

12.17 hrs.

**PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE
HUNDRED AND SEVENTH REPORT**

MR. SPEAKER: Item No. 9—Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao—he is not here.

Shri Asoke Krishna Dutt.

SHRI ASOKE KRISHNA DUTT (Dum Dum): I beg to present the Hundred and Seventh Report (Hindi and English versions) of the Public Accounts Committee on action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in their Eleventh Report on Railway Operations and Earnings relating to the Ministry of Railways.

COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE LEGISLATION

SIXTEENTH REPORT

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Jadavpur): I beg to present the Sixteenth Report of the Committee on Subordinate Legislation.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

TWENTY-EIGHTH REPORT

SHRI CHATURBHUIJ (Jhalawar): I beg to present the Twenty eighth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions.

12.19 hrs.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Now we take up further consideration of the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address.

Prof. Mavalankar was speaking—he is not here.

Shri Dhirendranath Basu.

SHRI DHIRENDRANATH BASU (Katwa): I am grateful to you for giving me an opportunity to speak on the Motion of Thanks to the President for his Address.

Sir, the President has mentioned in his speech:

"The Industrial Relations Bill now before Parliament constitutes a comprehensive approach to the establishment of sound labour-management relation. The Bill deserves earnest and early consideration by Hon'ble Members."

You remember, Sir, all sections of this House and many hon. Members spoke and requested the hon. Labour Minister to drop this Bill. There was no support for the Bill at all. This Bill does not improve the position of the labour at all. This is much against the interests of the labour relations.

Now, the trade union rights as envisaged in the Bill have been cut down. The trade union rights should have been there. It has been proposed that the union people be allowed representation. But in which regard? This has not been explained in the Bill.

It has been clearly stated in the Bill that in some of the industries, there would be no trade unions. The trade union's rights will be completely cut down thereby. So, we oppose the Industrial Relations Bill from this House. Already the Members from all sections of the House are opposing it.

With regard to economic situation in the country, well thought out job-oriented plans or joboriented programmes should have been reflected in his speech. Sir, Government's performance, its programmes—joboriented programmes—should have been reflected in the speech of the President. The speech lacks these things.

In our country, the population has increased considerably. In 1978, the

(Shri Dharendra Nath Basu)

unemployed from the Employment Exchange registers was 1.3 crores; in 1977 it was 1.5 crores but, in 1978, it was 1.75 crores. You can't find jobs for these unemployed people. Unemployment problem should be solved at any cost and this should have found a top-most priority in the speech of the President. If unemployment problem can not be solved in this country, then, there would be revolution in our country. At least in his Address, the President should have said that unemployment allowance should be given to the unemployed. Sir, I am glad to inform you that in West Bengal, the Government have announced to give the unemployment allowance, they have already started giving that to a about 50,000 people. We are told that they have given them the unemployment allowance. In the President's Address, there should have been a mention about giving of unemployment allowance to the unemployed people.

With regard to industrial development, I say there is no development at all. Many of the industries are now faced with closure. You would have seen from the various reports submitted by the different Committees, particularly, by the Committee on Public Undertakings that the Public Undertakings are all running at a loss. Last year, there has been a total loss of Rs. 873 crores. If the public undertakings go on in this way, I do not know, how the Government will manage their affairs.

Now, there has been a Chinese aggression on Vietnam. In the year 1962, there had been an Aggression by the Chinese and, as a result, they have occupied several thousands square miles of our territory and we have not yet recovered the same from them. I do not blame this Government for that. I would put the blame on the previous Government. We are going to make a friendship with them. The Chinese aggression on Vietnamese has been condemned by all nations of the world. I am glad that the President's Address has

mentioned about it. I hope the President will advise his Ministers to place this matter before the Security Council; the Chinese forces must be withdrawn from their territory. Their forces are already eighty kilometers inside Vietnam. Now, several thousand miles have been occupied by the Chinese forces. This is not a border dispute. Some disputes are also there in our country in Nagaland and in Assam. There are border disturbances. And these should be settled. The President should have mentioned that in his speech that the border disturbances should be settled and these should have been given the first priority. In the Muzaffarpur there was the harijan atrocity; there was a riot in Aligarh. In Muzaffarpur thousands had been killed. There had been atrocities on harijans. Raping took place. This is very very objectionable in a secular country like ours and government should not allow it. So, Sir, the Home Ministry has failed in that respect. The President should have condemned this in his speech.

