the Home Ministry data. In three years of her rule, that is, 1967, 1968 and



1969, more than 1100 Harijans were killed, according to the official admission. You can understand how many must have been killed during the remaining eight years. Sir, such is the record. I am not talking about the emergency and other things. During the period of 11 years, the prices continued to rise except in nine or ten months. And these facts are there. (*Time bell rings*). I am just finishing, Sir. When Shrimati Indira Gandhi took over in 1966 there were, according to their figures, Government figures, about 35 per cent people living below the poverty line. When she left 11 years later in 1977, the percentage went up to 47 per cent, notwithstanding the *garibi hatao* slogan of 1971 of mid-term poll. These figures I have given only to underline one point, namely, that these social problems, socio-economic problems of unemployment, poverty and hunger and landlessness could not be solved without structural changes and radical socio-economic transformation. Sir, one point I forgot to mention, namely, remunerative prices. The peasantry had all along been looted because they had been denied remunerative prices for their products, whether it was cotton or sugar or jute or anything else. This is the position on the agricultural front. That is why the suggestion for change.

Now, coming to self-reliance, during Shrimati Indira Gandhi's rule of 11 years two thousand new collaboration agreements were signed, when she was in power previously, with the western countries. What is the policy with regard to collaboration agreements and the foreign capital and the multi-nationals—there is no mention of it here.

Finally, Sir, one word before I sit down and that is a note of warning. Sir, they have got a massive majority. This House will not give them the massive majority and I hope for the next four years they will have to

sulk here as a minority party. Behave as a minority party not only in this House but being in a minority here, in a bicameral legislature. This House has a role to play, behave also with some amount of restraint in the other House. I regret to say I find—I am not going into the politics of it—most of the officers, who have been named for corrupt practices, for emergency excesses, are being brought back one after another as if to insult us. Here comes Mr. Jagmohan, who, I am told, is going to be the Lieutenant Governor, or already he has become. Mr. Bhinder has become the Commissioner of Police, Mr. N. P. Singh has been brought back and others are on their way in and others are on their way out. There is demoralisation among the high officials. Sir, I am not one of those who hold any brief for any official at all. I want some standards. Officials could not be dealt with in the elections of 1977 because they did not fight the elections. Charges have been made in Parliament, in the Reports of Commissions and otherwise also. Anyhow these officials are under a cloud. Why are they being brought back, except to insult the nation, except to announce thereby that emergency regime without the formal proclamation of emergency is on the way, that the emergency style is coming back. Sir, that is what is causing us fright, not my friends sitting in larger numbers there. That is the cause of the worry.

Now, you can understand that the Prime Minister has said that she will not pursue a policy of vendetta. But, do I understand that these officials and others who are coming back will not be motivated and will follow this declaration of no vendetta. Sir, it is in the nature of bureaucracy even in normal times, when such changes are made, that kind of their return is a passport to the reign of terror, vendetta, corruption and all the rest of it. I would urge upon the Government not to embark on this kind of a policy. There are many other such

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

officials. Keep them in the shade for the time being, the officers, guilty of emergency excesses and crimes. Get other officers if you like. (*Time bell rings*).

Sir, finally, one word before I sit down. Sir, I demand proportional representation. The present system has shown an artificiality. Parliament must reflect the popular political mood, differences, divergence of opinion and composition of political life. This should be duly reflected in the Lok Sabha, in this House and in the State Assemblies and the Government should also reflect these things in its composition, policy, behaviour and some such things. Unless this is done, these anti-defection measures will not do very much. We have seen the monstrous play of money power unprecedented in the history of our country during this election. Sir, we have seen helicopters, viscount planes and so many things going. Money flowed like water in some of the constituencies and our ruling party, our friends' party, has set an international record, if I may say so, next perhaps, only to the record set by Americans in their elections. Even that has been beaten now. We want to get rid of the menace of money power in these elections. Sir, no doubt, the Tatas, the Birlas, the Singhanias, Mr. K. K. Birla, Mr. Bharat Ram, have been the first to acclaim the formation of this new Government and call upon the Government to maintain, what they call, discipline. By discipline they mean, suppression of the working class and the trade union movement. They are happy, Sir; the Americans are happy. But the Americans are also unhappy because left has grown a little stronger and what is more, left parties have come together. Here I have got the *Time* magazine... (*Time bell rings*). Just a line I shall quote, Sir. I know you are a very interesting person. One line I will read and sit down.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): I am interesting person; no doubt, but I have got no time here.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, it is just one line. Here is the *Time* magazine of January 21.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI A. G. KULKARNI): All right, one last line.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Almost last. After giving an analysis of these two formulations, *TIME* is worried about not our friends there, they are worried about us. It says:

"For Indira: Victory and Vindication.

From deepest disgrace to an overwhelming landslide."

This is the caption. You must be happy to see what it says:

"An ominous prospect, however, is an alliance between the Communist parties that won a total of 37 seats in West Bengal. Though the parties have ideological differences, they may join with leftist parties and splinter groups in other States to qualify as India's only official opposition bloc in Parliament."

Now, a final word, Sir.

"Now, Indians believe that a chastened Mrs. Gandhi can run a single-party government with enough room to manoeuvre. Still, there is peril in the fact that the only coherent opposition is in the hands of the Communist bloc. With the options cast in such extreme terms, India's democracy may be entering its severest test."

We have entered a severe test. This test shall be passed by the people of India by building unity in the left and democratic forces, the only viable alternative that the nation needs and the nation must have. Thank you very much. As I said, you are a very interesting person.

श्री श्याम लाल यादव : मान्यवर, उप-सभाध्यक्ष जी, मुझे खुशी है कि जहां एक तरफ अमरीका और अमरीकन पालिसी की निन्दा करते हुए और अन्त में अमरीकन मेगजीन टाइम जो अपने विचारों के लिए विख्यात है उसकी लाइन को अपने समर्थन में पढ़ते हुए अपने भाषण को समाप्त किया, यह इस बात का सबूत है कि किस प्रकार से श्री भूपेश गुप्ता और उनकी विचारधारा के लोग भारत की राजनीति में कभी... (Interruptions)

पैर के बल पर चलते हैं तो कभी सिर के बल चलते हैं। यह इस बात का प्रमाण है। मान्यवर, यह अभिभाषण राष्ट्रपति जी ने जो दिया मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे मित्र रवी राय और भूपेश गुप्त ने उन परिस्थितियों को बिल्कुल नजरअंदाज कर दिया, अनदेखा कर दिया जिन परिस्थितियों में यह भाषण दिया गया। इतनी शीघ्रता के साथ भाषण हुआ। राष्ट्रपति ने खुद ही अपने भाषण में कहा कि अभी वक्त नहीं था कि पूरी पालिसी को आपके सामने रखते। इसलिए यह अपेक्षा तो नहीं की जा सकती थी। लेकिन प्रारम्भ में अपने पैराग्राफ 2 में राष्ट्रपति जी ने जो बात कही उस बात को मैं कहना चाहता हूँ जिसको इन लोगों ने बिल्कुल अपनी नजरों से हटा दिया। मान्यवर, तीन वर्ष पूर्व जनता पार्टी बहुमत से लोकसभा में चुन कर आयी थी। उनका एक बड़ा जबरदस्त बहुमत था। उस दल ने किस प्रकार से शासन किया, किस प्रकार से यहां के तन्त्र को नष्ट भ्रष्ट किया, इस बात को माननीय विरोधी दल के नेता

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

खास कर जनता पार्टी और लोक दल के लोग भूल गये। ये लोग एक होकर नहीं चल सके। श्री रवी राय अभी शहरी आजादी की बात कर रहे थे वे नये हैं अभी यहां पर नहीं हैं। किस प्रकार से उनके नेता ने सत्ता के लिए, प्रधान मन्त्री पद के लिए, जनता पार्टी को

तोड़ा। मोरारजी देसाई ने यह कहा कि श्री चरण सिंह ने हमारी पीठ में छुरा भोंका है वरन् जनता पार्टी चलती। तो किस प्रकार से उन्होंने लड़ झगड़ कर अपने शासन को तहस नहस किया, देश को बरबाद किया इस बात को तो वे भूल गये और आंकड़े पढ़े रहे हैं 77 के पूर्व के। मैंने उनसे पूछा कि आखिर तीन साल में जनता पार्टी या लोक दल एलायंस की जो उपलब्धियां थीं कुछ उनका भी तो वर्णन करते... (Interruptions)

श्री मुन्दर सिंह भण्डारी (उत्तर प्रदेश) :  
यह एलायंस कौन था ?

श्री श्याम लाल यादव : जनता पार्टी स्वयं एक अलायंस थी... (Interruptions)

और उसके बाद लोक दल अलग हुआ। लोक दल ने एलायंस बनाया कांग्रेस यू और कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी से। तो उस एलायंस ने जनता पार्टी या लोकदल ने कौनसी उपलब्धि की थी। तीन वर्ष के रवी राय जी आंकड़े उपस्थित करते। टाटा और बिड़ला घराने की पूंजी तीन वर्ष में कम से कम ड्यौड़ी हुई इसके आंकड़े नहीं पेश किये। टाटा-बिड़ल के पैसे के आधार पर लोक दल एलायंस के नेता चौधरी चरण सिंह सारे हिन्दुस्तान का हेलीकाप्टर से दौरा करते रहे उसको वे नजरअंदाज करते रहे उसको वे नहीं देखते और दूसरे जो गाड़ी या रेलगाड़ी से दौरा करते थे उसकी वे चर्चा करते हैं। इसलिए मान्यवर, ये जनता पार्टी और लोक दल के नेता सिर्फ अपने को धन्यवाद दें कि देश की जनता ने उनको बहुमत दिया लेकिन वे अयोग्य साबित हुए, अक्षम साबित हुए, देश का शासन नहीं चला सके। उन परिस्थितियों में जब उन्होंने शासन सम्भाला था तो उन्होंने किस प्रकार राष्ट्रपति का भाषण कराया और उसके बाद किस प्रकार से बदले की भावना से कार्यवाही की, यह सारे देश और जगत को विख्यात है। किस प्रकार से एक भय का वातावरण सारे

[श्री श्याम लाल यादव]

देश में पैदा हो गया कि जिस व्यक्ति का पिछले शासन से जरा सा सम्बन्ध था या वे जिस पद पर थे उन्हें उस पद से हटाया गया। यह बात हम भूले नहीं हैं। 77 में सत्ता में आने के बाद जनता सरकार ने मान्यवर, केन्द्रीय सरकार के अधिकांश सचिवों को, अतिरिक्त सचिवों को संयुक्त सचिवों को उनके पदों से हटा दिया और एक सिद्धान्त रखा कि जो राज्यों से अधिक दिन तक यहां पर दिल्ली में रहे हैं उनको अपने राज्यों पर वापस कर दिया जाय। इस सिद्धान्त के आने से अनेक अधिकारियों को दिल्ली से उनके स्टेट में भेज दिया गया। हम यह जानना चाहते हैं कि जो सचिव हैं, अतिरिक्त सचिव हैं या जो चेरमैन हैं किसी कारपोरेशन के भारत सरकार में वे अपने प्रदेशों में जाकर कौन सा पद अख्तियार करेंगे। प्रदेशों में बड़े से बड़ा पद मुख्य सचिव का होता है और वह पद किसी न किसी के पास होता था। ऐसा आपने किया। जिस प्रकार से उस समय अधिकारियों को दंडित किया, लांछित किया इसका परिणाम यह हुआ कि कितने अधिकारी बरबाद हो गए कितने पागल हो गये। एक कृष्ण चन्द्र को आत्म हत्या करनी पड़ी। शाहू कमीशन के जस्टिस साहब जो जज बनते थे सुप्रीम कोर्ट के मैं समझता हूं कि शायद उनमें योग्यता नहीं थी कि वे जज हो सकते सुप्रीम कोर्ट के। जिस प्रकार का उन्होंने निम्न स्तर का आचरण किया अपने कमीशन में बैठकर उससे गंदा आचरण, उससे गिरा हुआ आचरण, उससे घृणित आचरण और निन्दनीय आचरण शायद किसी जज ने हिन्दुस्तान के पिछले 30 वर्षों में किया। शाहू कमीशन में बैठकर वहां पर वे एक आरबिट्रेटर की तरह से काम करते थे और उस शाहू कमीशन की कार्यवाही को आल इंडिया रेडियो से दिन रात प्रचारित किया जाता था, टेलीविजन पर प्रसारित किया जाता था तथा इन्दिरा इंगान्धी

जी की तस्वीर को धूमिल करने का ही नहीं बल्कि उनका सफाया करने का प्रयास किया गया। वे सब चीजें जनता पार्टी भूल गयीं। मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूं जनता पार्टी से लोक दल से कि क्या उसी तरह का प्रचार आज टेलिविजन से या रेडियो से उन लोगों के खिलाफ या किसी नेता के खिलाफ यह सरकार कर रही है, कोई इस तरह की बात कर रही है जिस प्रकार कि उस जमाने में, 1977 में तीन वर्ष तक जनता पार्टी के शासनकाल में हुआ और मोडिया का दुरुपयोग किया गया।

3P M.

**एक माननीय सदस्य :** ऐसा काम ही नहीं किया हमने।

**श्री श्याम लाल यादव :** जरूर किये। लेकिन वह हमारी उदारता है, श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी को उदारता है, उनका कर्तव्य है जिसको वे निभा रही हैं कि किस प्रकार से जनता के शासन के तरीके से चलना चाहिये। तो मान्यवर, अगर उस जमाने में जिन लोगों के ऊपर एक डाकू मारा गया सुन्दर सिंह उसके लिए तो भिंडर के ऊपर मुकदमा चले और मैं कहना चाहता हूं और मेरे एक साथी ने भी इस सदन में कहा कि खाली उत्तर प्रदेश में पिछले तीन साल के अन्दर कम से कम दो हजार आदमियों को फर्जी एन्काउंटर करके जनता शासन की पुलिस ने कत्लेआम किया है। अगर एक एक एन्काउंटर को जांच बिठाई जाये तो गृह मंत्री भारत सरकार, एस० एस० पी० और यहां तक कि जिला के दरोगा तक उसमें मुल्जिम होंगे। लोगों को घरों से पकड़ा गया और जाकर के रात के सुनसान में गोली से उड़ा दिया गया। यह एन्काउंटर सारा देश जानता है कि एन्काउंटर के माने फर्जी एन्काउंटर घर से पकड़ कर, ले जाकर के उसे मार डाला जाए। ठीक है। डाकू था, बदमाश था, तो लोग उस पर इतराज नहीं करते, चलो हुआ। लेकिन एक डाकू के लिए

जब वह मारा गया और जब वह अदालत में लुप्त हो गया, इस बात की चिन्ता नहीं। अभी रबी राय जी कह रहे थे कि भिडर को कमिश्नर क्यों बनाया गया जब कि वे आई० जी० नहीं थे। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जे० एन० चतुर्वेदी जिन्हें यहाँ का कमिश्नर बनाया गया, वे किस सूबे में आई० जी० थे। जो रबी राय कह रहे थे कि भिडर को कमिश्नर बनाया गया है तो मैं उनसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि किस सूबे के जे० एन० चतुर्वेदी आई० जी० थे। चौधरी साहब के शहर के थे, उनके एक मेम्बर आफ पार्लियामेंट के भाई या भतीजे थे, लिहाजा अपनी गुड़िया को वहाँ पर उन्होंने बिठा दिया ताकि वे पुलिस में उपयोगी हो जायें और जिस प्रकार से जनता पार्टी इन्दिरा गांधी के खिलाफ कार्यवाही करना चाहे, उसमें वे सहयोगी बनें।

तो भिडर जब एक्टिव हो गया, दोष से बरी हो गया, तो उसके सम्मान की रक्षा होनी चाहिए। ऐसे अधिकारियों की जिन्हें आपने अनावश्यक दंडित किया, अपमानित किया, उनका अरपाध क्या था कि इन्दिरा गांधी के काल में वे किसी पद पर थे, उन्होंने अपने कार्यों का निर्वहण किया, तो फिर आपने जब उन पर मुकदमा चलाया, उसको जेल में रखा, छः मही तक, तो उसकी मानसिक स्थिति की आप कल्पना कर सकते हैं कि किस प्रकार से वह बर्बाद हो गया। तो उसे कमिश्नर बना दिया गया है तो मैं समझता हूँ कि यह उचित फ़ैसला हुआ। इससे सविसेज में एक प्रकार की नैतिकता पैदा होगी, साहस पैदा होगा कि अगर सरकार उनके साथ जुल्म करती है, तो फिर उनको पुनः स्थापित किया जा सकता है, उनके सम्मान को वापिस किया जा सकता है।

श्री एन० के० सिंह के ऊपर कल से बहस हो रहा है, चर्चा की गई है। लेकिन

मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ जनता पार्टी के लोगों से कि यह जो खास तौर से सी० बी० आई० का तौर-तरीक़ा है, वह ग़लत है। सी० बी० आई० ने जिस तरह से फ़र्जी केस बनाये तीन साल के अन्दर, कोई सत्यता उसमें नहीं थी। यह साबित हो चुका है।

**एक माननीय सदस्य :** पूरा अदालत में साबित होने के बाद भी।

**श्री श्यामलाल यादव :** अदालत को बात मैं कहता हूँ कि एक केस भी आप साबित नहीं कर सके और यह साबित हो गया है कि सी० बी० आई० ने जनता पार्टी के इशारे पर, प्रधान मंत्री मोरारजी देसाई के इशारे पर, तत्कालीन गृह मंत्री श्री चरण सिंह के इशारे पर सारे फ़र्जी केस बनाये।

**एक माननीय सदस्य :** कौनसी अदालत ने साबित किया है?

**श्री श्यामलाल यादव :** जिस अदालत में मुकदमा चलाया गया उसकी इन्तजार कर लीजिए। तो जब सी० बी० आई० का अधिकार ख़त्म हो गया तो अब आकर के लोग अदालत के सामने बयान दे रहे हैं। अमृतनाहटा ने जो बयान दिया है सुप्रीम कोर्ट में, भंडारी साहब उसको देख लें कि कैसा बयान उन्होंने दिया है। यह जो टमटा ने बयान दिया जिसको आपने काला पानी में फ़ैंक दिया था, उसने जो बयान दिया है कोर्ट में कि सी० बी० आई० ने उसको टारचर किया और मोलेस्ट किया और फ़र्जी उसके नाम से बयान लिख दिया, उसने कोई बयान नहीं दिया था। आपने इनके खिलाफ़ क्या किया, मैं यह कह रहा हूँ कि यह जो सारा कांड किया, वह जल्दी भूल नहीं जाइए।

[ श्री श्यामलाल यादव ]

मैं जानता हूँ कि एन० के० सिंह आपका चमचा था। जनता पार्टी के इशारे पर उसने सारी कार्यवाही की। अब अगर उसके खिलाफ कहीं कोई केस बनता है, उसकी जांच होनी चाहिये, उसके फलस्वरूप जो कार्यवाही हो सकती है, वह होनी चाहिये। ऐसे छोटे कुत्सित कार्य करने वाले अधिकारियों की रक्षा करना जनतंत्र की हत्या करना होगा।

इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जनता पार्टी, लोक दल के लोग अपनी करनी को देखें। उन्होंने देश के जनतांत्रिक ढाँचे को समाप्त करने का प्रयास किया, देश में सर्विसेज को कमजोर किया। सर्विसेज का कोई भी आदमी उस जमाने में सही बात को कहने को तैयार नहीं था, डरता था कि हम कहेंगे तो हमारे खिलाफ तुरन्त कार्यवाही हो जाएगी, हमको सेन्टर से स्टेट में भेज दिया जाएगा। कितने ही आफिसर्स तीन साल से छुट्टियाँ लेकर पड़े हुये हैं। जनता पार्टी ने जुल्म और अत्याचार का ढाँचा खड़ा कर दिया सारे देश में। मान्यवर, ये बातें सही हैं और मैं समझता हूँ कि सरकार को इसके लिए दबना नहीं चाहिये, जिन लोगों के साथ जुल्म हुआ है, अत्याचार हुआ है उनको समर्थन देना चाहिये, ताकि इस प्रकार का वातावरण खत्म हो।

दो बातें और कहना चाहता हूँ। जनता पार्टी के शासन में उत्तर प्रदेश में देवरिया के नारायणपुर गांव में वहाँ के अल्पसंख्यकों, मुसलमानों पर पुलिस ने ज्यादती की। यह स्वयं उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार ने माना है। ऐसे ही प्रदेश की सरकारें मध्य प्रदेश और राजस्थान में जुल्म कर रही हैं। आज समय आ गया है कि प्रदेशीय सरकारों में और केन्द्रीय सरकार में जो कशमकश है उसको समाप्त किया जाय। प्रदेश की सरकारें केन्द्रीय सरकार

को चलने नहीं देना चाहती। वे ऐसे काम करना चाहती हैं जिससे केन्द्र की सरकार बदनाम हो। जब सारे देश की जनता ने एक नेता को चुना, एक पार्टी को चुना है, तब उस पार्टी की सरकार का यह कर्तव्य हो जाता है कि सारे प्रदेशों की विधान सभाओं को भंग कर के नये सिरे से चुनाव करवाये। आज लाखों लोग मध्य प्रदेश से इस सिलसिले में संसद के सामने प्रदर्शन करने के लिए आये हैं। उस प्रदर्शन पर इन्हें एत-राज हो रहा है। लखनऊ में शांतिपूर्ण प्रदर्शन हुआ था . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Mr. Yadav, you can give that list later. You pass on to the next point.

