

to elect, in such manner as the Speaker may direct, four members from among themselves, to serve as members of the National Shipping Board, subject to other provisions of the said Act".

**MR. SPEAKER :** The question is :

"That in pursuance of sub-section (2) (a) of Section 4 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1958, the members of this House do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Speaker may direct, four members from among themselves, to serve as members of the National Shipping Board, subject to other provisions of the said Act".

*The motion was adopted.*

(viii) Central Silk board

[*Translation*]

**THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF TEXTILES (SHRI ASHOK GEHLOT) :** Sir, I beg to move :

"That in pursuance of sub-section 3(c) of Section 4 of the Central Silk Board Act, 1948, the members of this House do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Speaker may direct, four Members from among themselves to serve as members of the Central Silk Board, subject to other provisions of the said Act".

[*English*]

**MR. SPEAKER :** The question is :

"That in pursuance of sub-section 3(c) of Section 4 of the Central Silk Board Act, 1948, the members of this House do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Speaker may

direct, four Members from among themselves to serve as members of the Central Silk Board, subject to other provisions of the said Act"

*The motion was adopted.*

**12.51 hrs.**

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

[*English*]

**MR. SPEAKER :** We will take up matters under rule 377 after we finish the discussion and voting of the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address moved on 16th July, 1991.

Shri Jeevarathinam was on his legs he may speak for some more time

**SHRI YAIMA SINGH YUMNAM (Inner Manipur) :** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am on a point of order. Under the rules of business of this House, the mover of a motion is entitled to speak on the Motion. The Hon Member from Nagaland has moved an amendment to the Motion. It is also a Motion and so he is entitled to speak. Yesterday, it was agreed that the House would sit up to 8.00 p.m. and he was supposed to speak, but quorum was not there and so he could not speak yesterday.

**MR. SPEAKER :** I have understood your point of order. Your point of order is out of order. I will allow that Member to speak. Please take your seat now.

(*Interruptions*)

**SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT (Ponnani) :** Mr. Speaker, Sir, today is Friday and so we must have Lunch break. The Prime Minister should be requested to reply to the

Motion after the Lunch break, because we want to go to mosque for Friday prayers.

**MR. SPEAKER :** In fact the Prime Minister wanted to reply to the debate yesterday itself. It was postponed because some more Members wanted to speak.

[Translation]

**\*SHRI R. JEEVARATHINAM** (Arakkonam) : Hon. Speaker, Sir, let me resume my speech on the President's Address

I was referring to the drinking water problem. The Tribunal on Cauvery river water dispute has given its interim award. The award is yet to be published and I request the Hon'ble Prime Minister to immediately order the acceptance of the award.

The Palar river water dispute is also pending for a long time. Palar originates from the Nandi hills in Mysore. In violation of an agreement of 1802, the Karnataka Govt. has built a dam in Pethamangalam. This has resulted in low water supply in Palar river. During dry seasons, there is no water in the river. Water is not available in North Arcot and Chinglepat districts even at 400 or 500 feet below the ground level. Even the agricultural wells and drinking water reservoirs dry up. I, therefore, request the Hon. Minister to persuade the Karnataka Govt. to release adequate water in Palar river.

Sir, I must also draw your attention to coal shortage in Tamil Nadu. The coal shortage has seriously affected

power production and thereby has also hampered industrial production. I, therefore, suggest to the Govt. that they should resort to importing coal from other countries. We had a very bad experience with coalition Governments. They did not function at all. Only the Congress can provide a Government which works on the basis of socialism and secularism. The verdict in the last general elections was for the Congress. All parties should respect that verdict. The opposition parties must, therefore, give up their ideas of having a coalition Government and work in cooperation with the Congress Govt.

Yesterday, the Hon. Finance Minister spoke to the House detailing the economic crisis that the country is faced with. With a view to saving the country from the debt trap, I appeal to all parties to come together and work unitedly towards the economic progress of the country. All devotees of Ram must for the time being give up the demand for Ram Mandir in larger national interest.

The Hon. former Prime Minister, who spoke yesterday, gave a warning that an agitation would soon be started for implementing the Mandal Commission Report. I appeal to him not to go ahead with the agitation and save this country from caste and communal disaster. United we stand, divided we fall. With these words, I conclude.

[English]

**SHRI IMCHALEMBA** (Nagaland) : I thank you Mr. Speaker for

\*Translation of the Speech originally delivered in Tamil.

giving me time to speak on the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address

I would like to point out some aspects which were ignored in the President's Address particularly with reference to the Northeastern region. Many senior and esteemed Members of the House have expressed their concern about the growing lawlessness and militancy in the country. I for one share with them the concern in no lesser degree. I would like to point out that all these activities are carried out by the organised groups in different parts of the country. But all these groups may not have the same background and the same history. That is why, it would be wrong if we try to club them together to find out a common solution.

About the Northeastern region, all these subversive movements in the Northeast initially started as a peaceful and popular movement. I want to stress that today this peaceful and democratic movement has turned to violence because of our mistake. I think, we have to keep that thing in our mind. Even today, in the northeastern region, the situation has been going from bad to worse. It is because we are trying to find a military solution to the problem by ignoring the popular sentiments involved behind this movement. I think, if we are honest, let us agree on the thing that the situation in the Northeast has become serious after the ban on ULFA and the National Socialist Council of Nagaland (NSCN). If we are honest, let us admit that. Even today we are seeking a military solution to the problem by ignoring the political aspects

of the problem. Let us accept this particular fact.

It is for this reason that as soon as the ban was imposed on NSCN, the Nagaland Government voiced its objection and passed a Resolution about which I would like to state briefly here. It was on 29-11-1990.

"That Council of Ministers in an emergency meeting today discussed the recent announcement of the Government of India banning the NSCN under the Unlawful Activities Prevention Act, 1967. The Council of Ministers noted that the policy of the present Government in the State has been one of reconciliation with all factions of the underground with a view to bringing them to the negotiating table for a dialogue with the Government of India."

13. 00 hrs.

These things show that the Council of Ministers feel that the recent action of the Government of India cannot be conducive to the process of reconciliation and that the State Government should find a lasting political solution. The Council of Ministers expressed their regret over the fact that the State Government was not consulted by the Government of India before the declaration was made. It, therefore, requested the Government of India to review its stand.

My point is the ban was imposed without consulting the State Government and by imposing this ban, lot of problems have been created. Today Nagaland appears to be peaceful. But I would like to say that this peace is

deceptive. What is inside is quite different. Unless a situation is created whereby negotiations and discussions can take place with the underground, imposing ban is going to do more harm than good.

If military opposition of the kind that has taken place in Assam, had it taken place in Nagaland, I would like to say that the situation would have been worse than what it is today

The Nagaland Assembly has passed a unanimous resolution in the month of March this year. I want to go on record.

**SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT (Ponnani)** : Please adjourn the House.

**MR SPEAKER** : I will adjourn the House after the Member completes his speech. Prime Minister may speak at 2.15 PM after lunch hour.

**SHRI IMCHALEMBA** : Nagaland Assembly has passed a resolution stating that the cardinal principle for durable solution to Naga political problem is through love and understanding and discussion across the table.

The people and the Government have been trying their best through all sections of people to come to an understanding for solving their vexed problem through peaceful means. Both the public and the undergrounds have agreed in principle to solve the problem with love and understanding but not with arms confrontation. It has found its results and widely experienced in the past and even now peace-

ful means is the only solution to Naga problem.

It is, therefore, that this House expresses its deep concern by declaring NSCN unhelpful organisation and further urges to start negotiations with all sections of Naga underground with the spirit of love and understanding for permanent solution to Naga political problem.

These are some of the fact. If the State Government passes such Ordinances declaring them when discussions are going on, you create a problem. It should not be done without going into the detail and without taking the House into confidence.

ULFA was banned and when situation became serious, only then the offer of talks with ULFA have started. They have not to do anything before it was banned. That is my point.

These are some of the anomalies and I think revocation of the ban imposed on ULFA and National Socialist Council of Nagaland is very important. This is directly connected with the present situation emerging in the North-East India.

