

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, the Budget Railways, 2015-16; Shri Manoj Sinha may lay it on the Table.

THE BUDGET (RAILWAYS), 2015-16

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS (SHRI MANOJ SINHA): Sir, I beg to lay on the Table, a statement (in English and Hindi) of the estimated receipts and expenditure of the Government of India, for the year 2015-16, in respect of Railways.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE — *Contd.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have to lay one more Paper on the Table.

White paper on Indian Railways

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS (SHRI MANOJ SINHA): Sir, I lay on the Table, a copy (in English and Hindi) of the "White Paper on Indian Railways (February, 2015)".

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Members, I want to again announce that all parties should stick to their allotted time-limit. No. 2, no new names will be accepted. This has already been announced. Now, the hon. Leader of the House would like to intervene.

SHRI MADHUSUDAN MISTRY(Gujarat): Sir, before you take up the Motion of Thanks on President's Address, I have a submission to make.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have called the hon. Leader of the House. I will allow you after that.

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

वित्त मंत्री; कॉर्पोरेट कार्य मंत्री; तथा सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्री और सदन के नेता (श्री अरुण जेटली): माननीय उपसभापति जी, महामहिम राष्ट्रपति जी ने जो अभिभाषण दोनों सदनों के समक्ष रखा है, मैं उसके समर्थन में बोलने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ। कल से इस सदन में इस अभिभाषण पर बहस चल रही है और स्वाभाविक है कि प्रधान मंत्री श्री नरेन्द्र मोदी जी के नेतृत्व में जो एनडीए की सरकार चल रही है, उसके 9 महीने के कार्यकाल और उसकी नीतियों को लेकर दोनों पक्षों की ओर से टिप्पणी होगी। लेकिन एक बार हम अपने आपको राजनीति से थोड़ा अलग करके देखें, तो इन 9 महीनों में क्या हुआ है, यह भी अपने आप स्पष्ट हो जाएगा। Have these nine months brought about any basic change?

[श्री अरुण जेटली]

The first and the obvious change, if you compare it with the previous five years' term of UPA-II, is that the word 'corruption' is no longer being used in Indian politics. Nobody is listening to the use of words like 'scams', 'corruption', which used to be a matter of daily occurrence, daily debate, occupying media headlines, at least in the last nine months. ...*(Interruptions)*...

Nine months ago, there was an environment of economic doom. The world was writing us off. I am not going to make a detailed reference to this because we will discuss it in the course of the Budget. But, today, we are back on the global radar. And not only are we back on the global radar, the world also has now high expectations from India because other competing and comparable economies are facing serious challenges.

I was just reading the last issue of *The Economist*. Its has India on its cover page. The title is 'India's Chance to Fly'. I will only read the first sentence of their report and it says, and I quote, "Emerging markets used to be a beacon of hope in the world economy, but now they are more often a source of gloom. China's economy is slowing. Brazil is mired in stagflation. Russia is in recession, battered by Western sanctions and the slump in the oil price; South Africa is plagued by inefficiency and corruption. Amid the disappointment one big emerging market which stands out is India". This is by far considered one of the most prestigious journals in the world.

Sir, yesterday, the hon. Leader of Opposition, Shri Ghulam Nabi Azad, had said that you have only changed the name of the schemes. It is not merely the name; it is the complete substance. Would you only pay lip sympathy to the schemes or are you willing to take them up on a mission mode? That is the difference. The Jan Dhan Scheme for financial inclusion is not a change of name. What the UPA did as a part of financial inclusion was merely ornamental. The basic problem was that you treated a village as a unit; if a village has access to a business correspondent or a business correspondent or a bank has access to a village, financial inclusion is complete. And you didn't have people opening bank accounts; there were very few. Now, we had 12.5 crore accounts in 100 days, many of which have money put in them. And our next challenge will be how to put money into those accounts.

Every State Government, irrespective of the political complexion of the Government, every Chief Minister, elected representatives, MPs, MLAs, all participated

because we treated a family or an individual as a unit. Every person, every home in a village, had to be approached. There are States like Kerala where the success rate is 100 per cent. Every house has been included there.

Now, we all stand committed to federalism, but with the monumental decision we took a few days ago, pursuant to the recommendations of the Fourteenth Finance Commission, every State suddenly has found its revenue increased, not only increase in terms of percentage from 32 to 42, but also towards Panchayats and Municipalities, towards Disaster Management, etc. The eleven States -- and it is extremely important — which are revenue-deficit States, are also to be covered by providing a grant.

And unlike the Congress approach of saying 'New Delhi sends money', we don't believe that New Delhi sends money to the States. It is the right of the States. After all, the money is collected from the States. It is the people living in those States who contribute taxes. We collect them and we share them with the States. And, therefore, I found that States which have non-BJP Governments have become the biggest beneficiaries. And we are not saying this grudgingly. It is the right of those States, and they will get a chance to grow. Couldn't this decision have been taken earlier that the fruits of auction would go to the coal-bearing States? Mr. Bhupinder Singh is nodding because sitting there, he has been raising it repeatedly in this House that we have the coal and, therefore, give us the money. And we had the courage to say that hundred per cent of the money would go to those States.

If you seriously consider the changing polity, I would urge the hon. Leader of the Opposition — he is not there; Shri Anand Sharma is competent enough to protect the interests of the Party — to kindly introspect what has happened.

Kindly introspect what has happened. कल कह दिया कि आप काम करने में जीरो हो। हम काम करने में जीरो हैं, पर सीट आपकी स्टेट आफ्टर स्टेट में जीरो आ रही है। Seven State Assembly elections have been held in the last nine months. In Andhra Pradesh, we know who won! In Telengana, we know who won! In Odisha, we know who won! So is the case in Maharashtra, Jharkhand, Haryana and Jammu and Kashmir. We lost Delhi, but we got 33 per cent votes. जिस दिन 33 को 40 कर लेंगे, 42 कर लेंगे तो स्थिति बदल भी जाएगी। आपके पीछे राजीव शुक्ल जी बैठे हैं, आजकल हमारे ..(व्यवधान)..मैं नहीं हूँ, क्रिकेट के नेता हैं। सबसे बड़ी अचीवमेंट, जो क्रिकेट में मानी जाती है, जो नेगेटिव रिकॉर्ड्स में आता है, वह यह है कि जो दोनों पारियों में जीरो बनाता है,

[श्री अरुण जेटली]

the double-duck, the royal duck, as they call it. सात में से आपका आंध्र प्रदेश विधान सभा में भी ज़ीरो था और दिल्ली में भी ज़ीरो है। यह पहली बार है कि कोई नेशनल पार्टी जिन स्टेट्स में बीसियों साल तक हुकूमत कर चुकी है, वह डबल डक स्कोर करे। आपकी पंद्रह साल की परफॉर्मेंस थी और उसका यह हाल हुआ। आप कम से कम इसका आत्मनिरीक्षण कर लीजिए कि यह क्यों हुआ? कल आज़ाद साहब प्रधान मंत्री जी को यह सलाह दे रहे थे कि आपको अपनों से बचना है, you have to be careful of your own people. Well, charity begins at home. Instead of advising us, please take care of your own house. And if you have to take care of your own house, I will just recollect, remind you of, a very interesting line which was a part of the political campaign more than two decades ago in the United States. This was the famous election where President Bush was contesting against a newer candidate, Mr. Bill Clinton. In that election, an independent candidate, Ross Perot, entered the field. He was an industrialist. He booked the television time, spent a lot of money on advertising and campaigning, etc. He had a very fine advertising done. And he was using the discontent against the two at that time, and, therefore, was a negative candidate. He got about 11 per cent votes or so, the only independent to have got so. So, I wanted to advise Azad Saheb — he is not here — what that campaign line to the two main parties was. This is what you can, perhaps, use within your own house rather than advising us. The campaign line was, "Lead me, follow me or get out of the way." And, therefore, as far as advising us is concerned, you will recollect that the Prime Minister spoke in this House in the last session. You wanted him to come again. He has spoken outside this House also. And the consistent message has been that the Government is committed to protecting the rights of every group irrespective of their beliefs, caste or religion. Therefore, there will be no compromise on that. आज़ाद साहब ने यह कहा है कि आप जम्मू-कश्मीर में क्या कर रहे हैं? In fact, he went to the extent of using a word which, in my respectful submission, was disrespect to the wisdom of the people there.

पूरा जम्मू रीजन हमने स्वीप किया है। वैली में पीडीपी को ज्यादा सीटें मिली हैं, नेशनल कांफ्रेंस को कम मिली हैं। आज उस असेम्बली में स्टेलमेट है। उन्होंने कहा कि some people are a red rag as far as State is concerned. आपकी कठिनाई यह है कि आपके रेड रैग्स थोड़ा सा वेरी करते रहते हैं। आज़ाद साहब आए हैं। आपने कल कहा, "Some people are a red rag to the Valley." It is true that we have a distinct opinion about the historical blunders which have been made in relation to the State and I am sure whether the vision given by Dr. Shyama Prasad Mukherjee was the right one or Panditji's vision

was the right one, history will make a judgment on that. The regions have voted differently and if the regions have voted differently, how is the Government to be formed? आपने हमें तो रेड रैंग कह दिया, लेकिन आपके रेड रैंग की परिभाषा बदलती है। 1953 में शेख साहब आपके लिए रेड रैंग बन गए थे। उसके बाद वर्षों तक कांग्रेस नहीं होती थी, नेशनल कांग्रेस ही कांग्रेस थी। जो नेशनल कांग्रेस के लोग थे, वे प्लेबिसाइट फ्रंट पर आ चुके थे। सच में ईमानदारी से सोचिए कि कभी इतिहास लिखा जाएगा, तो जम्मू-कश्मीर के सम्बन्ध में आपका इतिहास क्या होगा? 1953 के बाद 1957 के, 1962 के, 1967 के चुनावों का जिक्र होगा, तो how did your party win the elections there? बीसियों उम्मीदवारों के कैंडिडेट रद्द कर देना। What is unthinkable in the world is that you reject the nominations of dozens of candidates and get your people elected unanimously. That's a part of the history and that was the history you made. Finally, you had to correct your mistake and enter into an accord, but you never learnt because without a popular support you wanted to be in power. So you were in power in the 50s and the 60s without the popular support. उन दिनों एक ऑफिसर होता था, जिसके सामने एक एफिडेविट साइन करना पड़ता था। तो मजाक चलता था कि यह लोगों की सरकार नहीं है, उस अधिकारी की सरकार है। आपको पूरी जानकारी है, एक डिप्टी कमिश्नर के द्वारा बनाई गई, क्योंकि जिसको चुनाव लड़ने की अनुमति दी जाती थी, वह उसका एफिडेविट कर देता था। So you won four elections like this. बाद में जब चुनाव सही हुए, सबसे पहला निष्पक्ष चुनाव हुआ, जो मोरारजी भाई के जमाने में 1977 में हुआ, उसके बाद जब वहाँ पर चुनाव प्रक्रिया ठीक हुई और फारुख साहब जीते, तो आपने गुलाम मुहम्मद शाह के साथ मिल कर फारुख साहब की सरकार गिरवा दी और अपनी सरकार फिर बनवा ली। आज आपको रहम आ रहा है कि मेरा राज्य बॉर्डर स्टेट है। What did you do for those three decades? बाद में पॉपुलर वोट कभी आपके साथ नहीं था, पर पावर के लिए पॉलिटिकल फ्लेक्सिबिलिटी आपके पास थी। पीडीपी बन जाए, तो उसके साथ सेकंडरी पार्टनर बन जाओ; नेशनल कांग्रेस बन जाए, तो उसके साथ सेकंडरी पार्टनर बन जाओ।

हारने के बाद भी हम सरकार में रहें, बिना ईमानदारी के चुनाव करवाकर भी हम सरकार में रहें, this is decades of history of the Congress Party as far as Jammu and Kashmir is concerned. And, now that the people of Jammu region have voted overwhelmingly for BJP and people in the Valley have voted overwhelmingly for PDP — some have voted for the National Conference — आज आपको तकलीफ है कि वहाँ पर हमारे बगैर सरकार कैसे बन सकती है। अब हमारे लिए भी बड़ी विचित्र स्थिति है, लेकिन हमने अपने स्टैंड में कभी भी ईमानदारी नहीं छोड़ी। पिछली बार जब जम्मू-कश्मीर में वाजपेयी जी की सरकार थी, अब अगर हमारी किसी से सबसे ज्यादा राजनैतिक असहमति होगी, तो हुरियत के लोगों से होगी, लेकिन चूंकि हममें पारदर्शिता थी, ईमानदारी थी, तो वे लोग भी एक ही मेज़ पर बैठकर हमसे बात करने को तैयार थे। आप भी दो बार हुकूमत में रहे,

[श्री अरुण जेटली]

लेकिन वे आपसे बात करने को तैयार नहीं थे, वे हमसे बात करने को इसलिए तैयार थे, क्योंकि हमारे यहां पारदर्शिता थी और हम उनके साथ भी स्पष्टता से और ईमानदारी से बात कर सकते थे। Today, history has inflicted a mandate and people have inflicted a mandate and in that they have said that one party is the largest in the Valley and the other is the party which is the largest in Jammu. So, either one region is to be kept out of power altogether, or, this may be a historical opportunity to bring about a larger national reconciliation in Jammu and Kashmir which would be in the larger interest of this country. And, therefore, to disrespect the mandate and say that 'Red Rags' have won is not proper. What you did in Kashmir for fifty years is the root cause of the problem that exists in the State today. Therefore, I would kindly urge you, while analysing the State with which you have a great attachment, all of us have a great attachment, to seriously ponder over what has happened in the last five decades.

उपसभापति जी, कई विषयों का जिक्र हुआ। दो-तीन छोटे-छोटे उदाहरण देकर, जो मूल विषय आपने उठाया है, मैं उस पर आता हूं। Coal Ordinance का जिक्र हुआ। आपकी हुकूमत में coal blocks का allocation कैसे हो रहा था? उस वक्त भी कोल का allocation PSUs को भी हुआ और निजी क्षेत्र के लोगों को भी हुआ। Coal was being allotted to the public sector undertakings and it was also being allotted to private undertakings. Private people were getting it by a discretionary mechanism — Screening Committee. Not a single rupee was paid by any one of them. I would, earnestly, urge Members from Odisha, Bengal, Jharkhand, Chhattisgarh to consider this. Coal belonging to those States was being given by an arbitrary/discretionary mechanism. मैं नाम नहीं लेता - X, Y, Z, and most of those people who were getting it, their links with you have been established. In fact, an institution of 'name-lenders' and 'rent-seekers' joined hands with industrial groups, became partners and the Screening Committee allotted blocks to them! So, you allocated coal blocks to private persons and PSUs, but by discretionary mechanism. Sir, hon. Supreme Court has rightly quashed it. The CAG said that Rs. 1,86,000 crores has been lost. Your representative said this is presumptive; it is a zero loss theory. Today, I feel, you condemned the then CAG, but, probably, that Rs. 1,86,000 crores was an understatement. The proof of the pudding is in its eating. After the judgment, we have brought an Ordinance and what is the Ordinance? The Ordinance says that everybody has to bid in an auction. आज मैंने पढ़ा, शरद यादव जी ने एक अंग्रेजी दैनिक इंडियन एक्सप्रेस में लेख लिखा हुआ है, कि इससे दाम बढ़ जायेंगे।

जिन लोगों को सीमेंट के लिए, स्टील-आयरन के लिए कोल चाहिए, उनके लिए नॉर्मल ऑक्शन होगी, जो बेस प्राइस होगा, उसके उपर बिड कीजिए। पावर सेक्टर के लिए पहली बार हमने कहा कि बेस प्राइस होगा और रिवर्स ऑक्शन होगी, यानी जो सबसे कम दाम बोलेगा, he will get coal block, because then he has to supply power at the cheapest cost. The cost of power is linked to the cost of coal that he gets. So, this coal block auction has been converted into a reverse auction by which the subsidy goes to the consumer. शरद जी ने जो लिखा, उसमें मैंने पढ़ा कि इससे बिजली के दाम बढ़ेंगे। रिवर्स ऑक्शन से तो कम होंगे, बढ़ेंगे नहीं। फिर हमने कहा कि जो पाँच राज्य हैं, जैसे- पश्चिम बंगाल, ओडिशा, झारखंड, मध्य प्रदेश और छत्तीसगढ़ हैं, इसके साथ ही थोड़ा सा महाराष्ट्र में है और थोड़ा सा तेलंगाना में है, the entire proceeds will go to these States. This is now pursuant to a judgment of the Supreme Court and somebody still says, 'Why have you brought this auction?' And, let me assure my friend Sitaramji that there is no de-nationalisation. We are not planning to touch Coal India Limited. The Coal India will remain as it is. As far as private parties are concerned, private parties were getting it through a discretionary mechanism. Now, they have to pay in order to get it. That is the only difference and the States will be richer and you should be happy. You are an elected Member from Bengal and your State is going to be one of the beneficiaries of this auction.

SHRI P. RAJEEVE (Kerala): Without retrospective effect!

श्री अरुण जेटली: एक चीज़ आप सोचिए। I am just taking an aisle. I don't personally disrespect any ideology or otherwise. Finance Commission की recommendations हुईं for revenue-deficit States. And, I would like to take up this as an issue for a political debate. If you can answer it at some stage, please answer it. You have States from the North-East which are revenue-deficit. You have Jammu and Kashmir which is revenue-deficit. You have Uttarakhand which is revenue-deficit. I am glad even Bihar is no longer a revenue-deficit State. Himachal Pradesh is no longer revenue-deficit. Amongst the big States, there are only two States which are revenue-deficit — West Bengal and Kerala.

SHRI JESUDASU SEELAM (Andhra Pradesh): Andhra Pradesh is also a revenue-deficit State.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Andhra Pradesh is a special case because of division. It is because Hyderabad has gone to Telangana. ...*(Interruptions)*... ...*(Interruptions)*... You are right. There is no dispute with regard to Andhra Pradesh. Sir, Andhra

[श्री अरुण जेटली]

Pradesh will be revenue-deficit for a few years and we will support that revenue. You have suffered because of the division and that will be supported...*(Interruptions)*...

Please consider this. Why should West Bengal and Kerala be revenue-deficit when Bihar is not revenue-deficit? Is it something to do with the kind of policies which historically have been pursued? I think, the time has come to think. Somebody said, 'If the economy keeps turning left, nothing is left in the economy.' And, therefore, the historic legacy which you left behind indicates that amongst the major States — even States with tribal population such as Chhattisgarh, Odisha, Jharkhand — why should Kerala, which is socially the best State in the country in terms of education, health and human resource parameters, be revenue-deficit.

I think, the time has come to think of these — that amongst the major States, the ideological legacy of policies left behind, this is really the condition. In mining also it is the same thing. The mining law in this country said on how all mines are to be allotted. Mines will be allotted on first-come-first served basis. जिसने पहले आकर application दे दी, उसको माइन दे दी। अब आज पूरी दुनिया में 2015 में एक primitive system है, नीलाम कीजिए, रॉयल्टी के अलावा जो उस मिनरल की कीमत है, जिसका वह exploitation करेगा और जिससे अरबों रुपए बनाएगा, वह पैसा देगा। राज्यों को, केन्द्र को, सबको उससे मदद मिलेगी।

मैं लैण्ड के विषय पर आने से पूर्व दो और विषय आपसे कहना चाहूंगा। आपने कहा कि "मनरेगा" को बदल दिया। इस साल में अभी एक महीना और कुछ दिन बाकी हैं, 34 हजार करोड़ रुपया एलोकेट हुआ था और 33,587 करोड़ रुपया दिया जा चुका है। 23 हजार करोड़ रुपया केवल वेतन में गया है। एक रुपया कहीं कम नहीं हुआ और प्रचार कर दिया कि this Government is ending MGNREGA. You raised the issue as to why तेल की कीमत 25 रुपए हो जाए। Oil has a complicated economy. तेल की कंपनियां प्रॉफिट कर रही हैं। अंतर्राष्ट्रीय बाजार में तेल का दाम कम हुआ। Are we aware that there was a historical backlog which the oil companies had? Notwithstanding that, by this reduction, the oil marketing companies are still have losses of about ₹30,000 crores. अब तेल की कीमत कम हो रही है, ऑयल मार्केटिंग कंपनी पैसा लूज कर रही है, यह कैसे होगा? आपके पूरे तर्क में इस technicality को फैक्टर नहीं किया गया। कीमत 80 डॉलर की थी, उन्होंने तेल खरीदा, तेल का ऑर्डर दिया। तेल बांटते-बांटते कीमत 60 डॉलर पर आ गई। The inventory losses are ₹30,000 crores. These are the companies in which Government has the majority stake; there are private shareholders; they are listed companies. Are we going to destroy these companies? Shouldn't these

companies factor in some part of the reduction in oil prices to cover up for this inventory loss? रेवेन्यू ने जो पैसा लिया। We should not grudge the revenue because रेवेन्यू का पैसा किसी की जेब में नहीं जाता, वह देश के लिए जाता है। अब "मनरेगा" पर खर्च करना है या गरीबों के लिए खर्च करना है, तो वह पैसा आएगा। अब मैं एक सैक्टर का जिक्र करूँ, वह है हाईवेज़। हमेशा देश में लगता था कि यह एक सफल प्रयोग हो रहा है। Highways are coming up. The legacy with which we have got the highways' sector back is that tender after tender not a single person is applying to build highways. The banks are not supporting them. The projects have become non-bankable. हर contractor के साथ dispute चल रहा था। This is the legacy left behind. Now that the highways sector has to be revived and for revival, public investment is required. So, we announced that a part of the money which is going into the revenue, *via* the route of revenue will go to the construction of highways. So, the Government starts spending on highways. Once the highways process starts, then you can tender and the private contractors will also start building up. Notwithstanding that, eleven times we reduced the prices of petrol and diesel and passed on the benefit to the consumer. So, that money has to be divided between substantial benefit that goes to the consumer, and partly the inventory losses are to be recovered, and, partly, the money has gone into revenue and used for such social purposes including highway building. Who can grudge this management of the economy? आप तो सरकार में हमसे कई साल ज्यादा रहे हो, आप अनुभवी लोग हो। आपने कहा कि शान्ता कुमार जी ने रिपोर्ट दे दी, फूड सुरक्षा खत्म होने वाली है। शान्ता कुमार जी ने फूड सिक्युरिटी बिल पर तो कोई रिपोर्ट ही नहीं दी।

शान्ता कुमार जी की रिपोर्ट फूड कॉर्पोरेशन ऑफ इंडिया की functioning के संबंध में है। How is the FCI going to be subsidized?