श्री श्याम लाल यादव : मैं दूसरी बात कहना चाहता हूँ। कलराज मिश्र कह रहे थे लखनऊ के प्रदर्शन के बारे में। उस शांतिपूर्ण प्रदर्शन को अशांतिपूर्ण कर दिया वहाँ की पुलिस ने, वहाँ की गवर्नमेंट ने लोगों को मार कर। कई सौ छात्र घायल हुए, गिरफ्तार किये गये। यह गलत कार्यवाही की गई। इस तरह का क्रम चलता रहेगा जब तक प्रदेशों में नये चुनाव नहीं होंगे। इसलिए मेरा कहना है कि प्रदेशों की सरकारों को अविलम्ब बर्खास्त करके नये चुनाव कराये जायें।

एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ। डिफेक्शन्स की बात की गई। आखिर डिफेक्शन्स को शुरू किसने किया? जनता पार्टी ने किया। जनता पार्टी का जन्म डिफेक्शन्स के आधार पर हुआ, डिफेक्शन के कारण वह शासन में आयी। जब जनता पार्टी थी उसी से डिफेक्शन करके चौधरी साहब ने लोकदल खड़ा किया। उसको जनता पार्टी ने स्वयं माना। यह डिफेक्शन जनता पार्टी की करामात है। अगर कोई समझता है कि बदली हुई

परिस्थितियों में नये नेतृत्व, जिसमें देश ने समर्थन व्यक्त किया है, के साथ चलना चाहिये तो मैं समझता हूं कि उचित है और उसका स्वागत होना चाहिए चाहे भजनलाल हों चाहे दूसरे साहब । मैं समझता हूं कि जो जनता ने नयी दिशा दी है उसके साथ वे चलने कोशिश कर रहे हैं ।

एक चीज और कह कर खत्म करूंगा कि किस प्रकार जनता पार्टी और लोकदल ने देश का अहित किया । आज कूड न मिलने के कारण डीजल की कितनी कमी हो गई है, डीजल का संकट पैदा हो गया है । चौधरी साहब ने लाल किले से अपने भाषण में इजराइल की तारीफ कर दी यह कह कर कि गायें वहां बहुत अच्छी होती हैं । अगर किसी का कोई दुश्मन हो, उससे जान लेवा दुश्मनी हो और उस दुश्मन की तारीफ कर दी जाय कि वह बड़ा अच्छा साफ-सुथरा घर रखता है तो फिर जिसका वह दुश्मन है उसको कैसा लगेगा । ठीक वही बात हुई जब इजराइल की तारीफ की गई । जो कूड सप्लाय करने वाले देश थे उनमें क्या भाव पैदा हुआ होगा । अरब देशों के साथ हिन्दुस्तान के हमेशा अच्छे सम्बन्ध रहे । इतनी खराब स्थिति हो गई कि डीजल की सप्लाय ही बन्द हो गई । जो डीजल जा भी रहा है उसका वितरण सही ढंग से नहीं हो रहा है । हमारे उत्तर प्रदेश के पूर्वी जिलों में डीजल पिछले दो-तीन हफ्तों से बिल्कुल नहीं जा रहा है । सारा डीजल पश्चिमी जिलों में भेज दिया गया है । हम लोगों के यहां गाड़ियां खड़ी हैं । एक और संकट पैदा हो गया है । जहां डीजल के पेट्रोल पम्प हैं वहां जनता पार्टी के, लोक दल के समर्थक गुन्डे डीजल-पेट्रोल डीलर्स से जबरदस्ती तेल लेकर के ब्लैंक में बेच रहे हैं और प्रदेश सरकार, वहां के अधिकारी, पुलिस प्रशासन इस प्रकार की सुरक्षा देने में असमर्थ हैं ताकि पेट्रोल

डीलर्स सही ढंग से डीजल बेच सकें । हमारे पास ऐसी बहुत सी शिकायतें आयी हैं । इसलिए मेरा कहना है कि प्रदेश की सरकारें इस प्रकार का रवैया अपना रही हैं जिससे कि केन्द्रीय सरकार की नीति असफल हो और बदनाम हो जाय ।

मान्यवर, इन बातों को कहते हुए मैं इस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करता हूं और चाहता हूं कि विरोधी दल के लोग सही तरीके से इस प्रस्ताव को पढ़ें और जनता ने जो नयी सरकार गठित की है, उसका समर्थन करें ताकि वह चले । यहां पर बहुमत-अल्पमत की बात करने की जरूरत नहीं है, जो सरकार बनी है उसका समर्थन वे करें ।

SHRI ALEXANDER WARJRI (Meghalaya): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I have tabled three amendments to the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address, and all of them relate to the North-east. We from the North-east are specially concerned with what happens in our area and that is why most of us are coconcentrating our attention on the North-east. Much attention is drawn to the recent happenings in the North-east. After the last Chinese war of aggression, the North-east has again come into the limelight in the eyes of the nation. National newspapers and journals have painted these happenings in various colours and shades. I regret to say that some of the news items given were not according to facts. Some of the newspapers have simply condemned and smeared the fair names of Meghalaya, Assam, Mizoram and the whole North-east. The incidents, for example, that took place in Shillong in October, 1979 have been so depicted by some national papers as to make it appear that the Khasi people, who conducted the struggle for a hill State in a peaceful and non-violent way for over ten years, were a blood-thirsty and violent people. The "hartal" of the 25th October was a peaceful one. No

[Shri Alexander Warjri]

volunteer was prepared for any violence. It was the refugees who were concentrated in two localities—not the permanent residents but those who happened to be in those two areas—who started violence in Shilong. They started by stoning a girl to whom I went immediately and saw in the hospital after she was stoned and they tried to kill a young volunteer in another locality in which they were concentrated. And that led to repercussions; that led to other incidents that took place on that day and on the days that followed. Even on the 21st of December, those incidents would not have taken place if the people of the so-called minorities had not taken out a procession in spite of section 144 being in force. Some of the newspapers have been blaming the missionaries for what happened in the North-east. I can categorically say that the missionaries have nothing to do with this. It seems that for anything that happened in the North-east, the missionaries have been made scapegoats. If anyone is to be blamed, Sir, it is the Government of Mr. Morarji Desai and the Government of Mr. Charan Singh. The present Prime Minister said a few days back that if information had been available, the troubles could have been avoided. Sir, I remember, nine months back, I with my colleagues from Assam had tabled a motion on the infiltration in the North-east on the influx and infiltration in the North-east. We had warned the Government nine months back. If the Government had taken action at that time, such things would not have happened. But Delhi was busy about whom to put in prison, whether they should pass the Special Courts Bill or not and so on. Busy with those things they forgot what was happening to the rest of the nation. We have been blamed our people have been blamed for secessionist tendencies. They said north-east has got a tendency to secede. Who is to be blamed for this? Last

year when a group of journalists in Shilong went to appeal to Mr. Morarji Desai when he was there in the Raj Bhavan, to extend to our boys and girls who want to appear in the All-India Services the facility to write their examinations in English, he said, "If you do not learn Hindi within one year, then get out of India." Now, who is responsible for this secessionist tendency then? Who is Mr. Morarji Desai to ask us to get out of India? We were in this country even before the Aryans came. Therefore, who is he to tell us to get out of India? I doubt whether there is any secessionist tendency on the part of our people.

Sir, much has been said in the newspapers and also on the floor of the House on foreign influence in the northeast, I belong to the north-east. I come from there. I not only suspect, I know that not only is there foreign influence, but foreign hand is there very much. The foreigners who are there are there not in hundreds but in thousands and thousands. I am not surprised if in this sensitive area spies of foreign powers have a hand in all this turmoil that took place in the northeast. I shall not even be surprised if a foreign army appears in our midst if a war is to take place in the East. The happenings in the northeast during the last quarter of 1979 have also been wrongly dubbed as communal. How wrong can one be if one looks only from one side? The movement of the people of Assam and Meghalaya is not communal; it is national. It is a national movement organised by non-political parties to drive out the foreigners from the country. The inroads that the foreigners have made are alarming in the north-east and pose a danger to the country. Is it communal if the Central Government failed to check the inroads of the foreigners and the people took it upon themselves to drive out these foreigners?



Now I would also like to draw the attention of the House to the protracted problem that is there in Mizoram. The protracted problem in Mizoram has also been an object of serious concern. Concerted efforts have been made and various methods have been adopted for a permanent solution to the problem. In 1974 peace advisory body was constituted consisting of representatives of all political parties, churches and social organisations. The forum expressed the need for establishing a rapport between the MNF and the Government of India.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA):** Your time is coming to an end. You can take another two-three minutes.

**SHRI ALEXANDER WARJRI:** The Government, on the other hand, has adopted a wrong policy of 'operation security', at the initial stage. Most of the villages in Mizoram have been combined together into group centres. Now these group centres have been looked upon by the people of Mizoram as concentration camps. The Army appears now to be an occupation army and according to Brigadier T. Sailo, the present Chief Minister of Mizoram—I quote:

The people in general are utterly disgusted with the Indian soldiers. The people have been so much antagonised and alienated from India. The obvious conclusion is that senior Army Officers in command of troops operating in Mizoram since 1966 have let down their Prime Minister and the people of India.

The 'operation security' which was intended to eradicate anti-social elements has alienated the loyal people. Now, realising this fact, the Government have initiated dialogue with the delegation of the MNF in 1966 which culminated in the signing of the understanding of July 1, 1976, in which the MNF have agreed to accept the settlement of problems in

Mizoram within the framework of the Constitution of India. However, the talk was called off on March 20, 1978 by the Janata Government and the MNF has again been banned. As a result, on June 1, 1979, the quit Mizoram notice was served on all non-Mizos. This was followed by incidents of violence and to deal with the situation the Government have to go back again to the old way of suppression and oppression. The situation has since become complicated with every firing incident, entailing diversified version and consequential confusion. The Government, in calling off the dialogue with the MNF and in arresting the MNF President, have committed a blunder. Any endeavour to solve the problem without fully understanding the people in the State would not succeed. It would only create more problems. As stands now, it is most unfortunate that the people at large are panic stricken, especially when the present Government in Mizoram is responsible for making the situation worse.

Now, to bring about lasting peace, firstly, the Government of India should accept the problem of Mizoram as a political problem and it should be solved only through political means. Secondly, the dialogue between the Government of India and the MNF should be resumed in the spirit of understanding reached between the two parties on July 1, 1976, and before this the MNF President Mr. Laldenga, should be released. Lastly, the people of North Eastern region are all disillusioned with the treatment by the Centre. After 32 years of independence, the achievements in the North East are very negligible, compared with the rest of the country. North East is very much lagging behind and I appeal to the Central Government to concentrate more and more on the North East and try to solve the various problems there. Problems that I have already mentioned and other problems faced by

[Shri Alexander Warjri]

the different States. Once and for all the Central Government should step down to settle—once and for all—the border issues between the different States. It is not enough to bring development and progress to the seven sister States. It is most necessary that they also have no friction between themselves.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): There is hardly any time left. Please wind up.

SHRI ALEXANDER WARJRI: Last but not the least, I appeal to the Central Government to think up seriously about the desirability of advising the President to assent to the Residential Permit Bill passed by the Meghalaya Assembly a few years back which is now in the cold storage here in Delhi.

Thank you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Will there be a statement today on the arrest of Mr. Romesh Chandra? We do not know.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): I do not know.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We would like to be present here. In the List of Lok Sabha there is an item called Statement on the Deportation of Shri Romesh Chandra by the British Government from the London airport. Generally, when such statements are made in the Lok Sabha, immediately thereafter such statement is also made here in this House. My Calling Attention notice is pending for two or three days. When will such a statement be made about it? I submit that my Calling Attention motion may be admitted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Let the Chairman speak to the Leader of

the House... (Interruptions) Mr. Bhanu Pratap Singh....

(Interruptions)

श्री भानु प्रताप सिंह (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, थोड़ा-सा समय जो आपने मुझे दिया है उसको मैं एक दूसरे पर कीचड़ उछाल कर बरबाद करना नहीं चाहता। कीचड़ बहुत है और दोनों तरफ है। आज हमारे देश में स्थिति यह स्थिति है कि कीचड़ उछालना सब से आसान काम है। मैं केवल इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि उस खेल को जिसे इस देश में राजनीति के नाम से पुकारा गया है उससे इस देश की जनता बहुत ऊब चुकी है। वह इतना भड़ा हो चुका है और यदि मैं यह कहूँ कि वह इतना अश्लील हो गया है कि कोई भी उसे देखना नहीं चाहता है तो यह गलत नहीं होगा। इसलिए मैं आरोप-प्रत्यारोप में योगदान नहीं करना चाहता। हाँ, कुछ तथ्य सदन के समक्ष उपस्थित करना चाहता हूँ जिससे कि कम से कम यह धारणा दूर हो कि आज जो पार्टी सत्तारुद्ध हुई है उसने देश की इकनोमी को बनाने में बहुत सफलता प्राप्त की थी। यह बात कही गई है कि 30 वर्षों के काम को 30 महीनों के अन्दर बिगाड़ दिया गया। मैं उन 30 वर्षों के रिकार्ड को पेश करना चाहता हूँ। मेरे पास बर्ड बैंक का एक एटलस है। इसमें यह बताया गया है कि सन् 1950-51 में प्रति व्यक्ति आय में भारत का स्थान संसार के 125 देशों में 85वां था वह सन् 1976 में गिर कर 111 हो गया। अब संसार के केवल 14 देश हम से गरीब हैं। इस के अतिरिक्त मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि संसार को आप छोड़िये, एशिया के देशों में भी सन् 1970 से 1976 के बीच में भारत में प्रति व्यक्ति आय में सबसे कम वृद्धि हुई है। 39 देश एशिया में हैं। उनमें से 6 देशों को छोड़कर जिनकी नेगेटिव ग्रोथ रही है, हिन्दुस्तान के सबसे कम ग्रोथ रही है और 1970-76 की जो अवधि थी वह इंदिरा गांधी के शासन का सबसे स्वर्णिम समय माना जा सकता है। मैं बताता

हूँ कि हम कहां थे और कहां आकर पहुंच गये। एशिया के पिछड़े हुए देशों में भी भारत का स्थान प्रति व्यक्ति आय की वृद्धि में सबसे पीछे रहा, केवल 6 देशों को छोड़कर जिन की नेगेटिव ग्रोथ थी। पाजिटिव ग्रोथ वाले देशों में हमारी आय वृद्धि प्रति व्यक्ति सबसे कम हुई, श्रीमन् में सदन के समक्ष यह भी रखना चाहता हूँ कि 1950-75 के बीच में क्या हुआ है। यह एक है जवाहरलाल नेहरू एंड प्लान डेवलपमेंट पर, जो कि युनाइटेड नेशन्स ट्रेड एंड डेवलपमेंट कॉन्फ्रेंस में दिये गये एक मेम्बर के भाषण का अंश है :

"The only ground which we have maintained in the world economy is our share in the world population, if this could be considered a matter of pride. According to all other major indicators, we have steadily lost ground. Since 1950, for instance, our share in world output has fallen from 2.1 per cent to 1.3 per cent. Our per capita income in 1950 was one-eighth of the world's average. Now it is one-twelfth. We accounted for two per cent of world trade in 1950. This has now fallen to less than one per cent. In 1950, we produced 10 per cent of the third world's gross national product, now down to six per cent."

जो पिछड़े हुए लोग हैं उनमें भी हम कितने पिछड़ते जा रहे हैं।

"Even in steel, the pride of India's progress, our share in this third world has receded from 40 per cent to 12 per cent."

यह उस 30 वर्ष की उपलब्धि है जिसको कहा जाता है कि जनता सरकार ने 30 महीनों के अन्दर बरबाद कर दिया। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या फिर इसी की पुनरावृत्ति होगी। मेरे पास आंकड़े हैं कि कांग्रेस शासन काल में पर कैपिटल इनकम में किस गति से वृद्धि हुई है। 1971-72 में 1.1 प्रतिशत, 1972-73 में 3.7 प्रतिशत, अगले वर्ष

3.3 प्रतिशत, फिर अगले वर्ष 1.3 प्रतिशत, फिर 6.6 प्रतिशत और फिर-6 प्रतिशत। यह सब मिलाकर इंदिरा शासन के जो अंतिम 6 वर्ष थे उसमें प्रति व्यक्ति आय में वृद्धि केवल 0.5 प्रतिशत हुई जब कि पिछले दो वर्षों में 1977-78 में 5.2 प्रतिशत की वृद्धि हुई और फिर 1978-79 में 3.6 प्रतिशत की वृद्धि हुई।

श्रीमन्, यह भी कहा जाता है कि जनता राज में मंहगाई बहुत बढ़ी। मैं मानता हूँ कि 20 प्रतिशत की वृद्धि बहुत अधिक होती है। किसी इकानामिस्ट ने कहा है कि जिस लोकतांत्रिक देश में एक वर्ष के अन्दर 20 प्रतिशत से अधिक मूल्यों में वृद्धि होगी वह सरकार कायम नहीं रह सकती। यह बात यहां एक बार नहीं दो बार सिद्ध हुई है। लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह पहला अवसर नहीं है जब कि 20 प्रतिशत की वृद्धि हुई हो। मेरे पास आंकड़े मौजूद हैं। 1971 में आल कमोडिटीज होल-सेल प्राइस इन्डेक्स 105.6 था। यह सिर्फ़ तीन साल के बाद 1974-75 में बढ़ कर 174.9 हुआ। यदि आप हिसाब लगाएं तो 66% मूल्यों में वृद्धि हुई है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या यह रिकार्ड मौजूदा रिकार्ड से आगे नहीं है ?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Mr. Bhanu Pratap Singh, you can take another two minutes or so.

श्री भानु प्रताप सिंह : मेहरबानी करके पांच मिनट और दे दीजिए। हमारे एक माननीय साथी ने पूछा कि पिछले दो वर्षों में जनता सरकार ने क्या किया। मैं और ज्यादा नहीं कहना चाहता हूँ क्योंकि पूरी जानकारी नहीं है लेकिन मैं कृषि क्षेत्र के विषय में कह सकता हूँ कि यदि पिछले 31 वर्षों के अन्दर कोई रिकार्ड हो जो जनता पार्टी के राज्य में दो वर्षों की उपलब्धि की तुलना

[श्री भानु प्रताप सिंह]

कर सकें तो मैं उनकी बात मानने को तैयार हूँ। लेकिन जरा आप ध्यान दें। सन् 1972-73, 1976-77 के पांच वर्षों में खाद्यान्न की औसत पैदावार 106.7 मिलियन टन थी तथा पिछले दो वर्षों की औसत पैदावार 128.9 मिलियन टन थी। 20 प्रतिशत की वृद्धि हुई। इसी तरह से रा-जूट के उत्पादन में 18.76 प्रतिशत की वृद्धि हुई। काटन में 22.69 प्रतिशत की वृद्धि हुई। गुड़ और चीनी में भी 25.17 प्रतिशत की वृद्धि हुई है। मैं मानता हूँ इस वृद्धि में बहुत कुछ योगदान अच्छे मौसम का रहा। परन्तु उतना ही नहीं इन दो वर्षों की अवधि में सिंचाई का रकबा पहले वर्ष 2.6 मिलियन हेक्टेयर बढ़ाया गया और दूसरे वर्ष 2.8 मिलियन हेक्टेयर बढ़ाया गया। यह दुनिया का रिकार्ड है। जब मैं मन्त्रालय में था तो सोवियत यूनियन के मन्त्री मिलने आए थे और उनको जब मैंने बताया कि 2.6 मिलियन हेक्टेयर हमने सिंचाई बढ़ाई है तो उन्होंने कहा—

"I take my hat off to the Indian planners and administrators who have achieved this record."

क्योंकि कहीं भी संसार में इतने बड़े पैमाने पर सिंचाई का विस्तार नहीं हुआ है जितना दो वर्षों में हमारे यहां हुआ। फर्टिलाइजर के प्रयोग में केवल दो वर्षों में 47 प्रतिशत की वृद्धि हुई है। यह इसलिए सम्भव हुआ कि जो कौमत्ते खाद की बढ़ाई गई थीं उसको दो बार गिराया गया। इस सब का परिणाम आम जनता के भोजन पर हुआ। पहले 6 वर्षों में प्रति व्यक्ति अन्न की जो सप्लाई थी उसके मुकाबले पिछले दो वर्षों में 10.3 प्रतिशत अधिक अनाज उपलब्ध कराया गया। 10 प्रतिशत भोजन अधिक मिला। चीनी की मात्रा तो 43 प्रतिशत अधिक रही है। मैं यह भी कहना

चाहता हूँ कि इस सब का नतीजा यह निकला कि कांग्रेस के शासन काल में जो निरन्तर अनाज विदेशों से मंगाया जाता था उस ट्रेड का डाइरेक्शन भी बदला। 4.5 मिलियन टन का औसत आयात कांग्रेस शासन के 5 वर्षों में हुआ; लेकिन दो वर्षों में धारा बदल गई हमने एक मिलियन टन से अधिक अनाज भारतवर्ष से प्रतिवर्ष बाहर भेजा है। अन्त में मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिस प्रकार का कार्यक्रम फूड फार वर्क चलाया गया वह भी संसार में अद्वितीय रहा है। सारे संसार में इस प्रकार के कार्यक्रम पर जितना खर्च होता रहा है उसके ढाई गुने से ज्यादा पिछले वर्ष हमने जनता पार्टी की तरफ से लोकदल की सरकार की तरफ से गांव में अनाज खर्च करने का निर्णय किया और उसके अनुसार खर्च किया। यह सब होते हुए भी हमारे साथी कहेंगे कि आपने बहुत कुछ किया मगर आपको फल क्या मिला। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जनता ने हमको नहीं हराया है, हमको हमारे नेताओं ने हराया है। मैं उनकी कोई सफाई देने के लिए तैयार नहीं हूँ। मैं आज अपने विरोध पक्ष में बैठे हुए साथियों से कहना चाहता हूँ कि वे अच्छी तरह से इस बात को समझ लें कि कोई नयी बात नहीं हुई है। जिस प्रकार से अल्पमत से लोक सभा में बहुमत में कांग्रेस पार्टी पहले पहुंचती थी, उसी प्रकार से इस बार भी पहुंची है। केवल जनता पार्टी वन जाने से विरोधी पार्टियों के एकत्र हो जाने से परिवर्तन आया था और जब जनता पार्टी टूट गयी तो वही हुआ जो पहले हुआ करता था, कोई आश्चर्य की बात नहीं हुई। मैं यह जानता था और इसी कारण से मैं अलग हो गया था और आज मैं केवल एक प्रोटेस्ट के रूप में इन नेताओं की कम ख्याली के नारे ऐसा लगता है जैसे उनको

स्मरण शक्ति कमजोर हो गई है या उनको यह मुगलता हो गया था कि वह जीतकर आये हैं इसलिए वह अकेले जो चाहें सो कर लेंगे इसलिये मैंने इनसे अलग होने का निर्णय किया। मैं फिर इनसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि उनके सामने तीन ही विकल्प हैं। या तो एक पार्टी की हुकूमत सदा के लिये स्वीकार कर लें या इस देश के इलेक्टोरल सिस्टम को बदलें या फिर एक हो जायें। चौथा विकल्प कोई है नहीं। मैं उस बात को दोहराना नहीं चाहता जिसे भूपेश गुप्त जी ने कहा कि इस चुनाव प्रणाली में जो नतीजे आते हैं उन्हें जनता की इच्छाओं का प्रतिबिम्ब नहीं कहा जा सकता; पूरे देश के नतीजे भूपेश गुप्त जी सुना चुके हैं मैं उसको दोहराना नहीं चाहता। केवल इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि जितने परसेंट वोट कांग्रेस के थे उतने से केवल एक दो परसेंट इधर उधर हुए हैं। कोई फर्क नहीं पड़ा है इन आंकड़ों पर गौर करिये। बिहार में 36.41 परसेंट वोट कांग्रेस 'आई' को मिले और सीटें 50 परसेंट मिलीं, हरियाणा में 29.29 प्रतिशत वोट कांग्रेस 'आई' को मिले और 50 प्रतिशत सीटें मिलीं, मध्य प्रदेश में 46 प्रतिशत वोट मिले और 87.5 प्रतिशत स्थान मिले, उड़ीसा में 55 प्रतिशत वोट मिले और 90 प्रतिशत सीटें मिलीं, पंजाब में 52 प्रतिशत वोट मिले और 92 फीसदी सीटें मिलीं; राजस्थान में 42 फीसदी वोट मिले और 72 प्रतिशत सीटें मिलीं; इसी प्रकार उत्तर प्रदेश में 35.9 प्रतिशत वोट मिले और 60 प्रतिशत सीटें मिली।

मैं अंत में केवल यही कहना चाहता हूँ कि यदि जनता और लोक दल के नेता वास्तव में लोकतंत्र की रक्षा करना चाहते हैं और कुसियों की लालसा छोड़

सकते हैं तो अभी भी भगवान उनको बुद्धि दे कि वे पुनः एकत्र हो जायें। अन्यथा इसकी आशा छोड़ दें कि कभी इस देश से एक दलीय शासन समाप्त हो सकता है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Yes, Mr. Basheer, please be brief.

SHRI T. BASHEER (Kerala): Sir, I cannot welcome the Address delivered by hon. Rashtrapatiji. The reason is very simple. If the President's Address can be taken as an indication of the Government's policy, one will be only disappointed. In paragraph 6, the President has mentioned the massive and broad-based confidence repose by the people in the new Government. There was a big swing in favour of the Indian National Congress in 1971. Later, after the post-emergency scene the swing moved to the other extreme. It went in favour of Janata Party, resulting in the formation of the Janata Party Government in 1977. Now the 1980 election verdict has again gone to another extreme. In 1977 it was demonstrated by the people that they did not approve of what the then Government did including the declaration of emergency. It was a negative vote. The Janata Party Government was bound to fail by the very logic of combination of political forces that created it. It took only two and a half years to dislodge from power. The Janata Government failed miserably to solve the problems of the people. The social and economic and political chaos unleashed by the Janata Party Government could not be controlled by the stop-gap arrangement of a caretaker Government. Sir, I would like to say that the present Government is the product of a negative voting of the people against the Janata Government's policies and politics. Here is another swing to the opposite extreme.

Sir, I would only appeal to the party in power to consider the salient feature of the successive elections

[Shri T. Basheer]

and to take lessons from those verdicts. Do not think that this is a mandate to forget the people and to do things according to your whims and fancies.