There are two other points. I would like to say about a very dangerous situation I would like to say that a very dangerous situation is gradually emerging in the North-East. That is, the Autonomous States Demand Committee. The people of Karbi Anglong and the people of North Cachar District have been demanding for an Autonomous State within the State of Assam. Further, I would like to say that so far their demand has

been peaceful and democratic. I know the people of this country and particular the people of Karbi Anglong and North Cachar District. A feeling is gradually creeping into their minds that unless you resort to some undemocratic means to put forward your demand or grievance, the democratically elected leaders in Delhi do not pay any heed these days and whether one likes it or not one has to do something about it. That is the feeling existing there today. It is a very dangerous thing. People are beginning to lose faith in the very system under which they are made to live.

Sir, to resolve this problem, a provision has already been incorporated into the Constitution. Article 244A of the Constitution has clearly laid down the basis under which this problem can be solved. It gives a very clear provision for these two States; Karbi Anglong and the North Cachar District, for an Autonomous State within the State of Assam. As I said earlier, that provision has already been laid down under the Constitution through the 22nd Constitution Amendment which has passed in 1971. That Amendment gives special provision for the creation of an Autonomous State within the State of Assam. That was passed in 1971. For the last 20 years, this provision has been kept unimplemented. Even a small child becomes an adult in 20 years. This is a very important matter.

**MR SPEAKER :** I know it is very important.

**SHRI IMCHALEMBA :** A militant situation is existing there. After this Amendment which was incorpo-

rated into the Constitution in 1971, the people of Karbi Anglong and the people of North Cachar District are not saying that they want to go away from Assam. Of course, the provision is already there. What they are demanding is greater autonomy under the nomenclature of Autonomous State within the State of Assam. Even this Parliament in its Amendment has given that nomenclature. What difficulty is there to resolve this problem? I am not saying that the Assam Government should take note of this. They can be taken into confidence. I don't see any reason why the people of Assam will not agree to resolve this particular issue. This is one of the important forums through which I want to make this point. I hope the Government will take this matter very seriously.

The last point which I want to make is about the withdrawal of the Armed Forces Special Powers Act, 1972. Of all the Acts that have been passed by the Indian Parliament, perhaps this is the most repressive Act that we have ever passed. In areas where this Act, the Armed Forces Special Powers Act, has been applied, I want to tell very frankly that it has left behind an indelible mark of suffering and torture on the face of the people. People who do not have the practical experience of this Act may not take it seriously. But people who have some practical experience of this Act, have experienced the cruelty of this Act. There cannot be any more cruel Act than this in the whole of this country. Under this Act, the State and its Armed Forces are given extraordinary powers. They are armed with extraordinary

powers, beyond the limits set by the Constitution. Army personnel up to the rank of Junior Commissioned Officers have authority and the power to shoot and kill people, to enter and search and arrest anybody, without warrant, on mere suspicion. When this law is applied, there is no civil administration, and the army takes over. What is most is that this law has been applied indiscriminately among the peaceful citizens. That is why, I want to request the Prime Minister and the Home Minister that these have to be reduced. It cannot be applied like that. Appliance of this law will gradually turn the people against the nation. This Act is particularly meant for the people of North-East India. Therefore, it is my request that this Act has to be withdrawn from those States where today it is applied, like, Assam, Nagaland and Manipur.

With these words, I thank you  
(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Chaudhury to speak. You have to finish your speech within two minutes

SHRI SATYENDRA NATH BROHMO CHAUDHURY (Kokrajhar) : In two minutes ? Then I will not speak. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI K.P. REDDAIAH (Machhli-patnam) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose the Motion moved by Sardar Buta Singh. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : Please bear in mind that you have to be very brief. You just make the point.

SHRI K.P. REDDAIAH : I am just making the points.

In para 11 of the Presidential Address, it has been mentioned that the Government recognises that the country is in the midst of an economic crisis of unprecedented magnitude. There is no mention in the Address why has this unprecedented situation cropped up—whether it has cropped up all of a sudden or is it due to the continuous default, malpractices and corrupt practices adopted by this Government for the last forty years ?

I want to bring it to the notice of the August House that after obtaining the votes from the 100 per cent people of this nation or whatever it might be, this House is serving the purpose of only five per cent of the population of this country. That is the basic reason why, including me, after having seen the administration for the last 42 years, one should not become a naxalite or why one should not become a terrorist. I shall narrate one point for the kind consideration of the Government I am not going to deal with as to how the corruption is taking place and how the IDBI and IFCI banks are being looted by the vested interests who account for the two per cent of the population of this country. I am not going into details about it. Everybody knows that how this one lakh crores of rupees of foreign debt has been siphoned off by a vicious circle and vested interests and how they are bringing it back by giving as a loan to Government by NRI's etc.

In such circumstances, why one should not become a naxalite. Even after 43 years of Independence, the position of a Harijan, the position of

an Adivasi and the position of a farmer in a village is the same as it prevailed in the year 1947 except the persons like me or the persons like others who had left the village and reached the town. This Congress Government made available ample opportunities for 2% of population to loot the country to the extent possible that one can loot.

That is the situation prevailing in this country. And the condition of 80 per cent of the population of this country remains the same. Now, I will try to give one or two instances.

Soon after the taking over of the Chief Ministership of Tamilnadu, Ms. Jayalalitha, has announced prohibition in her State. You can understand Sir, that prohibited drink is a poor man's drink. The cost of one litre of arrack in the country is fifty paise per litre or one rupee per litre. There are many intellectuals; many opposition parties; and towering personalities in this country. They know that a litre of arrack worth Re. 1 is being sold for Rs. 60 to the poor men—that is—Adivasis, Harijans and other backward classes of this country. Who are minting this money? Every State is getting 500 to 600 crores of rupees from the blood of the poor men. Nobody is going to stop this atrocity; nobody is going to question? Then why one should not become terrorist.

Regarding the fishermen. I would like to pose a question. The fishermen in the coastal areas face a lot of difficulties during cyclone times and without food, shelter and clothing and they somehow survive. Now the Government of India had sanctioned some

trolleys and some other fishing equipments and boats. To whom have these been given, Sir? They have given them to multi-crorepatis; but on what terms and conditions? They have given to multi-crorepatis with 95 per cent of the Government loan towards purchase of trolleys ignoring the fishermen who are there for ages together. The crorepatis have to put only 5% of their money.

In the country now a new phenomenon is taking place. In Andhra Pradesh, there is a seven star culture—this pertains to Hospitals. The Government on the one side says that we are in economic crisis but they are sanctioning seven star hospitals to people who want to put in their black money earned illegally into this operation. Our Government hospitals are not only having any medicines and even phenyle to clean the bathrooms and latrines of the Hospitals is not supplied to them. This is the situation. In this operation they siphoned off 25% of foreign exchange by importing equipment.

No doubt, the Government under the rule of the Congress had developed the country tremendously. But in whose hands is the wealth? That is the question. Everybody says including the opposition that there is no dearth of wealth in this country. But in whose hands is it? It is in the hands of the vested interests; in the hands of the politicians and is in the hands of the bureaucracy. The whole 80 per cent of the population including the farming community was ignored for the last 44 years. I want to bring to the notice of this House the situation prevailing in this country. The Finance

Minister has said the country's economy was seriously damaged because of waiver of farmers' loans. I want to bring to the notice of this House, Sir, that the maximum amount due to waiver of farmers' loans might have gone upto Rs. 600 crores or below Rs. 1,000 crores. For the last 42 years, there has been Rs. 64,000 crores of loans to the industrialists and waiver of interest on this loan has taken place. Is it not the unjustified statement of the Finance Minister? When a farmer is producing several million tonnes of foodgrains, you must be proud of the Indian farmer. Earlier we were importing foodgrains and what ever we had been paying towards the transport charges of the foodgrains from America have not been paid to them by this waived. By way of arrack selling you are getting Rs. 20,000 crores from the molasses for which the input is the sugarcane. I think the people of this entire country has got confidence in the Hon. Finance Minister and therefore he should not be cowed down by the Congressmen who are riding over him.

We have to forget partylines. About Mandal Commission my parents have taught me—otherwise this trouble could not have come in this country—  
[Translation]  
that we must wish a true brahmin if  
[English]

we happen to met him on the way. I am a Yadav, Kurmi. 52% backwardness is here in this country. They are serving the country honestly, they have not tasted corruption—either political corruption or economic corruption. They have not entered into this field; they are honest persons. I

am a hundred percent Hindu. When a Hindu is getting a small benefit from the Government of India by way of  
[Translation]

reservation they have inflamed passions in the entire country these BJP and the  
[English]

Congress vested interests. I am a hundred percent Hindu; how can you protect Hindutva when I am getting a small benefit from the Government and you don't tolerate it? The whole country is sought to be kept under the custodianship of these Sharmas. You have brought this country to this state

When Shri N.T. Rama Rao took charge, 50% of the country's corruption has been stopped. You made NTR as a scapegoat. I will tell you how NTR has stopped corruption He has taken up a scheme.

