

[श्री सवाई सिंह सिसोदिया]

को दूर किया जाना चाहिए और ऐसी व्यवस्था होनी चाहिए कि उर्वरक की दृष्टि से इतनी बड़ी पूँजी जिसकी आज राष्ट्र को आवश्यकता है और जिसके लिए देश को स्वावलम्बी बनाना है, उसको बनाने के कार्य में कोई दिक्कत नहीं होनी चाहिए और तात्कालिक आवश्यक कदम इस दिशा में उठाए जाएं।

**MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME
FOR THE PRESENTATION OF THE
REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE
OF THE HOUSES ON THE INDIAN
PENAL CODE (AMENDMENT)**

BILL, 1972

SHRI YOGENDRA SHARMA (Bihar):
Sir, I beg to move :

"That the time appointed for the presentation of the Report of the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Indian Penal Code (Amendment) Bill, 1972, be further extended up to the last day of the second week of the Ninety-third Session of the Rajya Sabha".

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The House stands adjourned till 2.15 P.M. to day.

The House then adjourned for lunch at thirteen minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at fifteen minutes past two of the clock.
Mr. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

**MOTION OF THANKS ON THE
PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS—contd.**

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The Prime Minister will now reply.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, this last year has been one of extraordinary difficulties for us as well as for a large part of the world. It was not unexpected that many sections of the Opposition should speak with anger and some of them with, if I may say so, malice but there have also been many thoughtful contributions.

Before I begin, I should like to express my deep sympathy to all those who have suffered physically or materially in the Jama Masjid area. Some hon'ble

member remarked that I have not expressed any sympathy. This is not correct, because after the very first news I got, even though I was not well at that time, I sent a message of sympathy and I kept touch with the Delhi Administration and the Home Ministry as to what relief was being given. We convey our sincere condolences to all the bereaved families.

There has also been a major calamity in the north, that is, the earthquake in Himachal and I know hon. Members would like us to extend our deepest sympathy. I extend sympathy on behalf of the Government and, if you would allow me, on behalf of the House, to all those who have suffered. It was all the more tragic because the earthquake took place at a time when most communications were blocked because of heavy snow, so that relief could not reach in time to many places. Even now, we do not have the full picture but we have tried our best and people all over India have responded to appeals and given blankets, money and other help. So we send our sympathy to the affected people.

I would also like to say that just a couple of days ago, last Saturday, I was in Tamil Nadu and I heard heart-rending stories of the distress caused by drought. While I was there, there was a drizzle but hardly enough to solve the problem of drinking water, let alone the severe blow to their agriculture and their crops.

Now, to come to the points made by hon. Members. One hon. Member said that there was variance in the views expressed in the President's Address and those expressed by my colleague, the Home Minister and myself about reforms in the electoral laws. I have not been able to find any such divergence of opinion. We all are agreed that there should be a debate on this matter. Even in the last Session we had said that we would like to discuss it with members of the Opposition but we do feel that it should be a very wide ranging, broad-based discussion all over the country. Some committee was formed. I think some of you have seen what suggestions have been made and, if I may say so with due respect, I do not find them very revolutionary.

Amongst the points made, one was problem of small farmers. It is true that originally the green revolution bypassed smaller farmers. As soon as we realised this, we are making efforts to have special programmes for them, for those who live in the drier parts of the country and for marginal farmers. Our country is so

vast and the number of people involved is so large that these programmes take time to make an impact and even when you can cover lots of people, it is nothing compared to what is to be done. I should like to assure hon. Members that this matter is very much on our minds. Any suggestions which they may have will be welcome.

The retrenchment of workers always creates problems for numbers of people. On the other hand, if a particular project is completed, you cannot say that the work should dragged on just because there is no alternative employment, but our instructions are that some way should be found, even if it means moving some of these people to some distance, to give them other work.