Sir, I am disappointed with the President's Address as I failed to see a clarity of direction in the Address. The President has pointed out in para 9:

"The Government would like to reaffirm its commitment to planning as an essential tool for engineering social and economic change."

It looks very strange that nowhere in the Address is mentioned the word 'socialism' which was always repeated by the leaders and spokesmen of the party in power; especially the present Prime Minister.

Sixteen years back, the Indian National Congress at a plenary session 68th at Bhubaneshwar in January 1964 adopted a resolution on democracy and socialism. The resolution was quite unequivocal about the concept of socialism. It was stated in the resolution:

"The Congress is working for a revolution in the economic and social relationship in Indian society. The revolution is to be brought about through radical changes in the attitude and outlook of the people as well as the institution through which they have to function."

Sir, has the ruling party any idea or even indication of effecting such a change? Sir, I am sorry to say that it does not have any such idea. In paragraph 9 it is stated:

"The great task of nation building will have to be resumed with redoubled vigour so that coming generation can hope for a fuller and better life."

This is of course a sweet general statement. But what about the burning problems of the country?

Sir, here I would like to mention about the problem of unemployment. The President's Address is conveniently silent on this burning problem. What about the mounting unemployment of the youth in the country both educated and uneducated?

The President's Address is mentioning about the efficiency of movement by railways. But the Address is silent on the bonus to railwaymen. We would like to know as to what is the policy of the Government towards bonus offered to the railwaymen?

The promise by the President in paragraph 7 of the Address is:

"The law enforcement agencies at the Centre and in the States will be activated."

The word 'activated' is significant in that the Central Government may become even relentless and may not tolerate the existence of State Governments differing in political complexion from that of the Centre. The post-election statements made by the leaders and spokesmen of the party now in power shows the desire of the Central Government to dislodge the State Governments that are not of their liking. Sir, there has been a lot of talk on the floor of this House and outside for and against toppling State Governments.

Sir, I would like to point out in this connection that mid-term election in the States cannot be ordered in the context of Lok Sabha elections. The issues involved in the Lok Sabha elections are different from the issues involved in the elections in States. The founding fathers of our Constitution accepted federalism fully knowing the possibility of varying complexions of politics at the Centre and in the States. Sir, the recent election to the Kerala Legislative Assembly was held just a fortnight after the Lok Sabha elections. The so-called wave could not rise above the Western ghats and enter the Kerala coast. If I am to quote the special correspondent of the *Times*

of India, reported from Trivandrum, it reads thus:

"The money power was displayed by United Democratic Front (this front is led by the party in power here) who thought that their rival was a close competitor. However, the voters at large were unaffected by this display."

The Government party at the Centre was compelled in Kerala to join hands with strange bed fellows—even the Janata Party.

The people of Kerala have voted to power in the State left democratic front with their sense of realism. Here the leaders and the spokesmen of the party in power at the Centre spoke about secularism. But in Kerala they embraced and allied with all sorts of communal parties and groups, Sir, their talk about secularism is hollow and their claim to secularism is meaningless. The party in power here has miserably failed in Kerala.

Unlike the present Central Government which is the product of a negative voting, the left democratic front Government in Kerala is the child of a positive voting.

THE MINISTER OF SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT (SHRI A. P. SHARMA): No, no.

SHRI T. BASHEER: Of course, it is the result of the negative voting. When the Janata Government came into power, you said that it was the result of the negative voting.

SHRI A. P. SHARMA: We never said that.

SHRI T. BASHEER: You said it. So, unlike the present Central Government the left democratic front government in Kerala is the child of a positive voting by the politically conscious electorate. The Government will surely and can surely deliver

goods. I don't want to say anything more at this stage. The taste of the pudding is in its eating.

Sir, Kerala has suggested and accepted the alternative. The emergence of this alternative at the national level in due course is a historic task. On the face of this social, economic and political alternative the waves are bound to withdraw. Social justice will succeed. Politics of personal hollowness has to yield to the far reaching forces of politics of ideology, politics of conviction and politics of commitment to the people.

Thank you, Sir.

श्री हरिसिंह भगुबाबा महिडा (गुजरात) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, पिछले तीन दिन से राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण पर बहस चल रही है। कई माननीय सदस्यों ने अपने-अपने विचार रखे हैं। मगर एक बात सब लोग स्वीकार करते हैं कि इस चुनाव में प्रजा ने इन्दिरा जी को, इन्दिरा की पार्टी को बहुमत दिया है और देश का काम इन्दिरा जी के हाथ सुपुर्द किया है। चुनाव के दौरान देश के कोने कोने में एक नारा उठा था—इन्दिरा लाओ, देश बचाओ। विरोधी दल में बैठे हुए कई माननीय सदस्य इस बात पर हंसी उड़ायेंगे, लेकिन पिछले तीन सालों में जनता राज में जो परिस्थिति देश में पैदा हुई उसे देखते हुए आज अनेक समस्याएँ हमारे सामने खड़ी हुई हैं और आज तमाम-समस्याओं की आग में सारा देश जल रहा है। तीन साल पहले जब इन्दिरा गांधी ने चार्ज दिया था मोरारजी देसाई को उस समय देश सब तरह से भरा पूरा था। देश के सरकारी गोदामों में दो साल तक देश के लोगों के लिये अनाज भरा हुआ था। औद्योगिक उत्पादन काफी बढ़ा हुआ था। खाद्य विषयक उत्पादन बहुत तेजी से आगे

[श्री हरिसिंह भगुबावा महिडा]

बढ़ रहा था और देश में कानून और व्यवस्था बिल्कुल सही ढंग से चल रही थी। लेकिन पिछले तीन सालों में जनता सरकार के हाथ में जब से देश की सत्ता आयी तो इन लोगों ने ऐसा वीभत्स बर्ताव किया कि जिसके कारण देश के सभी क्षेत्रों में हमें आज बदली हुई परिस्थिति दिखाई पड़ती है। पिछले 15 दिनों से हमारी सरकार ने सत्ता अपने हाथ में ली है और सामने पक्ष में बैठे हुए हमारे सदस्यगण उस सारी जिम्मेदारी को, इस सारी खराब परिस्थिति को इन्दिरा जी के सिर पर लादने का प्रयत्न कर रहे हैं। आज देश में काला बाजार बढ़ रहा है, टैक्स की चोरी जारी है, महंगाई बेहिसाब बढ़ रही है। आज देश में सीमेंट की कमी है, आज देश में तेल की कमी है, डीजल की कमी है, और शक्कर की कमी है। हर एक क्षेत्र में जहाँ चीजें बराबर थीं वहाँ आज हर चीज की कमी दिखाई दे रही है। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, कहा जाता है श्री एन० के० सिंह के बारे में और उन के लिये पिछले दो दिन से इस सभागृह में विवाद चल रहा है। हमें लगता है कि जिन लोगों ने पिछले सालों में अनेक अफसरों का हैरान और परेशान किया है और अफसरों को ही नहीं, इन्दिरा जी को ले कर और उन के साथ के कार्य-कर्ताओं तथा को हैरान किया है वे ही आज इस तरह के सवाल उठा रहे हैं। मैं गुजरात का एक उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ कि आज भी वहाँ क्या चल रहा है। गुजरात की जनता सरकार ने कांग्रेसी ताल्लुका पंचायत के प्रमुखों को बिना किसी केस के, बनावटी केस बना कर और उसे कोर्ट में ले जा कर उन को सस्पेंड करने का रवैया अपना रखा है। भरोच जिले में चार कांग्रेसी प्रमुखों को उन्होंने सस्पेंड करने का रवैया अपनाया और एक प्रमुख को 25 महीने तक सस्पेंड

रखा लेकिन केस नहीं कर पाये और जब उस का केस कोर्ट में गया तो कोर्ट ने कह दिया कि 'देयर इज नो केस एट आल अगैरेंट दिस प्रेसीडेंट'। तो यह मात्र एक ही केस नहीं है, असंख्य केस वहाँ इस तरह के हैं। एक ताल्लुका पंचायत के प्रमुख के खिलाफ पुलिस केस किया था कि उन्होंने जंगल की लकड़ी काट कर चोरी कर ली है। वह जमीन सरकारी थी। उस ताल्लुका पंचायत के प्रमुख के साथ चार और आदमियों पर केस किया गया था। जब अदालत में वह केस गया तो जिस जमीन पर जंगल की बात कही गयी थी, कमिश्नर की अदालत में पता चला कि पिछले दस साल के रेकार्ड के अनुसार उस पर झाड़ी तक नहीं थी। और पांच आदमियों पर वह

केस किया गया था लेकिन उन में से 4 P.M. तीन आदमी मरे हुए थे जिन पर वह केस किया गया था। मरे हुए लोगों के ऊपर केस करने से भी जनता सरकार नहीं हिचकिचाई। जो गांधी जी की समाधि पर उन्होंने जाकर प्रतिज्ञा की उससे देश की प्रजा को अभित करने का भयंकर प्रयास किया। प्रतिज्ञा लेने वाले लोग दो साल बाद समाधि को साफ करने लगे। राजनारायण जी हरिद्वार पहुँचे; दो खटारा भरकर गंगा का पानी ले आये। वह कहते थे कि यह समाधि भ्रष्ट हुई है। किसने भ्रष्ट की? मोरारजी देसाई की पार्टी ने। जब राजनारायण और चरणसिंह उनकी पार्टी में शामिल थे तब उन लोगों ने भ्रष्टाचार किया। लेकिन जहाँ जाकर प्रतिज्ञा की भ्रष्टाचार नहीं करेंगे, उन्ही लोगों ने इन्दिरा गांधी को भ्रष्टाचारी कहकर, तानाशाह कहकर, संजय को, सब कांग्रेस वालों को बदनाम किया। लेकिन आज तक उनके सामने कोई सबूत नहीं आया और जो कुछ उन्होंने साबित करने का प्रयत्न किया दिल्ली हाई कोर्ट ने उस पर क्या डिस्जिज्न लिया, सबके सामने



है। आज हम देख रहे हैं कि तीन सालों में एक भी केस इन्दिरा व उसके साथियों के सामने वह नहीं साबित कर पाये और कहते हैं कि उन्होंने भ्रष्टाचार को नाबूद किया। उसके बजाय मोरारजी के लड़के कान्ति देसाई ने कितना भ्रष्टाचार किया? मोरारजी के लड़के ने भ्रष्टाचार किया, जगजीवन राम के लड़के ने भ्रष्टाचार किया, देवीलाल के लड़के ने भ्रष्टाचार किया, सखलेचा के लड़के ने भ्रष्टाचार किया। तो ये भ्रष्टाचारी कौन थे? आपने भ्रष्टाचार बढ़ाया या घटाया इन्दिरा जी ने सही बात कही कि तीन साल तक जनता पार्टी के सामने एक ही सवाल था इन्दिरा जी को हैरान, परेशान करना और उनको खत्म करना। जनता पार्टी के एक एम०पी० ने ग्रहमदाबाद में खुले बाजार में कहा था मानिक चौक में कि उनको फ्राँसी के फ़ंदे पर लटकाया जाएगा। फ्राँसी पर लटकाने वाले थे ये जैसे भुट्टो को लटकाया गया लेकिन इन्दिरा जी को लटकाने का उनका सपना सिद्ध नहीं हुआ। पूरी प्रजा ने आज उनको रास्ता दिखलाया है। हर रोज़ छोटी-छोटी बातों पर, जैसे सिंह को यह किया, वह किया, उनको अधिकार है प्रिविलेज लाने का। लेकिन भिण्डर को क्या किया? भिण्डर को जेल में किसने डाला? किस वजह से उसको जेल में भेजा था? वह सच्चा है तो आज भिण्डर का प्रमोशन किया सरकार ने तो कोई बुरी बात नहीं की। सिंह के सामने अगर मान लीजिए कोई भी दूसरा अफसर हो वह अपराधी नहीं है तो उससे बदला नहीं लेना चाहिए, हम यह नहीं चाहते हैं कि किसी से ज्यादाती की जाए लेकिन आज जो बातें चल रही हैं हाउस में, जो हमने दो दिन से बातें सुनी हैं उनसे हमें बहुत दुख होता है। विरोधी दल के नेता श्री लाल आडवाणी आज जो बातें करते हैं वे पिछले तीन सालों तक यहां

बैठते थे तो वह भूल गये कि इस हाउस ने मोरारजी के लड़के कान्ति देसाई के मामले में एक प्रस्ताव पास किया था और भूपेश गुप्त और श्री राममूर्ति के पास जाकर उनको मनाते थे कि आप क्या करना चाहते हैं। मेजोरिटी हाउस के विचार जो थे जनता सरकार उसके खिलाफ़ अपर्ना मरजी से काम करती रही। भ्रष्टाचार इन लोगों ने बढ़ाया। कालाबाजारी इन लोगों ने बढ़ाई। मैं एक दो बातें और कहना चाहता हूँ कि जितना आदमी महान होता है उतना बड़ा दंभ कर सकता है। मोरारजी भाई जो हमारे एक्स-प्राइम मिनिस्टर हैं वह बताते हैं महंगाई क्यों बढ़ी। उन्होंने कहा है कि चरण सिंह की वजह से महंगाई बढ़ी है। मैं यह पूछता हूँ उनकी वजह से क्यों बढ़ी तो वह कहते हैं कि क्योंकि चरण सिंह ने बजट पेश किया था पार्लियामेंट में। जब चरण सिंह ने बजट पेश किया था तब इन्दिरा गांधी जी ने और उनके साथियों ने और विरोधी दल के सभी लोगों ने कहा था कि बजट की वजह से महंगाई बढ़ेगी, इन्फ्लेशन बढ़ेगा, इसकी वजह से लोग परेशान हो जायेंगे तब उस वक्त मोरारजी भाई और एच० एम० पटेल सभी लोगों ने चरण सिंह को बचाया था। वह कहते थे कि नहीं, नहीं इस बजट से महंगाई नहीं बढ़ने वाली है और अगर बढ़ेगी तो एक टके से ज्यादा नहीं बढ़ेगी। सूरत में जब लोगों ने उनसे पूछा कि महंगाई क्यों हुई तो उन्होंने कहा कि चरण सिंह के बजट की वजह से महंगाई बढ़ी। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि यह बजट कब पेश किया गया? जिस वक्त बजट पेश किया गया उस वक्त क्या मोरारजी भाई प्राइम मिनिस्टर नहीं थे? अगर थे तो उन्होंने उनको क्यों नहीं रोका। मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि वह खुद पावर में, ताकत में बने रहना चाहते थे। उस वक्त उनके सामने बड़ा महत्व पार्टी का महत्व था देश का महत्व नहीं था। उनसे चरण सिंह को रोक सकने की शक्ति नहीं थी कि वह बजट पेश न कर सकें। मैं पूछना चाहता

[श्री हरिसिंह भगुवावा महिडा]

हूँ पेश किसने कराया, क्यों कराया? क्या आपने पेश नहीं कराया? आपके हाथ में ताकत थी, शक्ति थी आप उनको रोक सकते थे। मोरारजी भाई कहते हैं कि चरण सिंह को मनाया था वह नहीं माने। मैं कहता हूँ कि अगर वह नहीं माने तो उनको हटा क्यों नहीं दिया गया। उनको निकाल क्यों नहीं दिया गया। मेरा कहना यह है कि अगर उनको निकाल देते, हटा देते तो उनकी पार्टी खत्म हो जाती, सत्ता हाथ से निकाल जाती। सत्ता उनको प्यारी थी इसलिये उन्होंने सत्ता को महत्व दिया देश को नहीं।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): You will have to start winding up.

SHRI HARISINH BHAGUDAVA MAHIDA: Yes, I am trying. सत्ता की वजह से यह हो रहा है और चरण सिंह के बजट की वजह से यह हो रहा है। इसकी जिम्मेदार मोरारजी भाई और सारी जनता पार्टी है। लाल आडवाणी हैं जो आज वहाँ बैठे हैं। माननीय सदस्य जो उधर बैठे हैं सब लोग इसके लिये जिम्मेदार हैं। अब उन्होंने यह महंगाई इन्दिरा गांधी के सर पर थोप दी है। अभी इन्दिरा गांधी को आए 15 दिन ही हुए हैं और इन्होंने कहना शुरू कर दिया है कि इनके राज में महंगाई बढ़ रही है।

मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज इन्दिरा जी के हाथ में सत्ता आई। लोगों ने इन्दिरा जी के हाथ में सत्ता सुपुर्द की है। तीन साल तक जनता ने जो व्यवहार किया, जो काम किया, जो भ्रष्टाचार किया उसको जनता ने कंडम किया है। जनता पार्टी आज जिसको तानाशाह कहती है उसके खिलाफ इन्होंने सैकड़ों कमीशन अपाएंट किये और उन पर केस पर केस बना दिया और उनको जेल में भेज दिया जब मैं कोर्ट में गया और पूछा कि इनको जेल में क्यों रखा गया तो जवाब नहीं दे पाए जब

कि एन०के० सिंह के बारे में अपनी लोकशाही जताते हैं। लोकतंत्र की बात करते हैं तो मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि देश का एक्स-प्राइम मिनिस्टर श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी का बिना किसी केस के, बिना किसी चार्ज के जेल में भेजने की हिम्मत की थी उस वक्त आपकी लोकशाही कहाँ थी। चिकमंगलूर में वह जीत कर आई थीं तब भी आपने उनकी सदस्यता खत्म कर दी और उनके खिलाफ ब्रूटल एक्शन लिया। उनको 8 दिन तक जेल में रखा। यह सब देखते हुए मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज हिन्दुस्तान को जरूरत है इन्दिरा जी की। इलेक्शन आयेंगे और इलेक्शन आयेंगे देश को जरूरत है ऐसी ताकत की जिनके हाथ में शक्ति हो। इन्दिरा जी के ऊपर देश की प्रजा ने विश्वास किया और उनको भारी बहुमत से जीताया। मेरी आप सब लोगों से विनती है कि वह देश का हित चाहती हैं, देश का भला चाहती हैं, राष्ट्र का भला चाहती हैं, राष्ट्र की प्रजा का भला चाहती हैं। देश में से गरीबी हटाना चाहती हैं। देश में से गरीबी को हटाना है तो 20 मुद्दा कार्यक्रम को अमल में लाना होगा। इस कार्यक्रम को अमल में लाना एक सही कदम होगा जिसका सरकार करना चाहती है। यह देश के हित के लिये है। और सरकार जो सही कदम उठाती है, देश के लोगों के हित में जो सही कदम उठाती है, उसमें लोग सरकार का साथ दें। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस प्रकार से सब लोग सरकार का साथ देकर राष्ट्र की भलाई के काम में और राष्ट्र के पुनर्निर्माण के काम में और जनतंत्र को इस देश में सुदृढ़ करने के लिए माटी, चूना और पानी बन कर अपना हिस्सा दें। यही अभ्यर्थना मैं करना चाहता हूँ।

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Vice-Chairman, we are debating not exactly the President's Address to Parliament, but we are debating formally the Motion of Thanks for the President having delivered that Address to both Houses

of Parliament. I do not see anything in this Address to thank the President or to thank the Government which has prepared this Address. What is there in this Address at all? After all, this Address contains a condemnation of all the doings of the previous Government. Was it necessary for the President to condemn it? After all, the people of this country have voted that Government out of power. And my friend was talking so much about that Government. I do not understand why he was beating a dead horse after the people have voted that Government out of power. Today we are concerned not with what the previous Government did. The previous Government has been voted out of power by the people of this country for its misdeeds, for its nonperformance, for its nonperforming up to the expectations of the people or for the betrayal of their expectations. Therefore, we are not concerned with that at the present moment. What we are concerned with is what this Government, which has got a massive majority of the people, a massive majority in the Lok Sabha in terms of membership, is going to do for the people. What does this Address promise for the people of this country in the future? What does it hold out? What does the future hold out for the people of this country under this Government? This is what we are concerned with and the people of this country are seriously concerned with this problem. As far as that is concerned, excepting some vague generalities and platitudes there is nothing concrete in this. They would say, after all we have come to power only during the last ten or fifteen days during which we had to prepare this Address and there was not enough time to indicate the concrete measures that we are taking. But after all, you have been governing the country for twenty-eight years before and you have been in Opposition for the last two and a half to three years and you know what the failings were of the last

Government. Therefore, at least the direction in which you are going to go in the future, some concrete indication of the direction in which you are going to move in the future, could have been given. If you are not capable of giving it in the first Address to both Houses of Parliament, then what is this Address worth? Is it worth the paper on which it is printed? It is a waste of Government funds, a waste of public money. What does this Address say? I just take one or two things. The most important thing to my understanding is this: "The Government would like to reaffirm its commitment to planning as an essential tool for engineering social and economic change." Very good. You have been committing yourself to planing as an essential tool for bringing about socio-economic changes. But planing is not something new to this country. We started the planning process in the year 1951 with very great expectations among the people, raising great hopes among the people. And every Plan document proclaimed that the objective of the Plan is to reduce the disparities in incomes and wealth that is prevalent in this country. After all the Five-Year Plans that you have carried out, has that objective been fulfilled? Or, has that objective been fulfilled in the reverse direction? Instead of reducing the disparities in incomes and wealth, you have increased the disparities in incomes and wealth. That has been the result of it. Therefore, this is an actual fact. This is something which the people cannot deny. The members of the ruling party themselves at that time were saying that the rich have become richer and the poor have become poorer. This is the result of the planning process that you have begun in the last several years. After all, when the people got angry with you because you could not fulfil their expectations, you were also thrown out of power. Since then three years have been there for you to think about what is wrong about the policies you

[Shri P. Ramamurti]

have been pursuing. Is it not a sufficient period for you? Or, is it a question of bankruptcy of thinking? Could you not have spelt out your programme instead of saying this shibboleth that the Government is going to commit itself of the process of planning as an instrument of socio-economic changes? What is the socio-economic change you have brought about in this country during the 25 years covering five Five Year Plans? It has been said that during the last three years, inflation has grown and in the last one year inflation was galloping, as if inflation is something new to this country? Was it something different in your period? This has been the result of your planning. What is the result? Your emergency period was portrayed as a period when you brought down inflation. The figures in the Reserve Bank Bulletin indicate that there is a sharp rise in the wholesale prices by over 12 per cent between March 1976 and March 1977. This was the second half of the emergency. This is not my statement. This is from the statement given by the Reserve Bank Bulletin.

**SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE:** Who denies that?

**SHRI RAMAMURTI:** What was the position with regard to the wholesale index for all commodities during the entire period of Indira era in this country between March 1966 and March 1977, which is supposed to be the golden era of Indian history? What was the lot of the common people? The wholesale price index was 135.4 per cent increase. The consumer price for industrial workers increased by 117.8 per cent. The consumer price index for urban non-manual employees increased by 111.1 per cent. In these ten years there was galloping inflation. Ever since the planning

process started inflation and deficit financing have been a continuous process. If the prices of commodities commonly used by the common people have been rising in the last three years, this is only a continuation of the very process started in your time. Where is then the wonder in the golden era of the Indira regime of which you are boasting?

What has been the standard of living of the common people? I am again quoting from a much more authoritative document. According to the statistics of the Planning Commission, in 1966 the index of real earning of workers with less than and an income of 500/- p.m. was 95, with 100 as base in 1966. The index of real earning in 1975, that is, within ten years, was reduced to 66. From 95 to 66 has been a wonderful increase in the standard of living of the working class in this country during the golden era of this country's history. You may say that the working class is a privileged class and that you are doing everything for agricultural labour and poor peasants. What is the condition of agricultural labour? The real earning of agricultural labour based on 1960-61 price—this is from the same source—is—May 1963-64—282.5; 1974-75—180.10. This is for male labourers; For females, 120 and 60.18; for children—121.75 and 57.96. These are the annual incomes of agricultural labour. So that the actual income of the agricultural labourers and the working class has been by as much as 50 per cent. I am not talking about other things. I am not going into the condition of middle class people. Those figures also I have got, but I have no time and I am not quoting all these figures. But the real fact of the matter is that the condition of the common people, the working class the peasants, the agricultural labourers, and all such people has been continuously deteriorating during this period. Is it something to boast about? That is what you are doing.