MR. SPEAKER : Now you have to conclude please. Now you must conclude.

SHRI K.P. REDDAIAH : I will bow down to the Chair's orders. Sir, only one point When Shri N.T. Rama Rao took charge he honestly tried to eradicate corruption. He took the list of IAS and IPS people. He asked them as to what was their asset as on date and whether it was not disproportionate to their known earnings.

MR. SPEAKER : Now you will please conclude. This is the limit now.

SHRI K.P. REDDAIAH : Sir, the country is facing a critical situation wherein we want to support the Government to solve the problems to



the extent possible .. (Interruptions)

**MR. SPEAKER :** We have at 3.30 p.m. Private Members Business. We have to complete the President's Address before that. Now conclude.

**SHRI K.P. REDDAIAH :** I thank you for your kindness.

**MR. SPEAKER :** The House stands adjourned to meet again at 1.25 p.m.

*The Lok Sabha than adjourned for Lunch till Twentyfive minutes past Fourteen of the clock.*

*The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at twenty-six minutes past Fourteen of the Clock.*

[English]

[**MR. SPEAKER** in the Chair]

**MR. SPEAKER :** Hon. Prime Minister.

**THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO) :** Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very grateful to the Hon. Members who have participated in this debate. I feel that the debate has been maintained at a high level, as it fits this August House.

Sir, it would not be possible for me to mention Hon. Members by name and deal with what they had to say. Therefore, I would like to take a few important topics which were dwelt upon by most of the Members, perhaps all of the Members and try to intervene on those topics separately, giving the opinion of the Government.

Sir, one observation, which was made by some Members was about the style of the Address—some called it dull, some called it colourless, etc. I have no comment on that except to say that the President perhaps wanted to explain things in plain language for the benefit of Members. I do not think we should fault him on that. This is the newly elected House and we would like—I would like—the President to explain things at length, instead of making it short. I would be happy and I am sure many of the Members would be happy to find that most points have been elaborated at length. So, the style, as far as it goes, is very appropriate to the occasion and I would not agree with those Members who might have found it too long or not very interesting and so on. In any case, in the Address of the President of India to Parliament, we do not look for what may be called, 'interesting things'. It is not so much 'the interesting things', as useful things, as things which the Members should in all responsibility take up for consideration and decision. These are the things which are normally and should be contained in the President's Address and that is what the Address contained.

Sir, I would also not like to dwell too long on some of the comments made by some Members, repeating what has been said many times before, namely that this is a minority Government. Now there is no need to repeat that. We have agreed that this is a minority Government. And even being a minority Government, it has to take decisions which other minority Governments formerly could not take

or did not take. This is a speciality with this minority Government. Members have called the Congress Party the largest single party in the House. That is true as far as it goes. But it is a little more than that. If my strength had been 119 or 120, I would still be the largest single party in the House. My number does not stop at 120. So, it is not only the largest single party but also a party which has got almost a near majority. Therefore, the difference between 120 and 240 is so obvious that we do not have to peg my number at 120. It is 240 or 241 which means that I only require 10, 12 or 13 to make the grade. But I have already said that I do not really attach any great importance to this number or whatever I am short of. I have said already that my approach to problems of the country is going to be different. I would like to go by consensus. I would like to make conscious efforts to create that consensus. While the decision is going to be the Congress Government's decision, while the responsibility for the decision, the responsibility of facing the consequences of the decision is going to be mine, I would at least like to satisfy myself that in every important case, I have done everything in my power to see that a consensus is created. So, that has been my approach and that is going to be my approach. So, the number I am short of or the number I am at, these numbers are really not very material. I would again appeal to the Members of the House not go on harping on this—being short by 15 or 14. This point we can forget and perhaps divert our attention and concentrate our attention on the real problems which face the whole

country, the whole House all of us together.

There is a vision which the Congress Party has always had before it. Without that vision, the Congress Party would not have been able to survive and function effectively for more than 106 years. It is not for nothing, it is not an accident of history, that this party has lived so long and promises to live longer. The point is that we have a vision. And this vision takes a holistic view of the whole of India. It takes every individual, it takes every section of society, it takes every area of the country, every region of the country into consideration and takes that holistic view. We do not go by bits and pieces. We do attempt problems by bits and pieces individually. But we always try to juxtapose that problem in the totality of the country and that is the vision which has never been dimmed. We have not allowed that vision to be dimmed.

We wanted this vision to be translated into action, into reality by what has come to be called continuity with change. Now we have continued to be what we are. And at the same time, we have changed enormously from what we have been at a given point of time. Take any Indian village for instance. Most of us come from villages. Can I say that my village today is the same as it was 50 years ago or 40 years ago or 60 years ago? No, I cannot say that. I cannot even say that my village is what it was five years ago or ten years ago. But still my village is called by the same name. It has the same appearance—more or less. It has the same basic features as it had, say,

100 years ago. Therefore, there is a continuity and there is a change. These two things go hand in hand and our culture is really at the root of all this. We have not believed in sudden changes. We have not believed in the clash of the opposites. We have not believed in that kind of thesis and antithesis which perhaps has animated some other systems. Therefore, I would like to say that when we ask for a change, we have to keep up the continuity and bring the change into it. For instance, take our laws, the ancient laws of India. They have changed enormously. But they have not really changed so that one law has been repealed and the other law has been written afresh. It is not like that. We have changed by interpretation, we have changed by certain new features being harmoniously blended into the old laws. That is how even our ancient legal system of India has survived for thousands of years. So, we believe change by usage. The law may say anything. But in a particular locality, if the usage has come to stay, it has acquired the force of law. That is what we believe in. We change by usage; we change by interpretation, we change by the whole approach to a particular subject. While the law might remain or the letter of the law may remain, the way we interpret it, the way we apply it to real life situations changes and that is how we bring change. So, it is continuity with change plus whatever modern ideas have been brought into this change.

Change has been brought by modernisation. Modernisation is not just what we have been talking about for the last four or five years. When we

changed from the old *takli* to *charka*, that was modernisation. And when we changed from *charka* to *textool charka*, which Gandhiji started to *amber charka*, that was further modernisation. And when that changed to *textool charka*, that was further modernisation. So modernisation process has been going on without our knowing because it has not been sudden. The change has not been abrupt. The change has not been such as it does away with the past and starts to bring the future afresh. That has not been the approach and therefore, it is change with continuity that has come. And the society has never been static. Let us understand this. It has never been static. It has always been dynamic. It has been going on. So, this has been a feature of Indian history. Sometimes, the country might have suffered as a result of all these changes but mostly the country has gone ahead. Panditji has said many times and perhaps it has been said by many other writers also that whenever this change stopped, whenever there was a stagnation in any department of life in India, the country has suffered and the society has suffered. Therefore, these are only some episodes which could be considered exceptional rather than a rule in Indian life. Life has been changing and all change has been generally in the positive direction. There has been no change in the negative direction as far as one can see. This brings us to the question of science and technology. Sir, always the advent of science and technology, advent of any innovation has been to solve problems. It is not science for the sake of science itself without any utility. It has always been utilitarian. We have always found

that when we change for a better method, whether it is from one *charka* to another, whether it is from one system to another, in the weavers' or dyeing process and in so many processes which we have in the villages. I am not talking of the big industries. I am talking of economic life as it is conducted in the villages of India. There has always been innovation and every innovation has been for the better, for greater benefit to the people concerned.

Now, technology has always had this objective in India. Technology is not just what we consider technology today. Any application of a scientific principle to real life situation is technology and that technology has always been for the betterment of the people and particularly, modern technology in the last five to ten years. We have tried to apply that to solve the problems of the country.