An hon. Member has spoken about education. He felt that Government does not regard education as a core subject. Now, the word 'core' is generally used in a special connotation, but no one will deny that education is the very core of any society. We should not look at it merely in terms of money or the funds allotted. Today education is being widely discussed all over the world and in India also there is a debate on the sort of educational reforms needed. It is true that funds have been cut not only from education, but from almost every programme, from every State, from every Central Ministry. I must say that my full sympathies are with the Minister of Education and his Ministry in their difficult task. I have asked the Planning Commission to do everything possible to ensure that none of the important programmes or the important changes which are being brought about are affected by these cuts.

It was suggested that scientists and technologists should be encouraged to go to the rural areas. Now, this is of crucial importance to our development and I fully support the hon. Member who has made this point. If hon. Members ever read my speeches they will notice that there is hardly any occasion, connected with science and technology, when I do not stress the point that not only must they go to the rural areas but work there to have a deeper understanding of rural problems. A major portion of our science must be directed to solving rural problems. I am not against fundamental science or basic research. They are important to a country of our size and importance. We will be able to tackle even the problems of basic science better if we are aware of some of the problems which are right on our doorstep. With small inventions,

small improvements, in the old materials used for buildings, in improving the bullock-cart or the Chakki—or grindstone and many other such small matters. I do not think this needs much effort but it would bring immediate relief to millions of housewives and millions of farmers. There is one group of experts, young people—scientists, sociologists, technologists and doctors knit in a small compact group—perhaps hon. Members are aware of this experiment—who is doing work in the rural areas of Ajmer. They are very dedicated. Some of them were in high-paid jobs. They have devoted themselves to work in one area and after making a success of it there for three or four years, they are branching out and opening similar centres in other States. Of course, these are still very small islands of work, but their importance is not only in the work achieved but equally in the fact that they are drawing the attention of other young people. If we can encourage young people from universities to take such interest in constructive activities, it would make a great deal of difference to our country all along the line.

About historical monuments, one hon. Member said that they are not being properly looked after. The Minister must be a little tired of the number of letters I write to him on this subject. I am constantly pursuing the matter. His reply is we do not have enough guards, we do not have enough money. While we are trying to provide them money, frankly I do not think it needs a big amount. We need to make local people more conscious that these are their treasures. When visitors, tourists or others want to make quick, easy money by selling pictures, sculptures or pieces of architecture, it is for the local people to be vigilant. At the same time, we must have adequate guards. This awareness is something which we should somehow include in our school courses so that people of the region recognise the value to the nation of their treasures and how they should be safeguarded. In our treasures I would include not only monuments and architectural treasures, but also the art of the region, the wildlife of the region and the forests of the region. Hon. Members are very anxious to have paper mills and industries, and I am for them too. Please do not think that I am cancelling any licence to a paper mill. But we must not denude our mountainside and our countryside of their forests. This is having an adverse effect on our rainfall and climate. Unfortunately, you do not see the results of such vandalism immediately; when you do realize, it is too late then and it takes years and years to grow trees again. Today we are suffering from what happened during the war. That was when the major deforestation began.

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

So, from now on we must create consciousness amongst all citizens and especially amongst young people. The same goes for wildlife. It is often asked that when people are suffering, why should we bother about animals. But various studies in the West have established that the elimination of any species has a bad effect on the general ecological balance and therefore also affects the human species. Agriculture has suffered because of the indiscriminate use of pesticides. There are pests which we do not like. But never the less they serve a useful purpose. Therefore we have to be very careful before we decide that some species can be expendable.

Every now and then one hears that action against smugglers has now been given up or has slackened. I am constantly writing to my colleague about this matter and I am assured that the work has not slackened. The drive is just as hard. Only now, because the novelty has worn out, it does not get so much publicity. But the matter is being pursued just as hard. We continue to need the help and cooperation of the general public in this matter as in many other matters.