Then, Sir, our Plan is a rolling Plan. Rolling plan cannot improve the economic situation. A well thought-out plan is needed. Our economic situation is in doldrum condition and it is deteriorating day by day. The Economic Survey for 1978-79 mentions that the rate of growth of exports fell sharply in 1977-78 and actually became negative in the first eight months of the current fiscal year due to various national and international factors. Gross national product in the current year is estimated on the basis of available indicators to increase by about 3.5 per cent as compared to 7.2 per cent in 1977-78. So, government should chalk out such well-thought out plans and job-oriented programmes that our economic situation may improve.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, you find at many places people are making noisy demonstrations. Why? What are the reasons? It is because they are unemployed. So, job-oriented programmes should be given top-most priority. The

hon'ble Industries Minister and the hon'ble Finance Minister have assured many a time that in the agricultural rural sector and rural areas the job oriented programme would be given top priority but that has not been done. The President should have touched this point in his speech.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to tell one thing: if the internal disturbance cannot be removed then we will come across the type of incidents which happened yesterday in Delhi. Such incidents are happening almost everywhere, namely, Aligarh, Muzaffarnagar, Bihar, etc. This shows that they cannot manage government properly. This is the problem in U.P. and same is the problem in Bihar. We are very sorry for this. We want the government should run properly and may continue for the next few years but if they are not able to run properly then people will lose confidence in them. With these few words I conclude.

श्री राम बिलास पासवान (हाजीपुर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपको धन्यवाद देता हूँ...

अध्यक्ष महोदय : राष्ट्रपति को धन्यवाद देना है।

श्री राम बिलास पासवान : मैं कि आपने बड़े समय दिया।

मैंने राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण को देखा है। मैं इस का आधिकारिक रूप से स्वागत भी करता हूँ। लेकिन जो सब से पहली बात है वह यह है कि हिन्दुस्तान की करोड़ों जनता, यही के करोड़ों गरीब हरिजन और पिछड़े समुदाय के जो लोग हैं जिन की इस सरकार के ऊपर एक प्राणा टिकी हुई है, उन के लिए उस दिशा में सरकार कदम बढ़ाने जा रही है या नहीं और गाँव गाँव कदम अपनी आवाज को ही नहीं बल्कि अपने कार्यक्रम को भी हम उन तक पहुँचा पा रहे हैं या नहीं, यह सब से विचारणीय प्रश्न है।

12.31 hrs.

[Shri Shirendra nath Basu in the Chair]

जो राष्ट्रपति जी का अभिभाषण है और उस में जो समस्याएँ विनाई गई हैं उन में मैं समझता हूँ कि जो हरिजनों की समस्याएँ हैं वेग में और जो पिछड़े लोगों की समस्याएँ हैं उन पर सरकार

को जितना अधिक बल देना चाहिये, जितना अधिक दबाव डाल कर कहना चाहिये चाहे उतना नहीं कहा गया है। कबनी में भी बोझों कटौती की गई है। हमारी सरकार, मैं इस बात को जानता हूँ कि जो भूतपूर्व सरकार भी उस सरकार से कहीं अधिक काम कर रही है और सब जगहों पर कर रही है। जहाँ से हम लोग आते हैं बिहार से, बिहार में जो हरिजनों की समस्याएँ हैं और जो पूरे देश में एक विकराल रूप में कायम है, सब जगह से हरिजनों के सम्बन्ध में प्रत्याचार के समाचार आते रहते हैं, लेकिन हम लोगों को खबरी है कि हिन्दुस्तान में पहली बके बिहारी में ऐसी सरकार कायम हुई है जिस के मुख्य मंत्री स्वयं अल्पसंख्यक हैं और जो स्वयं गरीब परिवार में प्राए हैं, उन्होंने स्पष्ट रूप से कहा है कि हरिजनों की समस्या का निदान सिर्फ कहने से नहीं होगा बल्कि हरिजनों की समस्याओं के निदान के लिए कुछ कारगर कदम उठाना पड़ेगा। हिन्दुस्तान के इतिहास में पहली दफा यह भीका प्राया है जब कि बिहार के मुख्य मंत्री ने कहा है कि हम सारी नियुक्तियों को खत्म कर के ऐट ए टाइम दस हजार हरिजनों को बहाल करेगे और उन को हम हथियार की ट्रेनिंग देंगे। यह बिहार की सरकार ने कहा है। जब बिहार का मामला आता है और जब बिहार में रिजर्वेशन की बात चलती है तो हमारे बहुत से साथी हैं जिन के दिमाग में एक कल्पमूर्जन रहता है, वह समझ में नहीं पाते हैं कि यह धारक्षण क्या है? जब उन को तोड़ने का मामला आता है तो मैं ने इसी सदन में कहा कि दो भागों में उस को बह बाँटते हैं। वह एक तरफ कहते हैं हरिजनों के सम्बन्ध में कि हरिजनों की रिजर्वेशन में या उन के रिजर्वेशन को और बढ़ा दें उस में उनको कोई प्राप्ति नहीं है लेकिन दूसरी तरफ जो आर्थिक और सामाजिक दृष्टिकोण से पिछड़े लोग हैं उनको यदि रिजर्वेशन देने की बात चलती है तो वह उन के गले के नीचे नहीं उतरती है।