मैं अंतिम विषय पर आता हूँ जो कि land acquisition के बारे में है। एक प्रचार चला कि यह किसान विरोधी है और कॉर्पोरेट्स की मदद करता है। जब एक्ट बना, श्री जयराम रमेश यहाँ पर मौजूद हैं, तो आपकी सरकार ने उस एक्ट में एक सेक्शन डाला- सेक्शन 105, उस सेक्शन के तहत आपने एक शैड्यूल क्रिएट किया, शैड्यूल फोर। In that Schedule 4, you put thirteen pieces of legislation including National Highways, railways, coal, atomic energy, etc., for which land is required और आपने 13 purposes को exempted purposes मान लिया। उन exempted purposes में न तो consent चाहिए, न Social Impact Assessment और न वह Right to Food वाला consideration होगा। आपने consent हटा दी, consent हटा दी। आपके कानून में 13 purposes ऐसे हैं, where these three things, including consent are not required. That is the original Act. फिर यह कहा कि एक साल के बाद इन एक्ट्स में केवल मुआवजा बढ़ा दीजिए। What did we do?

श्री जयराम रमेश (आन्ध्र प्रदेश): एक साल के अंदर।

श्री अरुण जेटली: एक साल के अंदर। I am glad Shri Jairam is correcting me because on these facts we are not in dispute. There will be one fact on which you and I will be seriously in dispute. आपने कहा कि एक साल के भीतर इसको बढ़ा दीजिए। हमने उन 13 के 13 एक्ट्स में कहा कि अगर land acquire होगी, you will have to pay twice plus twice solatium, which is four times; plus R&R. So we increased it. So, admittedly, it is a pro-farmer step that we increased compensation in those thirteen Acts. Now, those thirteen ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI P. RAJEEVE: We moved the amendment at that time to delete that Section 105 and Schedule 4.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: So that the whole country becomes revenue deficit like Kerala and West Bengal. If your amendments are accepted, the whole country will be revenue deficit.

SHRI P. RAJEEVE: Section 105.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: I have just told you, what has happened as a result of your policies. They are paying for it as a result of the legacy you left behind. In these thirteen areas, admittedly, no consent is required under the UPA Act, no SIA is required, no food security consideration is required. Total amendment का जो net है, जो 13 की सूची थी, उनमें पाँच और जोड़े हैं।

मैं आपसे हाथ जोड़कर, विशेष रूप से कांग्रेस पार्टी से विनती करता हूँ, आप हमसे कहीं ज्यादा पॉवर में रहे। You have been in power five-seven times more than us. Don't create an environment in this country where two words 'infrastructure' and 'industry' become bad words. And that is what you are doing. ...*(Interruptions)*... ...*(Interruptions)*... Please allow me to complete. आज सबसे बड़ा अपराध यह है कि आपको infrastructure की और आपको industry create करने की जरूरत है। Now, which are these five purposes? The first purpose is, and that is where your Act was defective — it was against India's interest — national security and defence. जयराम जी ने जब यह एक्ट बनाया, he put defence and security as an urgency purpose, but forgot to put it as an exempted purpose. So, as a result, if Government of India needs land for defence installations, for nuclear installations, हमें पहले यह बताना पड़ेगा कि किस purpose के लिए यह चाहिए और कहाँ पर चाहिए।

फिर वहां पब्लिक इकट्ठी करके 70 परसेंट लोगों से साइन करवाना पड़ेगा, फिर उन लोगों से सोशल इम्पेक्ट असेसमेंट होगा। फिर 5 साल में अगर वह इंस्टॉलेशन पूरी नहीं हुई तो उसके साथ खेत बनाने पड़ेंगे और पाकिस्तान को पूरी सूचना देनी पड़ेगी कि यहां पर हमारी इंस्टॉलेशन लगी हुई है by this hearing. It was a defective piece of legislation. It was against India's security interest. That had to be corrected. And, I would urge, you, to those in your Government, who have handled them — Antony Saheb is here — the disastrous consequences of following this Act, and the Act says, "Social Impact Assessment, Right to Food, shall apply when land is acquired for security and defence". एकजम्पटेड परपज नहीं रखा, यह कहा कि मेन्डेटरी परपज के लिए चाहिए होगा। तो हमारे दोस्त संजय राउत जी, जो सबसे ज्यादा, हमसे भी ज्यादा राष्ट्रवादी हैं, राष्ट्रवाद के साथ यह कहा खिलवाड़ करता है इसके ऊपर भी हम थोड़ा अध्ययन कर लें।

SHRI P. RAJEEVE: It was there in the original Bill. ...*(Interruptions)*...
...*(Interruptions)*... And Defence Ministry... ...*(Interruptions)*... ...*(Interruptions)*...
The Sumitra Mahajan Committee had approved it. ...*(Interruptions)*...
...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Rajeeve, please. ...*(Interruptions)*...
...*(Interruptions)*... Rajeeve, please don't interrupt. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: I will ask my colleague, Shri Manohar Parrikarji to come with the files and show them to Antony Saheb and Dr. Manmohan Singhji because they are both aware of it, where our strategic installations have been held up because of this Act. And you want to simply say, "Oh, we will give them an image that they are anti-farmer, pro-farmer; the country can suffer in the process". Now, this is the first purpose.

The second purpose is rural infrastructure. And, here, I have a serious complaint about my friend, Jairam Ramesh. जिस दिन यह कानून पास हो रहा था, हम लोगों ने इश्यु उठाया कि इस देश में किसानों का क्या होगा? How will irrigation projects come up? अब सिंचाई की योजना कैसे आएगी? आपने हमें कहा कि मैं सिंचाई के लिए इसको अर्मेंड कर देता हूं, वापस लोक सभा जाऊंगा, सिंचाई will become exempted. मैंने आपका पारित कानून देखा। मैं अपनी बहुत बड़ी भूल मानता हूं कि मैंने उस वक्त सीरियसली एकजामिन नहीं किया। Irrigation is not an exempted purpose, despite the assurance given to this House. And, I ask my colleague, Sushmaji, who was the Leader in the other House, we were all told, and every Member of this House was told that irrigation is being exempted. ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE MINISTER OF COMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY (SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD) I was told; I was told.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: All you did to irrigation was कि जिस इरिगेशन प्रोजेक्ट में स्टेट में SIA हो चुका है वहां सेंटर में एस0आई0ए0 की जरूरत नहीं होगी। That is all you did. प्रधान मंत्री ग्राम सड़क योजना भूल जाइए, उसको जमीन नहीं मिलेगी। रूरल इलेक्ट्रिफिकेशन के लिए जमीन नहीं मिलेगी। शरद यादव जी और बहन मायावती जी कह रहे हैं कि हम कारपोरेट की मदद कर रहे हैं। इरिगेशन, रूरल इंफ्रास्ट्रक्चर, रूरल रोड्स यह कारपोरेट की मदद है? How do you get land for these purposes? तीसरा परपज क्या है? आपकी इंदिरा आवास योजना, किसी बिल्डर और कारपोरेट की मदद के लिए बड़े मकान नहीं affordable housing and housing for poor. Affordable housing की परिभाषा जो 800 फुट से छोटा होता है। वे बिल्डर नहीं बनाते, वह बनाना सरकार की जिम्मेदारी है। आज 65 परसेंट लोग जो देहात में रहते हैं, उनमें से जो aspirational हैं, वे शहर में आना चाहते हैं, शहरों के आसपास छोटे शहर बन रहे हैं, उनके छोटे घर बनते हैं। Are we going to put that to a standstill? How will you get land for that? और ये सारे रूरल एरियाज के लोग हैं जो अरबन माइग्रेशन से आएंगे। शहर के लोगों के पास तो अक्सर घर हैं। Urban people have houses, good or bad. It is the rural migration for which you lead 'housing for poor'. आज जी0डी0पी0 में पूरा 15 परसेंट शेयर एग्रीकल्चर का है। The share in GDP of agriculture is 15 per cent, and 60 per cent population shares that 15 per cent.

तो 60 फीसदी लोग 15 परसेंट पैसा share कर रहे हैं। आज आपको 20-30 परसेंट लोगों को एग्रीकल्चर से निकालकर मैनुफैक्चरिंग में डालना है और उनके लिए जॉब्स क्रिएट करने हैं। यह अगले 20 सालों के लिए एक चुनौती है। आनन्द शर्मा जी, आप तो इतने सालों तक देश के ट्रेड मिनिस्टर रहे हैं। "Ease of Doing Business" पर यदि किसी के सबसे ज्यादा भाषण हुए होंगे, तो आपके हुए होंगे। अब यदि किसी बाहर के व्यक्ति को कहेंगे कि निवेश कर, उद्योग लगा, रोजगार दे, लेकिन जमीन के लिए पहले 70 परसेंट की consent ला, फिर यह सारी प्रक्रिया पूरी होगी और देखेंगे कि आपको जमीन मिलती है या नहीं मिलती। Are we reaching a stage where industry becomes a bad word? And the last one is infrastructure where land continues to be owned by the Government. अब शहरों में तो इंफ्रास्ट्रक्चर फिर भी है। दरअसल इंफ्रास्ट्रक्चर तो पिछड़े इलाकों में ज्यादा बनना है, तो क्या उन्हें पिछड़ा रहने दें? Mr. Deputy Chairman, this debate is not between rich and poor, farmer and non-farmer; this is between adding to the poverty of India and making India poor for the next two decades. May I just take the plea? I read a very interesting document, and this document, if I am permitted to read, — I can even place it on the Table — was sent to the hon. Prime Minister at that time in 2012. It says, I quote, "Prime Minister's urgent intention is drawn to the serious concerns

raised by the industry on the Land Acquisition, Rehabilitation, Resettlement Bill, 2011, recommended by the Parliamentary Standing Committee. The Bill in its present stage will have adverse long-term implications in manufacturing, industrialisation and urbanisation in India and will be key impediment in the operationalisation of Delhi-Mumbai Industrial Corridor project, creation of National Investment and Manufacturing Zone. Since most of the major infrastructure projects are today being implemented on PPP basis, it is imperative to broaden the definition of public purpose to include development of NIMZ and industrial townships under this project. The Bill envisages exclusion of PPP project and industrial townships and has certain provisions which not only will make the cost of land exorbitantly high but also make acquisition proceedings willy-nilly impossible. The insistence of consent of 80 per cent of affected families will seriously delay acquisition and in many cases halt infrastructure projects. It has been stipulated that the urgency clause cannot be invoked for industrial townships, expressways, highways, NIMZ which would lead to delay in land availability in our infrastructure projects. The imposition of hundred per cent solatium over and above a multiplier of two will lead to cost spiral impact on land prices. While the Bill was under examination by the Parliamentary Standing Committee, the Department had taken these issues up on ‘..such and such date..’, I had also written to the Chairperson of the Committee and given a detailed representation how the concerns of the Ministry have not been addressed in finalisation of the Report which was tabled in Parliament. A legislation of this nature in the present shape will render key infrastructure projects unviable, slow down the process of urbanisation completely. The coming years will see an increased demand for robust urban infrastructure and development of urban townships which can fuel the net rate of economic growth. The Prime Minister would like to take a call.’ It says everything I am trying to say. The author of this document is sitting here, Mr. Anand Sharma. Now the other day he got up and said, ‘You are anti-farmer because you are doing this.’ When this law was being framed, this is what the UPA Minister had to tell the Prime Minister. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI ANAND SHARMA (Rajasthan): Just a minute, Sir. ...*(Interruptions)*...
...*(Interruptions)*... I still stand by this. That was a well-considered recommendation which Mr. Jairam and my Government were fully aware of because these are national projects, national initiatives whether it is DMIC or National Industrial Manufacturing

[Shri Anand Sharma]

Zone or industrial townships. That is very, very clear. The only concern which we have is that the social infrastructure definition is not becoming clear, and also opening a door for the private sector. That is questionable that if you will allow the private sector, the State cannot acquire for the private sector. That is the issue.

It is not the job of the State to acquire land for the private sector, whether for the private hospitals or for the private universities. That is not the headache of the States.

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: We may come out with various explanations, now. But, at the end of the day, if I take Mr. Sharma's explanation, then, henceforth we will only find nationalized industries running businesses in India because the land cannot be given to the private sector. I only urge upon you ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH: They can buy it. ...*(Interruptions)*.....*(Interruptions)*... They can buy land. ...*(Interruptions)*... ...*(Interruptions)*... This Bill is about the acquisition of lands. ...*(Interruptions)*... ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay. ...*(Interruptions)*... ...*(Interruptions)*... Okay. ...*(Interruptions)*... ...*(Interruptions)*... All right. ...*(Interruptions)*... ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (Nominated) : In any law of any country, the acquisition for transfer to the private sector ...*(Interruptions)*.....*(Interruptions)*... That is written in the Parliamentary Standing Committee's Report. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay. ...*(Interruptions)*... ...*(Interruptions)*... Silence, please. ...*(Interruptions)*... ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI ARUN JAITLEY: Sir, two interventions have taken place. My friend, Shri Jairam Ramesh, and I have discussed it in the past also. He will remember this. I never reproduce our conversations, but I am aware of his argument and I am also aware of the response that I had given. He says, "buy agricultural land and set up an industry on it." So, if you want to set up an industry in India, buy agricultural land and set up an industry. My response then was an agricultural land cannot become an industrial land. It is for the State to decide whether to convert the 'land use' or not. The land itself may not be an agricultural land, it may be a waste land. If the only way of setting up an industry in India is, first buy lands from the farmers and

then go to the Chief Minister for the 'land use' change — we have seen what has happened in the last several years — then CLU will be the only industry left in this country. You know it. You just have to drive across into Gurgaon and you know what happened in that State. The State survived only on one industry, which was the CLU — the Change of Land User industry. And, you want to institutionalize it. I am grateful to Mr. Mani Shankar Aiyar. He permitted me for the last 45 minutes to speak and came only in the end. He says, "Do not acquire it, let people buy it." I, of course, know the difference. But you have thirteen exempted Acts, Mr. Aiyar, which are all acquisition Acts. They are not buying Acts. You can exempt 13 Acts from 'consent'; you can exempt 13 Acts from SIA. But, the moment rural infrastructure is added, housing for poor is added, the whole thing becomes anti-farmer. The moment 'irrigation' is added, it becomes anti-farmer. Therefore, this entire misguided debate, at some stage, must come to an end. The issue is: Do we want this country to grow or not? Or, do we want all investments to be diverted into other countries? Mr. Anand Sharma's experience is far more than mine. And, I stand fully in support of the proposal that Mr. Sharma gave to the Prime Minister. It is my regret that Mr. Jairam Ramesh was more persuasive and he managed to persuade the Prime Minister. That is all I have to say.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you. Now, Shri Sitaram Yechury.

SHRI MADHUSUDAN MISTRY: Sir,... *...(Interruptions)...*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What is the problem?

SHRI MADHUSUDAN MISTRY: Sir, I am sorry; yesterday, I was not present.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay. Mr. Mistry, you were not present when your name was called for moving the amendment motion. But now I can allow you. But it should not be quoted as a precedent. You can move the amendment nos. (88-106).

SHRI MADHUSUDAN MISTRY (Gujarat): Sir, I move:

88. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:-

"but regret that the Address does not mention about how the Government will remove the delay in payment of wages to the workers of MGNERGS and also the widespread corruption in the scheme."

[Shri Madhusudan Mistry]

89. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be added namely:-

"but regret that the Address does not mention about how the Government will provide the low cost housing to each and everybody at affordable prices and easy instalments and how they will stop the irregularities committed in building of the houses for poor and the middle class."

90. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:-

"but regret that the Address does not mention about how land would be acquired under the Land Acquisition Rehabilitation and Resettlement Act, and if the land is not fully used, will it be returned to the original owner and how the compensation without much hassle will be paid to the farmers and whether the farmers' children would ever get the employment in the project for which the land is acquired by the Government."

91. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:-

"but regret that the Address does not mention about the Government's intention towards the scholarship paid to the minority community students because certain State Governments have taken a view, the scholarship meant for minority community, its payment is either delayed or the stipend not paid at all to the students of this community."

92. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:-

"but regret that the Address does not mention about the Government's effort to increase the recruitment ratio for the girl child, in view of the shortage of teachers, the class-rooms and distance to the schools as it is reported that in some of the areas the children have to swim across the river to go to the school."

93. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:-

"but regret that the Address does not mention about the spread of the Swine Flu in the country in which hundreds of people have died and many State Governments have not even started providing medical treatment to the patients even in the big cities."

94. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:-

"but regret that the Address does not mention about the widespread incidence of custodial deaths and harassment of women even in the police custody not mention and the measures to stop it."

95. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:-

"but regret that the Address does not mention about the pathetic state of workers or shramiks reposed amendments to a number of labour laws, are detrimental to labour's interest and the policy of hire and fire seems imminent with the FDI's investment in number of key sectors."

96. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:-

"but regret that the Address does not mention about legal reform and National Judicial Appointment Commission and how the Government would stop the influence of moneyed people in a legal system and also corruption in Courts and ensure speedy justice to the client as thousands are languishing in jails because they do not get the speedy justice."

97. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:-

"but regret that the Address does not mention about the fact that maximum governance minimum government is only a slogan as delay on one project or another has become culture of the bureaucracy and the individual person has lost his/her independence as the citizen in the eyes of government machinery and is working only for a small group of elite of this country."

98. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:-

"but regret that the Address does not mention about the very role of NITI Aayog."

99. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:-

"but regret that the Address does not mention about how the Government will bring back the black money and distribute a sum of ₹ 15 lakh to every citizen." .

100. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:-

[Shri Madhusudan Mistry]

"but regret that the Address does not mention about the illegalities committed in SEBI and in capital market and also the benefit for inviting FDI in Insurance, in Defence, in Railways and in other sectors and how the financial sector, Legislative Reform Commission will act at the time of money scams in the financial sectors."

101. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:-

"but regret that the Address does not mention about how the labour interest will be protected while inviting the FDI in Railways and Defence infrastructure."

102. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:-

"but regret that the Address does not mention about how the Government will invite people into the Smart cities and how it will raise the money to build the Smart cities."

103. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:-

"but regret that the Address does not mention about how the Government intends to stop the slow pace of construction of Highways and eradicate the corruption in building up Highways."

104. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:-

"but regret that the Address does not mention about how it will stop the loss of transmission of electricity to the consumers and the recovery of losses by imposition of higher tariff to consumers as the Regulatory Authority has completely failed to safeguard the interest of electricity consumers."

105. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:-

"but regret that the Address does not mention about the imposition of Excise Duty every time the international petroleum fuel prices decreased as the Government should have given more benefit by decreasing the petroleum prices in view of decrease of diesel prices at the international level whereas it gave small decrease and at the same time increased the excise duty on it, thereby recovering money from the people to make huge profit for oil companies. "

106. That at the *end* of the Motion, the following be *added* namely:-

"but regret that the Address does not mention about what exactly the Government has done on the ground to clean the Ganga."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now, Shri Sitaram Yechury.