Now, Sir, in a debate like this, it is natural that our shortcomings should be pointed out and attention drawn to the failures of the Government and our Party. But it was saddening for me to hear the very first speaker, from the Opposition calling us a Government of failures'. I remember how, in the middle of last year, the very next day after our scientists had carried out our peaceful nuclear experiment, there was a meeting of Opposition leaders. But they had not one word of praise to say for the scientists' achievement. They did not have to pay compliments to the Government because I do not regard it as the achievement of the Government. It was the nation's achievement. But the Opposition seems to well itself with so many small things—and sometimes even with hatred and bitterness—that they can see no good in anything that is happening. It is their own sense of failure which makes them see failure everywhere around them. It is true that achievement also creates problems. It is when you are moving when you are doing things that you can make mistakes. It is only the dead who have no problems. But just because there are problems, it does not mean that there has not been any achievement or any forward movement.

For its part, the Government has started this year, 1975, with a sense of quiet confidence and solid determination. A hesitant government could not have put forward the hard and, if I may say so, almost heroic measures of economic discipline and reached agreements with neighbouring countries—

some of these agreements were not so popular—to solve a number of difficult problems and, finally reach the understanding which we have in Jammu and Kashmir. As I said earlier, I do not wish to claim success for the Government. But I certainly regard these as the successes of the nation. We shall continue to try to solve all problems which have remained unsolved and secure many more such successes for the nation in spite of the Opposition's obstructive defeatism.

The President's Address has given a detailed account of the economic scene. I do not propose to go over the same ground here. It is not surprising that prices went up. They went up here because they are going up all over the world and because of the situation of the last year. It was a matter worth noting that we managed to bring the price level down in the last five months, which so few other countries have been able to do. It is no use comparing the wages of one country with another. We have also to see where we started from. You cannot make comparisons unless you compare the base from which India started and the level at which our people worked and the level of people in other countries.

Sir, disparaging remarks have been made even about the downward trend of prices. Some people have tried to make out that it was due only to seasonal agricultural factors. No doubt the season has effect on some prices. But surely credit should also be given to the fiscal restraint which was exercised by the Government and the special effort *a made in the industrial field*, especially by the workers and managers in our public sector establishments. The President has congratulated them and I should like to add mine and your congratulations too.

If hon'ble Members will bear with me, I should like to repeat something which I have said on a couple of occasions outside this House. What has been the situation in the rest of the world? It is part of my duty to be apprised of what is happening and I have to read a large number of newspapers from different countries. In many of their articles and comments, noted columnists have described the grave economic difficulties which various countries in Europe have been facing in the last year or so. They have written about inflation, rising prices, increasing unemployment, recession. These are the problems before them. But the point which they have stressed is this—that these countries, such as France and Germany, were they follow democratic systems, have strong Opposition parties. Their ruling parties have slender majorities. The prevalent economic situation and the Government's

inability to handle at would have been a very convenient target for Opposition parties to use against their government. And had they used it effectively, perhaps they could have succeeded in bringing down their Governments. In point of fact this is not happening. Why ? Because they all realise the gravity of the situation. They realise that at a time when the entire economic scene is so fluid in the world, their country's stability is of utmost importance. So although they do criticise but, according to these people, the attack is in a very low key. There is similar comment about the criticism of the situation from the Communist or Eastern bloc of countries. Normally such a situation would have been exploited. They could have said that they had prophesied that the capitalist system would not work. Again, although there is some criticism, it is not the sharp criticism one would expect because they also realise that instability would affect them along with others and that no country can escape the repercussions. Perhaps some hon. friends opposite may contradict me, but so far as my information goes, and I have met some of the leaders of these countries also, even Communist economies have felt the impact of what is happening in Europe. They have not been able to isolate themselves from it. When I spoke about this to somebody in Delhi, he replied : "You see, political parties in these other countries have formed the Government. They know how difficult it is. So they have a greater sense of responsibility". I do not think that this is a valid point. Almost every party here has been part of the Government. It may not have formed the Government at the Centre. But it has had to face most of these problems in one State or another. And so they are aware that it is easier to speak about these things than to bring about major changes. These people have realised, and it is something which everyone must realise, that it needs the whole nation's strength not only to overcome such a situation but even to withstand it. The situation in India is more difficult than in other countries not just because the poverty-line is lower or because there are larger numbers of people to be dealt with, but even because of our size, because we have been growing in strength and self assurance. This itself has attracted a lot of illwill towards us. So we are subject to various pressures which other countries are not subjected to or they do not mind. Many would just accept a subservient position. But we stand up to pressures, so the situation here becomes very much more complex. I sincerely hope that the parties of the Opposition will also try and view these matters with a greater sense of responsibility.