मैं एक बात जानता हूँ कि जिन लोगों को रिजर्वेशन मन्त्र से पूजा है यदि उनका वज चलता तो हरिजनों को भी धारक्षण की बात जो चल रही है वह भी आज नहीं मिलता। जहाँ तक हरिजनों के धारक्षण को बढ़ाने की बात है प्राय भी जाहति है और सदन को भी मालूम है कि प्रथम श्रेणी में आज तक एक भी हरिजन या आदिवासी नहीं नियुक्त, किया गया है, द्वितीय श्रेणी में तीन प्रतिशत है, तृतीय श्रेणी में चार प्रतिशत है और चतुर्थ श्रेणी में जो शाहू देने का और चपरासगिरी का काम है उसमें पाँच प्रतिशत है। आज आज्ञादी के तीस बर्ष के बाद भी हरिजनों को कहने के लिए 14 प्रतिशत है और आदिवासियों को दस प्रतिशत है लेकिन जो सब से अन्तिम दर्जा है, सब से बटिया किस्म का काम है शाहू देने का और चपरासगिरी का उसमें भी आज तक पाँच प्रतिशत से अधिक हम को नहीं दिया गया। तो फिर यह कहना कि तुम तीस प्रतिशत, चालीस प्रतिशत ले लो कोई मानी नहीं रहता। मैं तो कहता हूँ कि यदि सदन को और सरकार को हमसे है तो सब से पहले पन्द्रह प्रतिशत स्थान हिम्नको दिया दें। यदि वह

[श्री राम बिलास पासवान]

स्थान हमें मिल जाय तो मैं कह सकता हूँ कि सम्मानजनक स्थिति में हम जा गए हैं। धारण क्या है? धारण से हमारी आर्थिक स्थिति नहीं सुधड़ती है। एक सरकारी पदाधिकारी यदि महीने में काम करे तो मरने के समय उस के पास एक पैसा भी नहीं रहता है। रिजर्वेशन से हम को हलना ही बल मिला है कि एक करोड़पति ब्राह्मण है, उस को भी यदि कोई हरिजन का लड़का बी.एस.पी., एस.पी., बी.बी.ओ. या क्लेक्टर बन जाता है तो उसे जा कर प्रणाम करना पड़ता है। लेकिन दूसरी तरफ वह करोड़पति हरिजन इस सामाजिक व्यवस्था के अन्तर्गत इतना दुर्बल है कि वह लक्षपति या करोड़पति है फिर भी उस को एक खारपति ब्राह्मण को प्रणाम करना पड़ता है। प्रति रत्ना मंत्री जैसे बलवान मंत्री भी मूर्ति को छूते हैं तो वह मूर्ति धोयी जाती है। इस तरह की सामाजिक व्यवस्था है। यह एक सामाजिक कुरीति है। इस सामाजिक कुरीति को खत्म करने के लिए धारण एक ऐसा हथियार है जो काम धरा सकता है क्योंकि एक धरती/सोडा है, पाँच हजार वर्ष से जिस के संस्कार बहुत भागे चले गए हैं और एक है जो हजारों साल से कुचला हुआ और दबा हुआ है। जब तक धाए/उनको समान स्तर पर नहीं लाते हैं और उस के बाव देस नहीं करते हैं तब तक तो पाँच हजार वर्ष वाला हमेशा भागे निकलता रहेगा और जो हजारों सभियों को कुचला और दबा है वह हमेशा दबा रहेगा। इसलिए जबरन इस बात की है कि न सिर्फ बिहार की सभिस में, न सिर्फ ५० पी० की सभिस में, न सिर्फ तामिलनाडु की सभिस में बल्कि केन्द्रीय सरकार की सभिस में भी काका कालेजकर रिपोर्ट को इम्प्लोयेड करना चाहिये। जनता पार्टी की सरकार को विलेरी के साथ भागे धा करे के कहना चाहिये कि हम धारण लागू करते हैं। डा० लोहिया की दुहाई धाए सभी देते हैं। उस समय हम स्टूडेंट्स के और संयुक्त सोसलिस्ट पार्टी की ओर से नारा लगाते थे—

