

duty as a Government, then you are failing in your primary duty and responsibility.

My next point is that corruption and nepotism have not been properly attacked. In the two years of the Janata Government, I cannot see any significant change in the quality of political and public life with regard to elimination of corruption and nepotism. I do not say that these things have increased. But these things have not gone down. It was expected of the Government and my friends sitting there, led by Lok Nayak Jaya Prakash Narayan, Acharya Kripalani and others, that corruption and nepotism will be uprooted. I am afraid, that has not been done.

The firm and purposeful leadership is also lacking. The Government requires leadership which must be determined, dedicated, effective and purposeful.

Having said that, all that remains for me to say is that some important legislations are missing in the President's Address and those legislations are the Anti-Defections Bill and the Lokpal Bill. They are not found any mention in the President's Address. I hope that will be done now.

One last word and I have done, and that is about electoral reforms.

I shall not speak about foreign affairs now, not only because there is no time now but, perhaps, I could take the opportunity of speaking on them when the Demands for Grants in respect of the Ministry of External Affairs come up before Parliament.

About electoral reforms. I do not like the President saying:

"The detailed proposals evolved will be discussed with the political parties."

Why only 'political parties'? Apart from political parties, the independents, the academicians, the citizens

and the general public should be consulted because electoral reforms are important. I want the Janata Government to go ahead with electoral reforms in the coming year, in the third year, to formulate them and have them adopted by Parliament, so that the new elections fought will be on the basis of the reforms in electoral laws, so that clean public life is maintained and allowed to grow and all dirt and other evils of public life and political life are done away with.

With these words, I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and the hon. House for having been charitable to me and for pardoning me for my lapse for which I, once again, tender my apologies.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 2.05 p.m. when the Prime Minister will reply to the debate.

The Lok Sabha, adjourned for Lunch till five minutes past Fourteen of the Clock.

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

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

MOTION OF THANKS ON THE PRESIDENTS' ADDRESS—Contd.

MR. SPEAKER: The Prime Minister.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI MORARJI DESAI): Mr. Speaker, Sir, though I had not the opportunity to hear every speech of my hon. friends who spoke on the President's Address, I have been careful enough to be acquainted with the criticisms that have been made and I must express my thanks to all the hon. Members for taking a keen interest in the Address even though it was described as something which was complacent, which is without any meaning, which is full of half truths, which concealed facts and all that. All kinds of things were said and yet that it has generated that

[Shri Morarji Desai]

much interest amongst all of them is a very significant factor. But that is usual.

I must also thank them for pointing out many things, right or wrong, because it was from these things one always benefits and that is how I take all the criticism. But, when criticism is over-done, it becomes difficult to benefit by it. That also ought to be recognised and realised. Where criticism is justified, it can be very severe also and I have no quarrel with that, but, where criticism is not justified but serious criticism is made, then one becomes a bit sceptic in looking at the criticism. There is a danger involved in taking up that line which I would venture to bring to the notice of my hon. friends.

One hon. Member went to the length of saying that it is a document *par excellence* which conceals government's dismal performance. I do not know what is the dismal performance? At any rate, he has called it performance, even if it is dismal. He was not heard to say that we did not do anything; and that there was no performance. But I do not see how that is justified.

If we look at the various points of criticism made, I think all reasonable persons will have to agree that the record as given in the President's Address of government's performance is neither dismal nor unsatisfactory under the circumstances in which we are working and considering also that after all we are human beings who deal with it and cannot claim perfection. There may be shortcomings no doubt, but they have to be viewed in a reasonable manner so that we can improve them. If we look at the whole criticism from this point of view, I am sure my hon. friends will see some relevance in what I am telling them.

In the first place, it was said that there is an atmosphere of violence prevailing in the country. Who is responsible for it? Is the government responsible for it? The Government is

trying to meet it as best as it can. But would not my hon. friends look within their own conscience and see if they have not been responsible for the violence? What happened after the privilege motion had been passed in this hon. House? I can understand people who disagree with it, but to go in the streets and organise demonstrations revel in them and then if you say that there is violence, who is responsible for it? If we are dealing with it in a civilised manner, it must not be understood that we will allow it to go on.