Sometimes people say that we are putting the blame or shifting the blame for every-
979RSS/74

thing that happens on to the Opposition. I can say for myself that I have never said so. I do not say that it is the Opposition which has created the present economic difficulties. But I have said that the Opposition tries to take advantage of the situation in a way that sometimes harms people. When you have massive strikes which aim at bringing the economy to a halt, when grain cannot move, then certainly it is taking an advantage which is not in the general interest of the nation.

Sir, we hear now of people preaching the doctrine of disobedience to public servants, of preaching, well, I can only call it mutiny to the army or the police. Has anybody bothered to consider the results of this ? Suppose we face a situation on our borders ? It has nothing to do with the Congress or with any political party. Once you encourage this kind of indiscipline, how do you contain it ? How do you face the enemy ? No thought is being given to these basic problems which, to my mind, are most important. If you do not have discipline in our forces, in our public servants, then no other problems can be solved, neither by us nor by any other government or by any other party which may hope to form the Government. Some people may think that if they create a situation of anarchy, then the churning of the ocean will yield up the nectar of office for them. But I can only say that if it comes about in this way, it will be very bitter nectar and I doubt if they will be able to swallow it any more than they can swallow poison.

SHRI M. P. SHUKLA : Poison also came along with nectar.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I should like to plead with the Opposition, persuade them if I can, but certainly caution them as I must, not to follow the politics of destruction and not to weaken the nation at a time when forces around us want India to be weakened so that they can pressurise us to follow the line which is more to their interest.

Much has been said here and outside about the Bihar agitation. Several Parties have formed an axis to wage the agitation and also to carry the torch to other parts of the country. A large number of statements have been made, are being made, which are often conflicting and contradictory. As far as I can see it, why are so many political parties interested ? Are they there disinterestedly ? Is it that they do not want power and they do not want to win elections ? If they are there, it is obviously to capture power. And what is distressing is not they want to capture power because in politics this is a legitimate aim for any political party and our system allows it, but what is distressing is that they want to capture power anyhow, not considering the means.

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

Those who would lecture us about communalism are themselves unabashedly communal. Some people who say they are non-violent, are co-operating with violent organisations; many who are talking about anti-corruption are certainly cooperating with corrupt individuals. A certificate has even been given to the RSS to the effect that it is only a social service organisation. Anybody who has read the speeches of RSS leaders, made over the last few years, can judge for himself. Have these speeches anything to do with social service or social welfare or cultural subjects? They are purely political, venomous speeches. Many of them are positively against certain communities in India. And I saw in some newspapers that RSS leaders themselves make no bones about their true aims. In fact, if I may quote: "The line between politics and social service is thin" and again: "We want to influence politics".

These are some of the visible contradictions. One may imagine that they can be temporarily ignored. But they have their impact. This so-called non-violent movement is giving strength to these forces and these groups which will destroy even those who are supporting them today. Such faces have been given respectability. They have been given opportunity to reach out to areas where they had no foothold before. This is extremely dangerous to the future of this country.

As I said, the democratic system provides legitimacy to any normal opposition activities. But the strategy which some opposition parties are following is a selective smear campaign by a very odd collection of self-styled moralists. To blacken the reputation of people in the Government is cynical and also immoral. As I have said on many occasions, if they are against corruption, they should speak out about the corruption of those who are with them, not only of those who happen to be in the Congress today. It is astonishing to claim that a race of shining knights will be born by the Jan Sangh and Jan Sanghrsh Samitis.

There also seems to be a policy of issuing certificates to some in my party in the hope that they will drive a wedge in the Congress. Well, of course, it is for our Members to decide what they do. I sincerely hope that they will not succeed in this. I believe Congress is too large and too open a party to be undermined by this type of incitement.