श्री सीताराम येचुरी (पश्चिमी बंगाल) : सर, मैं एक दुविधा में हूँ। हमारे लीडर ऑफ दि हाउस ने जिस तरह का जवाब लीडर ऑफ दि अपोजिशन, श्री गुलाम नबी आज़ाद को दिया और बाकी सवाल उठाए, अब उसका जवाब दूँ तो असली मुद्दे पीछे रह जाएंगे और उसका बिना जवाब दिए हम चुप भी नहीं रह सकते हैं। Let us take the Land Acquisition Bill, Sir. There are many points that the Leader of the House has made today, which should have been debated properly and considered. But the Parliamentary Standing Committee which considered this Bill in detail examined it and the Chairperson of that Committee is Speaker of the other House today. Let me read out some of the last points that were made by the Sumitra Mahajan-chaired Committee. What does it say? This is the Report, Sir. "The Bill defines — one of the recommendations — 'infrastructure projects' to include projects related to the generation of electricity, telecommunication services, roads, highways, water supply and other project that may be notified by the Government. The Committee feels that the Bill gives a wide discretion to the Government in notifying any infrastructure project and this clause should be deleted." It is the Committee headed by them. We moved amendments. They supported us then. And this is the charge, Sir, that I have always been making standing from here, whether the Leader of the House was the Leader of the Opposition then and when the Leader of the Opposition today was part of the Government then, we standing from here have always opposed those things which we considered to be anti-people, anti-economy and anti-country and we will continue to do that. What does the same recommendation say, Sir? He was talking about exemptions. What that recommendation says, I am quoting, Sir. "The Bill exempted 16 existing legislations." At that time, it was 16 but now it has been reduced to 13. "...that provide for land acquisition. The Committee recommended that no Central Act should be exempted from the provisions of this Bill and necessary amendments should be brought in those Acts to bring them on par with this Bill." The Committee recommended no exemptions. Now, you are extending the list of exemptions. And those that you have added in the list of exemptions are private educational institutions and private hospitals. I can go on. All these recommendations are there on the website. What the hon. Leader of the House

[श्री सीताराम येचुरी]

today says has been negated by a Committee headed by the Speaker of the other House today, who then and today as a Member of the ruling BJP was the one who recommended all this. Now the net result of this fight between तू-तू, मैं-मैं, between them, is that the country is losing. Hon. Leader, I am sure, has got very important business to attend, therefore, he is leaving. But anyway, I would only thank you before you leave for giving us a glimpse at what the Budget will contain. You have told us what you are going to do and that is up to the Government to decide whether it is, actually, a violation of the prerogative of the Finance Ministry or the Cabinet. But, of course, it is left to the Minister. There are many issues that have been raised, which require to be taken up seriously. He said, "No scams in the first nine months." In the first five years of the UPA-I Government, there were no scams.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF POWER; THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF COAL; AND THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF NEW AND RENEWABLE ENERGY (SHRI PIYUSH GOYAL): There were always scams. *...(Interruptions)...* Came out in UPA-II. *...(Interruptions)...*

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: I agree with the hon. Minister that there were.. *...(Interruptions)...*

SHRI PIYUSH GOYAL: You were supporting them.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Sir, I agree with the hon. Minister that these scams were cooking under UPA-I. They got exposed under UPA-II. Now, what is already cooking in these nine months under your Government, we will know later. So, do not say that in nine months, we are clean. Do not make such points where you spoke of the double duck, cricketing records. But remember, for one of the biggest cricketing records which Sachin made, he will remain on the record book; others may be broken. That one record for which he will remain is the maximum number of times you get out in your nineties, without scoring a century.

Without scoring a century, you get out. *...(Interruptions)...*
...(Interruptions)...

AN. HON. MEMBER: What is its meaning?

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: He was talking about cricketing records. I

am saying, 'You are aiming at that record.' You will never complete, and that is why I say this. Okay. Sir, all the issues that the hon. Leader of the House has mentioned, let me not go into them. Otherwise, you are very anxious to ring the bell when I speak. Therefore, I do not want to take up that time. ...*(Interruptions)*...
...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Not when you speak alone; this is for everybody.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: The issue is, he has spoken of the Assembly elections and the victories they had, except in Delhi. Now, Sir, please examine them properly. The subject here is not '*tu tu main main* or who won who lost.' Examine the victories that you had. And why? You floated on the anti-incumbency wave of a non-BJP Government there and with a divided Opposition. Nowhere have you formed a Government, including at the Centre, with a majority vote. You are in Government today with 31 per cent of the votes of those who actually went to poll. It is not a majority Government. Sixty nine per cent voted against you. But it is because of the situation where, riding on anti-incumbency, you won those elections; and here the anti-incumbency was against the Central Government in Delhi. Then, very proudly you were saying — of course, humiliating us in the Opposition — that the whole Opposition can travel in a bus. Somebody quipped in Delhi, 'the whole Opposition of the BJP can now travel in an auto rickshaw.' You are reduced to three. So, please do not discount the democratic verdict of the people. Why things have happened, please analyse them properly. It is only for the good of the country. Again I am saying, 'It is not '*tu tu main main*, who wins who loses.' It is for the good of the country. So, please understand that. It was either incumbency or a divided Opposition. These were the two factors. When they don't happen, there is no victory, and not only is there 'no victory', but there is a big landslide loss also.

On talking about the dispute on Jammu and Kashmir, the Leader of the House has correctly said that history will decide it. Fine. Let history decide who is right, who is wrong. I am talking of the history that is being made today. And what is the history that is being made? Every year we stand up to speak on the Motion of Thanks to the hon. President of India. This annual exercise is supposed to be a balance sheet of what the Government has done and what it will do for the next year. Now we have a peculiar situation. I don't know whether you — with your long experience — had such a situation where, instead of a balance sheet, what the Government wants to do keeps changing every year. What they promised

[Shri Sitaram Yechury]

in the last President's Address or what they will do, there is no mention of those things here. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has mentioned all of them. He has mentioned all the names of the Schemes — the name changes, that have occurred for the old schemes. They have come with new names. Fine. Our critique of them was that everything was concentrated on the Nehru-Gandhi family. Here you will have Shyama Prasad Mukherjees and Deen Dayal Upadhyays and the Schemes on their names. They had their set up of names for having the Schemes and they have their set of names. But the point is, what is the net result for the people of the country? If you follow the Left, you will be left behind. That is what the hon. Leader of the House said. He is the one who said this while quoting Margaret Thatcher — in fact not quoting but actually taking over what she said, 'It is not the business of the Government to be in business.' Then, why are you exempting all these, increasing the list of exemptions. It is not your business to be in business. So, let the business take care of that. Why are you doing all this for the business? ...*(Interruptions)*... ...*(Interruptions)*... That is the point, Sir. Why are you doing it again for the business? If it is not the business of the Government to be in business, then why are you doing that? That is where you are promoting their interest. It is very clear. There is exemption for private educational institutions; exemption for private hospitals. ...*(Interruptions)*... ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, please. Mr. Javadekar, please. ...*(Interruptions)*...

पर्यावरण, वन और जलवायु परिवर्तन मंत्रालय के राज्य मंत्री (श्री प्रकाश जावडेकर) :
प्राइवेट इंडस्ट्रीज़ इरिगेशन कहां कर रही हैं?

श्री सीताराम येचुरी : करवाने के लिए कानून बनाइए न। आप उसके बारे में तो सोचेंगे नहीं। प्राइवेट कौन करेगा? प्राइवेट इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स के लिए सिर्फ मुनाफा ही कमाना है क्या? आप उस लॉजिक और उस उसूल को मान लीजिए और उस हिसाब से सरकार चलाइए। सर, इस तरह की बातों से कुछ नहीं होगा, लेकिन स्कीम्स को नए-नए नाम देना या पुरानी स्कीम्स के नाम बदलकर उन्हीं को पेश करना — Old wine in new bottles and new wine in old bottles.

That does not really help the people of our country. What is the history that is being currently made? That is what I wish to draw your attention to and the House's attention to, that there is something very drastically wrong in the manner in which

this Government has begun embarking on this course of taking up the people's agenda.

Sir, the first 25 paragraphs of the hon. President's Address talk about the cultural heritage of India. Now, who are the people you have mentioned? It is very good that you have mentioned Shyama Prasad Mukherjee and Deen Dayal Upadhyaya, but there is no mention of the rich historical legacy that we have inherited, the legacy that comes down from Gautam Buddha, Mahavir Jain, from the Upanishads and from all the places and shrines that you all go to.

श्री प्रकाश जावडेकर: उन्होंने दस साल में नहीं किया। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री सीताराम येचुरी: आप सुनिए। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no. ...**(Interruptions)**... ...**(Interruptions)**...
Mr. Javadekar, please don't interrupt. Let him complete.

श्री सीताराम येचुरी: सर, फिर वही तू-तू, मैं-मैं पर उतर रहे हैं। उन्होंने क्या किया और हमने क्या किया? आप देश और देश के लोगों के बारे में सोचिए, यही हमारा आपसे आग्रह है। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

SHRI P. RAJEEVE: Sir, the lady Minister is chewing gums and making a running commentary.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please listen. ...**(Interruptions)**... ..**(Interruptions)**...
No cross-talking; please listen.

श्री सीताराम येचुरी: ख्वाजा मोइनुद्दीन चिश्ती की दरगाह पर गए होंगे। हम भी जाते हैं। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Silence please.

श्री सीताराम येचुरी: अब मदर टेरेसा कन्वर्जन कर रही हैं। कई लोग इसके बारे में बोले, जीरो ऑवर में चर्चा भी हुई। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

SHRI P. RAJEEVE: Sir, the lady Minister is chewing gums and making a running commentary. That is against the decorum of the House.

THE DEPUTY LEADER OF OPPOSITION (SHRI ANAND SHARMA): Sir, in any case, the Ministers are not supposed to be interrupting when the Leaders in the Opposition are speaking.

SHRI P. RAJEEVE: Sir, the lady Minister is chewing gums and making a running commentary. That is against the decorum of the House.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please.

SHRI ANAND SHARMA: The Leader of the House was heard with respect. Therefore, give the same respect to the Leaders in the Opposition also. And if the Ministers interrupt, that is a reflection on the Government.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Ministers should not interrupt. Nobody should interrupt, especially the Ministers. ...*(Interruptions)*... ...*(Interruptions)*... Silence please. Let us hear him in silence.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Sir, my point is, this Government has one agenda for public consumption and one real agenda on which it is actually working. The agenda for public consumption — what it is doing to the state of the people as far as the economy is concerned -- I will come to that in the later half of my speech. But what is the real agenda that is being pursued, Sir? You had the *Love Jihads* and *Ghar Wapsis* and all those statements that were made everywhere. They continue to be made, on the glory of the Hindu civilization and that the Hindus alone were the inheritors of this legacy in our country, when nothing can be farther away from the truth, Sir. I have said this before in this House and I tell you even today, that if you go by that myopic vision, India, as we know of it, cannot remain. And what were we asking the Prime Minister last time here? We had asked whether he would take action against Members of Parliament and Ministers who are making comments that are inflaming communal passions, which is against the Constitution and against our IPC. No assurance was given. The hon. Prime Minister went to some function of a Christian group and then preached tolerance. That is very good, but what we promised to our people in the Constitution of India is not only tolerance but we promised equality too. There is not even a mention of the words that people belonging to other non-Hindu religions will be treated as equal. Now, that is the real agenda that is being pursued and that is not in the interest of the future of our country, my country, and our glory. So, all that is being done today is a negation of that syncretic civilization that evolved and continues to evolve on these lands. Now, this is a very serious issue that is coming up before us, like the controversy over Nobel laureate Amartya Sen, the controversy over Mother Teresa, a Nobel laureate, a Bharat Ratna. These controversies betray a certain lack of commitment

to democracy. I am sorry to say this, but it is an unfortunate situation where the Central Government of the day encourages or protects those who are violating our constitutional provisions with impunity. You have these people going around today, who keep talking of only Hindus and Hindus as the only inheritors of this civilization. If you want, I can read out the speeches of the Chief of *Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh* when he spoke about Mother Teresa. What does he say?

He said, "It is good to work for a cause with selfless intentions. But Mother Teresa's work had ulterior motive which was to covert the person who is being served to Christianity." Then he says on another occasion, "*Hindustan* is a Hindu *Rashtra* which is a fact; we are going ahead with this idea. All Hindus have to be organized to make this nation great." Please organize Hindus if you want. I am also a Hindu who is born a Hindu but turned into being a *nastik* and a Communist. Who is a Hindu according to you?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: *Nastik* has also a place in Hinduism.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Precisely, and it is as ancient and I quoted this earlier to you. Please show some, at least, what the Prime Minister preaches to all the countrymen, tolerance. Please show some tolerance. If not granting equality, show some tolerance. ...*(Interruptions)*... ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please listen. ...*(Interruptions)*... ...*(Interruptions)*... Please listen to him. ...*(Interruptions)*... ...*(Interruptions)*... When your chance comes, you can reply. ...*(Interruptions)*... ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Being in Government does not give you the prerogative to be the only ones to speak. So, you allow the others to speak and say their points of view. You may completely disagree. Finally, the people will decide who is right and who is wrong. But please don't go on interrupting like this. In the same vein, the RSS chief continues saying, "This is a favourable time for the *Sangh*." So, what is happening today is the unleashing of the unsaid agenda which is palpable amongst the people. I am not going into the issues of J&K, etc., etc., on which we can debate; we have a point of view. But the question is, there is no time to go into all this. But then, what is the political aim of this? Earlier they used to charge today's opposition as saying that the Government is being run by a remote control from 10 Janpath. Today, the former President of the BJP, currently the Home Minister, says that there is no question of any remote control; we are

[Shri Sitaram Yechury]

the same. What did he say at the Hindustan Times Leadership Summit? He said, "RSS is not an external force. I am from the RSS; the Prime Minister himself is an RSS volunteer. We are RSS Members from childhood and will remain till we are alive." ...*(Interruptions)*... ...*(Interruptions)*... Clearly, this is an RSS Government. ...*(Interruptions)*... ...*(Interruptions)*... You may claim that he is right. Absolutely he could be right. Don't claim this dichotomy between fringe elements and the core. There is no such dichotomy. ...*(Interruptions)*... ...*(Interruptions)*... What we and my friends in the opposition were talking, there is no such thing as fringe and core. ...*(Interruptions)*... ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री तपन कुमार सेन (पश्चिमी बंगाल): आप यह तो admit करिए कि यह RSS की गवर्नमेंट है। ...*(व्यवधान)*...

श्री उपसभापति : Okay. ...*(Interruptions)*... ...*(Interruptions)*... Now please. ...*(Interruptions)*... ...*(Interruptions)*... बैठिए, बैठिए ।*(व्यवधान)*.....रंगराजन जी, आप बैठिए।*(व्यवधान)*.....

श्री तपन कुमार सेन : आप छोड़ोगे, तो जवाब तो मिलेगा ही।*(व्यवधान)*.....

SHRI PRAVEEN RASHTRAPAL(GUJARAT): That is why we oppose the RSS. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री उपसभापति : Now please. राष्ट्रपाल जी, आप बैठिए।*(व्यवधान)*... राष्ट्रपाल जी, आप बैठिए।*(व्यवधान)*... Please take your seat. ...*(Interruptions)*... ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Sir, I need your protection. Can I get it?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Silence please. Please proceed.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: So, that is why I will come to the agenda for the people. The President of the BJP himself says ये सब चुनावी जुमले हैं। The promises made during elections are चुनावी जुमले और छप्पन इंच की छाती की सरकार has now taken recourse. ये सब जुमले हैं। मैं इस पर भी आऊंगा और मैं जुमलों की सरकार के बारे में भी बताऊंगा कि ये क्या कर रहे हैं, क्या नहीं कर रहे हैं। इन्होंने कई वायदे किए हैं। पैराग्राफ 27 में President of India कहते हैं कि काले धन को लाने के लिए हमारी सरकार प्रतिबद्ध है। काले धन का क्या हुआ? वे सब चुनावी जुमले हैं। आप 100 दिन की बात छोड़िए, अब वे सब जुमले हैं। वह धन अब वापस तो आना नहीं है, सब चुनावी जुमले थे।

आन्ध्र प्रदेश के बारे में रि-आर्गनाइजेशन बिल के जो प्रोविजन्स हैं, उनको लागू करने की बात कही थी। क्या हो गया? चुनाव जीत गए, सरकार में आ गए और कुछ नहीं। अब वह सब उलटा हो रहा है। वे सब जुमले थे। सर, इसके बारे में तो बात बाद में आएगी। अब actually सवाल क्या है?

What is happening in our country is the worst form of vote-bank politics that is being played. Consolidate the majority vote bank. How? It is being done by spreading hatred against the minorities. And, this is the dangerous part - spreading hatred against the minorities - which the whole world is noticing. Not only we, our friend, Barack, as we have heard...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is he your friend?

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: No, Sir, he is our friend, the Prime Minister's friend. Mr. Barack has mentioned twice about this matter. Once it was said that no, you have misunderstood; nothing like a parting shot. Then, he goes back and says that this is no parting shot. Then, the next day, the White House issues another speech of his saying the same thing. So, please understand this. The world is watching; the people of India are suffering. So, they must rein in this real agenda of theirs that they are implementing today. That is not in the interest of our country and the idea of India as we know of it. Yes, I know, once upon a time, Sangh Sanchalak, Golwalkar, had said that three internal enemies are preventing RSS from going into forming the Hindu Rashtra. And, who are they? I don't know if you still believe in the faith that you are born in, but they are the Muslims, the Christians and the Communists. Now, these 'internal enemies' need to be eliminated; otherwise, they can't achieve their purpose. With such hatred, are they talking about the glory of the Indian civilisation, or, just the Hindu civilisation? And, what was the glory of this Indian civilisation? We have got our wisdom down the ages through various texts and sages who have taught us. What does Swami Vivekananda say? Last time, when I quoted him, I was challenged saying that that was not a correct quotation. I hope my friend is here. Anyway, he is not here at the moment. But now, Sir, I quote, "Without the Buddhist Revolution, what would have delivered the suffering millions of our lower classes from the violent tyrannies of the influential higher castes?" It is from Swami Vivekananda's work, Volume 4, page 462. Then, further, he says, "Mohammedanism came as a message for the masses. The first message was equality. There is one religion - love. No more question of race, colour or anything else." Then, what does he say is what was

[Shri Sitaram Yechury]

being challenged last time when I quoted. I quote, "I see in my mind's eye the future perfect India rising out of this chaos and strife, glorious and invincible, with Vedanta brain and the Islamic body." They talk of the glory of Hindu civilisation. They talk of making the *Bhagavad Gita* a national book. Now, what does *Bhagavad Gita* say? If they want, I dare them to reject that. I will tell you which *shloka* I am quoting from. It is Chapter VII, *shloka* 21, "Whatever celestial form a devotee seeks to worship with faith, I stabilise the faith of that particular devotee in that particular form." They are disregarding all this, disrespecting all this, brushing aside all this wisdom that has come down and that has kept this country united. I can quote what Gurudev Rabindranath said. I quote again, "Aryans and non-Aryans, Dravidians and Chinese, Scythians, Huns, Pathans and Moghuls have all merged and lost themselves in one body, and that body is India." I mean, what they are doing is anachronism of the worst order. They are trying to put the clock back and take India back into a situation of complete strife and anarchy, which cannot build a prosperous India. Forget building a prosperous India, even what we have today will be further destroyed. So, Sir, this is the real agenda which they are following. For that, what do they require - a distortion of science, a distortion our history. Mythology replaces history. Theology replaces philosophy. The Prime Minister says, "What great plastic surgery inventions India had, otherwise *Ganesh*, the God who is revered by various people, could not have been created." एक हाथी का सिर काटकर एक इंसान पर लगाया था। Take immaculate conception of Karna in Mahabharat; it is not only the Christians or Christianity of the Old Testament that talks of immaculate conception.

We have had that before; it was many centuries earlier. People were flying, people were going to Mars. Mangalyaan is not a new idea. Mangalyaan is something that we used to do centuries ago. Even if we suppose that you were doing all that; it is all *. Suppose you were doing all that, why are you in this state today? Why is it that our Buddhist culture, Buddhist treasure of art, Buddhist philosophy all to be found in caves? Why is it not on open ground? ...*(Interruptions)*... ...*(Interruptions)*... It is because Buddhist were actually hunted and ostracized from the society and moved out of the parameters of this India. ...*(Interruptions)*... ...*(Interruptions)*... They were moved out of the parameters of this India, whether it is to Bhutan or onwards to Tibet and China, whether it is to South-East Asia, whether it is to South in Sri Lanka, whether it is to the West until the Taliban destroyed it, whether it is to

*Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

the Bamiyan, the huge statues of Buddhism. Except for this part, it thrived all over the world. The message of equality and love was destroyed in our country. What do they want today to create is exactly the antithesis of what Swami Vivekananda said in 1893 during a speech to the Parliament of World Religions. What did he say finally in his speech?

On 11th September, 1893, while concluding his address to the Parliament of World's Religions, he said, and, I quote, "If the Parliament of Religions has shown anything to the world, it is this: That every system has produced men and women of the most exalted character. In the face of this evidence, if anybody dreams of the exclusive survival of his own religion and the destruction of the others, I pity him from the bottom of my heart, and point out to him that upon the banner of every religion will soon be written in spite of resistance: 'Help and not fight,' 'Assimilation and not Destruction,' 'Harmony and Peace and not Dissension'."

He said this 120 years ago. Of course, he could not have foreseen that there will be something like the RSS, which will prevent our country from achieving this. But this is what he said. The point I am trying to make is please come out with your open agenda. Don't give 'development illusions to the people' when the pursuit of the actual agenda is — and, to put it very pithily — to transform or metamorphose a secular democratic Indian Republic into their version of a rabidly intolerant * *Hindu Rashtra*. That is the project, and, that agenda is unfolding in the nine months.