Yesterday, a judgment was given by Court against Shri Shukla and Shri Sanjay Gandhi. And see what scene was created in the court by some of these people? They belong to the Opposition camp; they cannot deny it. Otherwise, they would not be there. Outside also they were attacking buses; there were very few people and not many. But, this is how this thing goes on. I had drawn the attention of my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, after the Privilege Motion that things were taken to the streets by some of them and they revelled in them. So many people had taken part in the demonstrations. I asked: 'Is this right? And he agreed with me that there should be no violence?' But, did he condemn it publicly? He knows the answer himself. It is these matters which ought to be considered. Is violence the concern only of Government? Is it not also the concern of my hon. friends? Have they not the same interest of the country at heart? If that is so, we ought to find ways and means for which I am trying my level best. We have been consulting the Opposition Leaders in all these matters. We also consulted the Opposition Leaders in the matter of communal disturbances and reprisals against the Harijans. And Government have appointed now a Committee under my colleague, the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Defence representing all parties to go into this question and to see what can be done. And we shall certainly take action accordingly.

That is what we had said. Therefore, is it not necessary for my hon. friends to be more appreciative of this action and to cooperate in it rather than to encourage violence when it suits somebody? That is all I can plead with them in this matter. The charge is not relevant against the Government. Let those who make that charge examine their conscience and they will find where the fault lies. We are trying to do our level best. I hope they will help us. Even if they do not help us, we shall still try to do better and see that we contain it.

It was said money supply has rocketed. Yes, personally I am not very happy with any growth in money supply. I have often said that it has increased much less than what it was before. In 1976-77 it was 20 per cent and it is 14 per cent in 1977-78. That also is high in my view. But prices rocketed by 12 per cent in 1976-77. But they did not increase—we contained them—in 1977-78 because we took other measures to see that supplies of consumer goods and other essential commodities are freely available. And that is what is accepted today that consumer goods are available to all people without any let or hindrance and at prices which are much lower than what they were before. For 10 years the inflation went on merrily and that has not been contained. We are not happy yet. We have got to bring down all prices.

SHRI C. SUBRAMANIAM (Palani): May I point out that the consumer index has been continuously rising since you took office?

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: That also requires to be examined further. There is some irrelevancy in the statistics. I have been saying it for quite some time now. But that has not been attended to. I will try to see if we can find a better method of compilation of statistics.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Idukki): To say that the prices are steady for that the statistics are all right and when we

say that the prices are moving up the statistics are faulty!

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: Let my friend have the courtesy of hearing me. Let there be some sportsmanship on the part of the Leader of the Opposition. I do not want him to immitate me. Let him show some good sense.

Then it is said that industrial growth was high in 1976-77. Yes. It was about 9.5 per cent whereas it was only 3.9 per cent in 1977-78. That is true. But what was the actual state of affairs? Why was it so? The industrial growth related to production which was not in common demand and the inventories went up very high which we had to inherit, a bad inheritance and in spite of that if we made real growth of 3.9 per cent it is something for which they ought to give us some credit. How could they? Then they will be condemning themselves. But with all that growth what was the real growth of Gross National Product. In 1976-77 the Gross National Product increased by 1.7 per cent and the Net National Product Increased by 1.4 per cent. And with this industrial growth of 3.9 per cent the Gross National Product in 1977-78 increased by 7.4 per cent and the Net National Product by 7.2 per cent. So, there should be some sense of proportion. Let my friend opposite study mathematics and also Economics to be understood better than what he is doing.

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE): For mathematics he can come to me.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: And then it is said that multi-nationals are being encouraged in this country. I suppose they are dreaming of what they were doing before. We are checking them. But we have no prejudices against them. We are more careful about our national interest and against that interest we will not do anything. Therefore, you see what has happened. During the last year Coca Cola and IBM—which are multi-national—have left this country. (Interruptions) But

[Shri Morarji Desai]

that was also on principle. We have no prejudices. Because they would not fall in line with the national interest we could not go with them. That is why they left.

Then it is said that there is a mad import policy. I do not know whether they know what the world 'mad' means. If 'sane' is called 'mad' then I have no objection. Afterall what is the import policy? We have imported articles which were scarce here and their prices had gone up. Edible oils had become scarce and very costly. We had therefore to import it and the prices have been made steady. Now was that import sane or mad? If one goes to a lunatic asylum, the visitor is considered mad.