संघर्ष ने बोधे गर्ठे

पिछड़े धाए को म साठ ।

बाहे धारते हों, मुसलमान हों, हरिजन हों, आदिवासी हों, गहसंख्यक हों—सभी पिछड़े लोगों के लिए २६ प्रतिशत स्थान सुरक्षित होने चाहिये। जनता पार्टी की हुकमत को भागे धा कर कहना चाहिये कि हम पिछड़े हुए लोगों के लिए केन्द्रीय सेवाओं में भी—बाहे वह धाई ए एस हों, धाई पी एस हों, धाई एफ एस हों, सभी प्रकार की सेवाओं में—धारण की व्यवस्था करते हैं।

दूसरी बात मुझे यह कहनी है कि सिर्फ सरकारी नौकरियों से काम नहीं चलता है। धाए सरकार की गैरकारी जेजल एक सम्मानजनक स्थान पर जाने का हथियार है। सबसे बड़ी बात यह है कि धाए जीवन के जो धान्य क्षेत्र हैं—राजनीतिक क्षेत्र, आर्थिक क्षेत्र, सामाजिक और आवासायिक क्षेत्र—वहाँ पर हमारी संख्या क्या है? वहाँ पर धाए देखेंगे कि हमारी संख्या बिल्कुल नगण्य है। सरकार को

चाहिये कि उन क्षेत्रों में भी हरिकर्मों तथा आदिवासीयों के लिए धारण की व्यवस्था करे।

तीसरी बात यह है कि हम कहते कहते मर गए, जनता सरकार के दो साल सनापत हो रहे हैं, कि समान शिक्षा लागू की जाये लेकिन धाए भी वेस में, दो प्रकार के स्कूल चल रहे हैं। एक तरह के स्कूल से कलक्टर पैदा होते हैं और दूसरी तरह के स्कूल से चपरासी पैदा होते हैं। एक स्कूल में डाटा, बिड़ला, मिनिस्टरों तथा अफसरों के लड़के पढ़ते हैं और दूसरे स्कूल में लड़कों को अपने घर से चटाई ले जा कर पढ़ना पड़ता है। धाए हमारी कांस्टीट्यून्सी के स्कूलों में स्कूल के लिए धाए अछपर छपर है तो मास्टर नहीं है, धाए मास्टर है तो बेंच नहीं है और धाए बेंच है तो धाए कुच नहीं है। वहाँ से लड़का क, ब, ग या प्रसिफ, बे, पै पढ़ेगा और धाए किमी तरह से उसने बी० ए० पास कर लिया और पब्लिक सभिस कमीशन में बैठ गया तो वह नलक बनेगा या फिर मास्टर, धाए सेवक बन जायेगा। दूसरे स्कूल के पढ़े हुए लड़के कलक्टर, धाई जी और डी धाई जी बनेंगे। इसीलिए हमने हमेशा कहा है—

राष्ट्रपति धा बेटा हो, या चपरासी की हो संताम, बाहून या धंगी का बेटा, सबकी शिक्षा एक समान ।

धाए सभी को एक समान शिक्षा दीजिए। जब तक धाए इस बुनियादी सवाल को हल नहीं करते तब तक धाए लाख नीतियों बनाये, बजट बनायें उससे कुछ भी होने वाला नहीं है। धाए जो बजट बनाते हैं उसको इम्प्लोयेड करने वाले कौन लोग हैं? बाहिया से बाहिया बजट भी धाए सही ढंग से इम्प्लोयेड न किया जाये तो उसका कोई फायदा नहीं मिलता है। धाए धाए गरीबों के लिए बजट बनाते हैं लेकिन उसको इम्प्लोयेड करने वाले जो अफसर बैठे हैं में धमीरों की तरफ मुखातिब हैं, डाटा बिड़ला की तरफ मुखातिब हैं। गरीबों के लिए बजट तैयार भी हो जाये फिर भी वह पैसा उसके पास तक नहीं पहुँचेगा। इसलिए सरकार की नीव, सरकार की नीव धाए नीतियों के कार्यान्वयन की पद्धति—यह तीनों बातें जब तक सही नहीं होंगी तब तक कुछ नहीं हो सकेगा।