SHRI A. P. SHARMA: We came just 15 days back.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: I am not talking of 15 days, but of ten years' of your rule.

At the same time, I would like to point out that you are talking so much about increase in the industrial activity and all that. What has been the total increase in the industrial activity? The Reserve Bank sources point out that during the first 14 years of the planning process there was an industrial growth at the compounding rate of 6.9 per cent. But after 14 years, during the 10 years after that, the industrial growth has been at the rate of 3.4 per cent. This is the actual position. Why is it that this recession had gone on? Today you are talking of inflation. But in your time when there was inflation, you justified it, Shrimati Indira Gandhi justified it that it is a world phenomenon. "What can we do?" But was there inflation in the Soviet Union? It was in the socialist countries. The world to your understanding means only the capitalist world. Yes, inflation is a phenomenon. The capitalist countries used the term 'stagflation'. You want to say that we are part of that world. Of course, you are a part of the capitalist world. Therefore, you are pursuing the same policies. Therefore, the fundamental question that we are concerned with is not the denunciation of what the previous Government did. But we are concerned with the process of planning as a means of social change or socio-economic change. Why is it that during the last five years the socio-economic changes that your plans have brought about are something fundamentally wrong. There is something fundamentally wrong with regard to the approach to the planning. Why is it so? Why is it that you are not able to bring about socio-economic changes? People talk about socialism. You talk of socialism. I want to tell you today that the Marxist Party, the

Communist Party, does not want socialism. We want to go forward. We have openly proclaimed that. We have the courage to say that. You will be surprised to know that the Marxist Party says that India today is not ripe for socialism. (Interruptions) I am talking of something serious. You cannot think of anything else. You do not want to hear. Your minds are so clogged that you do not want to hear. So, Sir, the whole basic question that is, why is it that today after all these things you are in this position, the country is in this position? Unemployment has been rising, not only during the last three years but has been rising during the entire period. You enacted so many land ceiling legislations, this and that. But what has happened as a result of that? According to the National Sample Survey, the number of landless households has increased from 6.1 million in 1954 to 21.4 million in 1971-72. The people who had some land were evicted from those lands and they became landless labourers. It has gone up from 6.1 million to 21.4 million. More than 2 lakh households lost their lands. This is the result of the wonderful land-reform measures that you have carried out all these years.

What is the growth of national income? The per capita growth in national income is negligible. Certainly, there has been growth of national income. But the common people have been getting more and more paperised. Others must have benefited out of the national income. Where has it gone? Figures are there. The Reserve Bank Bulletin figures are there which are very clear.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Mr. Ramamurti, your figures are taking away more time.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: But they are more telling than my speech and

[Shri P. Ramamurti]

words. The assets of the top twenty monopoly houses increased by as much as 76 per cent between March 1972 and March 1977, that is to say, in 5 years. (Interruptions) I do not want to beat a dead horse. That horse is dead.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Did you ever beat it?

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: We fought against them. You were their allies in Kerala and we fought you. We fought them during that period. We organised strikes against their policy. Your party did not do anything. We conducted struggles. Therefore, don't bother about that. When the time became ripe, we said: "Enough of you; you get away". So, this is the result of 20 years of planning process. And what is the position today? This type of development that you have adopted in this country has led to a position where you have got to rely upon them. Instead of getting surplus in big business, instead of getting surplus in the hands of the money-lenders, instead of getting surplus in the hands of the speculators, you have to get the surplus in the hand of the people. After all, investible surplus is there in this country. This investible surpluses are invested not for production purposes, but for speculative purposes. They are in the hands of the money-lenders, in the hands of the landlords and black-marketeers. If the investible surpluses are in the hands of these people, then what type of planning can there be in this country? What is the socio-economic change that can be brought about. I am not talking much about corruption. You were there and you did not talk much of corruption. When the Janata was there, they did not talk of corruption. I know that in this society with so much of money in the hands of the Tatas and Birlas and with so much of money power with the multi-nationals, nothing can be done. I

would say that even if God were to become the Prime Minister of this country, they would have the money to purchase even God. That is the social system you have got. What is the promise you are holding out? The promise is your Twenty Point Programme. And what is wonderful about the Twenty Point Programme? How is it going to bring about socio-economic change. Now, what is the amount of land that has been distributed in this country? Shrimati Indira Gandhi, at that time, in the Chief Ministers' Conference—I remember that because I had gone there—said that all the lands that they were showing as having been distributed was not the land taken from the landlords, but those were the lands which were forest and banjar lands. This is the statement she has made in the Chief Minister's Conference. And we pointed out to her how could she ever implement those land reforms. Yet, the task force of the Planning Commission has come out openly and stated that this Government has not got the political will and the Administration is bound up with landlords and hundreds of threats. Therefore, so long as you do not break up these threats and so long as you do not have a Government with the political will, these land reforms can never be implemented. After all, your Fifth Plan document openly and clearly stated that even the Minimum Wages Act for the agricultural labour cannot be implemented. The Government says and the Planning Commission says that the Act passed by the Government of India or by the State Governments cannot be implemented because the landlords....

SHRI KALP NATH RAI (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I am on a point of order. Sir, Mr. Ramamurti is talking of land reforms, and he was in the company of those people who were hundred per cent opposed to land reforms. During the earlier regime of Smt. Indira Gandhi, lakhs

and lakhs of acres were distributed, and those lands were snatched away by the landlords. You supported those people who took away all the lands of the Harijans and Girijans, and you talk of the political will. They are opposed to the land reforms. Smt. Indira Gandhi is the only leader who can do something for these people.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: Sir, is it a point of order?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): There is no point of order.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: It is a point of disorder. It is a point of disturbing.

SHRI KALP NATH RAI: How can you say that my party has no political will? Sir, he was in the company of landlords...

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: You have made your point." Do not make a disorder now.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR (Madhya Pradesh): He does not have to utter more nonsense now.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): No cross talk, please. Let Mr. Ramamurti continue. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI:

माथुर जी आप जरा चुप रह जाइये ।

I am quoting from what Smt. Indira Gandhi herself has stated the amount of land that has been distributed. You deny her statement. I have no objection at all. In her address to the Chief Ministers she pointed out in 1977 that this is not the real land taken from the landlords, and most of it is either banjar land or forest land. This is what she herself has stated. This is all I wanted to say. And you deny that statement; you go back on that statement. Therefore, Sir, the entire process of development....

SHRI SHRIKANT VERMA (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Ramamurti, does the West Bengal Government...

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: Don't disturb me. I have got very little time. I don't want to be disturbed. You hear me. You can answer me later. (*Interruptions*) I am not yielding. You can have your turn and answer me.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): You have got five minutes more.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: I am sure, Sir, the Members will be indulgent and give me a few more minutes.

Therefore, Sir, the major point that I want to make out is that with the entire process of development that has taken place in this country, since the investible surpluses in this country are not available for investment in productive purposes, you have had to depend upon more increased taxation—taxation on commodities of daily consumption—on foreign loans, on multi-national collaborations. And foreign loans inevitably mean yielding to their dictates. You have been able to resist to some extent but none the less, ultimately you have got to yield. This is what has been taking place.

Sir, talking about this, there is another particular, significant statement made in the Address. I will just talk about that and finish. It is said, "The role of Science and Technology will be strengthened. Steps will be taken to ensure that research and development get their place in all important sectors of national endeavour." I would like to point out that despite all these years of emphasising the role of science and technology in the development process of this country, a country which produces the third-largest number of scientists and technologists, and whose calibre is not unequal to anybody else whose calibre is equal to the highest

[Shri P. Ramamurti]

of any other country, why is it that there has been a continuous erosion, the running away of the best scientists of this country to other countries to serve the interests of foreign nations? Why is it that this has taken place? Have you thought about it. Are you going to develop science and technology when the public sector undertakings are being manned by IAS officers. By I.A.S., I understand Indian avatar service. They are fit for anything. They are the Rama avatars, the Krishna avatars or any avatar. They are fit to be in the Home Ministry. They are fit to be in the Commerce Ministry. They are fit to be in the Industry Ministry. They are fit to head the public sector undertakings, the Electronics Commission, this, that and the other. They are avatars. They are the all-knowing people. When your public sector undertakings are manned by these people, how can science and technology be developed by these people? They veto the development of research and science. How is it that you are going to advance in the field of science and technology? Science and technology can develop in this country only on the basis of a democratic discussion and free and frank flow of information among the scientists, junior scientists and the senior scientists. But that is taboo in the Government. That is taboo in the public sector undertakings. Nowhere is there free flow of information between the public and the scientists and among the scientists this is not allowed. If any talk takes place, down comes the axe from the superior officers because they are interested in having some links with the multi-nationals. I can certainly understand that in the beginning you may have had to go in for collaboration. But generation after generation have you to go in for collaboration? This is what has happened. I know, for example, that in 1971 there was a committee appointed which said that our country had enough scientific and

technological talent and that it could manufacture the deep penetration aircraft in 1971 itself. It came to that conclusion but nothing was done about it with the result that today you have to go in for the Jaguar aircraft for the deep penetration thing. Similarly, Sir, disturbing reports are coming that the Electronics Commission is going to be abolished. Proposals are being put forward that the Electronics Commission is going to be abolished and electronics industry is going to be permitted to be helped by foreign multi-nationals, and all those products which had been reserved in the 1954 Resolution for the public sector are now being thrown open to the private sector. The reports are there. I can tell you, for example, that Shrimati Indira Gandhi, while defending herself against her expulsion from the other House consequent upon the Privilege Motion, said that that Government was trying to mortgage a core public sector undertaking, namely, the Bharat Heavy Electricals to a foreign multi-national. She indicted that Government. What is it that you are going to do about it? The entire Electronics Commission is sought to be wound up and the entire electronics industry is sought to be thrown to the wolves. How can you be self reliant? After all, forty per cent of the defence industry depends upon electronics and if the electronics industry is not there and if you are going to depend on foreign multi-nationals for the development of electronics industry in this country where can there be self-reliance? Can there be any self-reliance even with regard to defence when your defence is going to be continuously dependent upon foreign countries? Are we safe with regard to that? Therefore, Sir, some specific measures with regard to these things have got to be spelt out. You do not do that. You cannot continuously go on depending upon foreign countries and foreign loans. If you are going to depend on foreign loans, it means more price for every product that you purchase. You have to pay back loans and if the investment costs are more, you have to export, export



and export. You have to export cloth from this country. People here need not have cloth. You have to export mangoes. You have to export plan-tain. You have to export vegetables. You have to export the entire sea food of this country. The people of this country have no protein. Let the sea food that is produced in this coun-try be exported. Why? Because you have got to export. These industries cannot otherwise be set up. This is the policy that has been pursued. There is nothing new in this. A new direc-tion could have been indicated. But there is nothing in this document to indicate a new direction. The same shibboleth which have been repeated *ad nauseam*, socialism, this and that. For example, what is socialism? If you ask somebody to define, nobody will be able to define. I am reminded of the sloka of a Brahmin in Tamil Nadu. When a Brahmin is invited to a feast, after taking the feast he gives the *aashirvad*. Before taking the food, he will not. He will give the *aashirvad* only after taking the food and in Sanskrit. He will say:

“सर्वे जनाः सुखिनः भवन्तु”

It means: Let all the people be happy. When his belly is full, let all the people be happy. And then he will add:

“गो ब्राह्मणाय सुखमस्तु नित्यं”

Let the cow and the brahmin—they are the special species—be happy every minute, every second. You take away these two words “गो ब्राह्मणाय” and substitute other two words and you have the definition of socialism that we had for the last thirty years:

टाटा बिरलाय सुखमस्तु नित्यं

This is the socialism we have had. I only want to know whether you are going to have the same socialism in the next five years. You may do any-thing; you may try to topple Govern-

ments. We know you are very *skillful* in toppling governments. I do not expect anything else from you. At the same time I may also tell you that despite your toppling the governments, there are forces in this country which can stand against it. Despite your toppling the governments, your writ did not run. Even after your big vic-tory, you were not able to succeed. This wind did not blow. In spite of the fact that Shrimati Indira Gandhi toured 26 constituencies in Kerala, 25 of those constituencies were lost by her. I am only sorry she did not visit all the 140 constituencies so that we would have won one more seat. Un-fortunately, that did not happen. Therefore, Sir, there are forces and these forces will certainly become stronger so long as we are rooted in the people, so long as we serve them. Despite the tremendous repression and sacrifice that we have to bear, so long as we have faith in the people, any amount of toppling game will not succeed. It is ultimately the people of this country, the toiling masses of this country, the working people of this country, who, when they are awaken-ed, will survive and will prevail, and not an individual. The future of this country is in the hands of toiling people. Once they are awakened, they will be the proteges of this country's destiny, not any leader, however great he might be. Thank you.

\*SHRI BHABANI CHARAN PAT-TANAYAK (Orissa): Mr. Vice-Chair-man, Sir. I rise to speak a few words on the motion of thanks on the Presi-dent's Address. Sir. the President's Address is nothing but just the Election Manifesto of the Congress (I) Party. Our President has criticised the main-tenance of the law and order and economic situation of the Janata Gov-ernment in such a way from which I shall certainly say that the President's Address is only the Election Manifesto of the last election of the ruling party.

\*English translation of the original speech delivered in Oriya.

[Shri Bhabani Charan Pattanayak]

The same President last year also delivered speech in the joint session of Parliament. That time he had highlighted the plan and programme of the previous Government in his speech. The hon. Members of this House are aware of these things. He had emphasised on making the country self-sufficient in food-grains by developing agriculture, giving employment to the unemployed youths in the industrial sectors, eradicating illiteracy by spreading education, upliftment of Co-operative Societies, providing better communication facilities by constructing new roads, providing railway lines to the places where there is no railway links and developing industries by increasing power production. Reference had been made also about electrification in backward areas. The Janata Government had also done a lot of development works in many sectors. Some hon. Members have criticised the planning of the Janata Government. But it is quite impossible to expect developmental works in all sectors within a very short time. I don't like to speak anything about this matter.

Sir, it is a matter of great regret that infighting started in Janata Party a few days after it came to power. Some people from outside the Party also started conspiracy for its division. Unfortunately the Janata Government could not remain in power for a full term. They remained there only for two and half years. Due to the failure of the Janata Government the other parties took the benefit and Mrs. Gandhi came into power much earlier than she was expecting. Our people have not voted Mrs. Gandhi with the plea that the Janata Government was incompetent and there was not any upliftment during their rule but they were very much disgusted to see the infighting among the party men. Therefore, they preferred to give their verdict in favour of Mrs. Gandhi.

I congratulate Mrs. Gandhi for her success in the election. Our people

have brought back her to power with great hope and aspiration that she will pay attention to the upliftment of the downtrodden people. I hope Mrs. Gandhi will fulfil their hope and aspiration.

While discussing the President's Address with much sorrow and anguish I would like to say that nothing has been said about anti-defection measure. During the tenure of the present President infighting started in the Janata Party. Due to defection on large scale the party lost its majority. To avoid political uncertainty in our country, unfortunately Janata Party was not asked to explore the possibility of forming the Government. In order to discourage defection the President dissolved the Lok Sabha and ordered for the fresh election. This remained as one of the important events of the Indian political history. I am sorry there is no mention about this important fact in his speech.

Sir, we the politicians give first priority for the restoration of self-interest rather than restoring the ideology, policies, programme of the parties and thinking about the welfare of our people. Some of our friends joined Congress (I) before 1980. Some leaders have also helped Mrs. Gandhi to come to power by joining with her party. Mrs. Gandhi has lot of experience about the role of the defectors. They are not the men of principle and they will defect again if they don't get any position in the Government.

I congratulate Mrs. Gandhi for her victory. At the same time I request her to give chances to the honest people of her party who believe in certain ideology and who have full faith in her party. But no chance should be given to the opportunists who change their colours for self-interest very frequently. I hope Mrs. Gandhi will help our country from anarchy and political uncertainty by rejecting this type of people.

Sir, Mrs. Gandhi is in power now. Many people belonging to her party

have come out successfully in the last election. In view of this I request her to consider two things. My first request to her is to keep co-ordination between the treasury-bench and the Opposition Parties. It is a fact that many a time some unhealthy situation arises for the allotment of party posts and leg-pulling starts for other reasons.

This prevails in the party where the number of defectors increases. I don't think Mrs. Gandhi will provide better administration in the presence of such type of people in her party. Our Prime Minister is also aware of this. Sir, efforts have been made in different states to topple the non-Congress (I) Governments. Due to defection there is uncertainty in those States. The Prime Minister can dissolve the State Assemblies by taking the shelter of law. But toppling Governments by encouraging defection is not proper. I request the Prime Minister to create healthy situation in the States by discouraging defection.

Here I would like to tell an old story. That is about conscience. When our hon. President fought first time for the Presidential election, Mrs. Gandhi was the Prime Minister at that time. She gave a call to her party-men to apply their own conscience in electing the President. In this way the Congress Party nominee Mr. Reddy was defeated. Mr. Sanjiva Reddy got elected during the time when Mrs. Gandhi was not in power. But at a time our President applied his conscience in such a way so that the Janata Party was deprived of the opportunity of the Government and Mrs. Gandhi could come back to power two and half years before the completion of the term of our Government. Forgetting every thing our President gave a chance to Mrs. Gandhi to come back to power. Now it is her duty to apply her own conscience to eliminate the present political uncertainty that is prevailing.

**SHRI N. K. P. SALVE** (Maharashtra): On a point of order, Sir. The

translation is not very immaculate. If the hon. Member is saying that because of the manoeuvres of the President, Mrs. Gandhi has come to power then it is palpably and clearly a violation . . . (Interruptions) Well, the translation is that you are critical of the President and it was because of the manoeuvres of the President . . .

**SHRI BHABANI CHARAN PATTANAYAK**: No, no. I have not criticised the President.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA)**: Probably it is the translation. In any case, we will see and we will have it taken out.

**SHRI BHABANI CHARAN PATTANAYAK**: I have not criticised.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA)**: Any way, your time is over. You conclude.

**\*SHRI BHABANI CHARAN PATTANAYAK**: It is not the President. I have said that it is a fact that he was defeated by the reason of Prime Minister, Mrs. Gandhi, but for him she is in power only for this.

Any way, I am sorry to say not a single word has been expressed by the President in his speech about the present uncertainty which has been created in our country. Defection is a matter of grave concern in our Indian politics. If it will be repeated any more at such situation of the country then the developmental programme will be hampered. So steps should be taken to check such activities. With these words I conclude.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA)**: Mr. Ajit Kumar Sharma. The time is very very limited. You will have to finish in about six minutes.

**\*English translation of the original speech delivered in Oriya.**

SHRI AJIT KUMAR SHARMA (Assam): Yes, Sir, although the time is limited, the subject I am dealing with is also the most important.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Excuse me. The time allotted for different groups is there. So far as others are concerned, a large number of them have spoken, and there are quite a few more yet to speak, and they are speaking for the first time also. So, it is not possible to give you more time from the time which is allotted here.

SHRI AJIT KUMAR SHARMA: Yes, Sir. About the Presidential Address different aspects have been dealt with by the hon. Members. But of the two most important subjects referred to in the Address, one relates to the situation in the North-Eastern region. The President, in his Address, himself has said:

"It is a matter of regret that today we do not have amongst us here representatives from a number of constituencies of some of the North-Eastern States."

From Assam, out of the 14 constituencies, only two have sent their representatives. The other 12 representatives are not there in the Lok Sabha. As the President says: "the problems of this region and more especially those of Assam at the moment require to be dealt with urgently and in a spirit of understanding and mutual accommodation on all sides." Sir, what I would like to emphasise is that although the President has referred to the need of understanding of the problem, what I have found from the different speeches and also from my talks with many hon. Members during these days, is that there is a lot of misunderstanding and ignorance about the problem, and unless these misunderstanding and ignorance are removed, there cannot be a solution to the problem. The

solution of the problem of Assam in the North-Eastern region is not related to that region alone; it is one of the greatest national problems facing the Central Government as well as the State Governments and Parliament.

Mr. Antulay, Dr. Zakaria and Mrs. Mukherjee have referred casually to the problems of this area. From what they said, I could understand that there was a lot of ignorance about the problem even amongst them. Sir, Mr. Antulay referred to the violence involved in the movement currently in Assam, Dr. Zakaria referred to the question of Muslims and Mrs. Mukherjee referred to 'a kind of secessionist movement' in the area. Sir, in this connection what I would like to point out is this. What kind of a violence is this that is going on in Assam, which has been reported or for which we all are, and anybody would be sorry and anybody would condemn? It is mainly the violence by the Governmental agencies and by the anti-social elements in the areas dominated by foreign nationals.

A short while ago there was a reference to an incident of violence in Lucknow. Even the Prime Minister has said that the violence was initiated by the police and not by the Congress(I) youth. But, Sir, at Duliajan oil area, on 18th January morning at a sitting assembly of 7,000 people, when they were all sitting, and sitting peacefully, the police fired twenty-eight rounds and killed 37 young men on the spot. This kind of police violence led to a mob frenzy resulting in the unfortunate death of one officer.

5 P.M.

Now, Sir, I would refer to another very serious part of it. What has happened in the Assam villages? Nobody seems to be informed properly on this. No national papers have reported about it. Yesterday we read the re-

port about the rape of women in the U.P.

But in Assam what has happened. Since the military personnel who were posted there to maintain peace and order not only committed atrocities but raped three married women and one girl, out of whom three are Hindus and one a Muslim, and seven unmarried girls, of whom two are teen-aged, of 13 to 14 years. In some cases the raped girls include both the sisters and the raping was done in the presence of parents and brothers by tying them with ropes and at the point of gun. There are cases where the victims have been raped by more than one army personnel. I know these incidents. I visited those areas. When I enquired of press agencies whether they had sent reports of these incidents, they said they have sent. But what we find is that only two or three national papers had reported these incidents. Now when even such atrocities are also ignored not only by the Government but also by the national press, then is there any fault with the people of Assam and of the north-east frontier if they start thinking that it is all useless to remain within India? You cannot blame them if they are forced to think like that.

Now, Sir, I do not like to detail all these things. But I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Member to the situation there. The situation is so serious that unless there is a thorough understanding of the problem and a thorough analysis of the problem you will not be able to solve it. Now, Mr. Ramamurti referred to the political will of the Government of India. The problems of Assam and the north-eastern frontier have arisen because of a lack of political will on the part of the Central Government for the last 20 years. Whenever a problem came, they wanted to just hush up the whole issue and patching-up solutions were found which created more problems later on. Now, what is the problem? Some people say

that it is a problem of the Assamese driving out Bengalis. Some others say it is a movement for driving out Muslims. May I say with all the emphasis at my command—I have been with the movement; I have supported the movement and I have all along been with the people in the whole of the State—that it is neither. Accidentally the foreigners who are there happen to come from Bangladesh, and they happen to speak the Bengali language. If the people there want to drive out the foreigners and if the foreigners speak the Bengali language and if you term it as an anti-Bengali movement, can you say that it is a correct reading of the situation? Is it not the duty of the Central Government and the rest of India to protect that area, to protect national sovereignty and national territory by driving out the foreigners who are there in large numbers? Now so much talk about foreign influence is there. As my friend, Mr. Warjri very rightly pointed out, there is no question of foreign influence alone; there is direct physical presence of lakhs of foreigners inside this region. This is the greatest problem.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA):** You will have to conclude, please.

**SHRI AJIT KUMAR SHARMA:** There the people started a movement and the movement has been going on for the last three months. And I can tell you, Sir, that lakhs of people—the total population of the State—have joined the movement. If anybody has gone and seen there, he would have realised the depth of feeling and the extent of participation. It is throughout a non-violent and peaceful movement, and lakhs of people have participated in it. They have conducted themselves in the most disciplined manner. Ten lakhs of people were arrested between 12th and 17th November when they offered *satyagraha*. And from the side of the movement not a single instance of violence was

[Shri Ajit Kumar Sharma]

indulged in or encouraged. And when you propagate that they were violent, it is a very great injustice being done to them, to the people of that area . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Mr. Sharma, your time is up. You should conclude. You have taken more time.