Shri Bhupesh Gupta especially referred to our friend and colleague, Shri Lalit Narayan Mishra. He was a man who was loyal to the country and to the people

and he did good to friend and foe alike. His death is not a loss merely to our party but to the country. There is no doubt that the wave of hate which was let loose in Bihar and elsewhere culminated in his death. From character assassination to assassination is not a long step. What ghoulish relish the Opposition has shown over his tragic death! To us, Sir, the death was bad enough. But the manner in which his opponents have tried to make capital out of it is even worse. They have tried to question the progress of the investigation and they have questioned even the appointment of a Supreme Court Judge. The assassination came as a great shock. And I thought that this very shock would help us to pull ourselves together and realise where these agitations were leading us and to feel that the time has come when things had gone far enough. To cry halt and take a new look at what is happening.

Nobody denies the need for reform. Earlier I spoke both about electoral reforms and educational reforms. But this is not the way to bring about reforms. Far from it. We are creating violence and indiscipline in educational institutions, which will be very difficult to remove of any time. If people believe in non-violence they should not be free and ready to provide alibi for violence. Corruption is bad and has to be rooted out. I spoke earlier of pests. Just as the pests eat up our crops, corruption also eats into the foundations of our national life and it must be exterminated as pests are exterminated. But we should take care that the pesticide which kills the pests does not kill all life and that is what I feel these agitations are trying to do. There is need for a national campaign for cleaning the nation of the corrupt and the corruptors. But first of all the anti-corruption effort should be channelised along clean lines, and legal lines. Charges against those in public life can be gone into by people who are capable of sifting evidence. The public cannot take action. But we do want popular help in pointing out corruption where they have personal knowledge of it. There may be corruption in the administration or in the Government and it should be rooted out. There is no question about that. But we know there is also corruption at the lower levels and you cannot deal with one and not with the other. At the lower levels we need the help of the people especially those who live in the neighbourhood and who may have greater information as to what is happening in their areas. And, if they feel strongly about these matters if students feel concerned, then they should try to find out the facts and

come out to help. I can assure them that in this they would have our support. But this does not mean that they are free to beat up people or set fire to buildings. I am sure that anybody who will look carefully at this matter will agree that corruption cannot be counteracted by the kind of agitations which are themselves financed by corrupt elements. That is merely a way of hoodwinking the public and the nation.

My name has also been bandied about. I do not know what to say because all kinds of allegations have been made, starting from 1953, or some such date. My life has been as open as anybody's life in the country not now but since . . . (*Interruptions*). I am not one of those who believes in the accumulation of money or property. There was nothing to urge me to give away my ancestral property. But now when matters are raised, I can only say, as I have said before, that nothing wrong has been done and that I would never countenance any such thing being done in my name or by anybody near to me. All the questions that have been asked in the House have been fully answered time and again. Whatever people's intentions may be, today an atmosphere of witch-hunting is being created—there is selective attack on certain people.

On the larger question of proprieties and improprieties, we should evolve certain national procedures through the wisdom of our public opinion and our Parliamentary prudence. Some countries have adopted the method of street corner tribunals. But is this what we want in our country? Has there not been great injustice where such decisions have been left to the public? The guilty may receive punishment, but along with them quite a lot of other people get involved merely because of private quarrels or disagreements.

Why do we use the word "witch-hunting"? I do not know how many hon. Members have studied that period of British history. Suddenly an atmosphere was created that certain women were indulging in witchcraft. If you did not like a particular woman, you left a black doll or some such token in a corner of her house. People would come and search and declare "Oh! this woman is a witch; she should be burnt". It was the most horrifying period of history. Some years ago there was a play on this subject, which my father and I attended. But I had read about these happenings

much earlier. This is how this phrase came into being. It was not as if there were real witches, hunted by people. Suddenly a hysteria would be created. Calculated innuendo would arouse suspicion and the public would get agitated.

Now this also gives rise to corruption. Corruption is not of one kind; it is of many kinds. Public morality and behaviour cannot be promoted by elevating gherao or rowdyism into satyagraha or condoning actions of disorderly groups of youth against teachers as our friend said yesterday, or any other group. We now have a situation where youth power is not being directed into constructive channels. Sometimes it is said: See what has happened in China. But it has only happened with the most tremendous discipline and hard work, not just by people deciding who is going to teach what and how?