जहाँ तक नौबतानों की बात है, मैं शुरू से कहता रहा हूँ कि धाए 25 साल तक नौबतान बनाना पड़ता है, 2६वें साल में उसकी नौकरी की उम्र की सीमा खत्म हो जाती है लेकिन वहाँ पर हमारी उम्र बाहे जितनी हो, हम एम एन ए, एम पी और मिनिस्टर बन सकते हैं। हमने कहा कि उस की "राष्ट्र-दु-जाब" में और यदि सरकार राष्ट्र-दु-जाब नहीं देती है तो "धनएम्प्लोयेड एसाउन्स" दे, बेरोजगारी मत्ता दे। यदि यह भी नहीं देती है तो इस में उम्र की भी सीमा लगाई गई है, नौकरी पाने की सीमा इस समय की 25 साल है, उस को खत्म किया जाय, बाहे उम्र की उम्र 26 साल हो, 30 धाए हो, 45

साथ हो, जब तक वह 58 वर्ष का नहीं हो जाता, उसे को सरकारी नौकरी पाने का अधिकार होना चाहिये। यदि उसे नौकरी नहीं दी जायगी, तो उसे धनअम्पलायमेंट एसाइन्स विभा जाय। इस समय नौकरी पाने के लिये 25 साल की जो सीमा है, मैं समझता हूँ नौजवानों के साथ अन्याय है। नतीजा यह होता है कि वह एम० ए० के पास, एम० पी० के पास, सिविलियर के पास बीकवा है, घुस देता है, किसी तरह भी नौकरी पाने के लिए कोशिश करता है और भाव जैसे मुझे साहब फांसी की सजा पाने के लिए दिन गिन रहे हैं, ठीक उसी तरह नौजवान भी एक-एक दिन गिनता रहता है, ताकि किसी भी तरह से 25 साल पूरे होने से पहले उसे नौकरी मिल जाय।

मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि नौजवानों के प्रति इस अन्याय को खत्म किया जाना चाहिये।

अब मैं दो शब्द विदेश नीति के सम्बन्ध में कह कर अपना भाषण समाप्त करना। आज चीन और वियतनाम का युद्ध चल रहा है। मैं यह समझता हूँ कि आज जितने भी बड़े राष्ट्र हैं—बाहेर उस हो, अमरीका हो, चीन हो, इन को एक दूसरे की नीति से कोई मतलब नहीं है, सब के सब अपनी-अपनी बायोनिंग में लगे हुए हैं, सब की यही दृष्टि है कि हमारा हथियार कहाँ बिकता है—बाहेर हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान का युद्ध हो, अरब और ईजराइल का युद्ध हो। मैं आप से यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी विदेश नीति ऐसी होनी चाहिये जिस के तहत जो छोटे-छोटे राष्ट्र हैं, जो न्यूट्रल राष्ट्र हैं, उनको इकट्ठा कर के आगे बढ़ें और अपने स्वयं के मुताबिक, कौन देश किस ईन्सू पर हमारा साथ देना है, उस को अपने साथ लें, न कि किसी के साथ बैठ कर कहें कि हम आप के साथ रहेंगे।

इस मन्दी के साथ मैं आपकी धन्यवाद देता हूँ।

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR (Gandhinagar): Before you call the next hon. Member, I want to make a submission. I do not want to speak, but let me make my point. I do express my apology for not being able to be present when my name was called in the morning. I was holding the floor yesterday evening at 6 O' clock when a little earlier I was called, I got only half a minute and then the House adjourned. I was under the impression that after the question hour today, there will be call attention and 377 and therefore this will not come up as early as it has. I was held up continuously at the Press Commission where I was giving evidence as a Member of

Parliament, from where I am coming here straight. In these circumstances, I do not know whether rules and conventions permit me to speak or not. But I was doing a public duty. Without creating a precedent, if you could allow me I shall be grateful. I have lost my right, I am only pleading now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You will get your chance after this, please take your seat now.

SHRIMATI RANO M. SHAIZA (Nagaland): I would not have spoken if I had not seen an article in today's papers entitled 'No reopening of Assam—Nagaland border issue'. There has been much tension in this area. But in spite of that I am sorry to note that in the address given by the President of India no mention was made of it. In the discussions some Members tried to bring in this issue and I will be failing in my duty if I do not present the case of the Nagaland Government at this juncture. In all these discussions we felt that the issues should be confined to agreements reached between the two Governments in 1972 and also on 2nd January, 1979 and 28th January, 1979. It would do good to take a little time to go into the important points of agreement reached between the two Governments. In 1972 the entire agreement had to come in because there was tension. The Assam Government had dwelt upon its right of taking over a whole district area in spite of the existence of the 1972 agreement, based on the notification of 1925; is not justified. In the agreement reached in 1972 no notification of 1925 was mentioned. Therefore, for what has not been settled, the question of reopening or closing the dispute does not arise. The interim agreement provides:

"So long as the interim agreements are enforced no settlement or encroachment in the areas covered by the agreements as from the date agreements were signed was to be allowed. And that settlements existing prior to the signing of the agreements are not to be disturbed.