When people jokingly say, 9 महीने के बाद कुछ पैदा होता है, तो सर, यह पैदा हो रहा है या हो चुका है, मतलब एक और अवतार में पैदा हो चुका है। अब ऐसी परिस्थिति में, Sir, you come to the agenda for the people. While this is something which we cannot allow, and, I am sure, nobody in India will allow this splintering of this crucible of human civilisation, and, that is because of these various religions and various cultures, which have come and mingled.

Now, if we talk of exclusivity, the unity of this country cannot ever be maintained. Our country can remain united only, and, I underline 'only', when you strengthen the bonds of commonality among the diversity that we have, and, it cannot be done by imposing uniformity on diversity, and, you are imposing uniformity. That cannot be allowed, and, that will not be allowed. That is the conviction that I have today. ...(*Interruptions*)... ...(*Interruptions*)... कभी-कभी सीखने की कोशिश करिए, सुनने की ही नहीं।

*Expunged as ordered by the chair.

[Shri Sitaram Yechury]

Sir, kindly look at Paras 44 to 52 of the President's Address. It is all about the various promises that were made to the people and the achievement that were made.

He talks about 'Make in India' as though it is a great invention. He announced 'Make in India' and the next week, the Nokia production facility in Tamil Nadu closed down. Twenty five thousand of skilled engineers of my youth have been rendered jobless and on the streets. 'Make in India' — the reality is something else from what the rhetoric is. The reality, if you want to see, is that today you talked about falling inflation. We heard the Leader of the Opposition. Today he said that we have reduced ...*(Interruptions)*... ...*(Interruptions)*... Leader of the House, sorry. I did not mean you. Leader of the House. I got so used to it in the last seven years that its a matter of habit. I am sorry. Its a slip of tongue.

He talked about the benefits of the international oil prices being passed on to the people. What is the reality? The reduction in price for the people, that has been given during these nine months, is ₹ 2.42 paise per litre for petrol and ₹ 2.25 paise per litre for diesel. But, what is the reduction of the cost that occurred due to international fall in prices? It is ₹ 7.75 paise per litre for petrol and ₹ 7.50 paise per litre for diesel. So, how much have you given the people? One-third? Less than that. Less than one-third of the benefit of the fall in oil prices has gone to the people. And they claim that they have given a lot of benefit to the people! Now, this is the obfuscation that is happening. The truth of the matter is otherwise and that is what you have seen in the Delhi elections' reflecting. Now, the point is that learn from that and stop this rhetoric.

You talked about '*Annadaata Sukhibhava*' in para 10 of the President's Speech. What is the state of affairs in our agricultural sector? We talk of the Leader of the House speaking in terms of sixty per cent living on fifteen per cent of the GDP. If they want to be brought here and create industrialisation, give them jobs. Very noble idea! But, what is the reality that we are seeing here. In the current Rabi season, that is going on in Indian agriculture, the cultivated area has reduced by 5.3 per cent. Farmers are abandoning cultivation. Cultivated area has reduced by 5.3 per cent — not productivity, nor production. Farmers are leaving your lands saying that they are no longer productive. Why? Mr. Sharad Pawar was here in the morning. He is not here now. For three years in a row we caught him here

when he was in Government. For three years in a row! The increase in minimum support price has been less than the increase in the cost of production, as estimated by the Agricultural Prices Bureau. Not by us! So, if you give them a minimum support price that is below the cost of cultivation, they incur debt and because of incurring the debt are unable to pay it back and they are committing suicide. After this Government has come to power, on December 19, I have the access and as published in media, the Intelligence Bureau (IB), sent a report to this Government which is marked to the National Security Adviser and the Principal Secretary also. What does it say? Suicide amongst the farmers is increasing and the reasons: due to outstanding loans, rising debts, low crop yield etc., etc. ...*(Interruptions)*...
...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री चुनीभाई कानजीभाई गोहेल (गुजरात) : सर, आप सही कह रहे हैं, लेकिन वह 2014 से पहले की बात है। उस बात को बहुत टाइम हो गया है।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, please. No, do not interrupt. ...*(Interruptions)*...
...*(Interruptions)*... There is no time. Please do not interrupt. ...*(Interruptions)*...
...*(Interruptions)*... Please don't interrupt.

श्री सीताराम येचुरी : सर, अगर आप आईबी में हैं, तो हमें बता दें। अगर आपको इस रिपोर्ट की जानकारी है तो बहुत अच्छी बात है, लेकिन हमें जो जानकारी है और जो छपकर आया है, मैं वही बता रहा हूँ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yechuryji, do not get distracted by them.

श्री सीताराम येचुरी : इस रिपोर्ट का टाइटल है, 'Spate of Cases of Suicide by Farmers' और इसमें कहा गया है, the main reason is that they are borrowing from private moneylenders and that is why you have the suicide cases on the rise. अब कौन से अच्छे दिन और किसके लिए अच्छे दिन, सर?

Then, you have talked about the NREGA. He said that this much of money has been spent. During the last nine months, according to your own Government's report, what is the number of people who are being employed under NREGA? It fell from 83.7 lakh households to 60.7 lakh in these nine months. Today, you had the Minister of Finance and the Leader of the House justifying it saying that we have spent all the money. But, why is there a fall in employment?

I can go on like this. The Government is tom-tomming saying that we are the fastest growing economy in the world.

SHRI TAPAN KUMAR SEN: Where is the money going then?

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: That they have to answer.

SHRI TAPAN KUMAR SEN: Where is the money going?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is no time left. Please sit down.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: Sir, they recently changed the base year calculations for economic statistics. And because of the change in the base year, they are showing the economy has progressed and we are now the fastest growing economy in the world. We have outstripped China. But they did not realise, ironically, that the same change in the base year has also shown the UPA Government in the last two years with much better record. So, all the election speeches were actually a complete rhetoric based on wrong facts. Forget that issue. Okay, we are the fastest growing economy in the world outstripping China. What is the reality, Sir?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now try to conclude.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: How can I, Sir, with all the disruptions? Please don't be unfair now.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, no. I am not unfair. Don't say that.

SHRI SITARAM YECHURY: The factory output growth slipped down in December 2014 to 1.7 per cent. The fastest growing economy in the world! Our factory output growth is 1.7 per cent falling from 3.9 per cent in December last year. Where are you and what is happening? In the economy today the growth is not taking place because the people of our country do not have adequate purchasing power to buy. Whatever little they are earning, either through growing unemployment or price rise, their disposable incomes are reducing. The net result is, our economy is not growing because of bottleneck of demand, not bottleneck of supply. This Government is going on talking of bottleneck of supply, foreign investments and domestic investments. It says that make them invest more and we will grow. Who are there to purchase what these investors produce, Sir? If the investors invest to produce something, somebody has to be there to purchase that. You cannot sell them in foreign markets because of the global economic crisis and your exports have fallen by 11.7 per cent. The only place you can sell them is in India. And in India people's purchasing power is reducing, so you can't sell them here. How will

the economy grow? Will it grow by bringing in greater and greater foreign capital? They will come here to maximise their profits by exploiting our mineral resources and our labour.

What needs to be done? I wish the Finance Minister were here to hear this. What needs to be done is to take policy measures to expand the purchasing power in the hands of our people. And how can that be done? Not by curtailing public investment or disinvesting public sector but by increasing your public investments that can generate new jobs, build the much needed infrastructure and the wages that the people get will expand the domestic market. What they are doing is the exact opposite of what is required.

All these issues have been raised about coal sector and he personally pointed it towards me and said it is not denationalisation. If it is not the denationalisation of coal sector, then tell me why have you removed the clause? The end-use clause is not important; you can hand over the coal mining to private players; and that means that they can use the minerals for commercial sale. Sir, in reality what is happening is entirely different from the process of privatisation of coal sector through the back door. It is happening in the name of electricity generation, fertilizers, etc. You exempted four categories saying private mining is allowed. Now you want to extend that further. You are undermining or cutting the branch on which you are sitting. Kalidasa taught us this wisdom long, long ago. What will happen if you cut the branch on which you are sitting? And that is precisely what this Government is now aiming at. Therefore, what is being done to the Indian economy, unfortunately, is that contrary to all that they have been saying the opposite is happening as far as the people are concerned. The real promises that they have made to the people कि अच्छे दिन आने वाले हैं ...**(व्यवधान)**... अच्छे दिन आने वाले हैं, 26 इंच की छाती ...**(व्यवधान)**... सॉरी, 56 इंच की, मेरी नज़र से गलती हो गयी ...**(व्यवधान)**... अब वह 26 इंच पर उतर गयी। वही मैं कह रहा था। ...**(व्यवधान)**...

What is the meaning of this to the actual youth of our country when we talk of creating a better India? Unfortunately, I know the constraints of the hon. President of India. He can only read out what the Cabinet approves and he has probably read out what the Cabinet has approved. And I hope that the speech of the hon. President of India does not turn out to be a mini election campaign or manifesto. What was written last year is totally ignored this year. This year, you have made

[Shri Sitaram Yechury]

a string of promises. Now, we don't know what will happen to them. But, the net result of all this is that the actual conditions of the people are worsening. The actual conditions of the people are worsening and you have this forked tongue operation that is happening, with one tongue speaking the rhetoric of development, which is not being realised, and the other tongue is the real tongue which is wagging. I think that is where lies a very serious problem of the vision that has been sought to be portrayed that we will build a better India.

Finally, Sir, I come to the question of Foreign Policy and India's standing in the world. You talked of good relations with the neighbours. What is the policy towards Pakistan? Are we going to talk or not? Are the talks going to take place or not? We are talking of a strong Government. The Minister of External Affairs has said that this is a strong Government which cannot be ignored in the world. We were hearing the accusation against our former Prime Minister. It was said that in the country, he is *maunmohan singh*. Abroad, he speaks, but not in the country. And now, in the nine months, I think our Prime Minister has travelled much more than what he has done in about four years. There are some countries which are left out. He is doing that either during the Session or immediately soon after. Fine! You go all over the world and try to build up your image. But, the question is: Is our Foreign Policy an independent policy or are we succumbing step by step towards becoming a subordinate ally of the US imperialism? The reason I say this is what is happening in the civil nuclear arrangement. They talk of it as an arrangement and what is there in this arrangement? It is that the supplier will not be liable, that there will be an insurance policy taken out, etc. But, by whom? It would be by our public sector insurance companies, not the private ones, where Government owns the equity. It will be from the public sector insurance companies which will be matched by the Government and that will be the corpus from which compensation will be given, but the supplier will not be held responsible at all. This is a complete violation of the law we passed and this is total surrender to the interest of the American corporates which is being paraded as something done with national objective in mind. So, with the neighbours, we do not know what is happening. With the USA and the world, we do not know what is happening. ...(*Time-bell rings*)...

Sir, I am concluding. Sir, you won't feel comfortable till you press the bell and I won't feel comfortable without hearing the bell. Therefore, Sir, in sum, this is neither

a balance sheet of the last nine months nor a vision for the future except promises of election rhetoric. Last time, nine months ago, on this very occasion of the Motion of Thanks, while concluding, I remember saying that this Government has neither given a blueprint of what it wants to do nor a 100 or 1,000 days target and now, there are no targets to measure what they have done. New targets and slogans have been given. So, this sort of rhetorical Government functioning is not in the interest of the country and worse, it is against the interest of our people. Therefore, I would sincerely urge the Government. Sir, we have moved amendments. I sincerely urge the Government to consider some of these amendments not because you will lose and we will win. That is not the attitude. The attitude is: Are we going to create a better India or not? Are we going to say that everybody in my country, irrespective of which religion he belongs to or an atheist that he is, will find equality, not a benevolent charity of tolerance. You can be charitable and give tolerance. That is not what is promised in the modern Indian Republic. What is promised is equality.

Are you giving this equality to all the citizens irrespective of their religious affiliations? My submission is no. It is getting worse, and this needs to be corrected. If, unfortunately, the Government doesn't heed to our point of view, or, opinion, then, the people will have to teach them a lesson whenever the opportunity comes. Therefore, Sir, through you, I request the Government to seriously consider some of these issues, and make necessary corrections in the interest of the country and the people. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Now, Mr. A.U. Singh Deo.

SHRI A.U. SINGH DEO (Odisha) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, it has been interesting listening to the speeches from both the sides. ऑनरेबल जेटली साहब की स्पीच सुनकर मुझे कैनेडी साहब का एक क्वोट याद आ गया। When John F. Kennedy took office he commented, "When I got into office the thing that surprised me most was to find the things were just as bad as we have been saying they were." वहाँ से शायद इन्होंने शुरू किया। Haywire fuel prices, recession, inflation, climatic conditions, climate change, increasing poverty, class divide were there. यह सुनकर अच्छा लगा कि प्रधान मंत्री ने President's Address में कई ऐलान किए, जैसे- 'Digital India', 'Make in India', 'प्रधान मंत्री जन-धन योजना', 'स्वच्छ भारत' इत्यादि। It is nice to see that the present Government is giving a direction. But the direction is only on paper.

[उपसभाध्यक्ष (डा. सत्यनारायण जटिया) पीठासीन हुए]

[Shri A.U. Singh Deo]

ये कब implement होंगी, कैसे implement होंगी, यह हमें देखना पड़ेगा। कहा जाता है, "Destiny belongs to those who believe in the beauty of dreams, and have the courage to persuade. Don't stop when you are tired, stop when you have done it." शायद इसी इशारे पर यह सरकार चलना चाहती है। हम लोग आगे जाकर देखेंगे कि यह कितनी कामयाब और कार्यकारी होती है। स्टेट्स की greater autonomy की बहुत दिनों से long pending demand थी। 'One policy, one size' doesn't fit for all the States. यह अच्छा है कि Centre's tax devolution स्टेट को 32 परसेंट से 42 परसेंट दिया गया है। यह एक कामयाब स्टेप है और यह हमारे स्टेट्स में काम आएगा, पर मैं एक बात point out करना चाहूँगा कि that Odisha and several other States have seen a percentage decrease in the devolution share under the 14th Finance Commission's report. Odisha's share of percentage has been reduced from 4.78% to 4.64% which is a 0.14 per cent decrease. मैं जानना चाहूँगा, क्यों? किस बेसिस पर यह increase calculate की गई? क्या यह बात मन में रखी गई कि जो स्टेट्स बैकवर्ड हैं, उनको ज्यादा अहमियत देनी चाहिए, सपोर्ट देनी चाहिए? यह चीज़ ख्याल में रखी गई या नहीं? मैं आशा करता हूँ कि हमारे आदरणीय फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर इसको क्लैरिफाई करेंगे। ओडिशा की special category State की बहुत दिनों से डिमांड थी। अब हम सुनते हैं कि 14th Finance Commission में ये distinction निकालने की सोच रहे हैं, recommend कर रहे हैं। जो special category States थे, उनको अगर इसमें से बाहर कर दिया जाएगा, तो उनके लिए क्या व्यवस्था होगी, जो बैकवर्ड हैं, यह हम आदरणीय फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर से जानना चाहेंगे। सर, बहुत कुछ कहा गया है सेक्युलरिज्म के ऊपर। This really is a matter of great concern for the country. ओबामा साहब, जब लौटकर गए, उन्होंने एक स्टेटमेंट दिया, जो सबको मालूम है, "acts of intolerance that would have shocked Gandhiji". मैं आपके सामने एक कैंपेन पढ़ रहा हूँ। जब ओबामा जी का नेगेटिव स्टेटमेंट आया on religious intolerance in this country, तो प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा, "My Government will ensure that there is complete freedom of faith and that everyone has an undeniable right to retain or adopt religion..." मुझे समझ में नहीं आता और कल ही के पेपर में आया है कि बी०जे०पी० के एक एम०पी० साहब ने कहा है, "Ghar Wapsi to go on till conversions are banned." तो किस भाषा में ये बात कर रहे हैं? प्रधान मंत्री जी एक चीज़ बोल रहे हैं, बी०जे०पी० के कुछ नेता कुछ और चीज़ बोल रहे हैं और जैसा येचुरी साहब ने कहा जो उनका main organization है, उनके हैड ने भी इस तरह का बयान दिया है तथा मदर टेरेसा को इसमें खींचा है। ये सब निंदनीय बातें हैं, जो होनी नहीं चाहिए। बड़े अच्छे तरीके से येचुरी जी ने इसको आपके सामने रखा है। स्टेटमेंट देने से काम नहीं होगा। प्रधान मंत्री जी एक स्टेटमेंट देते हैं, उनके एम०पी० वगैरह कुछ और स्टेटमेंट देते हैं। इसको क्लैरिफाई करने की जरूरत है। इसके लिए, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I will draw your attention to the Odisha

Freedom of Religion Bill, passed in 1967 in the State of Odisha. जब ऐसे मुद्दे 1967 में उड़ीसा में उठने लगे थे तो वहां के मुख्य मंत्री यह बिल लाए थे। इसका नाम था, The Odisha Freedom of Religion Bill — to provide for prohibition of conversion from one religion to another by the use of force or inducement or by fraudulent means and for matters incidental thereto. इसके Statement of Objects and Reasons ये थे -- "Conversion, in its very process, involves an act of undermining another's faith. The process becomes all the more objectionable when this is brought about by recourse to methods like force, fraud, material inducement and exploitation of one's poverty, simplicity and ignorance. Conversions or attempts to convert in the above manner, besides creating various mal adjustments in social life, also give rise to problems of law and order. It is, therefore, of importance to provide for measures to check such activity, which also indirectly impinges on the freedom of religion."

यह बिल आपके सामने है। उड़ीसा में आज यह लॉ है। अगर प्रधान मंत्री जी इस मैटर में सीरियस हैं तो स्टेटमेंट न देकर The Odisha Freedom of Religion Bill जैसा Bill लाकर एक लॉ बनाया जाए कि जो भी कंवर्ट करे जबरदस्ती बाय फोर्स, उनके ऊपर एक्शन हों, वे अरेस्ट हों। वैसे बार-बार उठता रहा है कि जो भी ऐसी स्टेटमेंट देते रहे हैं, उनके ऊपर कोई एक्शन सरकार ने लिया नहीं है और न ही लेने की बात करते हैं। यह सबसे बड़ी चीज आज भारत के सामने है। पूरी दुनिया देख रही है। जिसको प्रधान मंत्री जी ने आदर सहित भारत में बुलाया था, गैस्ट बने थे 26 जनवरी में, आज उन्होंने भी वापस जाकर ऐसा स्टेटमेंट दिया है। यह रिलीजियस इन्टॉलरेंस भारत के लिए बहुत ही निंदनीय बात है। अगर प्रधान मंत्री जी खाली भाषणबाजी में न जाकर इसे रोकने के लिए अटल हैं, तो वे इस बारे में बिल लाकर उसे कानूनी रूप देंगे और एक्शन होगा।

महोदय, मुझे कभी-कभी चर्चिल की बात याद आ जाती है। उन्होंने ऐसे ही लंदन की पार्लियामेंट में अपने भाषण में विरक्त होकर कहा था कि "My opponents sit in front of me, my enemy sits behind me." उन्होंने अपनी पार्टी के ऊपर इशारा किया था। मैं जानता हूं कि प्रधान मंत्री जी यह चाहते नहीं हैं। ये चीजें इनकी पार्टी से उठ रही हैं, वे बंद हों, लेकिन वे बंद नहीं हो पा रही हैं। इसलिए हमें एक लॉ की जरूरत है, जो आपके सामने एक example के तौर पर रहे। ओडिशा में 1967 में उस समय के मुख्य मंत्री ने यह किया था, आप उसे लाइए। आप उसे सदन में रखिए और उसमें जो भी चेंजेज करने हैं, करिए।

वाइस-चेयरमैन साहब, मुझे 2-4 मिनिट्स और दे दीजिए। I am touching on topics which have not been spoken of.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (डा. सत्यनारायण जटिया) : आपकी पार्टी के दो स्पीकर्स और हैं।

श्री ए. यू. सिंह दिव : सर, मुझे दो मिनिट और दे दीजिए। मैं डिफेंस के बारे में कुछ बातें कहना चाहूंगा। Between 1947 and 1962, the expenditure on defence remained below 2 per cent of the GDP leading to a humiliating debacle in 1962. The outlay for 2013-14 is 1.8 per cent of the GDP. Little has changed today. आप देखिए, over 70 passes are there in the North-Eastern Section between China and India. Chinese have 76 roads leading to all 76 passes. We, Sir, have one road going from Gangtok to Nathula. सर, ऐसी बहुत सी चीजें हैं, मैं उन्हें लाइट में नहीं लाना चाहता। आप इस पर concentrate क्यों नहीं करते? अभी Land Act के बारे में हमारे फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर साहब ने जो कहा, मैं उस बारे में पूरी तौर पर हमारे विपक्षी सदस्यों के साथ हूँ। यह एंटी-फार्मर, एंटी पुअर लॉ है, but for internal security, for matters of Armed Forces अगर इसे सस्पेंड कर के यूटिलाइज किया जाएगा, तो मुझे व्यक्तिगत तौर पर कोई ऑब्जेक्शन नहीं होगा।