SHRI AJIT KUMAR SHARMA: I will conclude by referring only to one or two things. The point is when we are discussing this issue, let us take it as an issue between the Indian citizens and foreign nationals and nothing more than that, nothing less than that. In this fight every Indian, wherever he resides, must support and give a supporting hand to this movement. Since the time is short I will only point out the issues involved. As I mentioned, there is the question of Governmental violence; the police and the military have created havoc there. They have killed at one place 37 people on the spot and seriously injured more than 500 people. And there is no inquiry as yet by anybody. We have placed the matter before the Prime Minister. We have also placed before the Prime Minister the question of raping of women. The Prime Minister had words of consolation on the death of an officer of but not a single words of sympathy for those unfortunate village women who have been tortured and raped by security personnel.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): If you go into the details it will take a long time and there are other people who want to speak. Will you kindly wind up now?

SHRI AJIT KUMAR SHARMA: Now, another point I would like to place before you is this . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): It becomes very difficult if you go on like

this. You will have to take some other opportunity to say those things. You have taken more time than is allotted. Otherwise, you will only be depriving Members of other groups of their opportunity to participate in the debate.

SHRI AJIT KUMAR SHARMA: I am concluding. There is the question about minorities. In the North Eastern region it is not a problem of protecting the minorities; it is a question of protecting the majority there. This problem has to be solved and it has to be gone into with greater detail. Minorities in Assam, both religious and linguistic have enjoyed full rights and more facilities than anywhere else.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Please wind up. I am calling the next speaker.

SHRI AJIT KUMAR SHARMA: My last point is about the geographical inheritance of the people concerned. I would request the leaders of West Bengal and the Government of West Bengal to have some more rethinking on this issue because at this moment some of the statements made by them have caused a greater deterioration in the relationship between the different communities there.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): Please sit down now, I am sorry. Now, Mr. G. C. Bhattacharya.

PROF. SOURENDRA BHATTACHARJEE (West Bengal): Sir, there is something which concerns me personally. It is a very uncharitable remark that has come from that side. I think only one side of the version has come before the House in this case . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI U. K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA): You can clarify it when you speak in your turn. Now, Mr. G. C. Bhattacharya.

**SHRI G. C. BHATTACHARYA** (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I stand to support the Motion. Mr. Ramamurti has raised the level of the debate and has posed a question. He has plainly said that the country is not ripe for socialism. I do not want to join issue with him. I am only reading out the Preamble to our Constitution which says: "We the people of India solemnly resolve to constitute India into a sovereign, socialist, democratic republic . . ." is not Mr. Ramamurti or his party or any party or any section of the people, true to the Preamble to the Constitution? This is the goal of every party. And that is the goal of the party to which I belong. May I tell him the only other path is the path of democratic revolution, national democratic revolution. Then what is the difference between you and us? If there is a path of national democratic revolution and you are also saying that you cannot see anything else—you are also in power in some States—this path being common, what is the difference. The difference is only one of emphasis on certain matters, not on basic issues.

[Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair]

Therefore, the call given by Mrs. Indira Gandhi that there should be a politics of conscience, instead of appreciating it, I am very sorry to say that the entire debate has been turned into indulgence in personal criticism. You decide today whether there is politics of consensus or politics of confrontation. If you think that the country can proceed on the path of confrontation even after this national, democratic revolution, I have serious doubts about that. Should we not respond to the call of the Prime Minister in favour of politics of consensus? If you keep that in mind, then we do not differ on fundamentals. We do not differ on basic issues. We should follow the path of consensus especially in the context of the rapidly developing world situation because of which the cold war has come to our

door step. Let us think seriously whether we should not respond to the call of Shrimati Indira Gandhi in the national interest. Many distortions that have taken place in the past have to be corrected. Let us examine the basic issues.

It has been stated in the Address that the Government will do its utmost to put down lawlessness and restore confidence amongst all people, especially those belonging to the weaker sections. This cannot be disputed. Then, the Address says that the Government would reaffirm its commitment to planning as an essential tool for engineering, social and economic changes. Can this be disputed? Similarly it is said in the Address that measures to control prices will be initiated and stringent action will be taken against anti-social elements such as smugglers, etc. How can there be any dispute on this? Then it is said that the 20-point economic programme will be revitalised and implemented. It is further said that the role of science and technology will be strengthened. There can be no differences on these basic issues. On these major issues distortions took place in the past. These have been corrected now. To start with, we can work together at least on these basic issues in cooperation. I do not think I am supporting everything which has been written here. I have certain reservations on some of the points. For instance, it is said that on the industrial front, emphasis will be laid on the rapid increase in industrial production through better utilisation of existing capacity. One must understand that 'existing capacity' is a very dangerous phrase. The 'existing capacity' includes also the capacity illegally developed beyond the licensing capacity. And this illegally raised capacity is in the very high profit sector, like drugs, chemicals etc. We have many multi-nationals in these sectors and we have many monopoly houses. The 'existing capacity' is a distortion. This is not in accordance with the manifesto of the party.

[Shri G. C. Bhattacharya]

The other point on which I do not quite agree is what it says about secularism. The main emphasis in this election so far as secularism is concerned is that if there is any communal riot full compensation for the loss of life and property should be given. This should have been mentioned in the Address. That will restore confidence in the minds of the minority communities. That would also be a deterrent. Even in riots taking place in other parts of the country like Assam and the north-eastern parts, if anybody loses life or property, there should be full compensation. Then, Sir, we are giving a call that the countries of the region should be allowed to devote their energies to the promotion of regional stability and co-operation with one another. Those days are gone. You are talking of the general stability. The whole world is so inter-connected today that talking of regional co-operation is only a partial truth; it is not the whole truth. We should be encourageous enough to say that we cannot have regional co-operation unless you have close links with those countries who will support your aspirations. What are the aspirations of these countries of this region? We are developing countries; our aspirations are one. We are natural allies. There are liberation movements and non-aligned countries. We should be very specific about this vital matter. Without their co-operation, without close links, we will not be able to .... (Time bell rings.) I am completing in five minutes, although I was given ten minutes.

Then it says: "...specially big powers". This is totally unacceptable to us. There are two big powers. How should they make this equation. There are two super powers. One is the group of socialist countries and another of imperialist countries. You are equating friends with foes—socialist countries and imperialist countries. This is also a distortion.

And this is also a departure from the manifesto issued at the time of the recent General Elections.

Then, Sir, I come to the Simla Agreement. I have no quarrel with this. But at the Islamic Conference they referred to Kashmir. Let us be very practical about it. The previous Government also tried for friendship and no quarrels. But friendship should not be taken as a sign of weakness. We should be vigilant about it also. Let us be very clear about it. Friendship should not be taken as weakness. Everything should be at par, on an equal footing.

Then, Sir, I am sorry to say that when the entire country says that there was aggression on Vietnam by China, we have mentioned that there is only a conflict. I cannot understand it. Even, unlike the Janata Government, we only say: "...affected by the Sino-Vietnam conflict". This has not been the policy of the Congress or this country. There is a clear evidence that China is the aggressor.

Then, so far as Kampuchea is concerned, our manifesto says that Kampuchea will be recognised. Their Government will be recognised. But we have not done it. That should have been the first act of this Government. But this has not been done. But we have said that we stand for Kampuchea being able to seek its own destiny free of outside pressure. In spite of demands, the previous Government too did not recognise Kampuchea. But in the Congress manifesto, the recognition of Kampuchea was specifically mentioned. But this has not been done. This is another distortion.

Then, we have mentioned that our relations with Japan and other countries of Europe are comprehensive in nature and are mutually satisfying... (Time bell rings) Japan has entered into a treaty with China recently, and immediately after that the Chinese were bold enough to attack Vietnam.



This American-Japan-China axis is not only dangerous for others only. This has got a particular bearing on our country. There is now an attempt to encircle India. Either you submit to Sino-American axis or you will be pressurised in every way. It may be North-Eastern region. It may be Kashmir. Or it may be our internal insurgent activities which are being abetted by China, America and British intelligence system. Therefore, when we talked of Japan, we should have mentioned the dangerous path which is being treated by Sino-Japanese-American imperialism against the developing countries of Asia and other part of the world. (*Time bell rings*) You will kindly recollect that we were given the assurance in this House by the previous Foreign Minister that there will be no more encouragement of insurgent activities from Bangladesh. But insurgent activities are going on. The North-eastern insurgents who are active in North-eastern region are being trained in Bangladesh. They are being supplied with arms and other materials. The insurgent movement has got strength from that country itself. There is another point about the agreement. Even at that time we opposed the agreement. It is detrimental to the interests of our country. It will kill the Calcutta Port completely. I earnestly hope that the Government will take notice of it and correct the distortions.

**SHRI SANKAR GHOSE** (West Bengal): Sir, the President's Address has mentioned that the law and order will be restored, prices brought down, planning emphasised, public sector strengthened and international relations improved. These are good things. I support this. But Sir, what we had expected is some concrete programme of the Government, some direction in which the economy can move. The Government has come with a very massive mandate so far as Lok Sabha is concerned. It is not a coalition Government. It can implement its promises if it chooses.

One of the most difficult problems before the country today is the question of unemployment. I would have expected that in the President's Address, the question unemployment would have found a place of pride and some concrete programme would have been there to solve this problem of unemployment. Sir, it is said that the programme will come later in the budget. The Government has come only recently. The budget will come after two months. The ruling party which has come to power had, in its election manifesto, made certain concrete promises to the people. There were certain promises which were very salutary and which were welcome to all the parties in this House. In regard to unemployment, it was mentioned that at least one person from each family will be provided with employment. This was a very very good declaration. It was further mentioned that, if necessary, the Constitution itself will be amended to ensure that at least one person from each family gets employment. To implement this, if you wait for the budget for another two months, this will get delayed. In order to ensure that at least one person in each family gets employment, we have to orient our planning policy, our economic policy, our banking policy, our administrative approach, our relationship with the entrepreneurs and everyone. And this requires a co-ordinated effort. And I hope that when there is a reply from the side of the Government, they will give a categorical assurance here and now that this promise which was made to the electorate will be implemented. I should have expected that one of the very first concerns of the Cabinet would have been to consider the promises that were made to the electorate and to ensure that they are fulfilled. I can assure the Government that if they come with that declaration that at least one member in each family will get employment, every party in this House will support the Government. Let it not be said that the election manifesto of the

[Shri Sankar Ghose]

ruling party requires another scrutiny. Let it not happen that the election manifesto becomes the first casualty of the President's Address. Sir, this is on the economic question.

Sir, in the election manifesto it was said that a special peace-keeping force will be organised, drawn from the minorities, from the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes to ensure that the communal violence is contained and the communal disturbances are contained. This is again a very good declaration. I should have expected that in the President's Address. This declaration would have been reflected, the President would have said that we will have a peace-keeping force and the entire country would have welcomed that proposal.

Sir, the third thing I wish to mention is about the floods and the drought, the natural disasters that are taking place throughout the country. There was a widespread feeling that in spite of what the last Finance Commission have done, the amounts provided for meeting these natural calamities are not sufficient. And in the election manifesto of the ruling party, there was a clear promise and a clear declaration that a Commission would be set up with a corpus of funds to meet these national disasters. This is again a very salutary thing and I should have expected that the President's Address would have contained this.

Sir, I have mentioned three points. I have mentioned about the employment of one person in each family; I have mentioned about the peace-keeping force, drawn from the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and the minorities; and I have mentioned about a Commission with a corpus of funds to deal with natural disasters. There are other things mentioned in the election manifesto too. There is the School health programme and the mid-day meal programme. It is mentioned that this

programme will be expanded so as to cover all the children within a period of five years. This was a specific, concrete programme and a concrete assurance, an electoral pledge given to the people. I hope even now the Government will repeat that pledge, that it will not be a party pledge, that it will be a governmental pledge and an assurance to the nation at large that within a period of five years all children will be covered by the school health programme and the mid-day meal programme. These four pledges were made in the election manifesto of the ruling party which has set up not a coalition Government but a Government with massive mandate. I wish all these four are implemented.

Sir, in the election manifesto, it was also mentioned that within a period of five years drinking water will be supplied to all needy villages. Can there be any dispute on this matter? Will any Member of the House oppose that? If the President had mentioned, "yes, this is the pledge of the Government, this was an electoral pledge of the ruling party and now this is the pledge of the Government," the entire House would have welcomed it. I wish even now that the Government will give an assurance that this pledge which they have given to the people will be implemented. This is the fifth item from the election manifesto and I wish they give a definite assurance.

Sir, the sixth item in the election manifesto concerns the teachers, the teachers who build up the future generation, that is the students who are the builders of the new India. Sir, the teachers have various problems. The election manifesto specifically stated that a National Commission on teachers will be set up to look after their emoluments, to look after their conditions and to look after what they require so that the teachers can play a more effective role in the educational process.

Here again this is an urgent need and I wish that the Government comes forward with a clear assurance on that on that.

(Time bell rings)

Sir, so far as the election manifesto is concerned, there was declaration contained in it that the minority character of the Aligarh University will be restored. That was a good declaration. I find that it has been reflected in the President's Address. But I am sorry to say that all the other declarations regarding unemployment, regarding drinking water, regarding teachers, regarding school children and regarding natural disasters, they do not find any reflection in the President's Address. There is still time for the Government to make up its mind and come forward with those declarations. I hope that the promises and pledges given to the electorate will not now go before a Secretaries Committee or sub-committee which will cause further delay and further processing and prevent them from being implemented at all. If it was a coalition Government, it was a different thing. But it is one-party Government having a massive mandate, which has come to power on the basis of certain pledges given to the people and I hope that these pledges will be fulfilled. This much about our social and economic problems.

Now, in the election manifesto there was also a pledge given that the Revolutionary Government of Kampuchea will be recognised, the Heng Samrin Government will be recognised. We know what the Pol Pot regime has done. We know the atrocities that had taken place. The recognition of a Government is, however, not based on whether we like the system of Government in other countries but on whether the Government has control. We know that the revolutionary Government is in full control of Kampuchea.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please wind up now.

SHRI SANKAR GHOSE: We have seen the statement that the Prime Minister made to the foreign journalists to the effect that the Revolutionary Government is in full control of Kampuchea and therefore that has to be recognised. I am mentioning all these things because the Government can do these things, if it has the will and the desire. I hope that its energies are not devoted only to the question of defection, to the question of possible dissolution of State Assemblies to the question of destabilisation of State Assemblies. These three Ds. defection, dissolution and destabilisation, which were not mentioned in the election manifesto should not have priority in Government's policies over those policies which were mentioned therein.

Sir, so far as the question of stable Governments is concerned, stability is assured not merely by winning an election. Stability can be assured by solving the economic problems. Therefore, if the question of unemployment is solved, if the pledges that have been given are fulfilled there will be stability. But I am sorry to say that many of those pledges are not even reflected in the President's Address. Therefore, I appeal to the Government in power that the specific points which have been mentioned in the election manifesto should be implemented. The election manifesto should not be the first casualty after the election has taken place. These are sacred pledges given to the people. They should be implemented in the spirit of national consensus and goodwill.

SHRI KHYOMO LOTHIA (Nagaland): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, at the outset, I would like to congratulate the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi and her colleagues for winning the election. Through this, we know that the people of India have become politically conscious. We have seen what has happened

[Shri Khyomo Lotha]

in 1977 when due to emergency excesses people were angry and they voted the Janata Party into power. But due to our own mistakes and quarrels within the party leaders the Janata Government could not function properly as a result of which we have seen that the people have voted Mrs. Indira Gandhi into power once again. But I must tell the ruling party that they cannot take the people of India for granted. It is not a licence to do as they like, as we discussed yesterday morning as to how things are turning to. We discussed the arrest of one very senior civil officer. I hope 1976 will not be repeated. I am quite sure that the people have faith in the democratic and Parliamentary system of Government and that was one of the reasons for the victory of the Congress-I in the elections. As some of their own members said while moving the motion on the President's Address, it is an act of God. It is an act of God and I do believe in it, to save secularism of this democratic country. Unfortunately, the Janata party, especially one of the members who moved the Freedom of Religion Bill, brought about a lot of agitation in the minds of the religious people in this country and we too were very much agitated. And even as an associate member of the ruling party we had to come out openly to oppose this Bill. It was a most embarrassing situation for us and many of us prayed, especially in the north-eastern region Christians and others, that only God could come to their rescue because this Bill was not only to suppress the Christians and other minorities, it was going to break the nation, the integrity of the nation. Therefore, I believe that it is an act of God. At the same time, I feel that what has been given to us by God, we must utilise it properly. And I do believe that the ruling party would have learnt enough lessons and would look to the welfare of the people.

Now I come to the problems in the north-eastern region. We have discussed at length as to what is happening in the north-eastern region, particularly in Assam. Our colleagues have said time and again that what is happening at present in Assam is because of presence of foreign nationals in that State. And I, as a member from this region, say that there are foreign nationals who have infiltrated into this region not only in Assam but also in the neighbouring States, and this is agitating the minds of the people. The movement led by students in Assam and other organisations, rightly expressed in a peaceful manner, their demand that the names of these foreign nationals should not be included in the electoral rolls. The caretaker Government should have taken care of it. I personally also sent a telegram on this issue, and I do not know whether it is proper on my part to say so, that the Chief Election Commissioner should have taken a strong position in this matter. In that case this agitation would not have occurred. It is true that many unfortunate incidents took place, including loss of life and damage to property but in such movements, these things do happen and some innocent people also suffer. We are all sorry for that. But it is clear that there are foreign nationals and their names have to be removed from the electoral rolls. Now when the Prime Minister discusses this problem with student leaders, and if a system is evolved to remove these foreign nationals, the same should apply throughout the region, not in Assam only. Sir, I call this movement headless movement. It is only the egg; and the egg is not yet hatched. If a solution of this problem is delayed, it will take another shape. Sir, as you know, in the north-eastern region, in Nagaland, the secession movement was started way back in 1946-47 and the problem is yet to be solved. Although there was an Agreement which came into being on 11th November, 1973, and which was signed by the under-

ground Naga leaders and the representatives of the Government of India in the person of the Governor of Nagaland, for the solution of these Naga problems, yet this question has to be finally settled. I would like our Prime Minister in whose regime this Agreement came into being, to finally solve this problem.

There are also the Mizo problems. The MNF leader who had more or less agreed to settle this issue within the framework of the Indian Constitution was brought over here in 1976, but unfortunately, during the Janata regime this case was handled in a wrong way. This has provoked the masses in the Mizo hills and a lot of violence took place. I am sure Mrs. Gandhi knows more about this problem because Shri Lal Danga was brought over here during her time. I would urge upon the Prime Minister to solve this problem without delay.

There are certain other aspects so far as the problems concerning the North Eastern region are concerned. I would like to point out for the benefit of the Government and this House that there are people who are fighting for secession, there are other groups who are very much doubtful of the genuine interests of the Central Government as to whether they take this North Eastern region as part of the great country or not. This is because in 1947 when the partition was to take place, at that time this North Eastern region, their Assam—was nearly given away to Pakistan. Again, as my own colleague in the last session pointed out, during the Chinese aggression also the entire North Eastern region was nearly given away. A hopeless message was broadcast to the people of the North Eastern region by the then Prime Minister. This has created doubts in the minds of the young people. (*Time bell rings*). The other aspect of the problem is the presence of foreigners in this region. Added to this there is unemployment. Educated youths, who have nothing to do, are very much worried about

their future and because of the influx of the foreigners the politicians are worried about their future. The sons of the soil are worried about their political rights. This has been brought to light in the form of this agitation which is peaceful at present, but as I said, once the egg is hatched it will become more serious. The movement similar to Assam may spread in Nagaland, Mizoram and Manipur. Then the entire Eastern region will be very badly affected. (*Time bell rings*). There is one more thing to which I would like to draw the attention of the Central Government. There is a prediction of a very serious earthquake which may occur within three years. It might occur 20th February this year itself. The prediction has been made by the scientists. I want the Central Government to go into this because this has created fear in the minds of the people. Sir, it is a very serious thing for the people living in the North Eastern region. The State Government is taken certain measures, but I would like the Central Government also to go into this and and out . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is all right. Yes, Mr. Ramanand Yadav.

SHRI KHYOMO LOTH: Let me wind up at least.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have taken such a long time. Yes, Shri Yadav.

श्री रामानन्द यादव (बिहार) : उप-सभापति जी, मैं अंतुले साहब ने राष्ट्रपति महोदय अभिभाषण पर जो धन्यवाद का प्रस्ताव उपस्थित किया है, इस सदन के सामने, उसका समर्थन करने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ। उपसभापति जी, राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में बड़ी ही अच्छी बातों की चर्चा की गई है जो कि शासक पक्ष और विरोधी पक्ष दोनों तरफ के लोगों के लिये सचमुच प्रशंसनीय

[श्री रामानन्द यादव]

है। उसमें जो सुझाव आये हैं वे सराहनीय हैं। उपसभापति जी, आप जानते हैं कि इस देश में न्याय पाना जो है वह बहुत महंगा हो गया है। गरीब तबके के लोगों के पास इतना पैसा नहीं है कि वह न्याय प्राप्त कर सके। यह बात ठीक है कि न्याय के अधिकार की स्वतंत्रता की चर्चा इसमें है लेकिन इस बात की चर्चा नहीं है कि न्याय को कितना सस्ता बनाया जाय, किस तरह से सस्ता बनाया जाय ताकि गरीब तबके के लोग कम पैसों में मुकदमों की पैरवी कर सकें और न वकीलों की फीस घटाने की इसमें चर्चा है। इस बात की चर्चा जरूर है कि भगवती कमेटी की जो रिपोर्ट है उसको लागू किया जाय। जब जनता पार्टी की सरकार थी तो कई दफा हम लोगों ने प्रश्न किया था कि भगवती कमेटी की जो रिपोर्ट है उसको लागू क्यों नहीं किया जा रहा है। लेकिन जनता पार्टी की सरकार ने उस कमेटी की रिपोर्ट को लागू नहीं किया। यह खुशी की बात है कि राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में इस बात की चर्चा की गई है कि न्यायालयों को सस्ता बनाया जायेगा और जल्द से जल्द न्याय दिलाने और उचित न्याय दिलाने की व्यवस्था की जायेगी।

उपसभापति महोदय, राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में किसानों द्वारा पैदा की जाने वाली जो चीजें हैं, जो क्राप्स हैं, उनकी रेम्युनरेटिव प्राइस देने की चर्चा इसमें है। लेकिन एक बात जरूर मैं कहूंगा कि जनता पार्टी के राज में इस देश में ईख के जो काश्तकार थे, उनकी ईख का पैसा, जो उन्होंने मिल मालिकों को सप्लाई किया था, आज उसका करीब दो सौ करोड़ रुपया मिल मालिकों के पास बाकी पड़ा हुआ है। उसका पिछले दो वर्षों से आज तक पेमेन्ट नहीं हो सका है। अच्छा होता यदि इसकी चर्चा इसमें होती। लेकिन इसकी चर्चा इस अभिभाषण में नहीं है कि ईख के काश्तकारों का मिल वालों के पास जो पैसा बाकी है उसको

चुक्ता कराया जायेगा। मैं ऐसा सोचता था कि किसानों की बात करने वाले चौधरी चरण सिंह जी की सरकार इस बारे में कुछ कदम उठायेगी लेकिन दुख की बात है कि उन्होंने इस बारे में कोई कदम नहीं उठाया। राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में इस बात की चर्चा है कि किसानों की जो तकलीफें हैं उनकी तरफ सरकार ध्यान देगी और उस पर कार्यवाही की जायेगी।