Now Sir, I would give a very small and a very commonplace example. We have been talking about drinking water to villages. Yes, lakhs and lakhs of villages have got drinking water during the last 40 years. But there are, at least, many thousands of villages which still have to get it. When Rajivji was here, he started the Special Technology Mission for drinking water. That mission got off to a very good start and within two or three years, they found a solution to some of the most intractable problems with regard to giving drinking water to villages. What is the experience of each one of us? We go to the village, give money to the B.D.O. or anyone

who is in charge of development there and the people sink a well and they find sheet-rock. People sink a well and they find brackish water. People sink a well and they get water which is full of flouride. What is the remedy? You go next year, give more money and find more flouride, more sheet-rock, more of the same! The problem is never solved. So, it is not a question of money. It is no longer a question of money. We have seen villages, I know villages where three or four times in three or four parts of village, we dug wells, we bored wells, but nothing happened. The same sheet-rock came. Is it a question of money? Is it a question of attention? Is it a question of someone not being able to do anything? I submit in this drinking water well, which is a very very common experience, the question is one of technology and not so much of money or attention. These are the problems which we have come across.

Take immunisation for instance. We send the vaccine to a village. In the vicinity of the town the vaccine is very effective. Go hundred miles and the vaccine becomes water. You think that the child is going to be saved. The child is not saved because the vaccine has lost its efficacy. There is what is called a cold chain for this vaccine. If that cold chain is broken anywhere, the vaccine becomes useless. On our books, it is written that it has been issued. We make statements in the Legislative Assembly or in Parliament that such and such a village has been sent vaccine. But that vaccine does not work. What is the thing that is missing? I would say that in a country like India, we have not

undertaken the necessary research to find vaccines which do not get deteriorated by heat or high temperature. These vaccines have come to us from other countries. If you take Ayurveda, a medicine which is 200 years old, which is 100 years old is still used. People are proud of these medicines. They do not get deteriorated by the lapse of time. This is the kind of medicine that we want in this country. The medicines that we are using or the vaccines that we are using should be neutral to changes in temperature. Have we taken real determined efforts to find such a thing? We have not done it because we have been just going by certain easy methods. Now is the time when we have to go into tougher methods of research and development so that all these things which do not suit our conditions here are changed into those which do suit our conditions here. These are the challenges of science and technology. These are the challenges which all sections of the House, all people of this country, every Government, State, district administration and Central Government have to attend to. There is no use of making these matters a party matter. Anybody might say that there is a death of a child because of bad vaccine. Yes, there will be. It may be in U.P., it may be in Andhra, it may be in a State ruled by one party or a State ruled by another party. The vaccine does not make any distinction between one party or another. Nor does the disease. Therefore, we have to attend to problems which are politics-neutral or party-neutral. And most of our problems are party-neutral. When we politicise them and when we make

them into party issues, the trouble comes and then action and reaction start operating. Therefore, Sir, this is the kind of future that we have to forge for this country and this is what I would appeal to all the Members to appreciate. The approach of this Government has to be problem oriented, solution oriented and the problem so long as it is above party line, it cuts across parties, will have to be attended to from that point of view and in that spirit.

Now, the President said something about drinking water. We have to attend to this drinking water problem on a continuing basis. It is not as if you give a well to a village and the problem is solved. It is not solved. The Water table is going down every year. The Water Table goes down because we use more and more water for irrigation. More and more water is pumped out and more and more wells are sunk for irrigation. This is the reason why even drinking water wells go dry when the season is not good or there is no rain fall. We have to think of doing this on a continuing basis. If it has to be on a continuing basis, there has to be an agency to look into it and that is the kind of agency we would like to set up in the name of Shri Rajiv Gandhi because he actually found a logical answer to this problem. He was looking to the answer, for the solution, based on technology and that is why we have decided to name this after him so that this programme continues and gives satisfaction to the people because without water there cannot be life. So, this life sustaining thing called water needs to be given to all people

in this country. It is not enough to say that there are so many villages still not getting water after 40 years. That is a slogan. Anyone can repeat that. But repeating that is not going to solve that because there are very tough areas where you just cannot get water. Particularly, in Rajasthan, Jakhar ji was telling to me that in his area people have to go I don't know how far, 8, 10, 12 or 15 miles—to fetch water. If that is the only work women folk are supposed to do then it is a very sorry state of affair. But then this again is not because there was any lack of attention. It is because of the terrain; because of the condition there. It is because of the fact that we have not really thought in terms of meeting those challenges on the basis of modern knowledge and technology. So, this has to be our approach to this problem.

Indira Mahila Yojna has been mentioned in the President's Address. This is something which has not been thought of so far. It is by the women, for the women and of the women. The idea is that the entire initiative of this Yojna has to come into the hands of the women and it does not have to be administered by men who by definition may not understand the problems of women as well as women do. So, this idea that the whole programme has to be administered, has to be implemented by women themselves empowers women. What we mean by empowerment of women will happen only when we squarely place responsibility and power on their shoulders and give a programme like this.

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE (Panskura) : Sir, I would like

to seek a clarification. You have said that you want above party oriented programme. National Commission on Indian Women was such an above party oriented programme. I seek clarification as to why have not you as yet declared that you are going to set up a National Commission. Please clarify that. . . (Interruptions)

When I talk of women I do not mean women of the Congress Party alone. I can assure that. That assurance is there. All of them are included. (Interruptions)

SHRIMATI MALINI BHATTACHARYA (Jadavpur) : All those women are silent, Sir. . . (Interruptions)

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT (DEPARTMENT OF YOUTH AFFAIRS AND SPORTS AND THE DEPARTMENT OF WOMEN AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT) (KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE) : You are not committed to women. Our Government is committed to women. . . (Interruptions)

SHRI AMAL DATTA (Diamond Harbour) : Do not shout all the time.

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE (Panskura) : You please ask your Prime Minister to agree to your demands. Let him declare that on the floor of the House.

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE: Our Prime Minister will do something for the women. . . (Interruptions)

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO : I did not bargain for these exchanges. In any case, my task would be to

make all of them sit together in a room while we watch from outside and I am sure, they will come out with a real good solution. . . (*Interruptions*)

This is a conceptual matter which I would like the Hon. Members to appreciate. I find, everyday, women coming up to me saying that her husband has left her. She comes with two children, she does not know where to go and she does not know what to do. These are examples which abound everywhere in this country. It is not as if only it happens in one area and it does not happen in another area. It only means that the position which this society has given to women has been perpetually of a subsidiary nature, of a dependent nature.

The idea in the Indira Mahila Yojana is to break these shackles, if possible. We would like to do that. That is why, when it comes to the rights of women, Rajivji wanted a Commissioner for the rights of women rather than generally for women. He made that distinction because the problems of women, if you really analyse them, they can be traced to one point that their rights seem to be inferior to the rights of men. So, it is a question of right which everything boils down to and that is why he conceived to the idea of a Commissioner for women's rights. We would go ahead with that. . . (*Interruptions*)

**SHRIMATI MALINI BHATTACHARYA** : That has been rejected by all the women's organisations. . . (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO** : We would like to start on that again.

**SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE** : All the Parties were committed to that. . . (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO** : I have no problem. I have no doubt that every Party will be committed equally strongly to the idea of women knowing about their rights and also getting their rights by any legal method that is available. This society must be able to give that right to women and if it does not, then to that extent the society itself will remain backward. I have no doubt about that. That is why, this Indira Mahila Yojana and the Commission for women's rights and may be so many other innovations which we may stumble into as we go along, all these things are package that is being considered for women. I am sure that everyone agrees. But, it so happens that it has been initiated by this Party and this Party's Government. So, one does not have to find fault with that. Only thing is, let us all come together and do it. If there is any flaw in it, please point out. There is no question of standing on prestige, we would certainly change whatever there is to change. We will certainly correct whatever there is to correct.

Sir, about economic recovery, the programme which has been brought out in the last few days, has been very widely commented upon.

**SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE** : Shrimati Geeta Mukherjee is walking out. . . (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO** : She has as much right to walk out as she wants. But I am sure, she is not walking out. She just went out.

The package of industrial policy reforms, we hope to bring about in the next few days and we will come before the House and the House will be able to comment on that. The only thing is the whole package on the fiscal side, on the economic side, on the side of trade and on the side of industry, this is the whole package and this package again. I would like to stress that brings about change with continuity. Nothing is abruptly changing. Nothing is being taken out. Nothing is being removed and something else is put in its place.