सर, हर साल आर्म्ड फोर्स के 60 हजार व्यक्ति रिटायर होते हैं जिनकी उम्र 35 से 45 साल के बीच रहती है। इनके लिए mandatory job reservation नहीं है, यह ऑर्डिनेंस फैक्ट्री में होना चाहिए, पब्लिक सेक्टर में भी होना चाहिए। हमारे यहां एक "इको टास्क फोर्स" है, जोकि भारत में देहरादून व राजस्थान में अच्छा काम कर रही है, हमें उसे भी बढ़ावा देना चाहिए।

सर, मैं नक्सलवाद को भी टच करना चाहूंगा। मैंने आज सुबह नक्सलवाद के ऊपर एक प्रश्न किया था, लेकिन हमारे होम मिनिस्टर साहब ने उसका जवाब नहीं दिया, हमारे स्टेट होम मिनिस्टर वह जवाब दे नहीं पाए। हम उस पर आपसे Half an hour Discussion के लिए आएंगे। Sir, Naxal menace is an important matter of national concern. इस का हमारे मंत्री जी ने जवाब दिया कि यह तो स्टेट की डिमांड है, स्टेट ने सीआरपीएफ मांगी और हमने दे दी। मैं जानना चाहूंगा कि क्या यह प्रॉब्लम स्टेट ने क्रिएट की थी? Is it not the problem of ten to twelve States in the country 'pan India'? Why should not the Central Government support the States in payment and reimbursement of SRE funds? They haven't given enough helicopters. They haven't given enough support for the Naxalites because they treat it as a State problem. This should be treated as a national problem. आप इसे नेशनल प्रॉब्लम ट्रीट कीजिए, इस पर कार्यवाही होनी चाहिए। सर, मैं आधा मिनिट और लूंगा।

Sir, the Indian Army gets obsolete equipments and I will tell you how in just one minute. सर, टैंडर फार्मेट को फाइनलाइज करने में 5 साल लगते हैं। जो पार्टी चुनाव में हार जाती है, वह सीवीसी, सीबीआई और सुप्रीम कोर्ट को जाती है और 10 साल निकल जाते हैं और जब तक वह इक्युपमेंट, सबमैरिन या प्लेन भारत पहुंचता है, 15 साल निकल जाते हैं। जिस कार्य के लिए वह इक्युपमेंट लिया गया है, वह obsolete हो जाता है। इसके लिए आप कार्यवाही कीजिए, इस ओर ध्यान दीजिए। हमारी डिफेंस और सेक्युरिटी स्ट्रॉंग होनी चाहिए।

मैं आपको समय देने के लिए धन्यवाद देता हूँ।

SHRI DEVENDER GOUD T. (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, I thank you for giving me this opportunity. I rise to thank the President for addressing both the Houses. The Address shows the direction of this Government. He has done a lot of exercise on it. Government has taken a lot of initiatives. I really compliment the Government for accepting the Finance Commission Reports. Decentralisation of power is very important for this country. देश के लिए यह बहुत अच्छा है, क्योंकि एक आदमी दिल्ली में बैठकर we are not going to solve the problem. With all my experience I am telling you that decentralization is the best answer for this. गवर्नमेंट ने इनीशिएट किया है और फाइनेन्स कमीशन ने रिकमंडेशन को accept किया है और Central dissolution of funds accept किया है। My only request to the Prime Minister is this. I have seen in the newspapers that he has written to the Chief Ministers that dissolution has taken place in the States. स्टेट्स में भी स्टेट्स फाइनेन्स कारपोरेशंस हैं, उनको भी accept करना चाहिए और लोकल बॉडीज को, जो सरपंच हैं, जिला और मंडल हैं, because in our State we call it as *mandal*. In most of the other parts of the country they call it *taluks* or municipalities. वहां लैक ऑफ फंड्स है, उनको देना चाहिए, उनको पास-ऑन करना चाहिए। किस तरह से पास-ऑन करते हैं, किस तरीके से स्टेट्स को करना है। यह सब सोचना चाहिए। We must advise them because this falls under States. स्टेट्स के जुरिसडिक्शन में आता है। We must advise them to give them proper funds because you must realize, आपको यह सोचना चाहिए कि the nearest public representative is the Sarpanch or Pradhan. प्रधान ही वहां एक ऐसा आदमी है, जो पब्लिक को रोजाना मिलता है। अगर वहां पानी न आए, तो उसको ही लोग गाली देते हैं, कोई दूसरा काम नहीं हुआ तो भी उसी को ही बोलते हैं। एमएलएज़, एमपीज़ और मंत्री, हम लोग इतने नहीं मिलते हैं। The Gram Pradhan or Municipal Councilors are the people who are close to the people वे पीपुल के नजदीक रहते हैं। उन लोगों को फंड्स देना चाहिए। अभी उनके पास फंड्स नहीं हैं। That is the fate of the villages. और विलेजेस में उनके पास अभी फंड्स नहीं हैं और उनके पास पावर्स भी नहीं हैं। पावर्स और फंड्स उन लोगों को देना चाहिए। Decentralisation is the best solution for the many problems of this country. You have taken a right direction that in our country ten percentage of dissolution of Central funds is not a small thing. It is really going to change the entire country. केंद्री के पूरे डवलपमेंट के लिए एंटायर चेन्जेज लाएंगे। उसके साथ ही साथ पूरे विलेजेस तक यह decentralization and dissolution of funds at the village level must take place. इस बारे में थोड़ा सोचना चाहिए और दूसरा, since I was listening to the Finance Minister's statement and others, many of the hon. Members and well experienced personalities of this House are talking about

[Shri Devender Goud T.]

reforms in the administration, reforms in the economy. This is not sufficient. Reforms should be there in all the sectors. Not only in the legal system, reforms are required but even administrative reforms are required. रिफॉर्म्स लाना चाहिए। इसके लिए किसी कमेटी को बनाने की जरूरत नहीं है। इस पर बहुत एक्सपर्टाइज हुई है, बहुत सारे कमीशंस की रिपोर्टें हैं। We just go through the reforms. The hon. Law Minister is here. Since 2010, you have not been giving funds to the Fast Track Court.

आप देखिए कि कोर्ट्स में कितने केसेज की पेंडेंसी है? Fast Track Courts have done a lot of good work. They have disposed of 32 lakh cases out of 35 lakh cases referred to them. Now, you have abandoned them! So, you have to think about it. Not only that, Gram Nyayalayas Act was passed six years ago. How many Gram Nyayalayas are functioning now? We have to think about it. आप लीगल रिफॉर्म्स में कुछ भी नहीं ला सके हैं। आपको सोचना चाहिए कि क्या लीगल रिफॉर्म्स लाने चाहिए? इसके साथ ही साथ ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव रिफॉर्म्स हैं, There are so many Reports submitted by Commissions and Committees. कमेटीज़ को क्या करना चाहिए, you must think about it. Only economic reforms are not enough for this country, legal and administrative reforms are equally important. So, you must take into account all these things. We are giving a lot of emphasis on technology. Just to win an election टेक्नालॉजी को यूज़ नहीं करना चाहिए। इसके साथ ही साथ ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन के लिए टेक्नालॉजी, कॉमन मैन के यूज़ के लिए टेक्नालॉजी has to be used. We must think that technology is for whom; it is for the people. We have to use technology according to our requirement. You must think about it in that direction. There are so many reports indicating that 80 per cent of people belong to SC/STs, OBCs and poor. बहुत सारे लोग सोचते हैं कि STs की प्रॉब्लम STs सॉल्व करेंगे, OBCs की प्रॉब्लम OBCs सॉल्व करेंगे। This is not the way. Without such people, without their development, यह कंट्री कैसे डेवलप होगी, यह हमें सोचना चाहिए और अगर कोई देश में इनीशिएट करता है, अच्छा काम करता है, तो you must help them. Sir, many problems are being faced by SC/STs and OBCs. बहुत सारी प्रॉब्लम्स हैं। I will give one example of OBCs, because I was a Member of that Committee. I was under the impression that 27 per cent reservation, as recommended by the Mandal Commission, is implemented. But, surprisingly, मुझे यह मालूम हुआ कि मंडल कमिशन की रिपोर्ट को आए 20 साल हो गए, still 8-9 per cent, out of 27 per cent, is not being implemented. हमें यह सोचना चाहिए कि वह क्यों नहीं इंप्लिमेंट हो रहा है, as promised by the Government. The entire 27 per cent approved by the

Government has not been implemented. There are so many Reports by Commissions. उनको आपने कैसे इंप्लिमेंट करना है, उसके लिए आप उन रिपोर्ट्स को एक बार पढ़िए और उनमें से अच्छे प्वाइंट्स लीजिए। And, whatever is possible, you do it. Why I am insisting on this is, instead of wasting time in appointing new Commissions, उसके बाद दो-तीन साल वेट करना, there are many Reports given by Commissions pending with the Government. Sir, Government is a continuous process. Parties may change, but the Government is a continuous process. A number of Reports are pending. Please go through them. आप उन्हें देखिए और देखने के बाद whichever is possible, उनसे अगर लोगों को बेनिफिट होता है, तो उनमें से कुछ प्वाइंट्स लीजिए, उनको इंप्लिमेंट कीजिए, उनको आगे लेकर जाइए और उनके लिए आप कोशिश कीजिए।

इसके साथ ही साथ इलेक्शन रिफॉर्म्स भी हैं। इलेक्शन रिफॉर्म्स में, I was very surprised. There are many senior Members here. कितना रुपया पकड़ा गया है? The Election Commission officially seized hundreds of crores of rupees. I was surprised to see such reports in newspapers. In my own State, one ex-Minister's car was caught by officials of the Election Commission, उसको burn कर दिया है। किसलिए burn कर दिया है? ₹ 125 crores officially seized from all parties but no cases have been registered! हम लोग यहां बैठते हैं, How many poor people are coming here? Political parties are asking...

जब इलेक्शन में खड़े होते हो तो कितना पैसा खर्च करते हो? दस करोड़ खर्च करते हो? एमपी बनने के लिए कितने hundreds of crores खर्च करते हो? आजकल लोग यह पूछते हैं कि कितना पैसा खर्च करते हो। Is this the qualification? The Constitutional makers ने इस क्वालीफिकेशन के लिए सोचा था क्या? हम भी हैरान हैं। It is really a surprising thing that many people are spending a lot of money on elections. इलेक्शन के डे के लिए Election Commission is working; they are catching the wrongdoers. Surprisingly, तीन सौ या ढाई सौ करोड़ के करीब पकड़े गए। Half of the amount is from my own State. आंध्र प्रदेश में ही they caught ₹ 125 crores from all different candidates. This money caught is official. Unofficially कितना गया है और कितना आंख मीचकर ऑफिसिस ने लिया, यह तो बता नहीं सकते; but, these are all many of the important reports you must go through. Sir, रिफॉर्म्स एक ही में नहीं है, there are two things; the first thing is that the money is playing a very important role, the second thing is that कुछ पॉलिटिकल पार्टियाँ पूरी जागीरदार बन गयीं। On this also we must think on how to change the political system.

Sir, I don't want to take much time. I would like to compliment this

[Shri Devender Goud T.]

Government for the initiatives they have taken. They have taken a lot of initiatives. उन initiatives को continue करिए। उसके साथ ही साथ you must take the views of the Opposition parties also seriously. Apprehensions जितना भी पब्लिक माइंड में है, we must try to remove them from the public mind. We should think on all these.

I once again compliment the President for making an Address. Thank you very much.

SHRI H.K. DUA (Nominated): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, thank you. I intend to speak on the President's Address, on the aspects which have been neglected by the House, that is, on foreign policy and security areas while there has been emphasis on domestic situation and economy.

Sir, we, as a nation, are given to under-estimate ourselves and some sort of cynicism also develops because of that in our capability. The fact is, in 67 years, we have emerged as a big powerful nation. The vision of the Founders of the Republic in the initial years and investment in the country,—I am talking about the capital investment and investment in foreign policy. We have been having a sort of national consensus on foreign policy. This can't be changed by any Government in power. Years ago, we were considered as a poor country and then became, for years, a developing country; and now, we are called the emerging economy. That is the change that has happened—the emerging economy to be guided by aspirant classes, etc., etc. Three economies are going to matter—the U.S., China and India—whatever the order may be. On one question, the consensus has emerged among all the parties that India should emerge as a major economic, political and nuclear power of the 21st century. There is no difference among the political parties, irrespective of their persuasion and dispensation. But, what is not realized is what it requires to be a big nation. That is not understood wisely. It requires considerable economic strength. It requires considerable military strength. And it also requires considerable national unity, national cohesion. On the last front, particularly, there have been some disturbing trends and they need to be checked as urgently as possible.

If there is no national cohesion, there would not be national unity, and whatever strength you may get by economic development, by this strategy or that strategy or whatever the military strength you have by acquiring more weapons or manufacturing more weapons, national unity will be disturbed. We will be wasting our energy on social tensions, which are not being attended to. We also require a

few years of total peace around us in the neighbourhood. Look at Chinese. After Deng Xiaoping — not that I am a great follower of other peoples' example, we have to live by our own judgement and our own situation — they decided not to have too many tensions and concentrate on economic development, concentrate on social development, whatever the results may be, it has paid dividends to them. We also need to attend to serious problems like lack of social cohesion at the moment and these disturbing trends. I think they should be curbed immediately, otherwise, they can go out of hands. If you do not have those, that national unity behind this economic, political and nuclear strength, you will not achieve the aim of emerging as a major power of 21st century. And it is time we don't waste, we should realise that we do not have much time to waste; otherwise, others will overtake us. It was good idea on the part of Prime Minister to have invited Prime Ministers of neighbouring countries to his Swearing-in Ceremony. Except for Pakistan, other areas have not been disturbed. Pakistan's Nawaz Sharif could not deliver because, on one side, he has terrorists, and, on the other side, he has Army rule; but we should understand that situation, and I think the Foreign Secretary's proposed visit to Pakistan should be supported by considerable political will so that the process of peace around, in our neighbourhood, should be supported. But, I am afraid, with other countries in the neighbourhood, we have not followed-up the promise of the Swearing-in Ceremony. Prime Minister did go to Bhutan; he did go to Nepal; he could not go second time; Minister of External Affairs visited Dhaka and China also, and visits have taken place. Japanese came, Chinese came, Obama came, Putin come, but they needed to be followed-up. Particularly, in the neighbourhood, I suppose, there is no follow-up with Nepal, not much follow-up with Bhutan; possibly, we think, we don't need to follow-up anything there; that may not be so. With Bangladesh, two issues are pending, which I thought, is our responsibility to sort them out. One is Teesta Waters- a deal done. That is the latest phrase which we have heard. A deal done, but we have not seen through it because we could not reconcile differences with West Bengal Government. I think some attempts should be made to live up to our promise to give Teesta Waters to Bangladesh. There is a friendly Government, in Bangladesh, friendly to India. You have to strengthen its hands, and if you don't give Teesta Waters, and do other things, I think, we are harming our national interests. On land boundary, luckily, it is out of the Standing Committee and I think the earlier it is implemented, the better it is. It is a question of a few villages, whether they are on this side or the other side; we are large enough countries to be generous and

[Shri H.K. Dua]

our wider national interest lies in the land boundary agreement being ratified and its ratification is needed. It is not a new agreement that has been arrived at. In Sri Lanka, luckily, there is a positive turn for India. I hope this is being encashed. I think foreign affairs officers must be aware of it, it is being encashed, and it is the positive turn after a long time.

But Indian Ocean situation, in general, should be of utmost concern. Look at what is happening at Maldives? Somewhere, down the line, I am not blaming 'A', 'B', 'C', 'D', the previous Government or this Government, that is not my argument, I think, we seem to have lost Indian influence in Maldives. While the Chinese are more assertive in Indian Ocean, we need to be careful about it, and evolve a clear-cut Indian Ocean policy. I am not saying that we should come out with sort of a Monroe Doctrine or that kind of a thing, but we should be careful in formulating in our Foreign Policy and security policy, and give considerable attention to the Indian Ocean.

On West Asia, we don't have an answer yet, whether those 39 people are alive or dead. Two possibilities were thrown up in this House, and the Minister of External Affairs said 'that both the versions were there, we don't know which one to believe'. One gentleman who had escaped from there had given both the versions. But, I thought the Government should make more enquiries to find out what has happened to those 39 people. Their families, in Punjab, particularly, or wherever they are, are being kept in suspense whether they are alive or no more there. The House should be taken into confidence as to what happened to them. But, that is not the only thing. We need to have a clear-cut policy on West Asia. India's neighbourhood is not just Wagha Border. Our borders extend from Singapore, Malacca Strait, right up to Suez. So, we need to have a clear-cut policy, particularly in West Asia, where we have six to seven million Indians living there. Our oil comes from Shia power Iran and Sunni power Saudi Arabia, both in conflict with each other. I think you need to evolve a very active policy so that there can be peace in a wider arc of our own India, if we want to be comfortable in pursuing our policy. (*Time-bell*) Sir, I will just take one minute. I am conscious of the time. Certainly, we have improved relations with Japan. Obama's visit has gone very well. But we would like to know whether this 49 per cent of investment in defence, which has been promised, lead to import of critical technology, which we wanted from America and they were denying us. We

are not sure of that. The Deal does not say much on that. The Defence Agreement also has not been released so far, although it was signed earlier. I don't know the status of it; it has not been released.

There are some other issues also. There are some questions that there have been two statements by the companies concerned, Westinghouse as well as Hitachi G.E. They have expressed reservations about the insurance pool proposal. Most probably, the insurance pool proposal for compensating, in case of a nuclear mishap will be accepted. But the companies, which have to give us the nuclear reactors, they have these reservations. I don't know how serious they are. Is it proforma noises they are making or are they real? It needs to be clarified. On the whole, the visit has gone up very well. I don't know how the Russians and Chinese have taken it. We should be taken into confidence as to what is our feedback from Russia and China on our dealings with Americans. Thank you very much, Sir.

DR. K. KESHAVA RAO (Andhra Pradesh): Thank you very much, Sir. First, I will start with the last paragraph of the President's Address, who said that this House is the sanctum sanctorum of democracy. If that is so, then, this is my complaint and grievance, which I have been bringing to the hon. Chairman here. This is the Council of States. There are States with ruling parties and the Governments, which would like to have their voice registered here in this House. But, unfortunately, even if I am the eighth largest opposition party, but being one in this House, I am not given that chance. So, is the Bodo, so is also Nagaland, and so is Mizoram. Mr. Chairman, I am not making any complaint, this must go to the Business rules Committee where you must really discuss as to how you would give us that voice which we deserve, which is due to us.

Sir, anyhow, this is customary that the President goes to us and addresses the Joint Session every year. Last time when he went, he gave a "list of intent", as to what he would do and what the Government would do. We gave all credence to them because we thought they won elections with a decisive majority, so they would stand by their words. The President Address has mentioned about black money. Now they are saying that it was only a poll stunt or a poll promise. We did not know how they were to deal with all the things that they said last time in their speech. Naturally, when I look at this President's Address, whether the Government looks into it or not whether the Leader of the House had looked into it or not, at least, we in this House are certainly relates to what he said last time. Nine months

[Dr. K. Keshava Rao]

have passed. Has the Government achieved anything? Have they done anything? It is for them to say. The Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Ghulam Nabi Azad, had yesterday in a very scathing attack on the Address brought many issues which I would not repeat in the same tenor, because I would not like to indulge in politics but nonetheless what he said is mostly true. I would like to say how they are true. A few minutes back the Leader of the House was talking about the land issue. I have come later but because he had said it, I would like to refer it. When Mr. Mani Shankar Aiyar got up and said with emotion that nowhere in the world the Government acquires land for private companies, Sir, he meant that the private parties have money to acquire their own land. The 13 Acts to which the leader was repeatedly referring to were already in place. They are not new laws. These 13 laws were in place. Mr. Jairam Ramesh said that these might be factored in first and later within one year they could be incorporated into the Regular Act. Sir, I do not belong to Congress or to BJP. As it is, even if I had been in the Congress, — I often took my stand— I would have opposed this Bill even if the Congress itself brought it, because I would not agree that the land could be just taken by the Government for a private Party's use. If land is to be acquired, if land is to be taken for the purpose of Government use, what we are saying for the infrastructure, what we are saying for the road, what we are saying for the irrigation dams, nobody would have objected. If it is for a Government hospital nobody would have objected to that. Even if you were to take under PPA, keeping land in your name, perhaps something could have been discussed. But you are acquiring it for private companies. I do not think one would go and acquire land for a private company through the Government. This is exactly the meaning of what Mr. Jairam Ramesh or Mr. Mani Shankar Aiyar were trying to explain to the Leader of the House. The 13 Acts they were trying to talk about were already in place. They already existed. They were only trying to say how they could be incorporated or factored into the Act. Sir, as I said, it is very nice that the Address starts with focus on 'inclusiveness', '*sab kaa saath, sab kaa vikaas*' inclusiveness. If it is inclusive policy that you are talking, it has two aspects, one is social inclusiveness and the other is economic inclusiveness. Our crisis, our grievance, our complaint is about the lack of, social inclusiveness for the first time, we have heard, Mr. Yechury reciting from Vedas or Bhagvad Gita or Upanishads and what not. A student of philosophy like me would like to keep quiet, let us keep that aside, but one thing is sure that this particular objection in this House from

this side for the last two days has been on one thing, what is known as a "singular identity" factor that you are seeking, an identity, a singular identity, you are seeking for yourself in a pluralistic society. That perhaps is will disturb the very fabric of this nation and our commitment to secularism or socialism. This exactly has been the concern, whether religion comes or not, that is how the rich and poor come.