The other day I made a statement about our understanding with Sheikh Abdullah. I was surprised—not that day but a couple of days earlier—to hear the remarks of an hon. Member—when he said that we had come to this agreement since Sheikh Mohd. Abdullah was now for the Congress. This is a ridiculous statement. It is not a question of personal or party agreement, but of national commitment.

If we have been able to come to some conclusions, it is because it seems to us that Sheikh Sahib has publicly committed himself to certain basic points to which we have always subscribed. Sheikh Sahib changed his views but we remained on firm ground. When he decided to rejoin us on our ground, which is a national and not a party ground, we thought that we should take cognizance of it. Members know that Sheikh Sahib was in the thick of the freedom struggle from 1935, that is when I first remember seeing him. He played a major role in arousing the consciousness of the people of Jammu and Kashmir. He formed the National Conference which was part of the State's people's movement for independence. He directed the people of Jammu and Kashmir towards secularism and a more progressive social outlook. In those days this was not easy because of the pulls of the Muslim League and other factors. He and his colleagues had to work hard and we all worked closely together for the common aim, that is,

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

the independence of India, of which Jammu and Kashmir was an integral part. Later, there was some disagreement and the Government of India did not hesitate to take action. Sheikh Sahib now says that there was a misunderstanding and that we did not take the trouble to fathom the true facts. I do not want to go into all that history. I am only trying to explain that in spite of what happened in the intervening period, if Sheikh Sahib now seems to have returned to the national mainstream, we should all welcome this and we should understand that if it is not easy for us, it is even more difficult for him. It is very difficult to come back and if I can take you into confidence, he is very angry with me personally because he feels that I, not personally as Indira Gandhi but as head of the Government,—have been responsible for his imprisonment for so many years. All this bitterness is directed fortunately not towards India, but towards me. It is not easy for him to forget the past suddenly. But we have both tried to reach an understanding so that a new chapter can be opened. This does not mean that the people of Kashmir were not with us. The people have been loyal and have worked for us. I mean they worked for Kashmir because they realised that the interest of Kashmir was linked with India on account of our basic policies. In fact, this is what Sheikh Sahib himself used to say earlier and he is saying it again. So, this is a new experiment and I sincerely hope that this experiment will work. But it will need a great deal of understanding. I do not think we should get excited by small things or by a word which is uttered. It will take time before the things are evenly balanced and we can progress along the road to understanding. I am glad that, leaving a small group of professional dissenters, the nation has overwhelmingly welcome the agreement. Perhaps, hon. Members have heard that even the hartal which was asked for by the Jana Sangh has not been successful. I think this is because of the understanding appeals to the good sense of our people. They realised that it is statesmanship to solve a problem which has grown over the years and that vision and goodwill can cut any political Gordian knot. I think vision and goodwill have been displayed by Sheikh Abdullah, Syed Mir Qasim and all the people who have handled the question from outside. I give my good wishes to the Government

and the people of Jammu and Kashmir for their progress so that they will continue to make even greater contribution to the political life of the nation of which they are an integral and inalienable part. I referred just now to the Jana Sangh hartal. Perhaps those of us who have studied politics will not be surprised that the Jana - Sangh from inside and Pakistan from outside should be opposed to this understanding. This is another proof that communalist forces always hang together. Proceeding from opposite directions, they manage to clasp hands. Anything that strengthens secularism is and has been repugnant to Pakistan.