Then, Sir, Science and Technology also came in for criticism and it is said that Science and Technology is not making progress, that it has been relegated to the background. They don't want even to know the facts.

And then it is said, nuclear energy programme also is being reversed. On the contrary we are taking things out of the morass in which they had plunged them on account of some actions.

And then it is said, we are allowing even our nuclear installations to be inspected. Whoever told them that? In spite of my clear enunciation of the whole position in this House, this is what they say by way of criticism. What can I say? I only sympathise with their want of material to criticise us. That is all that I can say.

After all, we are not going to make any compromise in this matter and we have said that inspection of our installations can take place only if inspection of all installations in all the countries take place. Otherwise how are we going to allow it? We are prepared to undergo any difficulties in the matter but we are not prepared to surrender national self-respect.

And then it is said, we are going with the U.S. and then they will apply 'S' and 'R' to it and then say, U.S.S.R. We are friends with all of them. Therefore, we don't surrender ourselves to anybody. It is on equal terms that our relations are with everybody. And we are happy that that is acknowledged by all of them. But they are jealous that we have better relations today than they had even after surrendering. And that is how the foreign policy is judged. When the Foreign Minister goes to China at their invitation and on their suggestion that we should solve our problems by discussion, and then, agreeing to it, if the Foreign Minister goes, I don't think how they can say it is ill-timed. What is the time? I don't know whether they are astrologers to give us auspicious time. But they are political astrologers as it suits their convenience. (*An hon. Member Shri Madhu Limaye*). We don't do like that, whether it is Shri Madhu Limaye or whether it is my hon. friend; I make no difference in this matter. Facts are facts. One has got to look at facts as they are. What have we done? If the Foreign Minister went there, has he compromised in anything? The moment he found that they had attacked Vietnam he cut short his tour and came away. What greater protest than that could have been made there? I doubt if his predecessors had any courage to do that. It is they who set up the consular agencies there, it is they who sent ambassador there, not we. Therefore it was they who started it and if we now try to work it better, why are they feeling aggrieved about it? I cannot understand.

We have made it very clear that the problem of the land which they have taken from us,—has got to be solved to our satisfaction. We have said that. There can be no compromise on that issue at all. Not only that. When the Foreign Minister went there and talked with them, they also agreed that they would have no dealings with the rebels from Nagaland and elsewhere. On

the Kashmir issue also they have begun to realise their mistake. But it takes time. But to say that we are compromising our position is not correct; I only hope that they find something more tangible for criticism of us. And then to say that we are going with the U.S.A., we are going with this man, we are going with that man, that has no meaning. I have made it very clear to all these friends, and they have agreed, that our relations with any country will not be at the cost of any other country. That is what we have made clear and we want to see that all countries become friends so that war is abolished. That is how we want to help in the whole world situation. But we have got to be considering of ourselves in this country. If we are weakened by my hon. friends here, in this matter, I do not know whether they are serving the national interest. That is all that I have to request them to consider.

In the science and technology field there are some people, who are being put up, to say that we are going against those scientists, there is no greater lie than that uttered by anybody. We are trying to see that real scientists are encouraged. But everybody who gets a degree of B.Sc. or M.Sc. is not a Scientist. One who is wedded to Science is a scientist. That is how we are encouraging them. As regards nuclear energy for peaceful purposes it is being pursued and pursued far more vigorously now than before. Not only that. In the Space Science also, we are making further progress. We have allotted more money to Science and Technology and for its advancement than before. Does that mean that we are paying less attention to it? If the arrangement that is made is more effective in ensuring that the various laboratories function more effectively and more checks are applied to some of the defaulting people who make a grievance of it, should they support those defaulting people or should they support this Government? Is it in the national interest to support those who did not pull their weight but were burdensome? Is it in the

interest of science and technology? That is how it ought to have been considered.