उपसभापति जी, जब से जनता पार्टी की सरकार इस देश में आई, जितनी पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग्स थी, वे सारे की सारी घाटे में रन करने लगी। इस बारे में स्टील प्रोजेक्ट्स जो हैं उनकी तरफ मैं आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूं। स्टील प्लान्ट्स जब कांग्रेस की रिजीम थी, तो उनके पास कोयला दो-दो महीने का इकट्ठा रहता था लेकिन जनता पार्टी के आते ही ऐसा भी समय आया था जब कि केवल एक दिन के लिये कोयला भिलाई के पास, रुरकेला के पास और बोकारो के पास रह गया था। उनके शासन काल में कोयले की पैदावार में कमी आई, फूड ग्रेन प्रोडक्शन में घाटा—और स्टील प्लान्ट में प्रोडक्शन घटा, आपकी टैक्सटाइल कारपोरेशन में उत्पादन घटा। हर चीज की पैदावार में गिरावट आई थी और वे सब घाटे में रन करने लगे। राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण में इस बात की चर्चा की गई है कि सरकार का ध्यान इस तरफ जायेगा और ये जो घाटे में रन करने वाले प्रोजेक्ट्स हैं, पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग्स हैं इसमें ठीक से सुधार किया जायेगा और इसको सुचारुरूप से चलाने की व्यवस्था की जायेगी।

उपसभापति जी, आपने देखा कि जनता पार्टी जब जीती और जीतने के बाद इस जनता पार्टी ने सबसे पहला काम यह किया, जो कि अन-डेमोक्रेटिक था कि उन्होंने अपने तमाम विरोधियों के ऊपर कमीशन बिठा दिये। श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी जो कि देश की प्राइम-मिनिस्टर थी और हार गई थी, जिन्होंने कि आर्डर दिया था चुनाव कराने के लिये और

जिसके कारण जनता पार्टी और दूसरे दल के लोगों को बहुमत मिला और कांग्रेस पार्टी हार गई, उनके ऊपर कमीशन बिठाये गये। हारने के बाद विरोधी दल के नेता के ऊपर जो कि कभी प्राइम-मिनिस्टर रह चुका हो इस तरह के केस, कान्काक्टर्ड केस बनाकर शुरू किये गये और इस तरह से जनता पार्टी के लोगों ने अनेकों कमीशन, प्रान्तों में जो कांग्रेस के मुख्य मंत्री उन सभी पर कमीशन, इंदिरा जी पर कमीशन और इंदिरा जी के बेटे पर कमीशन, उनके और सगे-संबंधियों पर कमीशन बिठाये। इस पार्टी ने यही काम किया कि कांग्रेस वालों को परेशान करो। राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में इस बात की चर्चा नहीं है कि यह कमीशन सारे के सारे स्केप कर दिए जाएं। मैं तो चाहता था कि राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में इन कमीशनों को स्केप कर देने की चर्चा होती तो बड़ी अच्छी बात होती। जब जनता पार्टी का शासन था तो हरिजनों पर बहुत अत्याचार हुए। विरोध पक्ष के माननीय सदस्य बोल रहे थे और हरिजनों की सुविधा की बात तथा उन पर अत्याचारों की बात कर रहे थे तो मुझे हंसी आ रही थी। मुझे याद है जैसे ही जनता पार्टी शासन में आई उसके 10 दिन के बाद बेलछी में 11 आदमियों को जिंदा जला दिया गया। धर्मपुरा, पथरीडीह, बेगुमराय बनारस में हरिजनों पर अत्याचार हुए। आगरा में जाटवों पर अत्याचार हुए जिसको लेकर हमारे मौर्य साहब को काल अटेंशन मोशन प्रस्तुत करना पड़ा था। मुझे बेहद खुशी है कि राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में यह चर्चा की गई है कि हरिजनों को सुख सुविधाएं और उन पर जो अत्याचार होते हैं उनसे रक्षा के लिए सरकार ध्यान देगी। एक साहेबान उधर से बोल रहे थे, मुसलमानों के संबंध में चर्चा कर रहे थे। उन्होंने यह कहा कि मुसलमानों ने कांग्रेस (आई) को वोट नहीं दिया। लेकिन वे भ्रम में हैं। उन्होंने ऐसी 62 कांस्टीट्यूंसीज की चर्चा की और कहा कि आपको इतने वोट मिले लेकिन उन्होंने

यह नहीं बताया कि जनता पार्टी को अलग-अलग कितने वोट मिले, लोक दल को कितने वोट मिले, सी० पी० आई०, सी० पी० आई० (एम०) को कितने वोट मिले क्योंकि वे प्वाइंट्स उनके खिलाफ जाते थे। मुसलमानों के ऊपर जनता राज में इतने दंगे हुए और इतनी अधिक संख्या में लोग मारे गए जिसकी कोई इंतहा नहीं है। मैं आपको मरने वालों के आंकड़े नहीं दे लेकता सूकिन कांग्रेस पार्टी के 30 वर्षों के प्रशासन में जितने लोग नहीं मारे गए थे उतने मुसलमान लोकदल और जनता पार्टी के शासन काल में मारे गए हैं बल्कि उससे भी पांच गुना मारे गए हैं। उप-सभापति महोदय, आप देखें कि जब कांग्रेस पार्टी का शासन होता था तो दंगे तब भी होते थे लेकिन वे क्षणिक होते थे। उनमें मशीनरी इनवालाव नहीं होती थी, मिनिस्टर इनवालाव नहीं होते थे। एक दो दिन में दंगे समाप्त हो जाते थे। लेकिन जनता पार्टी के राज में अलीगढ़ का दंगा महीनों महीनों चलता रहा, टाटा का दंगा महीनों महीनों चलता रहा। इसी तरह से मुसलमानों के ऊपर अत्याचार होते रहे। राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में इस बात की चर्चा की गई है कि माइनार्टी के हकों की रक्षा की जाएगी। दंगों को कड़ाई के साथ दबाने की व्यवस्था की जाएगी। जनता पार्टी जैसे ही शासन में आई सब से पहला अनडेमोक्रेटिक जो काम उसने किया वह यह था कि इयूनी कांस्टीट्यूटेड जिनका संवैधानिक रूप से कार्यकाल अभी था, 9 कांग्रेसी मंत्रिमण्डलों को एक पेन के द्वारा खत्म कर दिया गया। कैबिनेट की बैठक हुई, चौधरी चरण सिंह ने प्रस्ताव पेश किया कि इन विधान सभाओं को खत्म कर दिया जाए। चौधरी चरण सिंह ने पत्र लिख कर कांग्रेसी मुख्य मंत्रियों को लिखा कि आप इस्तीफा दे दें और विधान सभा भंग कर दें। लेकिन मुख्य मंत्रियों ने लिखा कि हम इस्तीफा नहीं देंगे। चौधरी चरण सिंह ने सभी मंत्रिमण्डलों जिनमें उत्तर प्रदेश और उड़ीसा के मंत्रिमण्डल जिनको बने अभी दो

[ श्री रामानन्द दादव ]

साल हुए थे उनको भी एक ही साथ खत्म कर दिया। कोर्ट के फैसले हुए, कोर्टने भी कहा। कुछ वकीलों ने सुप्रीम कोर्ट में अपील की। सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने कहा कि गवर्नमेंट को अधिकार है लेकिन डिसमिस करने से पहले यह चाहिए था कि गृह मंत्री गवर्नमेंटों से रिपोर्ट मांग लेते लेकिन जनता पार्टी की सरकार ने गवर्नमेंटों से रिपोर्ट मांगने तक का इंतजार नहीं किया। मैं तो चाहूंगा कि राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में इस बात की चर्चा होनी चाहिए थी कि यह जो चैर कांग्रेस सरकारें हैं, हरियाणा की, पंजाब की तमिलनाडु की, मध्य प्रदेश, बिहार, उड़ीसा (Interruptions). . . अब मुझे कहने दीजिए या आप ही कहेंगे। मैं नाम दे रहा हूँ. (Interruptions) उपसभापति जी, मैं चाहूंगा कि इन सरकारों की इस चर्चा होनी चाहिये थी कि इनको स्क्रैप कर दिया जाय। इसलिए कि अगर केन्द्र से और राज्य से कंफ्रेंशन होगा तो इस देश का विकास नहीं हो सकेगा, काम ठीक से नहीं चल सकेगा, फिर वही रवैया उत्पन्न होगा जो पहले था। काम भी ठीक से नहीं होगा, डेवलपमेंट का काम ठीक से नहीं होगा, प्रशासन ठीक से नहीं चलेगा और भारत सरकार जो आज है वह कोई अगर अपनी पालिसी या प्रोग्राम कराना चाहेगी तो वह नहीं करा सकेगी। इसलिए मैं चाहूंगा कि इन सरकारों को जल्दी से जल्दी स्क्रैप कर देना चाहिये।

एक बात की चर्चा और कहूंगा कि पिछड़ी जातियों की बात करने वाले हमारे लोकदल को लोग जो यहां बैठे हुये हैं, मैं वर्मा जी से सुन रहा था कि काका कालेलकर कमीशन के रिकमेंडेशन को कांग्रेस पार्टी ने कार्यान्वित नहीं किया। मैं पूछता हूँ कि चरणसिंह पिछड़ी जातियों का नारा देकर चारों तरफ इस देश में घूम घूम कर बोट मांगते हैं और वर्मा जी आपको याद होगा कि आपने भी कहा था कि रिकमेंडे-

शन का कार्यान्वयन होना चाहिए था तो क्यों नहीं चौधरी चरण सिंह ने, जब वे प्रधान मंत्री थे उसको किया। उन्हें चाहिए था कि वे काका कालेलकर कमीशन की रिकमेंडेशन को इम्प्लीमेंट करते। लेकिन बोट के ख्याल से केवल यह प्रक्रिया अपनायी गयी। चूँकि वे बोट लेना चाहते थे इसलिए पिछड़ी जातियों का नारा दिया। मुझे खुशी है कि पिछड़ी जातियों को, हरिजनों को, मुसलमानों को सुविधाएं प्रदान करने के लिए राष्ट्रपति ने भाषण में बड़ी चर्चा की है। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं आपको धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि आपने मुझे समय दिया।

SHRI AMARPROSAD CHAKRABORTY (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, at the very outset I want to remind the present Government that the day on which both the Houses of Parliament assembled, the 23rd of January, was the birthday of Netaji Subash Chandra Bose. From the Committee of I.N.A. and from my party, we made a representation—Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru had been President of the Committee—demanding a national holiday on the birthday of Netaji Subash Chandra Bose. But in spite of declaring a holiday on that day, the two Houses assembled on that day and the President's Address does not mention anywhere, even as a matter of courtesy, the name of Netaji Subash Chandra Bose, a national leader. Nowhere is it mentioned. Sir, I would only point out one thing. I think you have gone through the book "Last Years of British India", by Michael Edward: He says the transfer of power in 1947 was effected because of infiltration of patriotism in the army and so the British Government was forced to transfer power to the then Congress. And that was due to the mass action of Bapuji and also of the activities of revolutionaries and of the INA led by Netaji Subash Chandra Bose. On that day the President nowhere mentions it in his Address nor did the Government, which had been ruling for the



last 30 years, declare it a national holiday, the birthday of Netaji Subash Chandra Bose. So before I start, I must mention it because it is a long-standing demand; we have been demanding it every year. Now we are so frustrated seeing the attitude of this Government in not declaring this day as a national holiday.

6 P.M.

Secondly, Sir, I would like to say regarding the first paragraph of the President's Address. Many things have been said. I am not entering into details. Now a massive mandate has been given in favour of Mrs. Gandhi, in favour of Congress I. That is the analysis of different groups and different parties. But it is an admitted fact that because of the infight, because of frustration, because of their anger, the people cast their vote in favour of Congress I. But you will find there was no such thing in West Bengal, in Kerala, in Tripura. In spite of their attempts, the people have rejected the ruling party. The next point is the President has said in his Address that we are looking forward to a stable Government. I am apprehensive very much of this term 'stable Government'. There was a stable Government, there was a two-thirds majority, even after 1971. But what happened at that time? For twenty-eight times different State Governments were changed with that majority. The Government had to take recourse to issuance of MISA and promulgation of Emergency to keep this Government stable and the State Government, toppling. This is a stable Government but for what? For what purpose? I am afraid the hopes of the people who have returned this so-called stable Government will be belied. A stable Government has to take progressive measures. You go through the Reserve Bank statistics. For want of time I will not quote them. The Reserve Bank statistics show that during that period only 20 families of India have become richer and richer and the poor have become poorer and poorer. So while that

Government went on giving slogans for weaker sections, the poorer sections, the labourers, the peasants, we have in fact not seen any improvement in their lot for 30 years when they were in power. We have statistics given by the Reserve Bank and other authorities. For want of time I cannot cite them all here. It is an admitted fact that only capitalist groups only 20 families, are ruling India through this Government. And the poor people have not been given any relief whatsoever from this Government. In the President's Address there is no mention of any comprehensive economic programme. We have the unemployment problem, the labour problem, the problem of peasantry. None of these problems has been mentioned. Our experience of the last 30 years shows that we will only be frustrated again and again and again our hopes will be belied.

Regarding Assam you have heard many friends say one-sided things. I can tell you if the problem in Assam is not tackled firmly, the situation may lead to disintegration. Who are they to decide who are foreigners and who are not? The people in Aliporedwar came from Assam and have been living there in Assam for generations and generations. The people in Naxalbari camp also have been living for generations and generations in Assam. They have been living there for generations and generations. The man from Bihar, the man from UP, the man from Nepal, the man from Bengal, everybody has been described as a foreigner. Who has given them that right... (Interruptions).

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI (Assam): Sir, may I say with all humility that statements of this kind create more complications? May I ask the honourable Member to withdraw such remarks?

SHRI AMARPROSAD CHAKRABORTY: The Chief Secretary sent officers to Aliporedwar and Naxalbari and they gave reports that would show that the Chief Minister of West

[Shri Amarprosad Chakraborty]

Bengal said rightly that they have come due to fear and torture. (*Interruptions*). There are loots, arsons and rapes. Horrible circumstances have been created there. Now we are hearing the amusing statement that they are foreigners. Sir, there are some laws. Let them go to the courts and let them decide who are foreigners. They had sent telegrams to the Central Government and the Caretaker Government. They could not tackle it. I would request the Government to do something. Otherwise, the country will disintegrate. Tomorrow some State will say: You come from Bihar, you come from Uttar Pradesh, you come from Madhya Pradesh. You are living in our province. You are all foreigners...

SHRI AJIT KUMAR SHARMA: Mr. Jyoti Basu has made a statement—I can read it—that if you come from Pakistan, I can allow you, but if you come from any other part of this country, I shall not allow you.. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: I am only appealing to you.. (*Interruptions*). I will appeal to my friends not to make speeches which will further complicate the situation. We want Assam problem to be solved.

SHRI AMARPROSAD CHAKRABORTY: The Prime Minister is here. She should settle the problem.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please resume your seat. You have made your point.

SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY (West Bengal): Mr. Chakraborty just now said that there are people in Alipur who have taken shelter in the camps. They are Bengalis and have come away from Assam first away from their hearth and homes. To say that we cannot even mention it here is very unfortunate. Yesterday I gave certain instance not only of Bengalis, but even

Muslims. The Jamat-e-Ulema General Secretary is here. He came with the document...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is no time. Please resume your seat.

SHRI AMARPROSAD CHAKRABORTY: I will put only one question to our friends who are very vocal. Who killed Mr. Rabi Moitra.. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: I would again request.. (*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please resume your seat. There is no time.

SHRI AMARPROSAD CHAKRABORTY: Who did it I can give evidence.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: You are permitting him again.

SHRI AMARPROSAD CHAKRABORTY: I have only one more request to make. I have rather an amendment. I say that there must be a categorical statement from the Prime Minister that there should not be any dissolution of any Assembly in any State. This is my amendment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have made your point.

SHRI AMARPROSAD CHAKRABORTY: For want of time, due to shortage of time, I conclude my speech with these observations.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Harekrushna Mallick. Five minutes.

SHRI HAREKRUSHNA MALLICK (Orissa): Mr. Vice-Chairman, while opposing the Motion of Thanks, I want to say at the outset that on page 1, in paragraph 2, of his Address, the President has failed to dilate upon how the previous Lok Sabha was dissolved. I mention particularly in that context that a fellow citizen who is occupying the highest office of the land has played a partisan role in telling in public that 'I am not interested

in Ayarams and Gayarams.' But actually he proved that he was not interested in one Ram and that is Shri Jagjivan Ram. Then, I may say that Mr. Jagjivan Ram was denied an opportunity to prove his majority before the House. He was the Leader of the Opposition. His claim was not conceded, to form a Government. He was denied a chance.

Then, the Government was carried on without a Lok Sabha. There may not be a Lok Sabha, but Rajya Sabha was also a part of Parliament. There were many occasions of necessities when the Rajya Sabha should have been summoned. Not only I, but many hon. Members had demanded this, including Shri Bhishma Narain Singh, who is a Member on that side. There were many problems to be discussed such as the drought, and more so, the situation in Iran and Afghanistan. We could have summoned the Rajya Sabha. Now, I feel that since there was to be a move for the impeachment of the President, the President was afraid to summon this esteemed House.

Another point. In 1973, the Government dissolved some Assemblies in the same style as in 1970. The Lok Sabha was also dissolved on the advice of a minority Government. Last year also, the Lok Sabha was dissolved in the same manner. Therefore, I demand that we should see that the actions of the President and Governors should either be justiciable in a court of law or should be left to be discussed in the House itself... (Time bell rings).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your time is up. Mr. Maurya... (Interruptions).

श्री बुद्ध प्रिय सौर्य (आंध्र प्रदेश) :  
आदरणीय उपसभापति जी, मैं आपका आभारी हूँ कि आपने मुझे बोलने के लिए 5 मिनट दिए हैं। मैं 5 मिनट से एक क्षण भी ज्यादा नहीं लूंगा। राष्ट्रपति जी

के अभिभाषण का विरोध तो मैं नहीं कर सकता क्योंकि सदन की यह परम्परा नहीं रही है कि राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण का विरोध किया जाय, मैं आडवानी जी को याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि जब उनकी सरकार थी और मैं उधर बैठा था और जब उन्होंने सदन की परम्परा को गिराया था और इस सदन के एक प्रस्ताव का सम्मान नहीं किया था यह कह कर कि इस सदन के प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार इसलिए नहीं किया जा सकता कि वह एक प्रकार से अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव है, उस समय भी हमने राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण पर वोट नहीं किया था, विरोध नहीं किया था, उसको दबाया नहीं था। इसलिए मैं उनसे प्रार्थना करूँगा कि जो बात भी राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण में नहीं आयी है उसके बारे में मुझे भी खेद है। श्रीमन्, मुझे खेद है कि राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण में जो लोग इस देश में गरीबी की रेखा के नीचे रह रहे हैं उनके बारे में कोई जिक्र नहीं है। बेलची का हत्या कांड जिसमें वहाँ के जमींदारों ने 12 से ज्यादा मजदूरों को जिन्दा जलाकर मार दिया था उसका इसमें जिक्र नहीं है। आगरा में जहाँ पीएसी ने और पुलिस ने, उनके सिपाहियों ने निहत्थे लोगों को गोली से मार दिया था, पन्त नगर में यूनिवर्सिटी के मजदूरों को जिन्होंने जान से मार डाला था, मराठवाड़ा में जहाँ अम्बेदकर यूनिवर्सिटी के नाम पर लोगों को मारा गया उनके बारे में उनकी कुंठा के बारे में उनकी निन्दा के बारे में एक शब्द भी राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण में नहीं रखा गया है। मैं समझता हूँ कि उसके बारे में जिक्र आना चाहिये था। श्रीमन्, मैं यह भी निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इस बीसवीं शताब्दी में जब कि दुनिया के लोग बहुत ज्यादा आगे जा रहे हैं शोषित समाज के लोगों को खास तौर से पश्चिमी उत्तर प्रदेश में इस चुनाव में वोट डालने

[श्री बुद्ध प्रिय मोयं]

नहीं दिया गया। इस बात का भी इसमें कहीं जिक्र नहीं है। जुडिशियरी के बारे में राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने अभिभाषण के पैरा 19 में कहा है। उन्होंने चाहा है कि न्याय मिलने में देर नहीं लगनी चाहिये और किसी नागरिक को न्याय पाने से वंचित नहीं किया जाएगा, लेकिन मुझे खेद है कि राष्ट्रपति जी ने उसमें शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट और शेड्यूल्ड ट्राइब्स के बारे में कुछ नहीं कहा : जैसा कि मैंने संविधान संशोधन पर बोलते समय कहा था कि इस देश में एक भी जिले का डिस्ट्रिक्ट जज शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट या शेड्यूल्ड ट्राइब्स का नहीं है। सिर्फ एक जिला है जिसमें इस वर्ग का एक जज है पूरे देश में और इस देश में 300 से ऊपर हाई कोर्ट के जज हैं उनमें से केवल शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट के चार जज हैं और शेड्यूल्ड ट्राइब्स का तो एक भी नहीं है। सुप्रीम कोर्ट में एक भी जज शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट का नहीं है। यह कैसी बिडम्बना है कि आपको शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट के कानून मंत्री मिल जाते हैं, लेकिन एक डिस्ट्रिक्ट जज नहीं मिल पाता। यह कैसी बिडम्बना है कि आपको डिफेंस मिनिस्टर मिल जाते हैं लेकिन शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट का एक संतरी, बन्दूक उठाने वाला नहीं मिलता। इसका जिक्र भी राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में होना चाहिये था।

श्रीमन्, कपल्सरी और फ्री एजुकेशन के बा में हमारे संविधान का 45वां अनुच्छेद कहता है कि यह काम 10 साल में पूरा कर दिया जाएगा। डाइरेक्टिव प्रिंसिपल्स आफ स्टेट पालिसी दिशा देते हैं सरकार को, चाहे कोई भी सरकार हो, वह पूरा करे। दस साल में यह काम पूरा करना था अगर 10 साल में 14 साल तक के बच्चों को निःशुल्क और अनिवार्य शिक्षा दी जाती है तो शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट और शेड्यूल्ड ट्राइब्स

के लिए संरक्षण की बात जो आज कही जाती है वह उसकी जरूरत नहीं पड़ती। इसका जिक्र भी राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में नहीं आया है।

बेकारी की समस्या को लेकर और खास कर पब्लिक डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन के सवाल को लेकर 1971 में चुनाव आदरणीय इंदिरा जी के नेतृत्व में लड़ा गया था। जनता ने वोट दिया था उसके समर्थन में, लेकिन मुझे अफसोस है कि उसका भी कोई जिक्र, कि पब्लिक डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन सिस्टम की कोई व्यवस्था होगी ताकि शोषित समाज के लिए दुखी समाज के लिए जो दूसरों के मुकाबले में नहीं खरीद सकते हैं, उनके लिए सुविधा मिल सके, राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में नहीं है।

श्रीमन्, इस वजह से भी मैं यहां पर खेद प्रकट करना चाहता हूं कि कन्स्ट्रेंशन आफ वेल्थ के बारे में आर्टिकल 39(सी) में कहा गया है कि देश की व्यवस्था इस तरह से चलाई जाएगी कि उत्पादन के स्रोत किन्हीं विशेष हाथों में न जायें, लेकिन मुझे अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि आज 30 करोड़ का बिड़ला 1500 करोड़ का हो गया, हम देखते हैं कि 40 करोड़ का टाटा 1300 करोड़ का हो गया है, 30 लाख का मोदी 300 करोड़ का हो गया। सरकार ने आज तक संविधान के डाइरेक्टिव प्रिंसिपल्स की धाराओं का कोई ख्याल नहीं रखा है।

अफगानिस्तान के बारे में खुल कर नहीं कहा गया है और जिस राष्ट्र ने, जिस दोस्त ने हमेशा मुसीबत में हमारा साथ दिया और एक ऐसे राष्ट्र को जो हमेशा हमारी आजादी के साथ मजक करता रहा उनको एक ही पैमाने पर देखा गया है। कपूचिया की मान्यता के बारे में, जिसका सत्ताधारी दल के इलेक्शन मनीफेस्टों में जिक्र था, उसके बारे में भी राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में कुछ जिक्र नहीं आया है।

सभी गांवों में पीने के पानी की व्यवस्था का भी कोई जिक्र राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में नहीं आया है। 32 वर्ष की आजादी के बाद भी अगर हम देश के 6 लाख गांवों के लोगों को पीने का पानी नहीं पहुंचा सकते तो जनतंत्र एक मज़ाक समझा जाएगा।

जब ये लोग उधर बैठ गये थे सत्ता में, इस तरह की परम्परा बना दी गई थी जिससे पता लगे कि सदन सर्वश्रेष्ठ है। मैं हमेशा इस मान्यता का रहा हूँ कि न यह सदन सर्वश्रेष्ठ है, न वह सदन सर्वश्रेष्ठ है, न देश का संविधान सर्वश्रेष्ठ है, बल्कि इस देश की जनता सर्वश्रेष्ठ है। जनता ने एक फंसला कर दिया है। उस फंसले के अनुसार ये सारे कमिशन समाप्त हो जाने चाहिए लेकिन मुझे अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि इसका भी कोई जिक्र राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में नहीं किया गया है। स्पेशल कोर्ट्स के बारे में, एक कानून का विद्यार्थी होने के नाते मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस देश के रूल आफ लाँ को समाप्त करने की साज़िश की गई, एक तरह से यहाँ इन्साफ का गला दबाया गया था लेकिन श्रीमन्, उसका भी कोई जिक्र राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में नहीं किया गया है।

श्रीमन्, मैं आपका फिर से हृदय से आभार मानता हूँ कि आपने मुझे बोलने का समय दिया लेकिन मैं प्रार्थना करूँगा आपसे भी कि यहाँ पर जो परम्परा सदन में रही है कि राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण पर कोई वोटिंग इस सदन में नहीं हुई है, उस परम्परा को बनाए रखा जाना चाहिए, परम्परा को तोड़ा नहीं जाना चाहिए। जनता पार्टी के सदस्य परम्परा तोड़ने के आदी हैं लेकिन और साथियों से मेरा निवेदन है कि वह परम्परा न तोड़ें। धन्यवाद।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Scato Swu. Only five minutes.