(Shrimati Rono M. Shaiza)

It was however, observed with regret that the Assam Government did not honour the provisions of the agreements and totally abandoned their obligation and responsibility enjoined by the provisions of the interim agreement, so solemnly signed.

To cite one instance of the recent past, out of many such cases, in Mera-pan area under Doyang Reserved forest covered by the agreement signed on 2nd May, 1972, according to our assessment, about 122 families from Assam have been settled by dispossessing the Nagas who had settled there long before the signing of the agreements. These settlements were given after signing of the interim agreements in clear violation of the provisions of the agreements. Details of the settlers with names, months and years of entry into this area are enclosed as Annexure I to that. There are many more such cases of encroachments in other areas which were covered by the agreements. If these agreements continue to be violated and if the Centre's attitude is that the boundary question will not be opened, where will the Nagas go?

Another instance of flagrant violation of the agreement is the intention of the Government of Assam to create a buffer zone in the border area by giving settlements to many people who are not even citizens of India. In 1975 when some innocent Naga villagers cleared jungles for Jhum cultivation in Rajbari Gabruparbat and Naginijan in Tiru Hills reserved forest area which they traditionally used to cultivate in the past, to maintain strictly the spirit and letters of the agreements, the Nagaland Government ordered the Naga villagers to abandon the areas so cleared and they withdrew; but the areas cleared and vacated by the Nagas were subsequently settled with the people from Assam by the Government of Assam.

Regarding the settlement of refugees in border areas in the Tiru Hill Reserv-

ed Forest, a number of families reportedly refugees (Muslims) from Majuli as well as Miris from Teok areas were sent to Tiru Hill-Rajabari/Saleng areas by the Government of Assam. Some 10 such families were sent in June, 1977 in areas beyond Leprosy Colony, which was cultivated by Yachang villagers. It is learnt that some 30 more families are being sent.

Further, a group of Miris were sent in November, 1977 to the areas which were cultivated by Molungyimsen villagers. 30 houses were constructed and, more than 100 other families are reported to be sent. These refugees occupied land in Rajabari Tea Estate area earlier, which was cultivated by Yachang villagers in 1975.

It may be recalled that on a complaint (signal) from the Deputy Commissioner, Jorhat, dated 6th March, 1975, alleging that Nagas have cleared jungles encroaching lands in Rajabari Gubharu Parbhat, Neginijan Tea Estate in Tiru Hill Reserved Forest, the Deputy Commissioner, Mokokchung and other officers, along with the Manager of Selang and Rajabari Tea Estate visited the areas on 11th April, 1975. As a result, prohibitory order was issued by the Deputy Commissioner, Mokokchung on 16th April, 1975 and the villagers were made to vacate the land.

It is disappointing to see that the areas vacated by the Nagas were allotted to the people of Assam for paddy cultivation and settlement.

There have been numerous reports of encroachments and illegal settlements by the people from Assam in many areas covered by the agreements. On the top of these disturbing reports, according to a news item appearing in the *Assam Tribune* of 20th June, 1978, even the Chief Minister of Assam announced on the floor of the Assam Legislative Assembly that Doyang Reserved Forest, which was covered by the Agreement, would be thrown open for settlement. Clause 4 of the Agreement

clearly stated that the Doyang Reserved Forest shall continue to be reserved forest and maintained as such.

The situation in these areas not covered by the Interim Agreement proves to become the most sensitive. The area not covered by the Interim Agreement starts from South-West of Doyang Reserved Forest, including parts of Namer, Rangmapani and Diphy Reserved Forests, then right upto North Cachar Hills. Although specific Interim Agreements do not cover those areas, in a meeting held at Jorhat on 13th July, 1976 between the teams led by the Commissioner of Nagaland and the Commissioner of the plains Division, Assam, it was agreed that the spirit of the Interim Agreement signed in 1972 should also be applied to all these areas not covered by the Interim Agreement. This position was reiterated in a meeting held on 24th January, 1978 at Jorhat between the Commissioner, Nagaland and the Commissioner, Upper Assam Division, Assam.