Then, when one comes to foreign policy, they also find fault with me by saying that I have refused to interfere in the matter of the sentence against Mr. Bhutto. I do not understand how they find fault with me in this matter. If I say that I cannot interfere in the affairs of any country, how am I going to say anything else? But look at these very friends who are saying so much about Mr. Bhutto. Have they said anything about what happened in Nepal when two people were executed? Have they said anything about the Generals who were executed in Iran or somewhere else? I do not speak about any of these things because we must be consistent. We cannot interfere in other countries' affairs. It is their concern. Yes, if we discuss with them at any time, we can say whatever we have to say if they have asked for it. But that is a different matter. Otherwise, one cannot say it. How would we like if somebody interferes with our policy? Would we allow them to do so? Then how can we interfere with the affairs of other people? That is why we have to have more consideration in these matters. If all of us are wedded to non-aligned policy, I believe all of us are wedded to non-aligned policy, at least in this respect there is no difference of opinion, I hope. Though in detail sometimes they go away by their own alignments, we are not aligned to anybody. But I cannot say the same thing about all my opposition friends. They are certainly aligned to some or the other, some of them, not all. And then the criticism comes that according to their alignment, I must also show my alignment. How can I do that? We have to be correct in this matter and not merely correct, but truthful and that is what we are seeking to do. But the worst part was the criticism made by my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, when he said that the sense of oneness in the country is being lost fast. I do not know what dreams he is dreaming. But is

[Shri Morarji Desai]

not there a better sense now than before in all the State Governments? There are 7 State Governments which are not of the Janata Party. They are quite different. But our relations with them are the best, they are the same, uniform with all the Governments. Was that achieved in their time? But this has been achieved. I don't want to give my opinion about it. Ask them. They have publicly stated this. At the National Development Council also, with all kinds of different arguments, ultimately we all come to a conclusion where we don't quarrel. Is that losing oneness? I don't understand what be means by it.

And then the language problem is brought in. Where are we trying to push anybody against his own wish, desire or understanding? We are not trying to do that; but does that mean that we should lose sight of the fact that Hindi is the official language, according to our Constitution? Can I lose sight of that fact? But I am not pushing it. I have made it very clear. Then, who should be found fault with? Should the Government be found fault with, or those who are not going with the Constitution? But I don't ask them to do it, because this is not a matter where we should create a controversy or create unnecessary bad blood anywhere. It is to be done by agreement, by bringing people together and not by propaganda like this; but this is a wrong propaganda that is being made. That is where I would plead with my hon. friends that in the interests of the country itself, please don't try to increase the controversies or make them worse. We should try to narrow them down. And there, if I have lapsed in any way, I am prepared to be hauled over the coals and pay whatever price they want from me. I won't make such a mistake in spite of any provocations that may be given. And in that very matter, my friend opposite—he is very friendly when we talk, but—when he talks at me here, he says something else.

MR SPEAKER: It is the parliamentary way.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI : May be it is so usually in human societies. I don't know; but I am not like that. I am his friend. Whether he is, or not is his concern.

Then there we referred to Pondicherry. What did I say? I do believe that Pondicherry cannot remain always apart as a small island territory like that. It is not possible, but it has to be done in a proper manner. I have no doubt about it. Government has not taken any decision—that is what I have said.

An HON. MEMBER : What about Goa?

SHRI MORARJI DESAI : Goa is not the same as Pondicherry. Goa is four times Pondicherry. You seem to forget that.

SHRI C. SUBRAMANIAM : Why are you bringing it unnecessarily?

SHRI MORARJI DESAI : I am not. I am saying this because the criticism is made here, and it was also made there. I do not know why that kind of thing is said there. Instead of finding fault with them, they find fault with me. What did I say? If I am asked, should I tell a lie? I am not used to it; and I am not going to do it during my life, for anything. What I believe in, I will say. But that does not mean that I will push the Government into doing what I want. That is the line which is the line of Government also; but it is not to be done in a manner which creates difficulties. That we don't want to do.

About Goa, I have also said that Daman, Diu and Nagar Haveli have to merge in the neighbouring areas. They cannot continue like that. But

I cannot do that immediately. But it has to be done. Now people are telling me: Uttar Pradesh must be divided into several parts, Bihar must be divided into several parts. Otherwise they won't function. It may be. But how can I create these problems to-day, If these small things create problems, how can I talk about it? We have to wait for better times to consider this; that is all I can say... (*Interruptions*). My personal view is there; I do not cease to have personal views because I am Prime Minister.

SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR (Pondicherry) : That is what I wanted yesterday also; I never said anything beyond that.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI : I would not have written the letter if that was the use to be made of it.