And this is a great advantage of what we call the mixed economy propounded by Panditji. I shudder to imagine what would have happened in this country, if the mixed economy concept has not been there, has not been ingrained in our economy and in our thought right from the beginning for the last 40 years. What has been happening in some other countries where rigidity has been the rule? How much more difficult would it have been to change to the new system or whatever orientation of the old system? We would have had much greater difficulty to face if we had to bring about changes that we are bringing about more or less smoothly with a little criticism here and there but quite successfully today.

After all, the largest single economic activity in this country is in private hand, has always been in private hand and will ever remain in private hand as far as I could see; and that is agriculture. We passed resolutions about cooperative farming; we passed resolutions about collectivisation here and there, but, ultimately, it is the

farmer of India who has risen to great heights; he has shown that he can handle the food problem of this country, whereas in any other kind of organisation, we have seen possibilities: we have seen distinct instances of total failure. So, I would not like to compare one with another. But the point is that we have this very big overarching idea of mixed economy in which we can bring about all these changes.

Some Hon. Member was asking me whether there has been a decision to de-nationalise banks. I would say there is no decision to de-nationalise any bank. But whatever changes I would like to bring in the working of the banking system today, no one can deny that a host of changes are needed; a large number of changes are needed in the working of the banks. You go to any bank in a village. The Clerk or the Manager in that village is the richest man in the village; he is a lord of the village; he is the lord of ten villages all round. Is this fair? Should we inflict this kind of system on a society which is completely rural, predominantly rural, consisting of poor people? Is it fair to do that?

**SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA** (Bankura) : What changes do you want to bring in?

**SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO** : We will tell you what they are. I am the pro-changer; you are the non-changer here. Don't worry. I am not going to change without asking you, without consulting you. I will certainly hold you as one of the persons responsible for change. There is no doubt about it. I am amenable to reasons. If you convince me that the



changes I am contemplating are not good, I am prepared to take them back. I am prepared to modify them. So, I have an open mind. I only want you also to open your mind a little. We should not start with the assumption that what we already know is the last thing. From that point of view, we will approach every problem in this country.

Now about the Eighth Plan, we have had two yearly plans already. I think we should not go on with annual plans, that is going to be suicidal for our economy and for our development. I propose to take up this matter immediately and the Eighth Plan will begin sharp on the First of April, 1992. This is the time we take to prepare the plan. It is nowhere complete; it is in a state where it needs some time to be completed, to be prepared, and that is why, I declare here on the Floor of this House that the Eighth Plan will start on the First of April, 1992.

**15.00 hrs.**

That much time will be taken. For preparing the Plan that much time will necessarily be taken. In fact, we have taken much longer time in the past and whatever has to be done, it will have to be completed in these few months and it will come on 1st April 1992.

**SHRI BHOGEN德拉 JHA (Madhubani)** : Or you choose some other date instead of 1st April.

**SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO**  
That does not matter.

I now come to some of the most difficult problems which have been

exercising the minds of Parliament as well as the people of India like Punjab and Kashmir.

Now I come to Punjab first. We have had a long experience, some times good but mostly very bitter, on Punjab where all our efforts to bring about the situation where the problem is solved amicably have been thwarted by elements whose description is known to all of us.

So we had the Rajiv-Loneowal Accord. Everyone stood by the Accord. But for various reasons, the Accord could not be completely implemented and before it was implemented we ran into other problems. This year there was an idea that we should hold elections. Now I would like to say that holding of elections is nothing new. When Chohan Sahib was Home Minister about three-four years ago we had several meetings to consult the people of Punjab, political parties and others whether elections to Panchayats or elections to the Assembly would be possible, whether they think that they are desirable. So it is not for the first time that we have thought of elections or anyone has thought of elections. Elections have been there in the mind of the Government right from the beginning. We were told time and again that the time was not ripe for elections. In fact, at one of our meetings, very interestingly, the members said, "Why do you hold elections for Panchayats first? Why do you not hold elections for the Assemblies? If it is a question of candidates being killed, why do you not start with the Assembly candidates? Why do you go to the Panchayats, door Panchayats, villages?" This is the kind of

sarcastic remarks that some of the representatives coming from the villages in Punjab made at that time. I think Shankar Raoji would remember that. I was there and some others were also there

So, it is a question of finding the right moved for elections and right atmosphere for elections, not finding our own intentions. Our intentions have been there for elections all the time.

Sir, when elections were announced this year, we clearly got the signals that the situation in Punjab, whatever we might think of the virtue of elections, was not congenial to holding a free and fair election. I remember that there was a meeting of all the party representatives at the State level. Rajivji said, "You please go and attend that meeting." When the Punjab Congressmen came, he said, "You go, attend that meeting and whatever you come up with, we will consider that." As far as I can recollect, Buta Singhji and others will bear me out, there was a unanimous decision, a unanimous assessment, of all the parties that the elections should not be held because the conditions there are not ripe for elections, are not congenial for elections. Between Chandigarh and Delhi, however, when they came here and reported to their party leaders, I do not know what happened, within a day or two some parties seem to have changed their minds. Fair enough. But the point is that when we know that objective conditions there are not congenial for elections, then the reasons for changing one's mind do not lie in Punjab. They could lie only in our own minds. So, they are subjective and not objective in one word. This is

what I could conclude because what happened there is also known, it is admitted what happened here is also admitted. Meanwhile, Sir, there is another complication that faced us. This is what I would like the Hon. Members, the leaders of parties to consider because, I think, it is very important for the unity of India. One or two members came out with a statement that his party would contest the elections in Punjab only on the issue of seeking self-determination for his brethren leading to formation of a sovereign Sikh State Khalistan. Now this is not an excuse. Let me tell you. We have to hold elections in every State every five years if not earlier of course. But if at any election, an issue comes, which goes against the Constitution of India, which raises an issue of separation, of secession, am I to participate in that election? And if I do, what is the implication? That is what we have to consider. What is the remedy, we will come to that later. But is this a real problem or not? I would respectfully submit that if ten parties are participating in the elections, the Congress would be willing to lose, to win, to draw or whatever so long as the election is within the four corners of the Indian Constitution. After all we have been out of power in the State of Tamil Nadu for 23 years and heavens have not fallen. We have not come to power in West Bengal for a long number of years and heavens have not fallen. This is democracy. Any party which is voted to power by the people comes to power. But when there is an election, the implication of which clearly, not necessarily by the winning party, but while any party partici-

ing in that election, if it is interpreted as a referendum for a separate country, I would like to stop there and say, stop in my tracks and say, "There is something wrong here I will have to set this right before I go for elections" This is what the Congress Party decided. I attach great importance to this. We will go for elections in Punjab I would say that even if there is no law and order situation—suppose it is absolutely peaceful, Punjab is absolutely peaceful, any other State where you have elections is absolutely peaceful—and still if one of the parties says, "I demand a separate country I would fight this election on the basis of secession". I do not think you can go on with that election Whether he loses or you lose or I lose, that is not the question The question is one of participation and not one of victory or defeat So, this is a question which impinges very profoundly on the unity of India and I would not like to go ahead with the election unless I have exhausted all avenues of plugging this In 1965 or 1967 we plugged one part of this electoral process by saying that any one who becomes a candidate would have to subscribe to an oath If he does not, then he does not become a candidate But if he does become a candidate and later on reneges on the oath which he has taken—particularly in a situation where passions are running high, the temptation of a separate country, the temptation of a separate State within the country, how strong it is we have seen in some of the areas, if that operates—that also has to be plugged. Once in this there was a report They passed a resolution for Khalistan Nothing happens in point of fact I do not think that they are going to get

Khalistan or I do not think that we are going to allow Khalistan (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA** (South Delhi) One member of your party spoke of Khalistan yesterday

**SHRI P V NARASIMHA RAO** : I request you to listen to me I shall ask the Hon Member regarding what he has said Please listen to me and if whatever I am going to say, is proper it would be better if you accept it

[*English*]

If this is so, what happens internationally? What is being said in other countries about what is happening in Punjab? Is it only treated as a law and order situation as is in any other State or any other country in the world? Which other country does not have a law and order situation such as in Punjab if it comes to only judging it as a law and order situation? I would submit that it is not so There are forces at work which are not to see if this country could be dismembered By sitting there—they just sit and do not have to do anything—they create conditions here whereby the people of this country, some people who are misled, can themselves create conditions for dismemberment Now this is a danger which all of us know of Whatever happens in a particular election, how many candidates win or lose, what has been happening in Punjab is that candidates have not lost their deposits but most of them have lost their lives So this is the kind of election where the stake is loss of life, not loss of security deposit So this is the problem which we have to face. I am trying to explore some answer.

to this problem. I have had already discussions with leaders of some parties. I am calling the leaders of the others in the next one or two days

I would like to say that the basic problem, according to me, is secession and the threat of secession becoming an election issue and the consequences thereafter I would like to prevent it at all costs. Whether we can prevent it or not we have to see and we have to put our heads together. I feel, there is a way out. To the extent I have held consultations I have been told that there is a way out. I will come up with a note or some such suggestion to all leaders of the parties. If all of us agree, then we will have to do that first. After that I would not stand on any formality or any prestige, any gain or loss of my party when choosing the date of election. I can give you this guarantee. I am not really on that at all

[Translation]

**SHRI KALKA DAS (Karoibagh):** Hon. Prime Minister should say as to why the elections are not being held in Delhi. Under what circumstances the elections are not being held for the last 8 years. Even though the law and order is not bad in Delhi elections to Metropolitan Council and Corporation are not being held.