The other day I purposely did not speak about Mr. Bhutto because this matter is a purely domestic one and we resent any outside interference in our affairs, which is what Mr. Bhutto's call for hartal amounts to. Had we said anything at all about what is happening in Baluchistan and the North Western Frontier, how would he have reacted? He and his friends in other countries are raising the issue of Sikkim. Hon. Members have, perhaps, noticed that it was in that very week—what a strange coincidence—that Pakistan very quietly took over the State of Hunza but not a whisper, not a sound either out of China or the U.S. or by any of our newspapers, for that matter. Nobody has commented on it. But there is always a hue and cry when we do something. We earnestly hope that on further reflection, Mr. Bhutto will appreciate that we wish sincerely to resolve Indo-Pakistan differences by bilateral discussions and in accordance with the Simla Agreement and that this understanding on Kashmir which we have reached will be a help and not a hindrance to the normalization of relations with Pakistan. But, of course, the path is strewn with difficulty. I think Pakistan's new belligerency coincides with the beginning of the fresh flow of arms. The moral of this coincidence should not be lost on the world. It is totally specious to argue that arms should be supplied to Pakistan because we in India are developing a self-sufficient defence industry. I think it is dishonest to argue that our nuclear research poses a danger to Pakistan. As we have said time and again, our investigation of peaceful uses of nuclear energy poses no military threat to any one. The decision of the U.S. to resume the arming of Pakistan shows that the policy makers of that great country continue to subscribe to

the fallacy of equating Pakistan and India. It is this policy which has caused tension on the sub-continent. This decision amounts to the reopening of old wounds and hinders the process of healing and normalization towards which we have been working so persistently.

I do not intend to go into greater details about our relations with foreign countries. The President's Address gives a succinct account of the improvement of relations with our neighbouring countries, near and far. Difficult problems await us in the field of international economic diplomacy and our success depends upon the internal strength and unity that we can generate in our country. This is the special reason why efforts to create doubts, division and disarray should be halted. Our economy is on the mend but we are not yet out of trouble. To carry forward this process of recovery, all our energies are required. The economy will not improve if political quarrels continue to divert the people's attention from these basic problems and even prevent democracy from functioning as it should. As I have said earlier, opposition parties have every right to seek power. But they should do so by spelling out their policies and securing the people's approval for those policies.

Today the opposition axis is vague about their economic policies and their foreign policies. In fact, they are so busy with programmes for agitations that I do not know whether they have any time to think about policies or discuss them or to notice what is happening all around.

This agitational group includes all those who are dead-set against non-alignment and even trade with socialist countries. They want us to move away from the Soviet Union which has been our consistent friend in our times of trouble.

One hon. Member advised us to be greater friends with China. I do not want to talk on this subject. It has been discussed on so many occasions. Isn't it rather strange that people wish us to deny a friend who has stood by us, who has never put any pressure on us nor made any demands on us on the baseless assumption that we may barter away our independence. On the other hand, whose friendship do they promote? Those people who do not want our friendship, those people who do not take our outstretched hand, those people with whom friendship is not as warm as it should be. It is not because we have been found wanting. It is because of what they have done and what they have said and what they are saying that our relationship is cool.

Opposition groups include parties who have the quaintest notions about social equality and social justice. There is one group whose record of dealings with the Scheduled Castes is most unsavoury. So, it becomes our duty to guard the nation against all these internal weakening forces as well as external enemies. The Government will not be found wanting in this duty. My effort has been to lift the sights of the Government and the nation higher. I know that we have made many mistakes. I know that there have been shortfalls in our programmes, some of which are due to our own errors and some due to events and happenings beyond our control. But, can any country just keep looking at the difficulties and the shortfalls and the failures?

One hon. Member complained that the President's Address has not spoken of the future. I think it has given direction for the future. You can only reach the future if you walk towards it. What are most of the opposition parties doing? They are not looking at the future. They are just looking at their feet. They are trying to rake up as much mud as they can so that all problems are obscured—the basic problems, the basic vision of the people is obscured. They are raising doubts in the people's minds about their own capacity. We need resources, we need money, we need equipment, we need machinery and we need raw materials. But, if we do not have, if the nation does not have, self-confidence then all those things will not help the nation to go ahead. It does not matter how much funds Shri Subramaniam can raise or how much he can set apart for various items. We are trying our best to save. But, without self-confidence and without a clear direction, the nation cannot go forward.