So far as the 5th January, incident is concerned, the Nagaland Government, the party in power there and the public of Nagaland do not support that incident. In fact, we hang our heads in shame that such an incident has taken place. But what are the causes? Simple reasons continued provocations and harassment of Naga villages by Assam and indecision by Centre in the past. It is unfortunate and embarrassing. The subsequent agreement and the conference go to show that the people are ready for a proper settlement. Therefore, I would appeal to the House on such an occasion that if some of the clauses of the 1972 Agreement require any modification, that should be done. Because, if there is no chance for opening the boundary dispute, we shall be making a great mistake. On the one hand, the House seems to be happy with the announcement of the External Affairs Minister that the Chinese will discontinue helping the hostile Nagas, but on the other hand, the Home Minister announces

that the border between Nagaland and Assam will not be reopened. Where do you want the Nagas to go? Are we Indians or are we foreigners? The Central leaders, instead of taking sides in the question, should look into the issues with dispassion and do justice to the people of Nagaland. When did Assam come into being? Who were the Assamese? Were the boundaries between Assam and Nagaland demarcated? Only in 1880 the last battle between the Nagas and the British was fought. It was in my village of Khonoma which resisted them. So, the claims of the Nagas cannot be determined on the basis of a notification which was issued for mere administrative convenience in 1925.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR (Gandhinagar): As I was saying yesterday, the President's Address is not a ritual, but is a constitutional obligation, and it gives Parliament a chance to review what has been done and what ought to be done in times ahead. I have already given 18 amendments to this Address, and I do not want to elaborate on the subjects contained in those amendments.

My first point is that two years of Janata rule are now about to be over, and it is a sufficiently long period to give an assessment or a sort of judgment on the doings and undoings which the Janata Government have been able to perform. I congratulate them on many things that they have undone, particularly in the realm of the emergency aberrations and excesses. I also congratulate them on many things in other walks of life that they have done but what I want to suggest to them is that their performance has not come up to the expected level. And what is worse, I do not see in the history of parliamentary democracies, especially since 1945, any parallel where a Government has allowed its tremendous popularity and goodwill throughout the vast length and breadth of our motherland to be frittered away so soon and so wrecklessly as this Government has done in the last two years. This is not my charge, but I express my

[Prof. P. G. Mavalankar]

anguish, based on the honest assessment that I have been able to make. Therefore, my point is that we must find out what it is that they are not able to do.

Many things have been done of course. The President says that democracy has been restored. Good, but don't say it repeatedly. If you do it repeatedly, then please see that you too are also on democratic lines and democratic rails always! My hon. friend Prof. Dandavate has come back from U.P. I do not want to spend a minute on U.P. politics at all, but I cannot imagine in a parliamentary set-up the Speaker of a Legislative Assembly in the middle of the term of the Assembly converting himself from Speaker to Chief Minister? This is not done. If this was done wrongly by the previous regimes, surely, we should also say that this was wrong. I am not referring to individuals as such nor I am referring to the politics of UP Assembly. I am only saying what is going wrong when you are talking of democracy.

13 hrs.

You will find that the two years of Janata Government have done many good things. But my main complaint and grievance is that about these good things that have been done, they have not bothered to publicise them properly and adequately. It is the bad public relations from which this Government is suffering. I do not know why. I know, of course, partly why, because they are partly busy in their own infighting....

देल मंत्री (श्री. मधु बहुते) : मय वह
कलम हुआ ।

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR: If it is कलम हुआ तो ठीक है, I am glad. Partly they are also giving over-attention to the aberrations of Emergency and to the guilty persons involved. I am one of the last persons to say that the guilty must go scot-free. Not at all. In this very Parliament, in the

last Lok Sabha, times without number, I have taken liberties to oppose everything that went wrong during Emergency. But how long and how many times shall we go on harping on this record of Emergency misdeeds? What is expected of this Government is that they will now take lessons from Emergency experiences and do something which will help the people of the country.

Let me tell you, quite frankly—Mr. Dhanik Lal Mandal, the Minister of State for Home Affairs, is present here I am glad to see him here—the law and order situation is not as satisfactory as it ought to be. It is one of the primary concerns of any democratic Government, any Government, as a matter of fact, much more of a democratic Government. If we have restored freedom, can we say, we have also restored to some extent licence in the name of freedom? It was the poet Milton who in his memorable poem, "The Paradise Lost," had these lines when he said about the people—"Licence they mean when they cry liberty." One finds today that in name of liberty, a lot of licence is being used by people. Government are not able to check them at right time and on a proper occasion. A feeling of insecurity is increasing amongst the people, not only among the general people but particularly among women and children and weaker sections of the community, the people in the countryside. They feel that the persons responsible for, and who are in-charge of, law and order are not able to deliver the goods in giving them protection from life and property being damaged, destroyed or killed.