[English]

**SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:** There is such a thing as relevance. I have to stick to it; I would like to. When the question of Delhi comes, I will not bring Punjab in. I can assure you on that.

[Translation]

**SHRI KALKA DAS:** Why are the elections not being held in Delhi? We met the Prime Minister also in this connection. (Interruptions)

**SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:** When the question of Delhi is raised, I assure you, I will not raise the case of Punjab and Harvna while replying to that. (Interruptions)

**SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA:** Please announce the Delhi elections today. Delhiites will appreciate it.

**SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:** I sincerely want to oblige you but there is a procedure for it.

**SHRI KALKA DAS:** Please make the announcement today itself. (Interruptions)

[English]

**SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:** Coming to Kashmir again, I am holding consultations. What has happened in Kashmir, again I would not go into details. But we know what happened. In effect there is a big chasm between the people of Kashmir on the one hand and the Central Government or the administration on the other. There is no one who can distinguish a terrorist from a non-terrorist there. And unless you have the local people with the administration and we give them the guarantee that they will not be killed by tomorrow morning, no one is going to volunteer information. The people of Kashmir are patriotic. There is no question of their having anything with terrorists or anti-national elements. These activities are being fuelled from the other side. We have

been pleading with Pakistan, we have been telling Pakistan not to allow this to happen. All the governments have done that. Vishwanathji has done that Chandra Shekharji has done that, I have done that earlier and I am doing now. But the determination on the other side has not come down too much from time to time. So, I would see that we have to live with that problem and there is no use of asking the same questions and giving the same answers. The question is the same, the answer is the same. I have been seeing this for ten years. Again, it is a question of coming together and finding a solution. What do we do to bridge this, to bridge this big chasm? The President has said about peoples' Committees that could one method of supplying this missing link. But that is only the first step. We will have to think of many more steps and I would like to say that no one has a ready made solution. Even before we could think of anything else on positive lines, this hijacking, this kidnapping has come. Now, you can imagine how the people are exercised over it, how the Parliament is exercised over it. We know it. Even information is so fluctuating—what we get by way of information now is not the same as we get one hour back. We get something in the morning, something at 10 O'Clock. And in this changing information, changing situation, I am sorry it is not even possible, it has not been possible even to take the House into confidence. Chavanji has been struggling to do this. Both of us have been trying to find at least one stage where we could come and tell Parliament this has happened so far and this is going to happen or what we are

trying. Even that specific information we are not able to give you. Not that we do not want to, I would very much like to. In similar situations, I have come every three hours, four hours when the Operation Black Thunder was going on. The House may recall that in this House and the other House I came every three to four hours to announce something because something definite was happening there. So, I would like to submit that if we have not been able to give you anything, any specific hard information, it is because of this conflicting situation there and not because of the intention on the part of the Government not to reveal anything. We would not like to be secretive. There is nothing that we get out of being secretive. In fact, we get every support by sharing information with Hon Members.

Sir, we come to the other commitment about places of religious worship about which we have given a clear undertaking that barring the Ram Janambhoomi issue, in regard to the other we will bring a law. We do not want this religious bickering, this pollution of a harmonious atmosphere between communities in this country which on the whole has been there with exceptions now and then, to become the rule. The Congress Party does not want this. I am glad to say that no one wants this. The other parties also, as far as I know, have said that this should be put an end to. We are going to do that. This is something absolutely basic not only to law and order. I am not talking of law and order. When you talk of social justice, I attach equal importance to

social harmony. If we do not have social harmony, all the programmes of social justice will remain where they are, not one step can be taken further. Social harmony is absolutely important in this country. We know that when there has been disharmony all programmes have come to a grinding halt. Therefore, we must aim at social harmony and we cannot allow religious bickering, religious bitterness to foul the atmosphere to such an extent that nothing else is possible. So, that legislation we are determined to bring and I hope that I will get the enthusiastic support of all sections of the House because it is not just the Congress Party's manifesto or our own approach. It is I think the common approach.

About the protection to minorities, the Congress manifesto as well as other manifestoes more or less are on the same wavelength. We want protection to be given. We are only groping how it is to be given. I mean this to put it in a nutshell, for years and years we wanted to give protection; but we just did not know how it would work. We tried something, it worked and to some extent it did not work. Then we thought of something else; we thought of special courts, we thought of a rapid action force. All these things we have enumerated in the manifesto. We have done it by way of making some kind of foolproof package which will work, which we intend should work and that is the idea, that is the spirit. It is not that there is any great innovation unthought of by others. It is not so. We thought hard about it. For days and days we sat in the Committee of Manifesto and

we thought what else could we do, what else, what more, what further; this is the spirit. We came across so many ideas like giving suitable employment to the next of kin of those who have lost their lives, statutory provision for speedy, adequate compensation to riot victims, special courts, administrative innovations like holding the Collector and the SP responsible etc. etc. These are all piecemeals; small things. Each one of them does not amount to much may not; but all of them together is a package which does amount to something and does create the conditions of safety and security in the minds of the minorities. Because creating it in the minds is much more important first and then you can create it on the ground because once the morale of the minorities is where it should be, then the stage is set for the real harmony to ensue. Then the Minority Commission being given statutory status; all these things we have said and we are going to do each one of these and that is what I would like to say.

Before I come to the Mandal Commission, I would like to say something about foreign policy. Some speeches have been made. One thing I would like to make clear; clarify here is that on foreign policy—Advaniji will forgive me when I say—there does not appear to be any meeting ground between us and the Bharatiya Janata Party. Why should it be so? Atalji has adorned this seat of the Foreign Minister for as long as his party would allow him to—not his fault that he did not remain longer. Did he follow a separate policy? I don't think so.

We were in the opposition in 1977—79. He wanted something like genuine nonalignment—he just wanted to label it genuine. It is more or less the same. I don't think he made it more genuine by his presence. He was genuine perhaps; but nothing beyond that.

Today when I compare the manifestoes of the Bharatiya Janata Party and the Congress I am a little frightened. When the Bharatiya Janata Party says that nonalignment has become irrelevant I feel frightened because that was the common plank.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Lucknow) : We have not said that.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO : I remember to have read it

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : What we have said is that the situation has changed.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO : Yes, it has.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : And the foreign policy should take note of the changing international situation—nothing wrong about it.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO : Atalji, shall I read it? I seem to have read it. I remember you have said it. Your party has said that nonalignment has become irrelevant, that is the word you have used.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Nonalignment has become irrelevant to the extent that there is no cold war, that the world is no longer divided between two sides

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO : This is what I am saying. If we understand nonalignment properly, nonalignment is not a negative concept at all. It is not a negative concept, it is a positive concept. If there are two sides of the same coin, one side is nonalignment and the other side is independence.

It is synonymous with independence. So long as you want an independent country, it will have to be non-aligned.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : We want you to stick to the other side that our policy be independent. . . .

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO : Absolutely

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : and every issue should be tackled on that basis

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO : That is what is non-alignment. That is the essence of non-alignment. If what has been written in their manifesto is based on an erroneous appreciation of the essence of non-alignment, I have no problem at all, let them correct it, and non-alignment as our policy will come back as a unanimous policy, as a consensus because what you have written there is breaking the consensus. That is why I am frightened. I do not want that the consensus that has come down to us for 40 years or 45 years, may be thousands of years—the *Madhva Marg* which we have been talking about in our scriptures—should be broken. That is the precursor of non-alignment. Therefore, let there be no break. I would beg of you, Atalji

please have a look at it. That is what I have read in your manifesto which was given to me as a copy of your manifesto unless it is wrong or unless you have got two copies, like the two *khatas*.