SHRI SCATO SWU (Nominated): Sir, To me, para 20 of the President's Address is the most welcome para. I quote:

"The Government is committed fully to secularism and will take steps to ensure that the minorities, while preserving their distinct cultural identities, enjoy a sense of full and equal participation in all spheres of national life. Legislation for assuring the minority character of the Aligarh Muslim University will be introduced in the next Session."

Sir, what can be more gratifying and encouraging than this expression of assurance. In his wisdom, the President has reaffirmed Article 25 of the Constitution of India which leads:

"... all persons are equally entitled to freedom of conscience and the right freely to profess, practise and propagate religion."

The prosecution of Christians in Arunachal Pradesh has been there. We have reported the incidents to the Government many times for their intervention. I wonder what action the Government took in this regard. There should be no more reports of such nature. In this context, I would suggest that there should be an on the spot study group for being sent to Arunachal Pradesh in the event of fresh complaints. Mr. Morarji Desai, the former Prime Minister of India made three remarkable statements as far as we are concerned. Number one, he said that it was a mistake to have given a Statehood to Nagaland. We know for sure that that was not a liberal statement. The mind of every Naga felt disturbed on hearing this shocking statement of the Prime Minister of India. They questioned each other as to what is going to happen again.

[Mr. Chairman in the Chair]

Secondly, Sir, Mr. Morarji Desai said, "We will exterminate the underground Nagas." The Nagas feared

[Shri Scato Swu]

that the outcome of the policy of persuasion would be surely sabotaged by the policy extermination. Thirdly, Mr. Morarji Desai said that it was a wrong thing to have annexed Sikkim. This statement made the people of Sikkim annoyed and unhappy because the question of annexation did not arise. The people of Sikkim took the decision to merge with India on their own volition.

Sir, I welcome Mrs. Indira Gandhi as the Prime Minister of India and I hope she will not go the way of Mr. Morarji Desai. As far as the part of the country where we live in is concerned, on the 25th January, 1980, on the floor of this House Mr. Zail Singh, our Home Minister said, "now the light has come and the operator is efficient." We hope this statement would be justified in all respects in course of time. Sir, we have not been privileged fully to have equal participation in certain spheres of national life. It is my appeal that we should be encouraged to have equal participation in all spheres of national life. Thank you, Sir.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have listened very carefully to the speeches of various hon. Members when I could remain present in the House. In the case of others, I have gone through the points they have made. I regret that I could not remain present throughout the debate, as I had wished to do, as a similar motion was being discussed in the other House and there were unavoidable engagements connected with the visits of various high foreign dignitaries.

Sir, the debate on the President's Address is an occasion to discuss important Government policies. It obviously cannot spell out all policies. It can deal only with some major areas and some immediate problems. On our part also, we cannot deal with the entire range of issues within three days. Also, Sir, the hon. Members are well aware that when the President's

speech was written, this Government was barely four days old and we were not in a position to go in detail into various aspects as we did not have even the full knowledge of the state of affairs in the country. However, a number of important subjects have been covered by various speakers and I shall try to deal with as many of them as possible.

Before I get on to the more substantial things, I would like to deal briefly with what the Janata and the Lok Dal leaders did not only to political opponents but also the administration after the 1977 elections. It has now been repeated time and again that they did nothing wrong, that there was no persecution. I think all those who were even remotely in touch with our lives at that period are well aware of the campaign of persecution which was launched against me, my family, my personal staff and my colleagues. Entirely politically motivated commissions and inquiring authorities were set up, as many as 34—we are told by the Home Ministry. The manner of their functioning was similar to the witchhunt period of the middle ages, whipping up hysterical campaigns against individuals and falsely implicating them. Judges and heads of commissions openly met the Prime Minister and the Home Minister to receive instructions. This was made obvious when the pronouncements made by the Government were in fact carried out. Is this the independence of the judiciary?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame, shame.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Not only were the so-called accused intimidated. Even their old parents, close relatives and even distant relatives were threatened, arrested and mal-treated. Indiscriminate searches, at times when women were all alone at home, the sealing of bank lockers, the freezing of bank accounts of distant relatives, impounding of passports even in some cases where an entire stranger happened to have just a similar name, are indicative of their attitude. In one case the parents

were asked to explain expenditure incurred on a marriage which took place in 1947! Several former Ministers were arrested. Shri Gokhale was arrested on a charge for giving certain advice. Similar advice was given by Mr. Shah of the Shah Commission to a private party. But no action was taken against him. Ministers and CBI officers went abroad several times. It would be interesting to know how much was spent on these visits. My own arrest, my expulsion from Parliament and subsequent imprisonment are not hidden from this hon. House and we have many people sitting here who took a very active part in seeing that I should not be spared in any way. They shut their eyes and ears to the plain fact that no illegality or improper action had taken place on our part and hence nothing could be discovered, no matter how many trips they took abroad or within India, no matter how much they tried themselves or with the aid of foreign investigating agencies, such as the Interpol. The last such visit by CBI officials took place in the beginning of this very month, January.

Some Janata leaders have protested when I said that orders were passed that my pictures, my father's portraits, should be removed. I have been told by a colleague that there was a question in this House in which the answer clearly stated that the P&T Department had given such an order about Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's portraits.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame, shame.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I would like to share a small incident with the House which took place, rather which came to my notice, just yesterday. I received a letter. This letter was written in March 1977. It was given to one of our Ambassadors. I received it yesterday with a covering letter with the date of after I was sworn in as the Prime Minister saying that that was not the appropriate time to deliver this letter and, therefore, that it was being sent now. The letter, I may add, was entirely non-

political. It was by somebody who had written a book on the festivals, the culture and the tourist sites of India. But this shows the atmosphere which was created by the Janata Party and its Government amongst our officials whether they were posted in India or abroad.

Sir, the country is well-aware how this campaign is still continuing. The Janata Party and the Lok Dal are not satisfied with what they have done in that period. They obviously are not satisfied with the result of the election and they have not ended their campaign. Some responsible people have complained to me that in Madhya Pradesh and other States such as Rajasthan and U.P., forcible sterilisation is now being carried out and the people are being told that these are the orders of the new Central Government. I have written to the concerned Chief Ministers and I have no hesitation in saying that no such order has emanated from the Central Government. A similar situation has arisen with regard to demolitions of huts of Harijans and other poorer people.

The hand of the RSS which was seen during the last 33 months in administration, in police, in educational institutions and in civic life is still active. In Rajasthan and some other States, a wide-spread agitation is going on against the reservation of seats for the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. Who is behind this agitation? In Parliament, the other day, we decided to continue this reservation of seats in legislatures. But these people want to create a type of class war on this issue. Our people believe that the State Government is encouraging this agitation.

The Janata is not the only party persecuting us. The Marxists were allying themselves with Janata until they were convinced that they had no majority. For thirty months, the leftists had forgotten all about RSS communalism. They were a party to the Janata-created crisis and its serious consequences.

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

The sense of constitutional propriety of many hon. Members was benumbed when the Janata party dismissed Congress Governments in the States in 1977. How many of the people who are today . . .

SHRI YOGENDRA SHARMA (Bihar): We all opposed this.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I would just like to know how many people in this hon. House had opposed this at that moment when it took place? How many?

SHRI JAGJIT SINGH ANAND (Punjab): The entire CPI group.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: How many had spoken up against their other irregularities and wrong doings? When they had majority, there was nothing wrong with the electoral system; there was nothing wrong with having a large number of seats. But because we have come, it is said that the electoral system is to be changed; it does not really represent the people. This double thinking and double standard is typical of the Janata party. They are now belittling the decisive mandate by resorting to quibbling and statistical jugglery.

We are advised on various platforms by the Marxists to adopt the socio-economic philosophy of China which is now a partner of capitalist Europe and America. We have chosen the path of democracy in all facets of our national life. We do not want to follow the path which China has followed, the path which led them to total isolation until recently and the path which has now drawn them into the arms of capitalist society.

Sir, in this House, mention was made by several Members to Centre-State relations. The Constitution gives full rights to the States and we are anxious that this should not be diluted in any way. I have declared many a time that if there is any special difficulty, we will always

be ready to discuss such matters with them. However, nothing should be done to weaken the Centre and lessen its capacity to help the weaker States or weaker areas or weaker sections or to handle situations of crisis to strengthen and enhance the prestige of the nation. The Centre is also called upon to help in Inter-State disputes although the best way of solving such differences is to have an acceptable arrangement between the States concerned themselves. This matter was also gone into in detail by the Administrative Reforms Commission and they recommended that no change in the Constitution was called for.

There has been lot of shouting and anxiety expressed about the dissolution of the State Assemblies. Perhaps, this is the result of a guilty conscience of the Janata and the Lok Dal Parties. In 1977 they took the unprecedented step of demanding that various Chief Ministers should resign and dissolve their Legislative Assemblies of face action by the Centre. When they refused to oblige, the Centre at one stroke dissolved these Legislative Assemblies. The same people now loudly clamour that in spite of the verdict of the people in favour of our parties, Assemblies in the States ruled by the Janata Party or the Lok Dal should not be dissolved. This shows inconsistency of their stand and the lack of principle underlying their argument. Numerous other people, such as Governors and others, were made to quit their posts at that time.

I believe that there is also an effort being made that these State Governments should create as much difficulty for the Centre as possible in the implementation of our declared objectives and declared programmes in our election manifesto. Some hon. Members have moaned about stabilisation or destabilisation. Who started this process? Agitational politics was resorted to from 1973 to 1975, taking advantage of the difficult economic situation that was fuelled by the



international economic crisis, the monetary crisis, the energy crisis, internal economy, severe drought conditions and last but not least, the burden of the Bangladesh war. The experiment was started in Gujarat and then extended to Bihar. It was the same people who started the process of destabilisation in this country who are now charging us of destabilisation. It was they who started the physical assaults and civil disobedience, including the call to the Army and the Police to disobey lawful orders of the Government. Even a hunger strike was resorted to for the dissolution of the Gujarat Assembly. External forces also assisted in the manipulations.

Stability seems to have become a dirty word in the political lexicon of certain forces. Having worked for instability through inherently contradictory alliance they now feel rebuffed by the electorate. On our part, we see stability as an integral element of progress and advancement, of a decisive thrust forward for change and development, of social transformation and of political cohesion. Stability means not whether governments are changing or not changing or even how much majority a government has. I should like to remind this hon. House that for nearly a year and a half my Government was in a minority, but there was no feeling of insecurity anywhere in the country. Insecurity is how the people feel. That the people felt insecure and they felt that the country was unstable even when the Janata had 250 members, that is a fact of life. And that today with our coming they feel the opposite, that is also a fact of life. Therefore, instability is not going to come whether a government goes nor stays, but in how the government is functioning and how secure different sections of the people feel, how secure the weaker sections feel, how secure the minorities, whether they are the Muslims or the Christians or the Sikhs or the Buddhists, feel. That is what security is.

Assam is a very delicate subject just now. I sympathise with those who are suffering there, who are being denied various essentials. Every life is valuable, but experts are especially so. We share the sorrow of these people with anguish in our hearts. But I also share the feelings of the hon. Member who said here that at this moment, the major concern should be how to ease the tension, how to defuse hatred or dislike. And that cannot happen if we blame one another. This is why even when you know what is happening, you try not to talk about it—rather not to give it publicity. We can certainly talk about it. I have discussed this matter with the Leaders of the Opposition parties and, you all know that I accepted their suggestion that we should call the leaders of the political parties in Assam and discuss this matter with them so that we can find a solution to which, we hope, they will also subscribe. If we find a solution here and those people say, "we are not going to honour it", it will not help us in any way. That is why it is important not to aggravate such feelings. I have personally seen during the language riots in Assam how very sensitive and touchy the people become and the most innocent remark leads to an aggravation of the whole situation and it may even lead to somebody dying or being injured. That is why we feel that in such situations, we must be extremely careful with our words and our actions. It does not mean a lack of concern. In fact, it means the opposite. So deep is our concern, so deep is our anxiety that we must, rather than talking about it, bend all our energies to solve the problem while appreciating the difficulties of the local people—but in "local" there are people of all religions and languages—and appreciating the difficulties of all those who are today being called foreigners.

Today even those who had settled in Assam in the wake of Partition and in the migration from what was then East Pakistan in 1964 are being

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

branded as foreigners. People speaking non-Assamese Indian languages are being intimidated.

Some initiatives have been taken. Detailed discussions with the Governor have taken place. The students are coming to meet me, I am meeting them tomorrow. In the meantime, we have intensified the patrolling on the border to make it more difficult for people to come in. Before we make other comments, we should wait until these meetings are over and see what is their outcome.

An hon. Member has drawn attention to the recent crime wave in Delhi. It is obvious that this a continuation of the crime wave which has been sweeping the capital during the last 33 months. The number of cognizable crimes in Delhi is: 1976—23,105, 1977—35,856, 1978—43,383 and only the first half of 1979—21,370. This shows what a stupendous task we have before us to improve the law and order situation.

Atrocities on Harijans were mentioned in the President's Address. As you know, I was one of the very few people—I do not know actually if anybody else went to reach Belchi in very difficult circumstances and at a time when my own party members there were very reluctant to allow me to go and had made absolutely no arrangements. It was only when my party and I expressed our determined wish to go there even if we had to walk all night and we had actually started walking that they hurriedly produced an elephant. That could only give some relief to three or four of us and the rest, including my hon. friend Mr. Sharma, had to do it on foot, even swimming where the road was broken. And of course I do not want to forget the ladies. My friend, Mrs. Saroj Khaparde—I do not know where she is sitting—braved it also and did the whole trip on foot. Now, the atrocities on the Harijans:

*The number of cases reported in :*

|      |        |
|------|--------|
| 1976 | 5,986  |
| 1977 | 10,879 |
| 1978 | 15,059 |
| 1979 | 10,492 |

(upto September)

These are all figures gathered at the time of the Janata party rule.

Communal violence: It is certainly understandable if concern was expressed for the rising trend in communal violence during the last 33 months. But one hon. Member went on to say that the violence was due to wrong policy of the Congress and that there was no communal violence during the Janata rule. I should like to quote some figures to refute the statement. Actually, there is no need for figures. You have only to see the feelings of the minorities themselves. You have only to go to Jamshedpur, to Aligarh or to Purnea or any of the numerous places where such clashes have taken place to talk to them. And the same is true about the Harijans. It is not what we did or we did not do. Even if we leave that aside, what do the Harijans themselves feel? What have they said? This is the question, and this has made very clear to me. In fact, it is my concern for them and my deep distress at the stories they told me as early as May, 1977 or even earlier, perhaps, I think, the end of April, 1977, which urged me to go to some of the places which I visited and to come back into public life. Before that I was sitting quiet. These Harijans whose lands had been taken back from them, the Harijans who had been driven out of their villages, who had been driven out of their houses, and whose houses had been burnt, the Harijans in whose drinking water wells dirt had been thrown, and the tribals started coming to me almost immediately after the Parliamentary election in 1977 with facts and figures which we were told. I had specially gone at that time to see the Prime Minister, Mr. Morarji

Desai, to tell him to take special personal interest to see that that was

stopped and that they were accorded protection.

*Coming back to the communal clashes :*

|           |  |      |
|-----------|--|------|
| In 1976 : | No. of incidents . . . . .                   | 169  |
|           | No. of people killed . . . . .               | 39   |
|           | No. of people injured . . . . .              | 794  |
| 1977 :    | No. of incidents . . . . .                   | 188  |
|           | No. of persons killed . . . . .              | 36   |
|           | No. of persons injured . . . . .             | 1119 |
| 1978 :    | The figure of incidents goes up to . . . . . | 230  |
|           | No. of persons killed . . . . .              | 110  |
|           | No. of persons injured . . . . .             | 1853 |
| 1979 :    | No. of incidents goes up to . . . . .        | 297  |
|           | No. of persons killed . . . . .              | 260  |
|           | No. of persons injured . . . . .             | 2346 |

I may add that these are Janata party Government figures, the figures given in the various cities where communal riots took place, and which I visited, were far higher than these. In fact, I doubt if the Muslim community which suffered, will accept these figures at all.

I do not have to remind this House or the general public that the Congress has always stood for and promoted communal harmony in our country. Whenever there had been communal tension from the days of Ganesh Shankar Vidyarthi, Congress men were the first to rush there to help in establishing peace and to help in affording relief to the victims. The leaders of the Congress Party were the first to condemn the communal violence. All of you know that when this violence has taken place in the last 33 months, members of the Janata Party themselves, named some of their partners as being responsible for the clashes. It is no wonder that the law and order situation worsened and that Harijans and minorities were the special victims of this persecution. The police and para-military forces which are normally expected to provide protec-

tion, were thoroughly demoralised because of political interference, which ultimately compelled some of them to go on strike. They had to resort to an agitational approach for the redress of their grievances. In this situation, the police was not eager to register cases when complaints reached them. They were not eager to chase the culprits when thefts took place. They were not eager to bring to book anti-social elements when Harijans and minorities were intimidated. In many instances, cases had to be withdrawn if the involved people belonged to the then ruling party, especially in the States.

The Leader of the Opposition has referred to the misuse of mass media. I think all our people on this side are well aware of the misuse of the media made by him and his Government by distorting and suppressing facts, by giving repeated publicity to statements which were not substantiated later, by overplaying news concerning not his own party but his group in that party and by coercing proprietors of newspapers to remove journalists who did not follow their line. The media lost credibility to such an extent that even solid supporters of the Janata Party confessed

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

that they had to listen to foreign broadcasts for a more correct version of what was happening in India. Some hon. Members sitting opposite, Shri Piloo Mody and Shri Bhanu Pratap Singh from the Opposition, have tried to show that the last two-and-a-half years have been good years of economic growth. Whom are they trying to fool?

AN HON. MEMBER: Themselves.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI:

The facts are entirely contrary to this, as any report produced in their time by the Government will prove. I can only give some selected indicators. If you want more figures, they are easily available. The average annual rate of growth of Gross National Product during 1974-77 was 3.8 per cent; from 1977 till now it is 3.2 per cent. The increase in index of industrial production then was 6.1% now it is 3.8 per cent. Exports: 26.8 per cent then; now 6.2 per cent. Electricity generation: 9.9 per cent then; now, 7.1 per cent. Coal production: 8.7 per cent then; now minus 0.4 per cent. Railways: revenue earning traffic—tonnes originating: 9.5 per cent then; now, minus 3.4 per cent.

The hon. Member, Shri Mody talked of the Janata Government bringing down sugar prices to Rs. 2.50 to Rs. 3.00 per kilo. He has ignored the fact that this was only a temporary phenomenon resulting from high production of sugarcane. Even this was brought about by the progressive policies towards sugarcane farmers followed in the past which helped them to grow more cane. But the sugar policy was not steady and resulted in prices shooting up to even Rs. 6.00 per kilo from early 1979 onwards. Even the issue price of levy sugar had gone to Rs. 2.85 per kilo under the Lok Dal Government as against Rs. 2.15 per kilo when the

Congress Government had left power. I might also say that the treatment of the sugarcane growers was such that for the next crop, many have decided not to go in for sugarcane. Hence we face a situation when there will be an acute sugar shortage. Why have they done so. Because they went to Choudhury Charan Singh and perhaps also to the Prime Minister. They were told, "why have you grown so much sugarcane? Who told you to grow so much sugarcane?" This was their attitude. Instead of solving people's problems and trying to help them, there was always an attitude which created further difficulties for them and which was bound to create difficulties for the nation as a whole later on. There has been talk also of stability in prices in the last 30 months. What are the figures? The wholesale index average for the year 1974-75 was 174.9, in 1975-76 —173, in 1976-77—176, in 1977-78 it shoots up to 185.8 and it remained at that. Annual rate of inflation was 25.2 in 1974-75; the next year we brought it down to —1.9. In 1976-77 it went up a little to 2. But next year it goes up to 5.2 and for this year it was estimated at 17; but this is an estimated figure. Prices rose in 1973-74 and 1974-75. But anti-inflationary measures of the late 1974 resulted in a continuous decline of prices for the next 18 months. Prices rose by .20 per cent during 1979. But the then Government which was in a much stronger position because of food and foreign exchange reserves could not control the inflation. Prices of several essential commodities registered a very sharp increase from March 1977 to July 1979. There was a much bigger jump in respect of some commodities of daily consumption from July to December 1979 causing allround misery. This is wholesale price index. I have also separate figures for surveys which took place in Delhi, in Bombay and so on which are even clearer, but I do not want to take the time of the House.

Now I have here figures of whole-sale price index from March 1977 to July 1979 in percentage. Onions which rose by 41.5 per cent in 1977-79, from July to December 1979 went up to 139.8 per cent. Sugar which rose by 2.8 per cent between March 1977 and July 1979 went up to 11.1 per cent in July to December, 1979, Cereals which rose by 4.3 per cent went up to 10.3 per cent. Edible oils from 5.9 per cent to 9.4 per cent.

The Janata Party has claimed that the export of foodgrains under their Government was because they stepped up agricultural production. Agricultural production cannot be stepped up as a miracle. It did increase in 1977-79 but so it did in previous years also. They had good rain and they had the infrastructure which we had built which had helped the farmer to increase his production. Food production increased from 69 million tonnes in 1955-56 to 121 million tonnes in 1975-76. The export of foodgrains was made possible only because of the buffer stocks of 20 million tonnes which we had left in March 1977. These stocks were built by massive procurement in the years 1975-77.

Irrigation: I heard one Member quoting a Soviet expert. That expert rightly praised Indian planning in that context, because it was the proper planning and investment in the earlier years of Congress rule which enabled the creation of irrigation potential of this high order in 1977-78. Irrigation projects take time to yield benefit. And therefore the benefits in 1977-79 arose only from projects which had been planned and started much earlier.

I share the deep concern of honourable Members about unemployment. This problem has to be tackled by certain immediate programmes and finally to have real impact by development as a whole. We have pro-

moted programmes like the 20-point programme, small farmers' development agencies, etc. which will increase employment opportunities. In the five years from 1972 these gave a high level of employment. In 1972, the size of the labour force in millions was 240 and the level of unemployment in millions was 16.6. In 1977-78, the size of the labour force was 273 millions, but the level of unemployment remained about the same. This clearly shows that nearly 33 millions added to the labour force have found employment.