A large country like India must act with an inner conviction of its strength. I have tried to devote my life to build a tolerant India, a secular India and a peaceful India. I wish to continue to work for it and devote all my energy for it and, if necessary, die for it. Let us not be bogged down in petty squabbles which diminish the nation. Let us deploy our strength to face the issues which affect the long-term interests of our people.

Sir, I hope that those who have put in amendments will withdraw them and that the House will accept this Motion.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Let us now take up the amendments.

**Amendment Nos. 1 to 50 were negatived.*

For the text of amendments *vide* the 19th February 1975.

[Mr. Deputy Chairman]

*Amendment Nos. 51 to 63 were *negatived*.

*Amendment Nos. 64 to 67 were *negatived*.

*Amendment Nos. 69 to 96 were *negatived*.

*Amendment Nos. 141 to 155 were *negatived*.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I shall now put the motion to vote. The question is :

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

“That the Members of the Rajya Sabha assembled in this Session are deeply grateful to the President for the Address which he has been pleased to deliver to both Houses of Parliament assembled together on the 17th February, 1975.”

The motion was adopted.

THE PRESS COUNCIL (SECOND AMENDMENT) BILL, 1974—*contd.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Now, we take up the Press Council Bill. Yes, Mr. Sultan Singh.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): What about sealing the lockers and sealing of toshakhana? That has to be done. Instructions should be issued to seal all the lockers....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : We are now on the Press Council Bill.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : It is a constructive suggestion from the Opposition. We deliver gold to the country.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, let us go to the Press Council Bill now. Yes, Mr. Sultan Singh.

श्री सुलतान सिंह (हरियाणा) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारे देश में हमारे विरोधी साथी रोजाना प्रैस की फ्रीडम की बात करते हैं। जहाँ प्रैस कौंसिल प्रैस की फ्रीडम के लिए बनाई गई वहाँ में यह चाहता हूँ कि प्रैस कौंसिल के सामने एक आइडिया, एक नजरिया होना चाहिए और इस देश के अन्दर प्रैस के

लिए कोई कोड आफ कंडक्ट हो। आज हमारे देश में जिस स्तर पर जा रहे हैं ये अखबार उससे महमूस होता है कि विदेशी लोग हमारी प्रैस के बारे में क्या कहते होंगे। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपके सामने एक ‘मदरलैण्ड’ अखबार का हवाला देना चाहता हूँ। 26 जनवरी के इस अखबार ने लिखा है एक ज्योतिपी के नाम से और उम ज्योतिपी का नाम भी नहीं बतलाया। उसने कहा कि 1976 के अन्दर देश की प्रधान मंत्री लोकतंत्र को समाप्त करेंगी और उसके बाद लिखता है कि जनता बगावत करेगी और फिर उससे आगे चलकर वह अखबार लिखता है कि हिन्दुस्तान की प्रधान मंत्री इन्दिरा गांधी की मौत अननेचुरल होगी।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इससे ज्यादा घटिया, इससे ज्यादा जनरेलिज्म के नाम पर कलकित कोई कार्य नहीं हो सकता जो ‘मदरलैण्ड’ ने किया है। मैं आपकी मार्फत गुजराल साहब से दखिस्त करता हूँ कि आप प्रैस काउन्सिल जहाँ बनाते हैं वहाँ प्रैस कौंसिल [को यह भी चाहिए कि इतने घटिया अखबार इस देश में छपने न दें। यह खाली एक प्रधान मंत्री की बात नहीं है, यह खाली इन्दिरा गांधी की बात नहीं है बल्कि इससे हिन्दुस्तान के जनरेलिज्म का दिवाला निकलता है और दूसरे देश के लोग भी क्या कहते होंगे कि क्या यही हिन्दुस्तान का जनरेलिज्म है। एक अखबार टाइल पेज पर लिखता है।

मैं कहता हूँ कि इससे अधिक शर्म की बात और क्या हो सकती है। मेरे पास टाइम्स आफ इंडिया है। इसके अन्दर चण्डीगढ़ से एक स्टोरी छपी है। इसमें लिखा है कि “Congress rout in Haryana. Bring leadership issue to the court”

*For the text of the amendments *vide* Debate/dated the 19th Feb., 1975.