Yesterday, Mr. Sharad Yadav was very emotional. His speech really touched all of us. I don't know whether that touched you or not. He talked about the people whom we have not seen and in whose names we come into the House. Sir, people living in remote areas or like Jharkhand and others, which you are aware, have not really seen them and, but in their name, we come to the House, in the name of *Janata*. Their areas are not motorable. You cannot even reach them. And, we talk about them! You have representatives for all sections. But for tribals you do not have.

The hon. President spoke about Left Wing Extremism. I know there is a problem. The problem has been there for the last 40-50 years. But what have we done? We have just been talking. Yesterday, when a question was raised here about naxalism, all the supplementaries, which were raised, were only about the Armed Forces, how it was being reinforced, what modern arms were being given to police. Nobody talked about as to how this issue came up; how we must take them into confidence. If it is a socio-economic problem, you say so, as we have been saying, then please try to understand what the social problem is. What is the economic problem that is haunting them? If they are asking for empowerment, the economic aspect is just only one part of it. Empowerment encompasses many things. Empowerment means to live with dignity. Empowerment means I want to live a quality life. That is what the empowerment actually is. That is why we talk about tolerance, when we are talking about religious issues. I am not trying to dwell much on this because much has been said about this. The House has expressed this and we have also understood this. I do not want to go into details. But the fact remains that you must understand why all these grievance come at all. This is because of the special single identity that you are trying to seek; this is because of the special identity you are trying to seek, and give the similar identity to the nation, which has a pluralistic society. We must really think about it. It is very nice of the Prime Minister speaking boldly about this. But there are no takers. (*Time-Bell rings*)

Sir, please give me some more time. I will jump over all these things. The

[Dr. K. Keshava Rao]

Leader of the House spoke about the *Jana Dhan Yojana*. You say that this is financial inclusion. It is true that about 13 crore new bank accounts have been opened. There are already about 82 crore accounts in the country. During last 3 years 24 Cr. Accounts were opened. Opening of bank accounts will not make financial inclusion. Who is going to service them? These are going to be one-way accounts. The account holder has just opened the account. He is not going back to the bank to operate his account. I have got the records of seven months with me. Not a single such account is in operation. They have just opened them. 24 crore accounts, out of 82 crores, are not operative. All that is happening is loans are transferred to their account, they go and take that. If you think that this is some kind of financial inclusion, please try to give a rethinking as to what you should do to make them operative; how they can really gain out of it.

Secondly, you have been talking about *beti bachao, beti padhao*. The other day, when a question was put about this, the Minister said as this scheme had been approved recently, no funds had been allocated to the States, so far. It is very sad. It is a very laudable scheme that you have brought in. But when will you implement it? Nine months are over. Perhaps, you may talk about it in the Budget.

Sir, I would like to take just one more minute. I am not on a fault-finding mission. I am just trying to say that you have been talking about all these things but there has been no will for implementation. That is why objections are coming in. Once you start implementing them, I don't think objections would come in for such laudable programme. You talked about housing. How many houses do we require? Today, there are something like 60 million people who need houses — this is regarding the rural, and 30 million as far as the urban is concerned. Forget about it. We had housing schemes even earlier. In this housing scheme, if you have to do it, what you are saying is it is for the poor. But, you said, 'affordable housing'. Let me tell you the definition of 'affordable housing'. 'Affordable housing' means multi-storied apartments with a floor area of 70 - 120 sq. metres. That means, only developers build multi-storeyed peaks. That is a private affair; it is not housing for poor. The hon. Minister was talking about MG NREGA. The current allocation for the Scheme is Rs.34,000 crores. From 20.4.14 till December, the expenditure has been only. Rs.26,000 crores. Sir, same way, the mandays created were 34 per

family as against the 48 average. Likewise, housing provided so far is only 2,00,000 as against, as I told you, 60,00,000.

Now, I come to skill development. Rajiv Mission was there. I am not trying to praise one mission or the other. About 1.27 crore people had been skilled. Later, they thought of changing the Apprentice Act. They gave lot of funds.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. SATYANARAYAN JATIYA): Please conclude.

DR. K. KESHAVA RAO: You have achieved only 25.8 per cent of your target in the last nine months. I have calculated it on a nine-month basis; I have not calculated it on a one year basis. This is how we are trying to go. We wish this Government Godspeed because you have the mandate of the people. There is a perception of the nation, not perception of these few people here. The perception of the nation is that you would like to promote what is known as cultural nationalism. Perhaps, this will not be good for the nation. Today, I would say...(*Time-bell*)... But, nonetheless, you are taken in by the corporate sector. When the land issue comes, when we say land we are saying private land. Let the Government take land over for itself; we have no objection. On this, I have many issues. Anyhow, thank you very much for giving me this opportunity.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to thank the hon. President for his Address and to extend to him my sympathies for having had to read out what undoubtedly is the dullest speech that any President has ever had to make before our Parliament. There was absolutely no unifying vision in it. There were no long-term objectives spelt out. There were no themes in this speech. All we had was a laundry list of what the Government claims to have done and of what it claims it will be doing in the future. I had intended to limit my remarks to what the President's Address said. But I am obliged by the Finance Minister's intervention in this debate to respond to him as well. He is twisting our position to be one of anti-industrialisation and anti-urbanisation. Nothing could be further from the truth, but you cannot rob Peter in order to pay Paul. The purpose of this legislation relating to land acquisition was not to stop industrialization or to stop urbanization but to ensure that those who are deprived of their land and their property against their will are duly compensated. They have not been duly compensated. It is even worse that instead of allowing market forces to determine who will sell and who will buy, the State intervenes and acquires land in order to pass it on to private developers. There is

[Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar]

a doctrine of eminent domain which says that the State might acquire projects for its own use, not for the use of others. I can understand the State acquiring land in order to build a railway line or to build a highway or to build a canal.

But I cannot understand the concept of the State acquiring land in order to transfer it to an industrialist for his private exploitation. There are, Sir, three factors of production which I trust the Minister of Finance is aware of. There is the factor of capital, there is the factor of labour and there is the factor of land. Now, when in our system the State does not acquire capital in order to pass it on to the private sector and the State does not acquire labour, as it would in a slave economy, to pass it on to the private sector, by what right does the State acquire land in order to pass it on to the private sector? What is worse is that a huge amount of industrialization that is actually taking place in the private sector is leading to jobless growth. There is no connection whatsoever between the work of big business and additional employment in the country. That is why despite the staggering growth of industry during a portion of the UPA rule, which extended from about the beginning of the UPA rule till about the middle of UPA II, during that period the industrial growth rose but employment in industry did not significantly rise. What we are doing is displacing people from this sector that is the most employment-intensive, namely, agriculture, in order to bring in industry which, by definition, is not employment-intensive but capital-intensive and technology-intensive. Therefore, there is a real problem before the country that those who are least able to give voice to their fears are the ones who are being deprived — by whom; by this Government which they themselves have elected — of their own property. I am sure Mr. Jaitley would not rest content if the State were to acquire his home for whatever noble purpose. He would object. That is why, as a lawyer, he has done so well in protecting the private property of all his clients. That is how he has done it. So, the same man who, in his profession, protects private interest, suddenly in his capacity as a Minister wants to deprive poor people of their private property. And worse still, as our Committee, that is, the Standing Committee on Rural Development, of which I was a Member, pointed out that apart from a few Commonwealth countries, that is, ex-British colonies, there is no country in the world which permits the acquisition of property. There is no land acquisition in the United States, there is no land acquisition in Canada, there is no land acquisition in France, there is no land acquisition in Germany, and there is no land acquisition in Japan so much so that when they wanted to expand the Narita

Airport, which is the key to the prosperity of Japan, they were unable to acquire the land around and the court held that you have to buy the land from willing sellers. Now, in these circumstances, to misunderstand and misrepresent the situation with regard to the Land Acquisition Act as constituting anti-industrialization on our part or anti-urbanization on our part is to use the kind of lawyer's language at which Mr. Jaitley is so expert. There are real problems that have to be faced, and instead of using clever phrases, I trust the Minister of Finance would face the problems squarely. If he is unable to face them squarely, we will put them before him squarely and ensure that the people of India are not deprived of their property only because they are poor and only because they are voiceless.

I now come to the substance of what I had intended to say. Sir, if there is a theme that is available in the running of this Government for the last nine months, it is the concept of cooperative federalism or competitive federalism. I welcome — I think we welcome — this concept of cooperative federalism and competitive federalism and therefore we welcome what Mr. Jaitley drew attention to just now, which is that the share of the States in the national divisible pool of finances has been increased from 32 to 42 per cent. But, I think, it is extremely important that before we fall into the trap of cooperative federalism, we understand clearly that the Constitution of India does not make India a federation.

In the famous words of Dr. Ambedkar, "We are a Union of States with federal features" and, therefore, the federation concept has to be married to the fact of our being a Union and a Union, at that, of States. So, the Centre cannot abdicate its responsibility to the Constitution.

Sir, I submit that the present Government's focus, exclusive focus, on Centre-State relations, derogates from the Constitution, for our Constitution now envisages three tiers of Government, the Centre, the States and, thirdly, the Panchayats and the Municipalities. Now, it is astonishing that in a Government that claims to be devoted to the concept of maximum governance and minimum government, there is no place at all for local-self government. There is not a single word about the Panchayats or the Municipalities in all of the many boring paragraphs that this Government has made the poor President read.

Sir, nearly 25 years ago, this Parliament passed, and the Government promulgated, the 73rd and 74th Amendments to the Constitution, which now figure as

[Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar]

Parts IX and IX A. Neither minimum government nor maximum governance is possible unless self-governance and self-government is guaranteed to local communities, rural and urban. Maximum governance must mean the maximum empowerment of communities, of local communities, and maximum devolution to communities, local communities. Although the President's Address repeats the cliché "India lives in its villages", the Union Government seems completely uninterested in empowering elected village panchayats and urban local bodies. It limits cooperative federalism to the Centre and the State excluding the Panchayats and the Municipalities. I request the Government to look again at the concluding section of the 1987 Justice R. S. Sarkaria Report on Centre-State Relations. There they will find that Justice Sarkaria stresses the role of local governments in meeting the most aching needs of the people, which is neighbourhood control and supervision over neighbourhood issues that constitute most of the concerns of most of the people most of the time. Indeed, it is precisely because the people of Delhi saw that this Government is anti-mohalla sabhas, anti-gram sabhas, anti-panchayats and anti-municipalities that they have given you the drubbing that they gave. Learn, at least, from this election that you cannot have cooperative federalism if you exclude the elected local bodies. What this Government has done is that it has forgotten Mahatma Gandhi's injunction, which is given in Young India of the 10th of September, 1931. I quote — I quote from memory as much as from my notes — "I shall work", said Gandhiji, "for an India in which the poorest feels that it is his country in the making of which he has an effective voice". It is not unless the poorest of this country are made to feel that it is their country by being given the opportunity of participating in governance and in believing that it is not this Government but they themselves, with their own hands and their own brains, who are making this country. And they can feel that only if they are given an effective voice in governance. Only then will the India of Mahatma Gandhi's dreams be achieved. But instead of doing that, what this Government is interested in doing is replicating the authoritarianism that is evident in the Centre, in the States, to the detriment of local democracy, local government and local governance.

भागीदारी, जवाबदेही, जिम्मेदारी, these are no part of your so-called cooperative federalism. Sir, it is not enough to strengthen the States alone. What we need, as Sonia Gandhi has said, is a strong Centre, strong States and strong Panchayats and Municipalities. What the Government is doing is strengthening the States which is welcome, but weakening the Centre and leaving the Panchayats

powerless, which is not welcome. Indeed, instead of ensuring powerful Panchayats, the Government is ensuring a powerless Ministry of Panchayati Raj. It has been made into a mere adjunct of the Ministry of Rural Development when its mandate should cover the entire social sector and all poverty alleviation programmes. "सबका विकास" cannot be imposed from above. सबका विकास सबके द्वारा होना चाहिए, सबकी भागीदारी होनी चाहिए, चुने हुए पंचों और सरपंचों की जवाबदेही सबके प्रति होनी चाहिए, गाँव के कल्याण की जिम्मेवारी ग्राम सभा की होनी चाहिए। That would be true cooperative federalism. Sir, I am astonished to learn from the Ministry of Panchayati Raj's written answer to my Question No.113 of 1st December, 2014 that the Ministry has discontinued their bi-annual State of the Panchayat's Report. Then from where will they secure and consolidate information on the country-wide evolution of Panchayati Raj? How will they be able to check on which are the States that are moving forward and which are the States that are moving backward? How will they incentivize progress and discourage slippage? What is the corrective action required? How will they be able to determine it and to whom will they transmit it? It is ridiculous that the Ministry of Panchayati Raj should deny itself the one instrument that makes it possible for them to understand and evaluate what is the progress of the third tier of Government across the length and breadth of this country. Similar, Sir, are my concerns about the Annual Index of Devolution prepared by the IIPA. We don't have any information on whether they will be continuing that practice and, if so, they will not be able to run their incentivization schemes. So, what this Government is doing is fixing on how to make the States as authoritarian as they are making the Centre without any regard for what are the institutions of governance and Government at the grass-roots level where the people live. They are interested in devolving to other Governments; they are not interested in devolving power to the people or to the institutions of the people. We are, Sir, in imminent danger of reverting to the pre-1993 position on Panchayati Raj. That would be a blow both to the Constitution and to the pattern of three-tier federalism envisaged in the amended Constitution. Sir, it is good that the Centre proposes to reduce and rationalize Centrally-sponsored Schemes as stated in the President's Address. This, Sir, was an initiative taken by our Government and I hope the present Government will transfer social sector finances and responsibilities to State Governments, but not at the expense of the Panchayats and the Municipalities. In December 1992, by-passing Parts IX and IXA of the Constitution, this Parliament took a giant step forward to making ours both the biggest and the most representative democracy in the world.

[Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar]

Sir, we have since elected some 32 lakh representatives. I have to underline that figure. We have elected 32 lakh representatives to our local bodies, compared to a mere 5,000 in Parliament and the State Assemblies. Sir, nearly half of our elected representatives are women, that is, approximately, 14 lakh women, of whom approximately one lakh are Presidents of their respective Panchayats at the appropriate level. There are more elected women in India alone than in the rest of the world put together. This is an achievement without precedent in history and without parallel in the world. And yet, in the cause of so-called 'co-operative federalism' and reducing Centrally-sponsored schemes, this Government is sidelining these elected woman representatives instead of effectively empowering them. And, the same goes for SCs, OBCs and STs. For SCs, local bodies ensure electoral representation at each tier of the Panchayati Raj system proportional to the SC population at that level, plus reservation for SC Chairpersons; that has resulted in some 86,000 Scheduled Caste Chairpersons in this country. I am particularly glad to notice that there are some Members of the BSP among us. Please note this. What Panchayati Raj has done for the empowerment of the Scheduled Castes is more than what has been done by any kind of reservation in any other sector. For OBCs, the States have been enabled to make appropriate arrangements. For the Scheduled Tribes, in addition to proportional representation, in all the districts, all the blocks and all the Panchayats where there are tribal populations, we have the PESA, the Provisions of the Panchayats (Extension to Scheduled Areas) Act, 1996, which guarantees exclusive Panchayat powers to the Scheduled Tribes in all Fifth Schedule areas. But, instead of making all this part and parcel of three-tier co-operative federalism, this Government has pushed Panchayati Raj into the wings. (Time bell rings) Sir, I need only a minute and a half. The answer given yesterday by the Home Minister to Shri A.U. Singh Deo's Starred Question No.16, shows that PESA plays no role whatsoever in combating naxal terrorism. What a shame! You cannot have maximum governance by neglecting the poorest segments of the population. Co-operative federalism, as defined by this Government, is only imposing a crushing burden of bureaucracy on the *aam admi*. The Centre is opting out of its duty of ensuring grassroots empowerment.

Sir, the Fourteenth Finance Commission has granted an average of ₹20 lakh per year to every Panchayat. That is nothing. The cost is almost equal to that of building one community hall. Therefore, additional monies have to be directed

to the Panchayats by the Central Government. Equally, the Central Government has to incentivise the States to direct further sectoral financing by the States to the Panchayats. How can any of these be done if the Centre does not regard the Panchayats and municipalities as integral to the three-tier system of co-operative federalism? We need money for all these things.

The new NITI Aayog has the Constitutional obligation to take into consideration the development plans of District Planning Committees, mandated by Article 243ZD of the Constitution. All this requires the most careful implementation of the recommendations of the 2013 Expert Committee that I chaired. But, from what I can make out of the Questions of the Ministers of the present Government, there is little or no progress on this front. Instead, under the slogan 'maximum governance, minimum government', the Central Government is deluding itself, misleading the people and is derailing inclusive Government. That is why I have no trust in this Government. The sooner it stops writing the President's Addresses, the better for the nation.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (डा. सत्यनारायण जटिया) : श्री रवि प्रकाश वर्मा।

श्री अरविन्द कुमार सिंह : सर, वर्मा जी की यह maiden speech है।

[उपसभाध्यक्ष (डा. ई.एम. सुदर्शन नाच्चीयप्पन) पीठासीन हुए]

श्री रवि प्रकाश वर्मा (उत्तर प्रदेश) : सर, मैं आभारी हूँ कि आपने मुझे अत्यंत महत्वपूर्ण चर्चा में अपनी बात कहने का अवसर दिया।

सर, मैं महामहिम राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण पर चल रही चर्चा को कल से सुन रहा हूँ जोकि सरकार का अपना डॉक्यूमेंट होता है। इस पर लोगों ने अपनी-अपनी राय व्यक्त की है। सर, अब बहुत सी चीजें धीरे-धीरे साफ होने लगी हैं कि सरकार की ओर से क्या कहा जा रहा है, क्या किया जा रहा है, क्या दिखाया जा रहा है और क्या निभाया जा रहा है। मुझे लगता है कि यह चर्चा इसलिए बहुत महत्वपूर्ण है क्योंकि पूरे हिंदुस्तान में बहुत से लोग इस नई सरकार से बहुत अपेक्षाएं रखते थे, वे अपनी उम्मीदों को इस दिशा में देख रहे थे कि वे परवान चढ़ेगी या उन्हें निराशा हाथ लगेगी! सर, आज पूरी दुनिया में जब एक नया उपनिवेशवाद पैर पसार रहा है, जो देश अच्छी लोकतांत्रिक परंपरा लेकर चल रहे थे, उन देशों में भी उनके यहां प्रचलित मूल्यों को बदलने के लिए बड़े हाथ-पैर मारे जा रहे हैं। हमारी चिंता यह है कि जिस देश में सब को साथ लेकर चलना तय किया गया था, सब को बराबर के अवसर देना तय किया गया था, उसमें अब गरीब आदमी और गरीब हो रहा है और अमीर आदमी और अमीर हो रहा है। कल तक जो समाजवादी लोकतंत्र था, आज ऐसा लगता है कि इसे पूंजीवादी लोकतंत्र में तब्दील कर दिया जाए। निश्चित रूप से हिंदुस्तान के करोड़ों लोग जो संसद की ओर बहुत

[श्री रवि प्रकाश वर्मा]

आशाभरी नजरों से देखते हैं, उनके सामने अब यह तय करने का समय आ रहा है कि अगर आजादी के 67 वर्षों के बाद भी हिंदुस्तान की दिशा बदली जाएगी और इस तरीके से बदली जाएगी कि लाचार, कमजोर और गरीबों को बेसहारा छोड़कर सशक्त व जबर्दस्त लोगों के साथ सरकार खड़ी होगी, तो परिस्थितियां एक ऐसे मोड़ पर पहुंच जाएंगी, जहां से वापस लौटना संभव नहीं होगा।

महोदय, पहले भी चर्चाएं हुई हैं, मैं कल आदरणीय नेता प्रतिपक्ष की बात बड़े गौर से सुन रहा था। उन्होंने एक-एक बिंदु पर इस बात का खुलासा किया कि पिछले वर्ष जो राष्ट्रपति महोदय का अभिभाषण हुआ था और अब की बार जो राष्ट्रपति महोदय का अभिभाषण हुआ है, उसमें बड़ी दूरियां हैं। उसमें निरंतरता नहीं है। क्या चीज है जो हमें आज कुछ कहने को प्रेरित करती है और अगले दिन हम दूसरी बात कहने लगते हैं। इसमें दो राय नहीं कि जो डॉक्यूमेंट हमारे सामने रखा गया है, उसमें ऐसी बहुत सी बातें कही गयी हैं, जो देखने-सुनने में बड़ी अच्छी लग रही हैं, लेकिन दरअसल मैं हम जा कहां रहे हैं, क्या हो रहा है और आगे क्या होगा? मुझे कभी-कभी शंका होने लगती है कि जैसे इस सरकार के पीछे कोई खड़ा हुआ है।