7 P.M.

What is the record of the Janata Party in this field? The number of job seekers on the Live Registers of Employment Exchanges increased sharply even in 1977-78 from 10.81 millions to 12.33 millions. This was the period when those Governments were talking constantly about relieving unemployment.

In any debate, there is always a reference to *Garibi Hatao* and the increase in the number of people below the poverty line between 1966 and 1976. What is the source of the figures given by the hon. Member, I do not know. In any case those figures are not correct. According to the estimates made in the Planning Commission, the number of people below the poverty line in 1968-69 was about 28 crores representing 53 per cent of the total population. By 1977-78, this had come down to about 49 per cent as the percentage of the total population. These estimates can only be approximate and the removal of poverty is not something to be accomplished in a few years. It is a process that will take a long time and we must dedicate ourselves to this task.

Figures and statistics give different types of pictures. I myself have been travelling continuously, not from today, not since I am in office, but long before that. Except for some breaks while I was abroad, almost continuously I have been travelling either

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

with my parents or alone since 1930. I have, therefore, had the opportunity of seeing the changes. I have been to places where there were no roads and places where I had to walk twelve miles a day for several days and I have seen the changes in the people. There is change in the health especially of children and women, there is change in the clothes they wear. Therefore, to go on saying that nothing has been done in all these years is not a matter to be proud of because you are denigrating not the Congress Party, but the people of India. It is their endeavour, their struggle and it is their hard work that has achieved this. What we have done is to help them by having the correct policy and by giving a definite direction in which they should move. But the endeavour and sacrifice has been theirs, whether it is our farmers or industrial workers or our brilliant, young technologists, engineers, scientists and professional people.

The industrial production in 1979 has declined very sharply. There have been months together of zero or negative growth. This naturally had its impact on the external trade. Poor manufactures have necessitated higher imports. Items such as steel, cement, coal and aluminium some of which we were exporting are now being imported in large quantities. Imports have registered a growth of 13.8 per cent in 1977-78 over 1976-77, and 12.7 per cent in 1978-79 over the previous year. That also shows a high increase in the period of April to November 1979. When the percentage in the increase in imports touches 16.8 per cent. This has led to the widening of the trade deficit. The balance of trade has gone up in April to November 1978. The figure is provisional. In that period it was minus Rs. 729.25 crores. And next year, 1979, April—November, it was about minus Rs. 1181.3 crores.

An Hon. Member complained that the public sectors had languished during the Janata rule and asked what

the new Government is doing. During our last year in Government, i.e. 1976-77, the public sector had made a net profit of Rs. 239 crores. In the first year of the Janata rule, there was a net loss of Rs. 91 crores... (*Interruptions*). What we have built up brick by brick was damaged within two years. We have to motivate the workers and the managers of the public sector again to put in their best. They are capable of better performance and I have no doubt they will show much better results from now on... (*Interruptions*).

Before I go on to the foreign policy a word about Nagaland. I should like to assure the hon. Member who spoke about this of my deep sympathy for the Naga people. Perhaps he knows that when I first formed the Government in 1966 there was severe fighting in Nagaland. It was I who took the initiative, called the leaders here, and as a result of long talks—when at times it seemed almost impossible that they would yield any results—we reached an agreement. Nagaland formed its own Government and started on development works. I know it has a long way to go, but the people are talented and patriotic, and I am sure that with their hard work and whatever help we can give, they will soon achieve a better standard of living .... (*Interruptions*).

This applies not only to the Nagas but to all our tribal people. They have had a raw deal over the centuries, and it is our duty now—we cannot make up for this in a few years—to bend all our energies to do as much as possible, whether they are Mizos, Khasis, Garos or other tribal people in different parts of India.

We must also assure greater representation to the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes and the minorities in the spheres of service and national activity. That is not only fair to them but essential for national harmony and the strengthening of our society.

We are committed to an effective public distribution system. We had just started to form it. It was not easy for us to build up the system because that was a period of shortages. But we did hope that once the shortage was over, this system would be strengthened. Unfortunately, the Janata Party does not believe in this type of service to the people and, therefore, they did not keep it up. Now to build it again and make it effective is going to be one of the task which has to be undertaken.

Our foreign policy has always been consistent. The world today is at a critical juncture in the unending East-West rivalry for dominance. We do not wish to be a part of this rivalry. In fact, we want it to be channelled constructively. We also appeal to our neighbours to realise that the history of the post-War period has unquestionably demonstrated that smaller countries have nothing to gain by becoming pawns in the battle of supremacy between the other powers.

It has been our sad experience that arms given to Pakistan for whatever purpose have always been used against India. We are not afraid of Pakistan conquering India. But we are concerned that the induction of arms into Pakistan will encourage those who are against the process of normalisation.

We feel that the solution to the problem of Afghanistan should emerge from this region without interference by outside powers. We are prepared to initiate dialogues with our neighbours to achieve this end, and we appeal to our friends not to take any action that would frustrate this objective. There is not much that I wish to say regarding our foreign policy at this stage. Somebody has said that there is confusion in my mind or that I have been changing. I have not changed my attitude. I made it clear during the election campaign and that has remained our approach since that is in line with our policy of non-alignment. Especially at this time our

first and major concern is for the achievement of detente. We emphasize the stand we have taken. Detente was a big step towards lasting world peace. Unfortunately, now that has been thrown to the winds and once again we have the cold war situation. Europe has a genius of picking up problems which are basically European problems and putting them on to some other continent so that they themselves can avoid the unpleasantness and misery. The rivalry between the big powers has left the European borders and is causing tension in Asia. Our major concern today is not to see who is right and who is wrong, but to see how we can possibly prevent this cold war from turning into a fighting hot war. This is our major concern and that is why we are being extremely careful about what we say. The broad outlines of our foreign policy have been clearly defined in the President's Address. I should like to emphasise that the mandate which we have received from the people has considerably enhanced the prestige of India in the rest of the world. The world sees in it a strong and stable Government which is capable of projecting the right image of India and playing our traditionally leading role in international affairs.

**SHRI JAGJIT SINGH ANAND:**  
What about Kampuchea? It was mentioned in your election manifesto.

**SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI:**  
Obviously, we stand by whatever we said in our election manifesto. Or else why did we put it there? We have declared our policy regarding Kampuchea even before the elections were declared and before there was any question of a manifesto. The Janata Party is very strong in asking us to condemn what has happened in Afghanistan. I do not remember if they condemned the Chinese aggression in Vietnam or the bringing down of democratic regimes and other interferences in different parts of the world. As I said earlier, we have not changed

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

our minds about these matters. They are consistent with our foreign policy which has been clear from the beginning and we have no intention of diverting from it. One hon. Member mentioned Kampuchea. I would ask the Janata Party whether they have not heard of the atrocities committed on the people there when half the population was wiped out by the Pol Pot regime. I have not heard a word of condemnation or any desire for democracy there or any such sentiment expressed by most of the Members sitting opposite here. One hon. Member referred to India's relations with the ASEAN countries. We have established good relations with ASEAN countries and propose to strengthen them further. Just within a week of the formation of my Government, I had very useful talks with the Deputy Prime Minister of Malaysia.

Mention has also been made of the African people's struggle in Southern Africa. Our firm support to the African people for majority rule in Southern Africa is so well known that it needs no reiteration. It is a deliberate mischief to even suggest that there can be any change in our constant stand in support of the people of Southern Africa. Fortunately, the people who are involved in the struggle know me and my policies. They know the support which we have always given them and which we shall continue to give them until they are fully free. One hon. Member opposite knows of my very close involvement with the struggle in South Africa. I have not dealt with the amendments separately but have covered most of them in my reply. I hope, hon. Members will not press their amendments now. The principal directions of the Government's policy have been set out in the President's Address and in the coming weeks and months, this House will have an opportunity to consider various matters that the Government will bring forward to give a concrete shape to its commitment to resume the

process of national building, a process in which I hope to have the co-operation of all sections of the House. I thank all the hon. Members for the interest they have taken and the contribution they have made to this debate. Now that they have expressed their views in full, may I request them once more to withdraw their amendments? The enormous task facing the Government and the nation demands the co-operation of all. Thank you for your attention.

Sir, I now commend the Motion moved by Shri A. R. Antulay to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Mover of the Resolution has a right of reply.

SHRI A. R. ANTULAY (Maharashtra): Mr. Chairman, Sir, after the Prime Minister's very lucid speech I don't think I should take the time of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I shall now proceed to put the amendments to vote, calling out the names of the hon. Members who have moved the amendments. If they have been clubbed together.....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, the Prime Minister is tired also. And she has appealed. Out of human sympathy for her, I am prepared to withdraw most of my amendments, except one and that is amendment No. 104.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You cannot speak for everybody. Let them speak for themselves.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am speaking for myself. But human sympathy is the personal factor.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now Mr. V. B. Raju. You have got amendment Nos. 8 and 85.

SHRI V. B. RAJU: I am not pressing my amendments.



**\*Amendment Nos. 8 and 85 were, by leave, withdrawn.**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Jagdish Prasad Mathur—amendment Nos. 9 and 10.

SHRI JAGDISH PRASAD MATHUR (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I withdraw my amendments.

**\*Amendment Nos. 9 and 10 were, by leave, withdrawn.**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri P. Ramamurti. You have got amendment Nos. 11 to 38.

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI: I withdraw all my amendments except the one which Mr. Bhupesh Gupta did not withdraw.

**\*Amendment Nos. 11 to 38 were, by leave, withdrawn.**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Hari Shanker Bhabhra, you have got two amendments—Nos. 39 and 108.

SHRI HARI SHANKER BHABHRA (Rajasthan): I withdraw my amendments.

**\*Amendment Nos. 39 and 108 were, by leave, withdrawn.**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Kalraj Mishra, you have amendment No. 40.

SHRI KALRAJ MISHRA: I withdraw my amendment.

**\*Amendment No. 40 was, by leave, withdrawn**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Shiv Chandra Jha—amendment Nos. 41 to 49.

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा (बिहार) : सभापति महोदय, मुझे यह कहना है कि अमेंड को विद्वद्धा करों के ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: No speech is allowed.

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : मैं आपसे रुलिंग चाहता हूँ, व्यवस्था है, एक परम्परा रही है हाउस में कि अमेंडमेंट पर सदस्य बोलते रहे हैं, दो शब्द चार शब्द। यदि आप इस परम्परा को खत्म कर देना चाहते हैं तो आपकी मर्जी है। आप इस हाउस के सर्वेसर्वा हैं। सभापति महोदय, मैं केवल यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि संशोधन पर हर सदस्य को बोलने का अधिकार है।

श्री सभापति : आप बैठ जाइये : आपको अपना प्रस्ताव पेश करना है या नहीं। बस इस प्रश्न का जवाब दीजिये।

श्री शिव चन्द्र झा : सभापति महोदय, मैं विद्वद्धा करता हूँ। परन्तु मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप इस पर विचार करें कि भविष्य में सदस्य संशोधन पर बोलेंगे या नहीं बोलेंगे।

**\*Amendment Nos. 41 to 49 were, by leave, withdrawn.**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Sankar Ghose, there are Amendment Nos. 50 to 52 and 137 to 141 in your name.

SHRI SANKAR GHOSE: Sir, I withdraw my amendments.

**\*Amendment Nos. 50 to 52 and 137 to 141 were, by leave, withdrawn**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, Shri Kulkarni has amendment No. 72 in his name.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra): Sir, I withdraw my amendment.

**\*Amendment No. 72 was, by leave, withdrawn**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, Amendment Nos. 73 to 80 are in the name of Shri Syed Shahabuddin.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN (Bihar): Sir, I withdraw my amendments.

**\*Amendments Nos. 73 to 80 were, by leave, withdrawn**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Amendment Nos. 81 to 83 are in the name of Shri Bagaikar.

SHRI SADASHIV BAGAIKAR (Maharashtra): Sir, I withdraw my amendments.

**\*Amendment Nos. 81 to 83 were, by leave, withdrawn**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Dhabe, there is Amendment No. 84 in your name.

SHRI S. W. DHABE (Maharashtra): Sir, I withdraw my amendment.

**\*Amendment No. 84 was, by leave, withdrawn**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, there are Amendment Nos. 86 to 104 and 128 to 136 in your name.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I withdraw Amendment Nos. 86 to 103 and 128 to 136 and not Amendment No. 104. Amendment No. 104 is, of course, in the name of leaders of other parties also.

**\*Amendment Nos. 86 to 103 and 128 to 136 were, by leave, withdrawn**

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am pressing Amendment No. 104 to a vote.

DR. RAM KRIPAL SINHA (Bihar): Sir, except the Prime Minister, I will request the hon. Ministers who are not Members of this House to kindly vacate before voting.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, that is not necessary. (*Interruptions*).

**\*For text of amendment, vide debate dated the 28th January, 1980.**

Sir, whatever they may do outside, here they will not indulge in false voting.

DR. RAM KRIPAL SINHA: My friend, the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs will bear witness to me. It was he who pressed this question and the Ministers in the previous Government used to withdraw.

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI LAL K. ADVANI): Mr. Chairman, Sir, it need not be so. It did happen last time. It has not happened in the Lok Sabha also. Hon. Member who are Ministers they may remain here. The only thing is that they should not press wrong buttons. That is all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nobody who is not a Member of this House will be allowed by me to vote. That is the end of the matter.

Now, before Amendment No. 104 is put to vote can I go through with the rest of them?

Mr. Alexander Warjri, Amendment Nos. 105 to 107 and 109 stand in your name.

SHRI ALEXANDER WARJRI: Sir, I withdraw Amendment Nos 105 to 107 and 109.

**\*Amendment Nos. 105 to 107 and 109 were, by leave, withdrawn**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Advani.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Sir, except for amendment No. 104, I withdraw all other amendments.

**\*Amendments Nos. 115 to 127 were, by leave, withdrawn**

SHRIMATI LEELA DAMODARA MENON (Kerala): Sir, my amendment before the House is not withdrawn, formally. I was here.

**\*For text of amendment, vide debate dated the 28th January, 1980.**

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I remind the Member that the amendment has to be moved in person. You were not here.

Now, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, do you press amendment No. 104?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes. I am reading out the amendment.

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."

श्री बुद्ध प्रिय मौर्य : श्रीमन्, मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। इस सदन में माननीय भूपेश गुप्त जी हमारे बड़े भाई माने जाते हैं वे इस नाते से कि वे इस सदन में सब से ज्यादा . . . . .

(Interruptions)

श्री सभापति : प्वाइंट ऑफ आर्डर रोज करना हो तो करें।

This is not a point of order. Please resume your seat.

श्री बुद्ध प्रिय मौर्य : श्रीमन्, आपने मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न नहीं सुना। 104 में मेरा भी नाम है और मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि यह सदन का परम्परा रही है कि यहाँ पर प्रेसीडेंशियल एड्रेस के ऊपर वोटिंग कभी नहीं हुई। यहाँ तक कि जब हम वहाँ पर

थे, हम विरोधी दल में बैठते थे और जनता पार्टी सत्ता में थी उस समय हमारा 2/3 बहुमत था, हम चाहते ता वोटिंग करवा सकते थे लेकिन श्रीमन् इस सदन की परम्परा रही है कि राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण पर कभी भी वोटिंग नहीं हुई है। इसलिए मैं आपकी रुलिंग चाहूंगा, इस पर आपका व्यवस्था चाहूंगा। क्या आप इस परम्परा का तोड़ रहे हैं?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Maurya, the House is now proceeding to a division on that motion. You have withdrawn your amendments.

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA: I am also there in 104. I have every right to speak.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have no right to speak now. The House will now proceed to a division.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: At least, his name be deleted.

SHRI DINESH GOSWAMI: Sir, before you proceed for division, may I make one submission to both sides of the House?

Sir, what I am trying to submit is, the opposition has voiced a very serious concern on the matter which Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has raised but there is also a convention in this House, which we have followed that we do not normally vote in the President's Address. At every time when these motions have come up, all the times this has been resolved by mutual adjustment between the Treasury Benchese and the Opposition. May I, therefore, request the Treasury Benches that when the Opposition Benches have voiced certain feelings through amendments, etc., they should give some reaction so that we may avoid the kind of situation which is going to be an unpleasant convention?

[Shri Dinesh Goswami]

I would also like to point out that we will definitely follow the convention, but then the Treasury Benches may also remember that this following of a convention should not be a one-way traffic. The Treasury Benches should also follow the democratic convention. May I request that instead of creating such a situation, let there be a mutual understanding between the Treasury Benches and the Opposition?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Goswami, it seems to be a little late for you to try to pour oil on troubled water. You should have done it earlier. Now the Division Bell is ringing and at this moment the House shall proceed to Division.

The motion of amendment which is before the House is being read by me again.

The question is:

"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.'

SHRI BUDDHA PRIYA MAURYA: This House has no right to censor the Government. It is unfortunate, this House has no right to censor the Government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Maurya, please have a little patience. This House will now proceed to mechanical voting.

*The House divided*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ayes—79; Noes—75.

Ayes....79

AYES 79.

Advani, Shri Lal K.  
Alva, Shrimati Margaret  
Amarjit Kaur, Shrimati  
Anand, Shri Jagjit Singh  
Asthana, Shri K. B.  
Bagaitkar, Shri Sadasiv  
Basheer, Shri T.  
Bhabhra, Shri Hari Shankar  
Bhagat, Shri Ganpat Hiralal  
Bhandari, Shri Sunder Singh  
Bhattacharjee, Prof. Sourendra  
Bhola Prasad, Shri  
Bose, Shrimati Pratima  
Chakraborty, Shri Amarprosad  
Dhabe, Shri S. W.  
Dinesh Singh, Shri  
Ghose, Shri Sankar  
Gupta, Shri Bhupesh  
Gupta, Shri Ram Lakhan Prasad  
Hashmi, Shri Syed Ahmad  
Imam, Shrimati Aziza  
Jha, Shri Shiva Chandra  
Joshi, Shri Jagdish  
Joshi, Shri Jagannathrao  
Kulkarni, Shri A. G.  
Kumaran, Shri S.  
Lahane, Shri Motiram Udaybhanji  
Lakhan Singh, Shri  
Madhavan, Shri K. K.  
Mahavir, Dr. Bhai  
Mallick, Shri Harekrushna  
Master, Shri K. Chathunni  
Mathur, Shri Jagdish Prasad  
Menon, Shrimati Leela Damodara  
Menon, Shri Viswanatha

Mishra, Shri Kalraj  
 Mody, Shri Piloo  
 Mohinder Kaur, Shrimati  
 Mukherjee, Shrimati Kanak  
 Mukhopadhyay, Shrimati Purabi  
 Narendra Singh, Shri  
 Nigam, Shri Ladli Mohan  
 Nizam-ud-Din, Shri Syed  
 Oza, Shri Ghanshyambhai  
 Pant, Shri K. C.  
 Parbhu Singh, Shri  
 Parikh, Prof. Ramlal  
 Pattanayak, Shri Bhabani Charan  
 Pradhan, Shri Patitpaban  
 Rajan, Shri Pattiam  
 Raju, Shri V. B.  
 Ramamurti, Shri P.  
 Ray, Shri Rabi  
 Reddy, Shri K. V. Raghunatha  
 Roy, Shri Kalyan  
 Sahaya, Shri Dayanand  
 Saleem, Shri Mohammad Yunus  
 Samad, Shri Golandaz Mohammed-  
 husain A.  
 Sarup Singh Dr.  
 Sebastian, Shri K. C.  
 Sezhiyan, Shri Era  
 Shah, Shri Viren J.  
 Shahabuddin, Shri Syed  
 Shahi, Shri Nageshwar Prasad  
 Shanti Bhushan, Shri  
 Sharma, Shri Ajit Kumar  
 Sharma, Shri Yogendra  
 Shastri, Shri Bhola Paswan  
 Shastri, Shri Brahmdeo Ram  
 Sheikh, Shri Abdul Rehman  
 Siddhu, Dr. M. M. S.  
 Singh, Shri J. K. P. N.  
 Singh, Shri Shiva Nandan  
 Sinha, Shri Indradeep  
 Sinha, Dr. Ramkripal  
 Soni, Shrimati Ambika  
 Surendra Mohan, Shri

Surjeet, Shri Harkishan Singh  
 Varma, Shri Mahadeo Prasad  
 NOES—75  
 Adivarekar, Shrimati Sushila Shankar  
 Anjiah, Shri T.  
 Antulay, Shri A. R.  
 Arif, Shri Mohammed Usman  
 Balram Das, Shri  
 Banerjee, Shri B. N.  
 Bhattacharya, Shri G. C.  
 Bhim Raj, Shri  
 Chanana, Shri Charanjit  
 Chandrasekhar, Shrimati Maragatham  
 Das, Shri Bipinpal  
 Dinesh Chandra, Shri Swami  
 Dutt, Dr. V. P.  
 Dwivedi, Shri Devendra Nath  
 Gogoi, Shri Tilok  
 Goswami, Shri Dinesh  
 Goswami, Shri Sriman Prafulla  
 Gowda, Shri U. K. Lakshmana  
 Gupta, Shri Gurudev  
 Habibullah, Shrimati Hamida  
 Jadhav, Shri Pandurang Dharmaji  
 Jain, Shri Dharamchand  
 Joshi, Shri Krishna Nand  
 Joshi, Shrimati Kumudben Manishan-  
 kar  
 Kalaniya, Shri Ibrahim  
 Kesri, Shri Sitaram  
 Khan, Shri F. M.  
 Khan, Shri Khurshed Alam  
 Khaparde, Shrimati Saroj  
 Lokesh Chandra, Dr.  
 Lotha, Shri Khyomo  
 Mahida, Shri Harisinh Bhagubava  
 Makwana, Shri Yogendra  
 Malik, Shri Syed Abdul  
 Manhar, Shri Bhagatram  
 Maurya, Shri Buddha Priya  
 Mehrotra, Shri Prakash  
 Mehta, Shri Om  
 Mhaisekar, Shri G. R.  
 Mishra, Shri Mahendra Mohan

Mittal, Shri Sat Paul  
 Mondal, Shri Ahmaḍ Hossain  
 Moses, Shri M.  
 Mukherjee, Shri Pranab  
 Naik, Shri L. R.  
 Pande, Shri Bishambhar Nath  
 Poddar, Shri R. K.  
 Rai, Shri Kalp Nath  
 Rajasekharam, Shri P.  
 Rao, Shri V. C. Kesava  
 Reddy, Shri R. Narasimha  
 Roshan Lal, Shri  
 Sahu, Shri Santosh Kumar  
 Salve, Shri N. K. P.  
 Saring, Shri Leonard Solomon  
 Sharma, Shri A. P.  
 Sharma, Shri Kishan Lal  
 Sheikh, Shri Ghouse Mohiuddin  
 Singh, Shri Bhishma Narain  
 Singh, Shri Ng. Tompok  
 Singh, Shrimati Pratibha  
 Sisodia, Shri Sawaisingh  
 Sujan Singh, Shri  
 Sultan, Shrimati Maimoona  
 Sultan Singh, Shri  
 Swu, Shri Scato  
 Totu, Shri Gian Chand  
 Vaishampayan, Shri S. K.  
 Varma, Shri Bhagwati Charan  
 Venkatrao, Shri Chadalavada  
 Verma, Shri Shrikant  
 Warjri, Shri Alexander  
 Yadav, Shri Ramanand  
 Yadav, Shri Shyam Lal  
 Zakaria, Dr. Rafiq

*The motion was adopted.*

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I shall now put the Motion to vote, as amended by the acceptance of Amendment No. 104.

The question is:

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

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

## MESSAGES FROM THE LOK SABHA

### I. The Government of Union Territories (Amendment) Bill, 1980.

### II. The Contingency Fund of India (Amendment) Bill, 1980.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** There are two messages from the Lok Sabha. The Secretary-General is called upon to report the messages.

**SECRETARY-GENERAL:** Sir, I beg to report to the House the following messages received from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary of the Lok Sabha:—

(I)

"In accordance with the provisions of rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith the Government of Union Territories (Amendment) Bill, 1980 as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 30th January, 1980."