We will have to sit and sort this out. It is possible that we may have to spell this out. You say India is going to be a separate centre of power. We are thinking of dismantling all centres of power and you are talking of India becoming a separate centre of power. This is really not in keeping with the present world and present-day thinking about the world. You have a second look at it, I am not finding fault, I am only pointing out that your manifesto has come to a stage where you admitted the inherent consensus on foreign policy is being fractured. We should not allow that please.

Sir, I would like to say something about a World Bank Report that was received here and was not shown to my predecessor Prime Minister. It is something which needs some clarification. Some time back, some days back, Chandra Shekharji wrote to me saying that there was a Report of the World Bank and it was not shown to the Prime Minister, that is, himself, nor was it shown to the Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission, Mr. Dharia, if I remember right. I immediately wrote back to him to say that 'I am collecting the information and will come back to you.' I have to say that when I made enquiries, I was told that such reports come daily, lots of reports come, and they are not necessarily shown to the Prime Minister. This is the kind of feed back I got. I would like to tell

him very respectfully, and tell the House that, I do not subscribe to this view. If there is a Report from the World Bank or any such prestigious body, it should come to the Prime Minister of the country. If it has not come in this case or in any other such cases in the past, whoever are the victim Prime Ministers, I would like to say that I don't want to be a continuation of those victims. I would like to see it. Certainly, I have given instructions that any report of this nature must be circulated to the Prime Minister not with the absolute certainty that he will read it, but as a matter of principle, a report which is available to any one in the Department of Finance should be available and they should find it important enough to circulate it to the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister also. In this case I don't know whether he saw it, according to Chandra Shekharji the answer was in the negative here also. So, this is serious and I would like to take corrective steps.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Ballia) : This is not the only serious matter. You have quoted one portion of my letter, not the other portion of the letter. Soon after I left the office, the Government that has come to office has acted on the basis of that report within seven days. That is more shocking and more surprising. It is not such an innocuous report. According to you, the report was not shown to the earlier Ministry due to custom. All I can say is, most of the decisions that have been taken by your Government as the corrective measures of the economy, are based on the suggestions made in that report. I wrote in the letter that this is a very serious



thing and that should be looked into. I am not bothered about the report. I am not such a knowledgeable person whether I will be able to read it or not. But I have read many reports. I know many things about it, but I am not free to say about it. I mentioned the other thing in the letter which you have not quoted in this House, namely that you are acting on the basis of that report.

**SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO :**  
I was coming to that point. It is good that Chandra shekharji raised it. Even if he had not raised it, I was coming to that point inevitably because I could not do it in piecemeal, I could not do it in a lopsided manner. I am convinced about what I am going to say just as I am convinced about what I have already said.

**MR. SPEAKER :** I hope that the House agrees to give more time to this Motion and take up the Private Members' Business after this Motion is disposed of.

**SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS :**  
Yes.

**SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO :**  
Sir, I will finish very quickly. I am very sorry to overstep on the rights of the Private Members. If I had known, I would have made it a little shorter.

Sir, about the second point which he has raised. I have no hesitation in saying that I have myself come across reports six months before this report came which contained more or less the same things. They were prepared by our Secretaries here. There is no

mystery about these things. Vishwanathji knows about it, Sinhaaji knows about it, Manmohanji knows about it and everybody who is anybody in economics knows what in effect are to be the measures which are brought into force in a situation such as we are in today. So, there has been a report, a voluminous report which has been presented to me by the Finance Minister which contains exactly or more or less exactly what the World Bank report is supposed to contain. So, all over the world, people are thinking on the same lines. Therefore, I do not attach any alarming feeling to the World Bank report. (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA :**  
Let the report prepared by the Finance Ministry and also the World Bank report be placed on the Table of the House.

**SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE :** It is an accident of history that your view agreed with that of the World Bank.

**SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO :**  
It is not an accident of history, what is not accidental is that the same ideas have been propounded here in the Ministry and everywhere, economists of a particular line of thinking have propounded the same ideas.

**SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA :**  
This is your line of thinking.

**SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR :**  
Sir, let the Prime Minister produce one report from the Finance Ministry which coincides with the opinion given by the World Bank. Let me know what it is.

**SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO :** I have seen it myself and I am satisfied about it. (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE :** Then, why did you not dare to put it in your Election Manifesto ? (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur) :** Sir, if it has gone to everybody in the world, then why did not the Prime Minister announce it ?

**SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO :** What is there to announce ? We have been announcing it. (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR :** Why cannot the Prime Minister lay the report of the World Bank and also of the Ministry which was produced to him six months before on the Table of the House ? (*Interruptions*)

**SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO :** When I say I am satisfied I am talking with a certain amount of responsibility. (*Interruptions*)

Sir, I would now come to the most important aspect of the Mandal report.

Sir, the Mandal Commission report has come in for mention and I would like to say briefly that the Congress manifesto is very clear, very comprehensive on what the Congress Government is going to do for the backward classes.

“Undertaking special measures in favour of the socially and educationally backward classes including reservation in jobs was first made over 40 years ago and it has been successfully implemented by Cong-

ress Governments in several States. This commitment will be a basic plank of the Party policy at this juncture. In implementing these special measures, preference will be given to poorer sections among the backward classes. While ensuring that if candidates are not available from the poorer sections, the benefits will go to other members within the backward classes.

The Congress will come forward with necessary legislation to establish a Backward Class Development Corporation.

Committed to ensure benefits of reservation are provided to other economically backward sections of our people who are not covered by the existing scheme.”

Now, this is the scheme which the Congress in its manifesto has placed before the people. When I compare it with the manifestoes of other Parties, I find that the CPI(M) manifesto wants the benefits of reservations to reach really deserving sections amongst backward classes. This is their wording I do not find any material difference between what I said and what the CPI(M) said. This means that the CPI(M) wants the benefits to go to the poorer amongst the backward classes. That is what they mean by “more deserving” and so on. It also speaks about Karpoori Thakur formula. It also fully recognises that the poorer sections amongst the upper castes also require relief. I do not see any material difference between that part of the Congress manifesto which deals with this subject and the manifesto of the CPI(M).

**SHRI SOBHANA DRESWARA RAO VADDE** (Vijayawada) : In several Congress-rule States, reservation for backward classes was on the basis of caste, not on economic criterion.

**SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO** : I will come to what the Hon. Member's Party has said later on. But I am on the CPI(M) at the moment.

We have gone one step beyond. We have not spoken about the Karpoori Thakur formula because it has run into some legal difficulty. The Supreme Court or some authoritative judgement says that this kind of "more backward" "most backward" etc., is not constitutional. However, we leave that aside because we have not put it in our manifesto, thinking that it may run into difficulties. What we have said is, the economic factor in the same block of backward classes. The poorer takes it first. But if there is none among the poorer sections, it does not jump from the backward and go to the forward. It remains in the backward. And, in any case, it has to be within that block itself. That is what we have said.

We have also said on economic criteria also, some reservation needs to be given. The Janata Dal has also said this because first they announced the decision. Within a few days, if I remember right—Vishwanathji will correct me if I am wrong—they also came up with five to ten percent reservation to the economically weaker sections. Although the Chandrasekhar Government did not take any different stand in the Supreme Court where the case is being heard, he has said it in

so many words. This is what he has said.

"Drafting of the Party's manifesto is a joint exercise. Government are not opposed to the Mandal Commission report. However, for implementing the recommendations of the Mandal Commission, considerable ground work needs to be done."

—Implying that it has not been done when he wrote it.

"While we should recognise that caste considerations cannot be ignored in determining backwardness, economic backwardness should also be kept in view. Any policy in a matter like this, should aim at a synthesis of these two factors."

This is the position, BJP wants it only on economic considerations

**SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA**.  
No.

**SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO** : You are also wanting the same as we want.

**SHRI LAL K. ADVANI** (Gandhi Nagar) : I may mention at this particular time that even in the 1989 manifesto, the BJP had very clearly enunciated that while broadly we do not go against the Mandal Commission, we would like the economic factor to be introduced in it. In 1989, as far as I recall, neither your manifesto nor the CPI(M) manifesto said anything of the kind that you have incorporated in 1991.

**SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO** : It is very heartening to know that BJP is the pioneer. You are the pioneer in this respect.

**SHRI CHANDRA JEET YADAV** (Azamgarh) : This seems to be the first case of consensus.

**SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO** : That is what I am coming to ultimately. That is what I am really coming to. Even after some lives have been lost, even after elections have been fought, lost and won, partially on the basis of this, can we not make it again at least now a matter for consensus? Much has happened which ought not to have happened, should not have happened and should not have been allowed to happen.

**SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT** (Ponnani) : What about reservation for minorities?

**SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO** : That also we have said. That also we have said in our manifesto. Those minority sections which are backward will get the same reservation as the backward classes themselves. That is what we have said. That anybody I think would say when it comes to talking across the table.

**SHRI VISHWANATH PRATAP SINGH** (Fatehpur) : Perhaps one thing has been lost sight of, that the Mandal Commission report has the economic criterion as a composite unit. There is weightage of economic criterion in it. It has a social criterion, educational criterion and economic criterion. In the economic criterion, it has been taken those sections of society whose income is and whose wealth assets are below 25 per cent State average, those sections of society who live in kutchia houses 25 per cent above the State average and those sections of society who mainly live on

manual labour. This is the economic criterion already incorporated in the Mandal Commission report and the weightage is there.

**SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO** : If that had been so, I would respectfully ask Vishwanathji, why he did not include it in the first order? Why he had to, after ten or 15 days say "We will give 5 to 10 per cent to the economically backward class people also"? Let us not go into that. I am not really asking you to go into that. Let us forget it. Let us start on a clean slate. Whatever has been written in it, if it is bad, let us leave it. If it is good, to the extent all of us agree, let us keep it and then go ahead. This is what I would like to say on the Mandal Commission. There are so many other recommendations. There are 21 to 22 recommendations in the Mandal Commission. It is unfortunate that we have zeroed in on the most controversial report and the non-controversial recommendations have been just left to the winds. Let us all agree on those non-controversial recommendations. You will find that the face of the backward classes will change in this country if we really implement it.

**SHRI CHANDRA JEET YADAV** : Reservation is the most important thing. You cannot do anything without reservation. Reservation is the most cardinal thing in life. This is the problem. For 40 years they did not do it, because they do not want to give reservation.

**SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO** : We have seen how reservations have worked. I am not mentioning all the

other recommendations as a substitute to reservation. Please do not think like that. We started with reservation. Everybody wants reservation. The patient wants milk, the doctor recommends milk. What else you want? *(Interruptions)*

**SHRI CHANDRA JEET YADAV.** Do you stick to your manifesto? Your lawyer, when sent to Supreme Court, said: "We stand by what we have said in the President's Address." You avoided reservation in your President's Address. *(Interruptions)*

**SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO :** No, I am not. I am not avoiding anything. I am reiterating my manifesto here. I want to talk to you on the basis of the manifesto. There is absolutely no going back on it. Let the whole world know about it. *(Interruptions)*

I am sorry to have taken 15 minutes more. It was not my intention.

*[Translation]*

**SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN :** Mr. Arjun Singh was present in the House during the last two days when the matter was being debated. Since the Government did not clarify its stand on the issue, that's why the Supreme Court extended the date. Yesterday it was mentioned that next day was the last date and this was why the date had been extended upto 8th August. I want to state that the Government has talked of only 5 to 10 per cent reservation. On 27th August last year, Shri V.P. Singh had stated quite clearly that out of 50 per cent reservation, 27 per cent is for backward classes as recommended by the Mandal Commission, and 22.5 per

cent is for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. So the total comes to 49.5 per cent .. *(Interruptions)*

*[English]*

I am not criticising. I am only making suggestions.

*[Translation]*

On 27th August it was made clear that first the Mandal Commission report should be implemented and thereafter 5 to 10 per cent reservation may also be made for the poor people of upper castes. The intention of the Government no doubt is clear, but as soon as the question of economic criterion is put before the court, it will run into difficulties because economic criterion does not fall in the jurisdiction of the court *(Interruptions)*

Is the Government interested in implementing Mandal Commission Report or not? If any amendment is taken to Supreme Court, it will run into rough weather on the plea of fresh examination and the implementation as a result might get delayed indefinitely. Even if the Government is sincere, the executive order may be issued later on by the Government in power. But in Andhra Pradesh this is not the case. I want an assurance from the Hon. Prime Minister that the Government will not do anything which might provide a plank to the Supreme Court to deliver a judgement against Mandal Commission.

**SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO :** When the reference of Andhra Pradesh has been made, I want to state that 30 years back when Telangana Regional Committee was functioning .. *(Interruptions)*

[English]

Just one minute, please.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY (Nominated Anglo-Indian) : Just I want to take two minutes. On the Mandal Commission, I have spoken in this House I have made my views clear when I spoke I got the support of Mrs Indira Gandhi when I refused to allow my community to be classified as a backward class. She congratulated me because she said that she wanted the word 'backward' to be taken out of our social vocabulary. The Mandal Commission Report was full of weaknesses. It was, first, intended to benefit only the Hindus and it made no room for people on economic criteria. According to the Mandal Commission, it was only the top rungs of the castes that got all the plums. The intermediate castes also got a fair amount of plums. But the real backward classes got absolutely nothing at all. The Supreme Court has ruled that the reservation should not be increased beyond 50 per cent. (Interruptions)

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : I am sorry, I have taken a very long time I do not want to over-stress (Interruptions) What? I will tell you outside. (Interruptions) There have been many instances where towering personalities of this country have refused to be treated as backward classes. Shri Kumaramangalam's Grand-father Dr. Subbarayan Said, "I am not allowing my community to be treated as a backward class." Of course, with the generation, the *neeyat* also changed. And now he is backward class. These are the instances. So, ultimately, a time

will come when what we really aim at is to end the backwardness where none is prepared to be called backward in relation to any other class. That is what we should aim at instead of really getting into the non-issues which are of no importance. That is the goal and we will have to find that goal in our life-time. I hope, it will be possible and with the cooperation of all of us, doing the same job, aiming at the same objective, it will be possible.

Thank you very much. Thank you, Members. (Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN : Mr. Speaker, Sir, my question has not been replied to by the Hon. Prime Minister. (Interruptions)

SHRI PIYUS TIRKEY (Alipurduar) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Hon. Prime Minister has not uttered a single word about the Scheduled Castes .. (Interruptions) ..

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : A number of amendments have been moved by Members to the Motion of Thanks. If the House agrees, I shall put all the amendments moved together to the vote of the House.

*The Amendments were put and negative*

MR. SPEAKER : I shall now put the main Motion to the vote of the House. The question is :

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

"That the Members of Lok Sabha assembled in this Session are

deeply grateful to the President for the Address which he has been pleased to deliver to both Houses of Parliament assembled together on the 11th July, 1991."

*The Motion was adopted*

MR. SPEAKER Now we shall take up Private Members Business

*(Interruptions)*

DR. LAXMI NARAYAN PANDEYA (Mandsaur). What about Matters under Rule 377? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI SRIBALLAV PANIGRAHI (Deogarh): Sir, I am on a point of order. The point is that before further discussion on Motion of Thanks on the President's Address was taken up, you were kind enough to observe that matters under Rule 377 would come after that business is over. Naturally this is pending now.

MR. SPEAKER That is not a point of order. I rule it out. I said that if there was time we would take it up. Now, it will be taken up tomorrow. The Private Members' Bills are to be introduced.

15.57 hrs.

**Constitution (Amendment) Bill\***

*(Amendment of Articles 74 and 163)*

*[English]*

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES (Muzaffarpur): I beg to move for

leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India

MR. SPEAKER The question is "That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India"

*The motion was adopted*

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES I introduce the Bill

15.57½ hrs.

**Constitution (Amendment) Bill**

*(Amendment of Article 26)*

*[English]*

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES (Muzaffarpur) I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India

MR. SPEAKER The question is "That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India"

*The motion was adopted*

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES I introduce the Bill

15.58 hrs.

**Special Protection Group (Amendment) Bill\***

*(Amendment of Long Title etc.)*

*[English]*

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAI (Chandernagore) I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to amend the Special Protection Group Act 1988

\*Published in Gazette of India, Extra-ordinary Part II, Section 3 dated 19.7.1991