I will be more careful in writing letters to you now.

SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR : I preserve it and I gave it in public.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI : The unkindest cut was; that we were vindictive against the ex-Prime Minister. By what stretch of imagination this is said, I do not know. How? In what manner have we been vindictive? Is she not completely free to go about and say whatever she likes to say against us, most of it lies?

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN : I want to seek a ruling from you. This is the second time the Prime Minister is using the word 'lies'. Earlier he said it with respect to somebody else. He is using it now. I want to get a ruling whether it is parliamentary? If that is so, it can be used by us also.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI : I do not say so about a Member but if I say that about one who is not a Member I do not think it is unparliamentary.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN : The question is whether the word 'lie' is parliamentary?

MR. SPEAKER : I will examine it. As regards Members it is unparliamentary. Whether it can be used against others, I shall examine.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI : If you think it is not parliamentary, I will say all right they are untruths. I withdraw that word 'lie', if that satisfies the hon. Member.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN : I have no objection; I want your ruling; my request for ruling is there.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI : I do not want to quarrel about words; I bother only about the substance and the substance stands. If we have a special court, that is also being done after reference to the Supreme Court, even there what is being done is that there is no special procedure in the special court, the procedure will be the ordinary procedure and we are not making anything special to take away any rights but it is only to expedite the disposal of the cases so that they do not drag on for a long time that we are doing this... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA (Tumkur) : What about special courts for smugglers and blackmarketeers?

MR. SPEAKER : Order please.

AN HON. MEMBER : They are the owners of the Janata Party.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI : If they can refrain from this kind of allegations and counter allegations I will be very happy.

Why give substance to it? Are not substances being given? One has to reply. If I do not reply to the point, it is said I have not replied and the President's Address does not

(Shri Morarji Desai)

mention everything. Of course criticism here may mention everything under the sun. But how can the President's Address say everything under the sun? Then it will be two or three volumes.

It has to be made only in substance and that is what is sought to be done.

Therefore, I should like my hon. friend to think about those matters and help us in those matters. We have been trying to have full rapport with the Opposition leaders in various matters and we discuss with them; they were also good enough to discuss with us because if they do not discuss, how could I function? I am thankful to them for that; we also discussed the communal matters, the Harijan problem and in a conference it was decided that I should appoint a committee to go into it. We have appointed a committee representing all Opposition Parties as far as possible under the chairmanship of Shri Jagjivan Ram Ji; It will go into this problem and give suggestions about ways and measures which we will certainly carry out. That is what we want to do.

In the matter of many evils that we have inherited we are trying to solve them. For backward classes also, we have appointed a backward classes Commission who will give us their views after considering everything as to what we should do in this matter and we will not take twenty years as was done before. That will not happen. We will take action on its report. We will take action on their report and see that the matter is satisfactorily solved. That is why we have appointed it. That is why we have appointed a Minority Commission. That is why we have also appointed a Commission for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. We are trying to see that they work without any let or hindrance, that they work properly and

have full scope to do so, so that we can have better understanding and better solution of all these problems. After all, the interest of all of us lies in seeing that this country is fully integrated, that all communities come together, that we work as one body look at the interests of the country and nobody oppresses another. That is what we want to do. But we have to go some way further in order to achieve the results because we are suffering from a very bad inheritance. It is nobody's fault but it is there. We have got to overcome it. We are trying our best to do it. In that, I will always seek the cooperation of my hon. friends because without that we cannot do much and I hope it will always be forthcoming. I am sure here also we will bring in that kind of atmosphere in course of time.

MR. SPEAKER: A number of amendments have been moved by the hon. Members to the Motion of Thanks. Shall I put all the amendments to the vote of the House together?

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR (Gandhinagar): I want my amendment No. 20 to be put separately, because I want to pinpoint the attention of the House. It is about wasteful expenditure in several Government departments and agencies.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other hon. Members wanting his amendment to be put separately?

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN (Coimbatore): I want Amendment No. 153 regarding the Industrial Relations Bill to be put separately.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: Amendment No. 383.

SHRI A. BALAJANOR: Amendment No. 322.

SHRI DHIRENDRANATH BASU (Katwa): Amendment Nos. 317 and 318.