जो अपना चेहरा बचाए हुए है और ऐसी परिस्थितियां पैदा कर रहा है, ऐसे निर्देश दे रहा है कि विवशता महसूस होने लगी है। सरकार कुछ करना चाहती है, लेकिन अचानक कोई नई चीज सामने आ जाती है और फिर सरकार उसको संभालने में लग जाती है। एकदम से मेरा इशारा उन सांप्रदायिक शक्तियों की तरफ है, जो कहीं एक प्रच्छन्न रूप से, छुपे हुए तौर पर इस सरकार के पीछे हैं और रोज नए-नए बयान देकर सरकार को मुसीबत में डालती रहती हैं। मैं याद करना चाहता हूँ, आदरणीय शरद यादव जी ने इस बात को दोहराया था कि माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी के सामने जो समस्याएं आ रही हैं, वे अंदर से आ रही हैं और उन्हें उन चुनौतियों को स्वीकार करना होगा, लेकिन सच्चाई तो यह है कि क्या इतना स्पष्ट बहुमत मिलने के बावजूद हम यह मान लें कि जो स्थिति हमारे पिछले प्रधान मंत्री की रही है, वही स्थिति हमारे वर्तमान प्रधान मंत्री की भी है? अगर ऐसा है, तो यह दुर्भाग्य की बात है। यह समय सरकार को अच्छे परिवर्तन लाने के लिए मिला था, उन परिवर्तनों की तरफ देखने के लिए मिला था, जो हमारे संविधान में निहित हैं और जिनको बड़े संघर्षों के बाद जमीन पर उतारा गया है। मुझे दुख भी है और हैरत भी है कि इस बीच में बाहर कुछ चर्चाएं हुईं, जब दिल्ली में चुनाव चल रहे थे, बड़े जिम्मेदार लोगों ने संविधान में निहित जो धर्म-निरपेक्षता और समाजवाद का सवाल है, उस पर सवाल पैदा कर दिए।

माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि इसी सभा भवन के अंदर आज से बहुत साल पहले, 1928 में सरदार भगत सिंह जी ने एक बम फेंका था। उन्होंने सिर्फ बम ही नहीं फेंका था, साथ में एक पर्चा भी फेंका था। उस पर्चे में जो भावना निहित थी, वह बहुत स्पष्ट रूप से कहती थी कि हमें आजादी चाहिए, सिर्फ अंग्रेजों से नहीं बल्कि भूख से भी, लाचारी से भी, मजबूरी से भी, बदहाली से भी और जेहनी अंधेरे से भी, जिस जेहनी अंधेरे ने हजारों सालों से आदमी का शोषण करके उसको आगे बढ़ने से रोका है। यह समाजवाद का रास्ता बड़ी कुर्बानियों के बाद तय किया गया है। इसके लिए पता नहीं, कितने हिंदुस्तानियों ने अपनी जान दी है। उन लोगों ने अपनी जान दी, जिन्होंने सपना देखा था कि हमारे बच्चे आजाद वतन में एक इज्जत की जिंदगी जिएंगे।

माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, 7200 जातियों के इस देश में कभी किसी को बराबर नहीं माना गया, कभी किसी को बराबर के अवसर नहीं दिए गए। आजादी की लड़ाई का जो मूल मंत्र था, उसे लेकर एक गरीब से गरीब आदमी भी गांधी जी के पीछे चल करके, सुभाष चन्द्र बोस के पीछे चल करके और बड़े नेताओं के पीछे चल करके उस लड़ाई में शरीक हो गया था और वह इसलिए शरीक हुआ था कि उसने एक सपना देखा था। जिस आदमी ने लाचारी में, गरीबी में युगों काट दिए थे, उसको सपना दिखाई पड़ा था कि जब वतन आज़ाद होगा, तो हिंदुस्तान में लोकतंत्र होगा, समाजवाद होगा, धर्मनिरपेक्षता होगी और सबको बराबरी का हक मिलेगा, यानी एक अच्छा हिंदुस्तान बनेगा। हम उन कुर्बानियों को ऐसे जाया नहीं कर सकते। अगर किसी को यह लगता है कि एक संकीर्ण मानसिकता को लेकर वे हिंदुस्तान के लोकतंत्र को तब्दील कर सकते हैं, तो उनकी यह सिर्फ गलतफहमी है और उन्हें इससे बाहर आ जाना चाहिए।

माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज जो परिस्थितियां हिंदुस्तान में बन रही हैं। इसमें दो राये नहीं कि हिंदुस्तान ने पिछले कुछ वर्षों में तरक्की की है, लेकिन अभी मंजिल बाकी है, अभी रास्ता बाकी है, हम निर्णायक मोड़ पर पहुंचने वाले हैं। आज राजनीतिक रूप से हिंदुस्तान का आवाम इस कदर जागरूक हुआ है कि कमजोर से कमजोर आदमी भी अपनी राजनीतिक भागीदारी को सुनिश्चित करना चाहता है। ऐसे मौके पर अधिनायकवादी प्रवृत्तियों को आगे बढ़ाया जाएगा, तो उसकी प्रतिक्रिया अच्छी नहीं होगी। यह मैं आपके माध्यम से सबको बता देना चाहता हूँ। मुझे लगता है कि समय आ गया है, जब हमें तय करना चाहिए कि आजादी के 67 वर्षों के बाद भी हिंदुस्तान में जो गरीबी है, जो बदहाली है, जो लाचारी है, जो मजबूरी है, उसकी उम्र कितनी होगी।

इस सदन के अंदर बहुत बड़ी चर्चाएं हुई हैं। आज हिंदुस्तान की नई पीढ़ी, जिसके बारे में कहा जा रहा है कि उसकी तादाद आने वाले वर्षों में 85 सैकड़ा होने जा रही है, आज वह इस बात को लेकर संवेदनशील है, बहुत जिज्ञासु है कि आखिर पिछले 67 वर्षों में ऐसा क्या होता रहा कि आज भी गरीबी दूर नहीं हुई? लाचारी, मजबूरी दूर नहीं हुई? बदहाली दूर नहीं हुई और वे परिस्थितियां भी दूर नहीं हुई, जो आदमी से आदमी पर जुल्म करा रही हैं, चाहे 84 के दिल्ली के मामले हों, चाहे 1992 के बम्बई के मामले हों, चाहे 2002 के गुजरात के मामले हों, चाहे 2006 के असम के मामले हों, चाहे 2008 के ओडिशा के कंधमाल के मामले हों। नई पीढ़ी जानना चाहती है, इतने बड़े-बड़े गुनाह हुए, किसको सज़ा मिली? अगर नहीं मिली तो कब तक सज़ा मिलेगी और क्या यह हिंदुस्तान ऐसे ही चलता रहेगा? आज जब इस डॉक्यूमेंट के माध्यम से सरकार ने अपने मनसूबे सामने रखे हैं, तो हम जानना चाहते हैं कि हिंदुस्तान के अंदर यह लोकतंत्र क्या लोगों को न्याय दिला पाएगा? क्या सामाजिक न्याय दिला पाएगा? क्या उनको आगे बढ़ने के अवसर दिला पाएगा और क्या उनको पूरे तौर पर बराबरी का हक दिला पाएगा?

माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरी जो शंका है, अभी सीताराम येचुरी जी भी कह रहे थे कि जो घटनाएं, जिनका जिक्र मैंने अभी किया, तो यह पहली बार नहीं है। बहुत साल पहले जिस तरीके से बौद्ध समुदाय के लोगों को यहां से exterminate किया गया, उनको यहां से बाहर भगाया गया, उनको जान से मारा गया, यहां से कतई बेदखल करके हिंदुस्तान के बाहर पहुंचा दिया गया, तो शंका पैदा

[श्री रवि प्रकाश वर्मा]

होने लगी है कि कहीं यही कहानी हिंदुस्तान के अंदर अब दोबारा तो नहीं दोहराई जानी है? एक-एक करके हर समुदाय को निशाना बनाया जा रहा है। आज सबसे दुखद स्थिति यह है कि नाम समुदाय का लिया जा रहा है, लेकिन जो निहित हित हैं, जो लोग करना चाहते हैं, उन्होंने अपने लोगों को भी नहीं बरखा। मैं दोहरा देना चाहता हूँ कि 2006 में असम में जो कत्लेआम कराया गया, उसमें तो ऊंची जाति के हिंदुओं ने नीची जाति के हिंदुओं को मारा। ओडिशा में 2008 में जो कत्लेआम कराया गया, उसमें भी ऊंची जाति के हिंदुओं ने नीची जाति के हिंदुओं को मारा। इसलिए मारा क्योंकि वे ईसाइयों की सुरक्षा करना चाह रहे थे, तो आखिर मंशा क्या है? करने का मकसद क्या है और क्यों इस तरह की गतिविधियाँ आगे बढ़ रही हैं? सरकार उनके सामने इतनी लाचार और हताश क्यों महसूस कर रही है? कहीं न कहीं से जब धर्म परिवर्तन की बात आती है, तो हमें इस बात पर गौर करना पड़ता है कि आखिर इसकी जरूरत क्यों पड़ रही है? मौका मिला है हिंदुस्तान की तकदीर लिखने का, मौका मिला है हिंदुस्तान के अभाव दूर करने का, मौका मिला है वह सब करने का, जो पिछली सरकारें नहीं कर सकीं, जिससे कि हिंदुस्तान का आम आदमी सुखी हो, हिंदुस्तान की जनता सुखी हो। जो आने वाली पीढ़ी है, नई जमात है, उसको कम से कम एक सहारा मिले, उसको इस वतन के प्रति फख्र महसूस हो सके, लेकिन बड़ी अजीब सी बात है, आज जब चर्चा इस बात पर होनी चाहिए कि हिंदुस्तान में दस में से आठ लोग लाचारी और गरीबी की हालत में जी रहे हैं, तब हिंदुस्तान का मॉडल क्या होना चाहिए? हमारे पुरखों ने कोई गलती नहीं की। जिन लोगों ने संविधान सभा में बहस की थी, उन्होंने हिंदुस्तान को एक समाजवादी, धर्मनिरपेक्ष गणराज्य के रास्ते पर चलाया और इसलिए चलाया कि जब लोगों को मौका मिलेगा, तब उनको आगे बढ़ाया जाएगा और एक दिन आएगा, जब सब बराबरी के साथ खड़े होंगे। आज जब हम खुले बाज़ार की ओर बढ़ रहे हैं, तो बहुत सी चीज़ें ऐसी आ रही हैं, जिनको हमें गौर से देखना होगा कि कहीं वह हमारी जो मूल विचारधारा है, हमारा जो बेसिक वैल्यू सिस्टम है, उससे कॉम्प्रोमाइज़ तो नहीं कर रहा है? मुझे बड़ी हताशा हुई, जब माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी के सूट को लेकर चर्चा हुई। जब अमेरिका के राष्ट्रपति यहां आए थे, उस अवसर पर माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी ने जो सूट पहना था, अखबारों में उसकी भांति-भांति की चर्चा हुई। मुझे तकलीफ हुई और मुझे ही नहीं, हिंदुस्तान के बहुत से लोगों को इस बात से तकलीफ हुई कि आखिर क्या संदेश दिया जा रहा है? लेकिन उसके बाद जब अखबारों में खबरें चलीं तो मुझे पता चला कि उस सूट को बाज़ार में नीलाम किया गया और चार करोड़ या साढ़े चार करोड़ रुपए में वह बिका। मुझे हैरत होती है कि हिंदुस्तान की सीमाओं पर शहीद होने वाले जो हमारे बहादुर सैनिक हैं....

किसी ने उनकी गोलियों से छलनी जैकेट भी कभी खरीदी है, नीलामी में ली है, जिससे हिन्दुस्तान के नौजवानों को सही मैसेज दिया जा सके, हिन्दुस्तान का सही रास्ता तय किया जा सके? आज ये सवाल हमें सोचने पर मजबूर कर रहे हैं, आज इन सवालों ने हमें ऐसे चौराहे पर लाकर खड़ा कर दिया है, जहां पर हमें निश्चित रूप से यह तय करना पड़ेगा कि हमें जाना कहां है, हम कहां जा रहे हैं, हमें करना क्या है और हम क्या दिखा रहे हैं। माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे लगता है कि संविधान का वादा अभी अधूरा है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. E.M. SUDARSANA NATCHIAPPAN): Time is over.

कुछ माननीय सदस्य : सर, उनकी मेडन स्पीच है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. E.M. SUDARSANA NATCHIAPPAN): Maiden speech is for fifteen minutes. ... (Interruptions)... ... (Interruptions)... Your Party has no time left.

श्री रवि प्रकाश वर्मा : सर, मैं लम्बा नहीं खींचूंगा, मैं जल्दी खत्म कर दूंगा।.. (व्यवधान).. सर, कृपया मुझे अपनी बात कहने का मौका दीजिए। मुझे लगता है कि संविधान का वादा अभी अधूरा है और हिन्दुस्तान की सारी समस्याओं की जड़ में वह भयानक अशिक्षा है, वह अज्ञान है जो हिन्दुस्तान को अंदर से निगल रहा है।

माननीय महोदय, कुछ समय पहले मुझे बाहर जाने का मौका मिला। एक गोरा मुझे वहां मिला। उसने मुझे कहा, मिस्टर वर्मा, आप जहां से आए हैं, वह धरती की सबसे पुरानी सभ्यता है, कदाचित् दसियों हजार साल पुरानी। जिस वक्त आपके यहां ज्ञान में, विज्ञान में, भाषा में, गणित में, नक्षत्र विज्ञान में, मेडिसिन में बड़ी-बड़ी रिसर्च हो रही थी, उस वक्त पूरा का पूरा यूरोप आदिवासियों की तरह अंधेरे में जी रहा था। केवल दो हजार साल हुए हैं। यूरोप ने ज्ञान को आधार बनाया है, ज्ञान का विकास किया है और उसके सहारे अपनी अर्थव्यवस्था का विकास किया है। आज यूरोपियंस का जो रहन-सहन का स्तर है, वह धरती का सबसे ऊंचा रहन-सहन का स्तर है। उसने यह बताया कि हम इतना खर्चा करने के बावजूद भी जो कुछ बचाते हैं, उसे पूरी धरती पर उन लोगों पर खर्च करते हैं, जो या तो कुदरत के सत्ताए हुए हैं या इस धरती पर दुष्ट लोगों के सत्ताए हुए हैं। वे बोले, मिस्टर वर्मा, यह जिम्मेदारी तो आप लोगों की बनती है। आप धरती की सबसे पुरानी सभ्यता के लोग हैं। आपकी सिविलाइज़ेशन धरती की सबसे पुरानी सिविलाइज़ेशन है। आपके ऊपर बड़ी जिम्मेदारी है कि पूरी धरती पर जहां कहीं भी दुख है, तकलीफ है, कमजोरी है, लाचारी है, आप उनकी मदद करें। लेकिन आप मुझे यह बताइए कि इतनी पुरानी सभ्यता होते हुए भी, इतनी पुरानी हैरिटेज होते हुए भी आज आपके यहां लाचारी, मजबूरी, बेकारी, इतना भ्रष्टाचार, आपस में इतनी नफरत, इतनी गरीबी — यह सब आज तक बाकी क्यों है? मैं आपके सामने स्वीकार करना चाहता हूं कि मुझे बड़ा धक्का लगा, मुझे बड़ा शॉक लगा कि यह गोरा हिन्दुस्तान के बारे में क्या जानता है, मुझसे वह क्या उम्मीद कर रहा है और मैं उसे क्या बताना चाहता हूं कि हम लोग आखिर क्यों पिछड़ गए? जो समाज ज्ञान से संचालित होने वाला समाज था, जो पूरी दुनिया को रास्ता दिखाया करता था, आज वह समाज अंधेरे में क्यों जी रहा है, लाचारी, मजबूरी में क्यों जी रहा है? मुझे लगता है कि कुछ लोगों ने, तंगदिल लोगों ने, स्वार्थी लोगों ने हिन्दुस्तानी समाज को, जो ज्ञान से संचालित होने वाला समाज था, दुनिया को प्रकाश देने वाला समाज था, लाठी से संचालित होने वाला समाज बना दिया और लाखों-करोड़ों लोगों को समाज और उसकी जिम्मेदारियों से मुक्त करके, उसको जाति व्यवस्था में बांधकर राजनीति से बाहर कर दिया। आज हम जिस मोड़ पर खड़े हैं, हम दुबारा से नयी शुरुआत करना चाहते हैं, ऐसा मुझे दिखायी पड़ रहा है। आज मैं इस अवसर पर यह कहना चाहता हूं ...।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. E.M. SUDARSANA NATCHIAPPAN): Thank you. Please conclude.

SHRI RAVI PRAKASH VERMA: Sir, I am just concluding. मेरा मानना है कि सरकार जिस रफ्तार के साथ आर्थिक सुधारों की ओर बढ़ी, हमें लगता था कि सरकार के पास आर्थिक कमियां हैं इसलिए आर्थिक सुधारों की जरूरत पड़ेगी, लेकिन पूरी दुनिया में, जहां कहीं भी आर्थिक सुधार लागू किए गए हैं, उसके पहले प्रशासनिक और न्यायिक सुधार व्यापक स्तर पर लागू किए गए हैं। आज हिन्दुस्तान में प्रशासनिक स्थिति यह है कि एक-एक काम को कराने के लिए एमपी-एमएलए की चिट्ठी की जरूरत पड़ती है, *suo motu* किसी का कोई काम नहीं हो सकता है। आम आदमी को आज जरूरत पड़ती है कि हर हाल में अधिकारियों से या जनप्रतिनिधियों से किसी भी तरह से सम्पर्क बनाकर रखना है ताकि कोई काम न रुके। जो भ्रष्टाचार की स्थिति है, उस पर कोई नियंत्रण नहीं है। सच्चाई यह है कि आज कानून की स्थिति ऐसी बनी हुई है कि आदमी को न्याय नहीं मिल पा रहा है। मैंने आपसे जिक्र किया कि हिन्दुस्तान में ऐसे बड़े-बड़े मामले हुए हैं जिनमें आज तक लोगों को न्याय नहीं मिल सका और सामान्य जीवन में भी आदमी को न्याय मिलने में इतना डिले होता है कि उसका मकसद ही खत्म हो जाता है।

यह बड़ी महत्वपूर्ण बात है कि आदमी को असुरक्षित रखकर, उसको न्याय न मिल सके, उसको प्रशासनिक सुरक्षा न मिल सके, लेकिन वह आदमी, आर्थिक सुधार के जो भी कार्यक्रम हैं, उनमें अपनी भागीदारी सुनिश्चित करे।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. E. M. SUDARASANA NATCHIAPPAN): Please conclude. I am sorry I have to call the next speaker.

श्री रवि प्रकाश वर्मा : यह बात आज तक कभी मेरी समझ में नहीं आई। हालांकि सरकार ने आधे मन से कुछ काम करने का काम चालू किया है, लेकिन यह वास्तविक रूप है कि हमारे संविधान में जो वायदा था, अगर आज़ादी मिलने के दस साल के बाद पूरा हिन्दुस्तान शिक्षित हो गया होता, अगर वह समर्थ हो गया होता, competent हो गया होता, तो मुझे लगता है कि सरकार को ज्यादा सहयोग मिल सकता था। लेकिन लम्बे समय तक हिन्दुस्तान की जनता को यथास्थिति में रखा गया है। आज 67 वर्षों के बाद भी जो जातियों का स्ट्रक्चर है, मैं इसको locking mechanism के तरीके से समझता हूं। आदमी को यथा स्थिति में lock करके रखा गया है, de-politicize करके रखा गया है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. E.M. SUDARASANA NATCHIAPPAN): I am sorry; I have to call the next speaker.

श्री रवि प्रकाश वर्मा : सर, मैं कन्क्लूड कर रहा हूं। मैं अपने बिंदुओं पर ही बात करूंगा।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. E.M. SUDARASANA NATCHIAPPAN): I am bound by our rules.

श्री रवि प्रकाश वर्मा: सर, मैं मुख्य बिंदुओं पर ही बात करना चाहता हूँ। सर, सच्चाई तो यह ...**(व्यवधान)**...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. E.M. SUDARASANA NATCHIAPPAN): You have to conclude. You will get a lot of chances. You are speaking well. You will get another chance.