Now, I want to quickly point out that one gets an impression in some of the States in this country that there is nothing like Government. Somebody said sarcastically—my Marxist friends may relish it—that in some parts of India, the State really is withering away because there is no Government worth the name in those parts! The House knows what those parts are. I do not want to mention them. If you cannot perform your

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.

MR. SPEAKER: I will go one by one. I will now put Amendment No. 20 moved by Shri Mavalankar.

Amendment No. 20 was put and negatived.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE (Howrah): Amendment No. 91.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry I cannot put it because it has not been moved. Amendment No. 153 also has not been moved. Amendment No. 383 also has not been moved.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: It was moved.

MR. SPEAKER: The office says it was not moved.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: How can the office say so? I am here.

MR. SPEAKER: The office is checking it up. I will come to it later. Amendment No. 322 has not been moved.

SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR: I am moving it, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Not now; that is not possible. Amendment No. 153 has not been moved.

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN: Mr. Rajan moved it.

MR. SPEAKER: I am afraid it has not been moved. At the beginning itself we said that those who are moving their amendments may send slips within 15 minutes. You have not sent it. I will now put Amendment Nos. 317 and 318, moved by Shri Dhirendra-nath Basu, to the vote of the House.

Amendments Nos. 317 and 318 were put and negatived.

SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR: Sir, my amendment No. 322 should also be put to at least voice vote. I am not pressing it to division.

MR. SPEAKER: The normal procedure is that when any business is taken up, if any Member wants to move his amendments, he has to send a slip within 15 minutes. All the slips are kept in safe custody. So, there is no difficulty in checking them. But if Shri Rajan says that he has sent a slip, I will accept it, in spite of the fact that the slip has not been received here.

SHRI K. A. RAJAN (Trichur): No, I have not sent the slip, I have only given notice of the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: That is not enough.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: If a member has gone out for more than 15 minutes, does it mean that he is deprived of his right to move amendments?

SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR: After all, there are not many such cases; only five cases. It can be by voice vote.

MR. SPEAKER: All right. I think it is far easier.

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN: Very often when we raise something you quote the rules. So, may I be permitted to quote the rules? If Shri Rajan stands up and moves the amendment, I think it should be considered sufficient.

MR. SPEAKER: All right.

SHRI K. A. RAJAN: I beg to move:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:—

"But regret that no note has been taken in the Address of the united and unanimous opposition of the working class to the Industrial Relations Bill and the demand for its withdrawal." (153)

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: I beg to move:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:—

“but regret that there is no mention in the Address about the failure in stopping ‘Political Witch hunting’ against people of previous Government.” (383)

SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR: I beg to move:

That at the end of the motion, the following be added, namely:—

“but regret that no mention has been made in the Address about the grievous loss of lives and property in Pondicherry due to agitation against apprehended merger and about the steps that are required to be taken to maintain the identity of the Union territory of Pondicherry clearing all fears and speculations regarding its status and respecting the wishes and aspirations of the people of the territory.” (322)

MR. SPEAKER: I will now put to the vote Amendment No. 153, given notice of by Shri Rajan.

Amendment No. 153 was put and negatived.

MR. SPEAKER: I will now put amendment No. 383, given notice of by Shri K. Lakkappa, to the vote of the House.

Amendment No. 383 was put and negatived.

MR. SPEAKER: I will now put amendment No. 322, given notice of by Shri A. Bala Pajanor, to the vote of the House.

Amendment No. 322 was put and negatived.

SHRI VINAYAK PRASAD YADAV (Saharsa): I wish to withdraw my amendments Nos. 71 to 73 and 371 and 372.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the leave of the House to withdraw his amendments?

HON MEMBERS: Yes

Amendments Nos. 71 to 73 and 371 and 372 were, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER: I now put amendments Nos. 26 to 38, 187 to 200, 213 to 231, 361, 374 to 376, 378 to 380 and 392 moved by Shri Keshavrao Dhondge to the vote of the House.

Amendments Nos. 26 to 38, 187 to 200, 213 to 231, 361, 374 to 376, 378 to 380 and 392 were put and negatived.

MR. SPEAKER: I now put all the rest of the amendments to the vote of the House.

All the other Amendments were put and negatived.*

MR. SPEAKER: 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 19th February, 1979.”

The motion was adopted.

*Amendments negatived : Nos. 1 to 19, 21 to 25, 92 to 104, 118 to 124, 135 to 142, 176 to 186, 238 to 259, 317 to 321, 370, 385, 391 and 394.