श्री रवि प्रकाश वर्मा: सरकार का जो डाक्युमेंट है, वह आज हमारे सामने कुछ सवाल पैदा कर रहा है और उन सवालों का जवाब हम सरकार से चाहते हैं। सर, मुझे एक बात बहुत साफ-साफ कहनी है कि हिन्दुस्तान में गरीबी एक political issue है। क्या वाकई में गरीबी issue है? मुझे लगता है कि productivity सही issue है। जितने भी लोग गरीब हैं वे under productive हैं और सरकार को एक पॉजिटिव नज़रिया रखते हुए, हर आदमी को, जो हिन्दुस्तान में पैदा हुआ है, उसे एक productive resource में कन्वर्ट करने के लिए कमिटमेंट करना चाहिए। सरकार मान लेती है कि लोग गरीब हैं। सरकार की योजनाएं बनेंगी और लोग उसका लाभ उठाएंगे तथा गरीबी दूर करेंगे। हिन्दुस्तान में गरीबी सिक्के का खेल नहीं है सिस्टम का खेल है। हिन्दुस्तान के अंदर 1947 में गरीबी थी, तो वह अंग्रेजों के कारण थी, लेकिन आज 2015 में गरीबी है, तो उसका कारण सरकार की गलत नीतियां रही हैं।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. E.M. SUDARASANA NATCHIAPPAN): Okay, please sit down. Next speaker, Shri Sukhendu Sekhar Roy.

श्री रवि प्रकाश वर्मा: सर, मैं कन्क्लूड कर रहा हूँ। मेरे पास बहुत से बिन्दु हैं, लेकिन समय की कमी है। मैं आपके माध्यम से सरकार से आग्रह करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर सरकार यह दावा कर रही है कि उसका जीडीपी बढ़ रहा है, तो हम इस बात की तरफ आंख खोलकर देख रहे हैं कि सरकार का खर्चा एजुकेशन पर और टेक्नालॉजी डेवलपमेंट के ऊपर बहुत ज्यादा बढ़ना चाहिए। सर, मेरा सरकार से एक खास आग्रह है कि अब समय आ गया है कि हिन्दुस्तान में कॉमन एजुकेशन सिस्टम लांच हो। जो छह प्रणाली की शिक्षा चल रही है, उसने एक नई वर्ण व्यवस्था की रचना की है, जो गरीबों के बच्चे हैं, उनको अलग किस्म की शिक्षा और जो सम्पन्न लोगों के बच्चे हैं, उनको अलग किस्म की शिक्षा दी जा रही है। मुझे लगता है कि यह स्थिति ज्यादा चलने वाली नहीं है। सर, हिन्दुस्तान के बच्चों के साथ discrimination हो रहा है। मैं उम्मीद करता हूँ कि सरकार जो विज़न डाक्युमेंट लेकर आई है, उसमें वह इस बात पर गौर करेगी। मुद्दा यह है कि इस वक्त हर हाल में poverty versus productivity की जो बहस है, उसे आगे बढ़ाए जाने की जरूरत है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. E.M. SUDARASANA NATCHIAPPAN): Okay, thank you. You have already covered the points. Kindly conclude.

SHRI RAVI PRAKASH VERMA: I am concluding. सर, मैं एक बात और कहना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान की जो जीडीपी ग्रोथ है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. E.M. SUDARASANA NATCHIAPPAN): I am sorry I have to say nothing will go on record.

SHRI RAVI PRAKASH VERMA: Please give me a minute more. I am just concluding. सर, इसमें एक खास बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार ने महिलाओं के प्रति अपना एक नज़रिया दिखाया है। मेरा यह मानना है कि जो महिलाएं मेहनत कर रही हैं, काम कर रही हैं, अर्जन में लगी हुई हैं, उनकी स्थिति अलग है, लेकिन जो हाउसवाइफ है, जो फैमिली की हब है, क्या उनकी सेवाओं का आर्थिक मूल्यांकन हो सकेगा? वे नई progeny सामने लाती हैं, बच्चों को संस्कार देती हैं, फैमिली का हब बनती हैं और ह्यूमैन डेवलपमेंट करने में अपना बड़ा योगदान देती हैं, मुझे नहीं लगता है कि अगर सरकार इसको नकारेगी, neglect करेगी, तो उनके साथ न्याय कर पाएगी?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. E.M. SUDARASANA NATCHIAPPAN): Okay, thank you very much.

श्री रवि प्रकाश वर्मा: सर, मैं एक बात कहकर अपनी बात खत्म कर देना चाहता हूँ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. E.M. SUDARASANA NATCHIAPPAN): Okay, thank you very much. Please sit down. Kindly oblige. Nothing will go on record. Next Shri Sukhendu Sekhar Roy.

SHRI SUKHENDU SEKHAR ROY (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the President's Address to the Joint Session of Parliament has lost its significance over the years, as it appears that it has become an empty ritual, and the President's Address which is being discussed now is not an exception to it. It appears that the President's Address is something like a report card of the Government to the parliamentarians.

Sir, at the outset, I would say that if one gives a cursory look at the President's Address, it would appear that this Government is not a game-changer but a name changer, as rightly pointed out by the hon. Members, particularly the hon. Leader of the Opposition, and how the names of different schemes have been changed from the previous Government's projects to the present Government's projects. I don't wish to repeat all that.

Sir, I wish to quote just one line from the President's Address, 'Inclusive

growth covering the poorest of the poor is my Government's top priority'. If the Government takes it seriously, then the Government ought to have considered the UN Millennium Development Report, 2014, whereby the Report had assessed that 40 million of Indian citizens are the poorest of the poor and they constitute one-third of the poorest of the poor of the world. This is the situation prevailing in this country and still, the slogan of inclusive growth is being chanted by the new Government without envisaging any definite action plan to help the poorest of the poor who are living in sub-human conditions. We have heard this slogan over the years and now, a new slogan 'maximum governance, minimum government' has been echoed in the President's Address, referring once again to the poorest of the poor. This will continue to be a hoax, I repeat, this will continue to be a hoax, until and unless the basic conditions of the poorest of the poor of our country are improved within a definite time-frame.

Sir, the President's Address mentions about a Government initiative called Himmat to ensure women's safety in Delhi. Subsequent to the Nirbhaya incident what we find in Delhi is that the atrocities on women, particularly incidents of rape, have been increasing alarmingly every day. The other day, even a Japanese woman was not spared; she was gang-raped in a moving car in the National Capital. What impression would the foreigners have about the National Capital of Delhi and the country as a whole when such incidents have been increasing alarmingly every day? क्योंकि भारत की राजधानी में महिलाओं की कोई सेफ्टी नहीं है, इसलिए सारी दुनिया में भारत की छवि खराब हो रही है।

Sir, the President's Address refers to legal reforms and setting up of the National Judicial Appointments Commission. This is another half truth because the Government of the day has not yet issued any notification about the setting up of a National Judicial Appointments Commission, for reasons better known to the Government. There is no mention about the non-issuance of the notification for setting up of the National Judicial Appointments Commission in the President's Address.

As a result, the system which was going on for a long time, over the years, at the whims and fancies of certain judicial officers, is still going on. Even in today's newspapers, we have found that one High Court Judge from Odisha has been elevated to the Supreme Court, and the Law Minister justified the earlier situation, which is being continued even today, without adhering to the Act passed by both

[Shri Sukhendu Sekhar Roy]

Houses of Parliament, that is, the National Judicial Appointments Commission Act. This is because the concerned Ministry has not issued any notification as yet. That is why the Act has not been implemented.

Now, secondly, so far as judicial and legal reforms are concerned, what about the Judicial Accountability Bill proposed by the earlier Government? So much has been said about judicial accountability. In so many quarters, it is being discussed. But the President's Address is conspicuously silent about the Judicial Accountability Bill which was proposed by the earlier Government. Even those who are in the present Government supported it like anything. Sir, we always stress the need for administrative and electoral reforms, and I am sorry to say that there is no mention about administrative and electoral reforms in the President's speech. To our dismay, we have found that these matters have not found any place in the President's speech.

The President's Address has a tall claim about the formation of NITI Aayog. After eliminating the Planning Commission, NITI Aayog has come in. I am having copies of the 1950 Resolution of the Central Government, Resolution No.1 P(C)/50 dated 15th March, 1950. This is how the Planning Commission was formed by the then Government, the first independent Government of this country whereby the Planning Commission was given certain powers to exercise, like, not only do planning for the country but also make plan allocations. But now this NITI Aayog, which has been formed on the 1st January this year, says that a group of people with authority entrusted by the Government will formulate/regulate policies transforming India. But as to how this transformation will be effected, there is no guideline or anything which has been said in the features contained in the NITI Aayog. Sir, it has been stated that all powers, financial powers, about Plan allocations, will now be exercised by the Finance Ministry. The Planning Commission was a separate body. They used to work independently so far as planning and plan allocations are concerned. They used to make recommendations to the Government and the Government was empowered to accept any recommendation or not to accept or to amend some recommendations. So, after several discussions with Chief Ministers, etc., the Planning Commission used to formulate the Plan of the Government of India and go for allocations. But now, Sir, the allocation of funds has been entirely given to the Finance Ministry. Supposing in a given situation, a political party 'X' is

in power at the Centre and political party 'Y' is in power in one of the States, if the 'X' party, which is ruling at the Centre, and the 'Y' party, which is ruling in the State, are politically opposed to each other, it may so happen that the Finance Ministry of the Government of India may exercise their powers on political considerations to deprive benefits to that particular State.

As It happens sometimes and we have enough experience about it. Therefore, propriety demands that the Finance Commission, which is a constitutional body to look into the financial matters between the States and the Centre, should have been given a permanent status by amending the Constitution and all financial powers allocated to the States ought to have been given to a constitutional authority like Finance Commission and not to the Finance Ministry of the Central Government. This way this Government has usurped the powers of the people in other terms.

Sir, I now come to the other point which has been referred to in the President's Address. The Address reassures that the Government is committed to stop generation of black money, both domestically and internationally. We have heard enough of it. We have discussed enough of it. I will now tell you a small story of one of my distant relatives, who was a Government employee, a Lower Divisional Clerk; after retirement I have found him going to the bank twice or thrice a week. I wondered why this gentleman is going to the bank twice or thrice in a week. So I asked him the reason for his going to the bank. Very often he said that he was going to check whether ₹. 15 lakhs has come in his account or not. I don't know who has told him. But this is the story about the middle class people, this is the story of the general people of my country because according to them a very powerful gentleman has assured them that ₹. 15 lakhs will be deposited in each and every account of the Indians because they will bring back the black money from outside the country. And what is the reality? All we know is that a single individual said that whatever information that he has given, leaked for Indian Government is only one per cent. If the Indian Government contacts me, I can give him 99 per cent information about the black money deposited in different accounts outside this country. What is the net result? Has the Government taken any action to contact that gentleman and to have more information about it? I even put a question in this House and the reply was evasive. Sir, now Namami Gange is another nomenclature. It is a Sanskrit nomenclature. All right, nobody objected. We must go for Namami Gange, but the Central Water Commission of the Government has ignored the fact. Even the President's Address

[Shri Sukhendu Sekhar Roy]

has not mentioned that the Central Water Commission of the Government of India has recently raised an objection. What was the objection? It is because the Indian Government has signed an MoU with the Australian Government, which is effective from 2015-2020, *i.e.* for five years and that they will go for preparation of Ganga River Basin Master Plan etc. for Ganga rejuvenation. Central Water Commission objected before the MoU was signed. The Central Water Commission categorically objected on the ground that India's water security would be at stake. Why will the National Water security be at stake? The reason given by the Central Water Commission was that the hydrological data of Ganga is classified and once this Australian Government agency comes for this survey and other things, then, all this classified information will go into the hands of the Australian Government and you can understand what will be the impact. That is why not Trinamool Congress, not any other Party, not any other opposition Party, but it is the Central Water Commission which opposed tooth and nail. But, unfortunately, the Government did not adhere to the valid objections made by the Central Water Commission. It may be *quid-pro-quo*; I don't know. Now-a-days, something is going on behind the screen between Australia and India. So, it may be a *quid-pro-quo*. I cannot rule it out...*(Time-bell rings)*...Sir, I will take only 2-3 minutes more.

Sir, the President's Address highlights the visit of the Chinese President. The Address also says, '...the historic visit of the US President.' What we have seen in the aftermath of the visit of the Chinese President and the US President? On the other day, the Indian Ambassador in Beijing was called by the Chinese authority to protest about the recent visit of our hon. Prime Minister to Arunachal Pradesh! This is the outcome of the Chinese President's visit to India. Our hon. Prime Minister visiting a State, which is an integral part of India, is objected to by the Chinese authority by calling Indian Ambassador in Beijing! So, this is the mutual relations that we have developed.

वे साबरमती आश्रम में दोले में झूले, हमने टीवी में यह देखा, सबने देखा, लेकिन उसका नतीजा क्या निकला? उसका नतीजा यही निकला कि हमारे अम्बेसेडर को वहां बुलाकर धमकी दी जा रही है कि तुम्हारे प्रधान मंत्री अरुणाचल प्रदेश में क्यों गए? अरे! हमारे देश में हमारे प्रधान मंत्री कहां जाएंगे, कहां नहीं जाएंगे, इसको क्या चायनीज़ अथॉरिटी तय करेगी? क्या आज यह हालत पैदा हो गई है? लेकिन हम President's Address में लिखते हैं कि देखो, विदेशी राष्ट्रों से हमारे रिलेशंस कितने अच्छे हुए। So, this is the situation.

What about the US President. We all know what he had said. He said that religious tolerance, age-long practice of religious tolerance in India should be maintained at any cost. What is the programme for maintaining religious tolerance? It is 'Ghar Wapasi'? हमारे यहां से जब ओबामा जी अमरीका घर वापस गए, तो उन्होंने हमको कुछ सुझाव दिए और हमने 'घर वापसी' प्रोग्राम अपनाया। वह 'घर वापसी' प्रोग्राम क्या है? वह प्रोग्राम है कि जबरदस्ती किसी के धर्म को बदल दो और मदर टेरेसा जैसे महान् व्यक्ति को बदनाम करो। ये सब कार्यक्रम, रूलिंग पार्टी के जो other associates हैं, इन लोगों ने किए।

MR. VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. E.M.S. SUDARSANA NATCHIAPPAN): Please conclude.

SHRI SUKHENDU SEKHAR ROY: I am concluding, Sir. हमारी सरकार खामोश रही। जब 'घर वापसी' प्रोग्राम चल रहा है, तो हमारी सरकार खामोश रही। वैसे तो बहुत बातें की जाती हैं। इस तरह मदर टेरेसा की आत्मा की परवाह की जा रही है या कुछ और किया जा रहा है? यह 'घर वापसी' है या 'डर वापसी'? इससे तो डर वापस आ रहा है। गुजरात में जो कुछ हुआ, बाबरी मस्जिद तोड़ने के बाद जो हालात पैदा हुए थे, उस समय जो डर पैदा हुआ था, वही डर अब फिर से वापस आ रहा है। यह 'घर वापसी' नहीं है, यह 'डर वापसी' है, लेकिन इसके बारे में President's Address में कुछ नहीं कहा गया है।

Now, I would like to conclude with two sentences from a great poet, not from Bengal and not Gurudev Tagore, but a great poet from Punjab who was respected by the entire country during his lifetime and even today by those who have interest in poetry always go through his poems. वे पर्शियन में लिखते थे, फारसी में लिखते थे, लेकिन उनको समझ में आया कि my poems are like wild flowers without any fragrance, because people cannot understand Persian. Therefore, he started writing in Hindi and Urdu.

वे हिन्दी और उर्दू मिला कर लिखते थे। उन्होंने क्या लिखा? बहुत जमाने पहले उन्होंने जो लिखा था, I quote from his couplets:

"इकबाल बड़ा उपदेशक है,
मन बातों से मोह लेता है।
गुफ्तार का वह गाज़ी तो बना,
किरदार का गाज़ी बन न सका॥"

सर, मैं अभी बहुत से भाषण सुन रहा हूँ। मैं 40 साल से भी अधिक समय से राजनीति में हूँ, आप जैसे बहुत से लोग भी हैं। हम बहुत से भाषण सुन चुके हैं, बहुत से भाषण हम भी दे

[Shri Sukhendu Sekhar Roy]

चुके हैं। जो लोग गुफ्तार के गाजी बन गये हैं, वे अभी तक किरदार के गाजी नहीं बन पाये हैं। लेकिन वे दिखा रहे हैं कि हमारी 56 इंच की छाती है और हम भारत को बदल देंगे और घर वापसी प्रोग्राम से हम सारे कौम को बदल देंगे। बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. E.M. SUDARSANA NATCHIAPPAN): Shri Zhimomi, you have got five minutes to speak.

SHRI KHEKIHO ZHIMOMI (Nagaland): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the House is far from the required number of quorum. Yet, with the time concession, I shall speak and five minutes' time is not at all enough.

Sir, I rise to extend my support to the President's Address moved by the hon. Member. The President's Address to the Joint Sitting of Parliament sends out a message to the nation and I support that. At this juncture, Sir, I also would like to express my regret about the non-coverage of paramount issue of the North-East, that is, the growth of insurgency in the North-East. Sir, the Naga political issue is alive in the country for the last almost a century. Yet, the successive Governments have failed to address this. It is very unfortunate. But, at the same time, there are Statesmen Prime Ministers, who met representatives from the Nagas. The first Prime Minister of India, late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, could understand the political issue of the Nagas and he felt that the military operation was not an answer to the issue. He recognized it as a political issue. Then, the process of political issue was started by creating the State of Nagaland as the 16th State in the Indian Union. Unfortunately, after the death of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, for a period of thirty years, from 1967 to 1997, ceasefire was broken.

But, in 1997, the statesman, Prime Minister, Late Shri Narasimha Rao, gathered all the courage and invited the Naga freedom-fighters to come to their neighbour-side table, without any condition. That encouraged the Nagas to enter into the ceasefire agreement. The condition was at the highest level, *i.e.*, the Prime Minister-level, in the third country, involving the third party. In the process, the second ceasefire was concluded between the Nagas and the Government of India in 1997.

After that, the healing touch was given by Atal Bihari Vajpayeeji. The statesman Prime Minister realised that the Nagas need due recognition based on

the Naga history and the uniqueness of Naga history. That arrested the minds of the Nagas, the magnanimity of the then Prime Minister. But, unfortunately, the ten years of UPA Government could not take forward the issue to a positive conclusion. Maybe the coalition constraint of the ten year UPA-I and UPA-II could be the reason, because on both the terms, there were many *ayaram* and *gayaram* Members and at the same time, there were *ayaram gayaram* political parties also. So, maybe, due to that constraint, the UPA-I and UPA-II failed to address the issue. Out of 13 Prime Ministers of the country, the first Prime Minister, Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru, the second Prime Minister, Shri Narasimha Rao, the third Prime Minister, who was the 11th Prime Minister, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee and the 12th Prime Minister, as I have mentioned, may be due to coalition compulsion, could not come to a logical conclusion. And, now with the 11th Prime Minister, having overcome ...*(Interruptions)*... ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. E.M. SUDARSANA NATCHIAPPAN): Mr. Zhimomi, the time is over; try to conclude it.

SHRI KHEKIHO ZHIMOMI: Yes, Sir, I am not going to utter even a single word that my colleagues have uttered. As the new Prime Minister has absolute majority in Lok Sabha and since the problem is an initial problem, on the approach to the Naga political issue, I fully expect, and appeal to the hon. Members, that there may not be two opinions on the Naga political issue, as it is a national political issue. The Naga political issue is known as the father of all insurgency in the North-East and also some other parts of the country.

It is high time that the issue should be addressed. It is dragging for 18 years with more than eighty rounds of talks. I only remember in my childhood the story of Hundred Years War between the English and the French. Beyond that, I have not heard that a ceasefire continuing for 18 years. It is the eighth wonder in the political approach.

Now, Prime Minister Modiji has made a good beginning on the footprints of Atal Bihariji by giving recognition to the genuineness of Naga history.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (DR. E.M. SUDARSANA NATCHIAPPAN): Try to come straightway to the main issue.

SHRI KHEKIHO ZHIMOMI: I have congratulated the hon. Prime Minister on

[Shri Khekiho Zhimomi]

behalf of my State and my own behalf because he has exempted Dr. S.C. Jamir, the Governor of Odisha, who was a UPA appointee. But, based on the footprints given by Vajpayeeji, he was exempted from the general punishment, I would rather say the Spoil System. We appreciate it. We are seeing a good beginning.

(MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN *in the Chair.*)

Sir, the support of the hon. Members of this House and the love of the nation will help us to jointly work and the century old generation issue may be given the final touch.

Secondly, the most important issue is the border area people. Be it the Tamils in Sri Lanka, be it in the Western front, be it in the Northern front, (*Time-bell rings*) or be it in the Eastern front, the border area population should be treated equally, with the treatment given to the other population of the country.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI KHEKIHO ZHIMOMI: Because the border area people have been alienated. The Disturbed Area Act is not applied to the border area States. The Disturbed Area Act of 1985 has been enacted especially to be imposed in the Northern State and the State of Nagaland. We are born in that climate.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, please conclude. You have taken more than the allotted time.

SHRI KHEKIHO ZHIMOMI: The fear psychosis on the part of the border area people is certainly there. So, it should be compensated; be it Kashmir, be it North-East, be it anywhere. The alienated people should be compensated, brought to the mainstream and that will be the greatest army for the defence of the country. Thank you, Sir.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have to inform Members that the Business Advisory Committee in its meeting held on the 26th of February, 2015, has allotted time for Government Legislative and other Business as follows: