

running on hand-to-mouth basis and actually facing threat of closure during the busy agricultural season. The situation is serious enough to call for immediate action of the Government. I, therefore, urge upon the Government to move quickly in the matter.

I would request the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs to bring it to the notice of the Minister concerned and according to the practice now evolved, they have to reply to us.

14.17 hrs.

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

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We will take up the Motion of Thanks on the President's Address and continue the debate. Shrimati Ahilya Rangnekar may continue her speech.

SHRI G. M. BANATWALLA (Pon-nani): Yesterday I raised a point about my amendment for clemency to Mr. Bhutto. I am happy that the hon. Speaker has admitted it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He may move it.

SHRI G. M. BANATWALLA: I beg to move:

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

“but regret that the Address fails to appeal to the President of Pakistan for clemency to Mr. Zulfiqar Ali Bhutto sentenced to death in accordance with both the popular feeling within our country and the world opinion.” (394).

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Shrimati Ahilya Rangnekar may continue her speech.

श्रीमती अहिल्या पी. रंगनेकर (बम्बई उत्तर-मध्य) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, कल मैंने अपने भाषण में बताया था कि हमारी गणोक्तबन्धन एकोनोमी में कैमा क्राइसिस है और कन्ज्यूमर्स प्राइस इन्डैक्स भी कैसे बढ़ रहा है। इस का इस अभिभाषण में कोई जिक्र नहीं है लेकिन यह कहा गया है की स्माल स्कैल इंडस्ट्रीज की तरफ हम देख रहे हैं और उस से काफी एम्प्लायमेंट बढ़ जाएगा और उसका अच्छा असर हमारी एकोनोमी

पर पड़ेगा। कहते तो ये यह हैं लेकिन जब पालिसी भ्रमल में लाते हैं तो हम यह देख रहे हैं कि आज भी मल्टी नेशनल को सब सुविधाएं मिलती हैं। महाराष्ट्र में बम्बई में जो 47 लाइसेंस दिये गये हैं, उन में से 37 लाइसेंस बिग इण्डस्ट्रीयलिस्ट्स और मल्टी नेशनलस को दिये गये हैं। इस तरह से आज इंडस्ट्री को बढ़ाने के लिये जो भी लाइसेंस मिलता है, वह आज भी बड़े लोगों को ही मिलता है। इतना ही नहीं, इन लोगों को सहूलियतें देने के लिए और भी चालबाजी शुरू की है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, उन्होंने अपना घंघा बांटना शुरू कर दिया है। उन्होंने ने इलेक्ट्रोनिक्स की फैक्ट्री चार हिस्सों में बांट दी है और बांट कर कहते हैं कि यह हमारी छोटी इंडस्ट्री है। हमारे यहां पालियामेंट के मेम्बर श्री डी० डी० देसाई हैं। उन्होंने भी अपना कारखाना बन्द कर दिया है और उस की जगह पर तीन चार यूनिट आ रहे हैं। इस तरह से कारखानों को डिवाइड करने का तरीका चल रहा है। इस तरह से वे लोग मुनाफाखोरी करने के लिये ये सब सुविधाओं का फायदा उठा रहे हैं। हमारे इंडस्ट्री मिनिस्टर के बहुत बयान आते हैं लेकिन उन पर प्रिक्टिस में कुछ नहीं होता है। इस की तरफ सरकार को ध्यान देना चाहिए। अगर इस पर ध्यान नहीं दिया जाएगा तो वही पुराना तरीका हो जाएगा और इस से डिस्पैरिटी ग्राफ इंकम बढ़ती रहेगी।

आप रिजर्व बैंक की रिपोर्ट देखें। उस में लिखा है कि प्रोडक्शन कास्ट बढ़ रही है और वर्किंग क्लास क वेजिज कम हो रहे हैं, उन की तनख्वाह कम हो रही है। कारखाने वालों का मुनाफा बढ़ रहा है। वे लोग नयी मशीनें ला रहे हैं जिससे प्रान्पनायमेंट बढ़ रही है।

मैं एक खाम बात की ओर भी आप का ध्यान दिलाना चाहती हूं। श्रीरतों के बारे में बहुत डिस्क्रिमिनेशन हो रहा है। नयी नयी मशीनें ला कर हमारी श्रीरतों को बेकार बनाया जा रहा है। इकुअल वेजिज एक्ट के होते हुए भी श्रीरतों को इकुअल वेजिज नहीं मिलते हैं। हम ने महाराष्ट्र में देखा है कि वहां एम्प्लायमेंट गारन्टी स्कीम है, लेकिन वहां महिलाओं को इकुअल वेज नहीं मिलते हैं। हम अगर कहते हैं तो कह दिया जाता है कि हम कोशिश कर रहे हैं। कोशिश क्या की जाती है? जानबूझ कर उन को सेकेड ग्रेड में रखा जाता है। आप इस चिल्ड्रन इयर में उन की माताओं की मदद नहीं करेंगे, महिलाओं की मदद नहीं करेंगे तो इस इयर का कुछ नहीं होने वाला है। हमारे प्रेजीडेंट साहब ने अपने भाषण में महिलाओं की तरफ कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया है।

हमारे मिनिस्टर ने एक कान्फेन्स बुलायी थी कि वर्किंग वीमेंस के बारे में कुछ करेंगे। मैं आप को बताती हूं कि हमारी वर्किंग वीमेंस की क्या हालत है। उनके आफिसिज में पीने के पानी और दूसरी सुविधाओं का कोई इंतजाम नहीं है। ग्रेड वगैरह की बात तो दूर इन चीजों का इंतजाम भी हमारी वर्किंग वीमेंस के लिए नहीं हो पा रहा है। दूसरे वर्किंग वीमेंस के ग्रेडस में जो डिस्क्रिमिनेशन किया जाता है, उस का क्या होगा, इस का जिक्र प्रेजीडेंट साहब को करना चाहिये जो कि उन्होंने नहीं किया। सब जगह एयर होस्टेस को मैरिज करने का आधिकार है लेकिन हमारे मिनिस्टर कहते

[श्रमती महिला पी० रांगनेकर]

हैं कि हम उन को मैरिज करने का अधिकार तो दें बाले हैं लेकिन बच्चा पैदा करने का नहीं। एक बच्चा पैदा होने के बाद और अगर 35 साल की हो जाएगी तो उन को काम से निकाल दिया जाएगा। यह डिस्ट्रिक्मिनेशन हम नहीं होने देंगे। औरतों के बारे में यह सब जगह डिस्ट्रिक्मिनेशन होता है। दूसरी जगहों पर ऐसा नहीं होता है। आप अपनी पालिसी को ठीक करिये नहीं तो महलाओं को भी आप से लड़ना पड़ेगा। यह मैं आप को बता देना चाहती हूँ।

एक बात मैं आप के सामने एजुकेशन के बारे में रखना चाहती हूँ। प्रेजीडेंट साहब ने कहा है कि एलीमेंट्री एजुकेशन को बढ़ाना चाहिए लेकिन यूनिवर्सिटी एजुकेशन को रेस्ट्रिक्ट करना चाहिये क्योंकि यूनिवर्सिटी ग्रेजुएट्स बहुत हो गये हैं। यह गलत बात है। हमारे देश में यूनिवर्सिटी एजुकेशन कितने लोग लेते हैं? अगर आप झाँकें देखेंगे तो पायेंगे कि हिन्दुस्तान में हजार में दो, पाकिस्तान में हजार में चार, चाइना में हजार में तेरह और अमेरिका में हजार में चालीस लोग यूनिवर्सिटी एजुकेशन लेते हैं। हमारे यहां से पाकिस्तान में ज्यादा लोग यूनिवर्सिटी एजुकेशन लेते हैं। आप हजार में केवल दो को यूनिवर्सिटी एजुकेशन देते हैं। यूनिवर्सिटी एजुकेशन को आप बढ़ाना बन्द कर देंगे तो एलीमेंट्री एजुकेशन बढ़ाने में आप का हाथ कैसे लगेगा? क्या आप का एलीमेंट्री एजुकेशन बढ़ाने का यह तरीका है? आप को एलीमेंट्री एजुकेशन भी नहीं बढ़ती है क्योंकि जन बच्चों को खाने को नहीं मिलता है, वे पढ़ने नहीं जाते हैं। अगर आप उन को सारी सुविधाएँ नहीं देंगे तो इस मामले में भी कुछ होने वाला नहीं है। इस बारे में भी कोई जिक्र इस भाषण में नहीं है।

इस भाषण में कम्युनिस्ट राइट्स और रिजनों पर अन्यचार के बारे में कुछ नहीं कहा गया है। इस बारे में और बहुत से मददगारों ने बहुत कुछ कहा है, इसलिए मैं उसे दोहराना नहीं चाहती हूँ। लेकिन मैं विदेश नीति के बारे में कुछ कहना चाहती हूँ। इसमें लिखा गया है कि हमारी नीति गुटनिरपेक्षता की है लेकिन हमारी और अमरीका की विचारधाराओं में कई मौलिक समानताएँ हैं। यह डेंजरम क्या है। आप क्या मौलिक समानता अमरीका और अपने में देखते हैं। अमरीका अमरीका की नीति यही रही है कि दुनिया में इम्पीरियलिस्ट पावर्ज का कब्जा हो। एशिया में वह इसी नीति का अनुसरण कर रहा है। इस वास्ते यह एक डेंजरम प्रैक्टिस है और इस को आप को छोड़ देना चाहिये। इस के चलते आप की नीति गुट निरपेक्षता की नीति नहीं रह सकती है। इस के माने तब यह होगा कि हम अमरीकी कैम्प में जा रहे हैं। आप देखें कि आज अमरीका का वीयतनाम और चीन के बारे में स्टैंड क्या है, ईरान में उस ने क्या किया है। इस सब को देखते हुए अगर आप इस नीति को नहीं छोड़ेंगे तो आप की विदेश नीति गुट निरपेक्ष नहीं रह सकेगी और आप इम्पीरियलिस्ट कैम्प में चले जाएंगे।

एक अन्तिम इशारा मैं श्री रवीन्द्र वर्मा को देना चाहती हूँ। आप ने कहा है कि आप इंडस्ट्रियल रिलेशंस बिल लाएंगे। आप अगर चाहते हैं कि इंडस्ट्रियल रिलेशंस अच्छे हों तो आप को मालिकों के खिलाफ

कुछ सख्त कदम उठाने होंगे। आज बम्बई में ज्यादातर कारखाने अगर बन्द बड़े हैं तो स्ट्राइक की वजह से नहीं बल्कि मालिकों की वजह से बन्द पड़े हैं। इंडस्ट्रियल रिलेशंस बिल नाई के धंधे को छोड़ कर बाकी सभी धंधों को ऐसेंशियल सर्विसिस की श्रेणी में लाएगा। इस को वकिंग क्लास कभी नहीं होने देगी, अपनी पूरी ताकत का इस्तेमाल कर के हमका विरोध करेगी। इतना इशारा दे कर मैं अपनी बात को खत्म करती हूँ।

CHAUDHURY BRAHM PARKASH (Outer Delhi): I rise to support the Motion of Thank to the President for his Address. I mostly agree with the achievements of the Government specified in the Address. Some of my friends have also thrown some light on those achievements.

On the question of foreign policy, I disagreed with those who say that we are tilting towards America. By and large our foreign policy has been correct, and we have maintained a proper balance. I hope we will continue to go in the same way.

Mention has been made in the Address of the panchayat and co-operative movements. I am glad that at least these two neglected and most important sectors have been mentioned in the Address, but I must say that though the Report of the Asoka Mehta Committee on Panchayats was submitted almost six months back, nothing has been done so far. No consideration has been given to it either by the Central Government or the States. I have been to many States and I have found that most of the States have been going in a very wrong direction, because one of the fundamental recommendations of the Committee is to give statutory or developmental power to the district samiti or the zila parishad, but some of the States are bypassing the districts. If you bypass the district nowhere can control be exercised by the people. Bypassing the district means you are leaving the control in the hands of the politicians and the bureaucracy. In the recommendations of the Committee, a fallacy has also been introduced, namely that powers have not been given to the panchayats at the village level, but some other centres of power have been created. In

a way, the report as a whole is defective as it does not transfer real democracy to the people. We no doubt have been speaking a lot about rural development. I have some experience of going through some of the States, some of the rural areas and I myself come from the rural areas. All talk of rural development will be totally meaningless until and unless the panchayat system of administration, at the district level, block level or intermediary level and at the village level is brought into the picture and statutory power is given. Further, I would say that early attention should be given to this subject and some constitutional provisions should be made in the Constitution by which some statutory powers are given to the panchayats under the Constitution. Without that, no State will give any power to the panchayats. Whether it is a state ruled by the Communist party like Kerala or West Bengal or one ruled by Congress like Andhra of Karnataka or one ruled by the Janata Party, nowhere, the politicians are prepared to give real powers, financial powers, administrative powers, development powers to the panchayats. This must be taken note of.

The second point about the co-operatives. We have talked a lot about the cooperatives that we will be having cooperatives for the distribution of fertilisers and all that. But with pain I would submit that the cooperatives have remained all over India, except a few pockets, on paper only. What does a cooperative mean? It is a voluntary organisation or institution of people formed to carry out their economic activities for the interests of the Members. 99 per cent of cooperative organisations all over the country today stand superseded. They are ruled by the officers, by the Directors and the Administrators and no party is an exception to this recourse to supersession. We have no doubt done good work to restore democracy. We have amended the Constitution, which was amended drastically by the past regime. We have also taken credit for amending certain provisions of certain other legislations and we say that democracy is

supposed to be restored. But that restoration of democracy is for whom and for what. I do not think that statutory or constitutional restoration of democracy would benefit millions of people at the lower level. If democracy is to have any meaning, it must percolate to the villages, to the other democratic institutions at the lower level, to the local bodies. When all the local bodies are superseded, when panchayat elections are not held for years, when cooperatives are superseded, what means have you got, what framework do you have for carrying on democracy? Democracy is only at the top which can be toppled by any ambitious party or ambitious leader at any time because we have no grass root democracy left in the country. Unfortunately, after the death of Nehru, the first thing we have done is to do away with democracy at the grass root level all over the country. I would submit that immediate attention should be given to restore democracy to the local bodies in India, to restore panchayati Raj in India to the cooperatives because that is the surest way of building up democratic institutions all over the country. That only could give us a framework, a basis for real democracy at the apex level.

After saying all this about the grass root level democracy, I would also say a few words about the Centre-State relations. I am sorry to find that one of the causes of tensions in India, an important cause is the Centre-State relations. Whether it is at the administrative level or at the political level, more and more powers are being concentrated in a few hands at the centre and at the level of the States. There is no doubt about it that as far as the relationship between the Centre and the States at the political level are concerned, it is the concern of the political parties. But the political powers unfortunately are tending to become more and more centralised. The hon. Members of Parliament should also see to it, irrespective of the party to which they belong, that when we speak of Centre-State relations here in Parliament, political relationship at the

[Chaudhury Brahm Prakash]
political level is also rationalised. As far as the Centre-State relations at the administrative level or constitutional level are concerned, I feel that more powers are necessary for the States.

In this connection, I would also submit that all the so-called Union Territories should not be treated as Union Territories. Union Territories are the worst administered. So, the Union Territories should be treated as full-fledged States. I do not know what is the difficulty in that. It is a legacy of the British. They wanted to have certain pockets of Centre of power to have a control over the neighbouring States. So they wanted these areas to be under their control, under the control of the Centre. Why should we have Union Territories under the Central Government? I would also submit that the big States in India like Madhya Pradesh, UP and Bihar are almost unmanageable and it is an injustice to the millions of people living in those States. I have gone through these States, I know myself the suffering of the people in those States because the whole machinery is centralised at the capital level and nothing goes to the district level or other levels. These States should be divided on certain equitable bases so that they may do more service to the country.

Another reason for tension in this country is the language issue. I am pained sometimes when I see people dogmatically asserting the position that should be given to Hindi. That is causing great harm and tension in the whole country. It is unrealistic if we say today that we do not need English and that we would not need English for ever. Perhaps some people may become angry when I say this. But English is going to remain with us. I would suggest that we should accept English as one of our associate languages. We should not quarrel about it. Then Hindi will have much more field to prosper. At the same time, we have done great injustice to Urdu. I come from a place which is about hundred miles around Delhi, where Urdu had been in use. Urdu was born and

brought up in Delhi. It is considered as a foreign language now. I am today an illiterate person because I know only Urdu! I speak Urdu. Today there is hardly anything which I can read in Urdu. Most of the people do not understand Hindi, but they have imposed Hindi on us. Actually Urdu was in use in and around Delhi. So, Urdu must be restored as an additional State language and it should be given its due honour.

I want to mention a very important point now which I should have done first. The hon. Members here have mentioned about law and order, about corruption, about killings and firings. This is not a party problem, this party problem or that party problem. It has become a national problem. We should solve it as a national problem. Fortunately, we have some elder statesmen in all the political parties. They are still living, they are still there. If they are not going to solve this problem, I do not know what would happen in future.

Why is there corruption? Why is there the problem of law and order? It is because there is tension in the society. In the urban areas, only about 20 per cent of the people have enriched themselves. They are not more than 5 per cent of the total population. In the name of reservations, only a few communities, a small percentage of them, get the jobs. The people who are poorer, the people who belong to backward classes, are unhappy. In the intermediary classes, a small percentage of families have enriched themselves and the rest of the population is unhappy. They want jobs. They are not getting jobs. They are poor people. This is the cause of tension all over, in the country side as well as in the urban area. We must analyse the causes.

I do not find any difference between caste and class. A few people belonging to certain castes are living in cities in a well-to-do way. They have all the advantages. The people belonging to certain other communities who live in villages have all the disadvantages. What is the difference between caste

and class here? There is not so much difference in Punjab, Haryana and Himachal Pradesh. It is because their economic condition is better. Wherever there is poverty, there is a cry of caste. The poverty is too much in Bihar. So, the cry of caste is very much there. It is so in eastern U.P. The cry of caste and backward class is the loudest there. So is the case in Madhya Pradesh and in other places.

These tensions have to be removed. I would submit that our leadership, leaders of all parties, should rise to the occasion. The country is in danger, the future is in danger. I have an intuitive feeling that we are going towards more and more dangerous times. How are we to face that? Instead of sitting across the table, we are going to streets. Instead of "forget and forgive", we are trying to seek vengeance upon each other. Our politics have gone into the hands of extremist people, whether it is the extreme in the Janata Party or whether it is the extreme in the Congress Party or whether it is the extreme in the Communist Party. The whole politics is going into the hands of extremists. Is it right? We have gone to the streets, we are fighting in the streets.

I know that very bad precedents have been laid down by the former Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi. Certain things started in her Jays. Instead of reversing those things, unfortunately, we are trying to follow the same traditions, the same way and the same methods. With the Government here run by the Janata and the Governments in some States run by other parties, I do not know how far we can go. So, the leadership of this country belong to all parties; they should sit together, try to forget and forgive and try to evolve a new culture—a new political culture which was the gift of Our elder Statesman of 100 or 50 or 60 years ago—the culture of Lokmanya, the culture of Mahatma Gandhi, the culture of Jawaharlal Nehru, the culture of Maulana Azad. We should try

to evolve a synthesis of culture and also not borrow ideas of revolution blindly from other lands and try to inject them here.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO (Mormuga): Sir, I had asked for some clarification from the Hon. Minister at the time he made the statement. Now the position is this ...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: That is all over.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: Let me say. I am asking

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: No, Mr. Faleiro; you had already asked and I have replied. Don't get up now.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: It is his duty under the rules.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There is no rule; we are on the President's Address.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: I am asking when he is going to reply. Under the rule ...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He need not reply, there is no need for any reply. It is only a suggestion.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: No, it is a question.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please take your seat now.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: I am sorry, you are not going according to the rules. I am very sorry.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Lak-kappa.

(Interruption) **

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Your remarks are very unfair.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: I am asking you to go according to the rules.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please take your seat. This is not the way.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: What is not the way?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The way you are raising it in the House.

And this is not the first time you are doing it.

(Interruption) **

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please take your seat.

It will go off the record—whatever he has said, because these are indecent remarks which should not go on the record.

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO: Is this the way to behave?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You should know how to behave. You are in the habit of getting into a temper and you don't know what you talk. Please take your seat.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA (Tumkur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I must be very thankful to you for giving me an opportunity to speak on this President's Address. This document—the Address by the President—does not evoke any inspiration since no indication in regard to any of the vital issues confronting this country has been made in this address.

I do not want to repeat the points made by other Members but I will only mention certain issues and problems confronting this country, which have not been solved by the present Government. This is a routine document in which he has described the performance of the various Ministries in the last one year. If the last one year's performance is clubbed with the previous year's performance, I think the Janata Government has no right to exist as a Government because this present Government is not governing at all. Therefore, it is no surprise that this document does not convey anything in regard to the performance of the Janata Government.

The present Government is a conglomeration of various units, various classes, groups and interests. I may say that 'Ghatakwad' and 'Sanchalaks' are running the Government. The fascist forces are again raising their ugly heads in this country in the garb of Janata rule. It is a very sad affair for this nation that the people of this country have handed over the glorious heritage and culture of this country to the hands of wolves—that is the fascist, RSS bogy which is, for the last two years, holding the country to ransom. Danger and threat to the integrity of this country is very much in the offing because of certain even that took place in this country.

It is stated in the Address that every thing done by this Administration is in the interests of growth of democracy. Is there any democratic functioning in this country for the last two years, I would like to ask. Where is the democratic process? Its growth has been eroded today and for the last two years we could not attend even to vital issues and to the economic problems of this country. Throughout the two years you have only sorted out your own difficulties, your own conflicts, your own squabbles. Do you think this country will wait till all your squabbles and quarrels and conflicts are settled? Can you treat that as a national issue? This is what the President has failed to say. He has not been able to say it, even though he has stated, in various speeches he had made regarding the economic issues of this country, that today the economy of this country is in complete shambles. I can read out the relevant portions. Why this leisurely pace of growth of economy and employment when you have stated that our country will be prosperous within ten years and we will eradicate not only poverty but unemployment? Of course you have eradicated the problem of unemployment by dethroning the Ministers and getting them back again. These are the unemployed people in the Janata

Party who get jobs again! They got back, in spite of their utterances, their statements, their accusations and vilifications.

The Press Journal asks:

"Is the Indian economy healthy? Has its growth been satisfactory? What is the outlook for economic growth—and growth in per capita income and employment?"

It says, again:

"Even the powers-that-be entrusted with the country's affairs, appear to feel that with the economy in such a good shape, they could afford the luxury of incessant political battles among themselves as in U.P. and elsewhere, not to speak of the Centre".

See the gigantic dimension of the problems that the 700 million people are facing. They are facing acute shortages. People are suffering from not only want of jobs, but want of fair prices for agricultural commodities.

Are the people allowed to live peacefully? In the last one year for 410 times there were police firings. But at the same time you say that you want to uphold democracy. You are running democracy with armed constabularies and other forces. May I quote one incident which happened recently, on 26th January, in Haridwar? When our Congress people went to unfurl the national flag on the Republic Day, there was terrorism; the RSS goondas and an RSS-based MLA went to the dias; they not only threatened us, but they also incited the armed constabularies and the police to humiliate the Muslims and Harijans on that occasion. Do you not want to respect the Republic Day function? Do you not want to see that the celebration is done in a proper manner? U.P. is a very big State. We have seen how the administration in U.P. has come to a grinding halt. This is one of the important points that I wanted to raise. This Government has not even done what the people expected to receive at the hands of the Janata Government, let alone the other points.

Harijans have been killed in various parts of the country. In Bihar nearly 250 Harijans were killed, and nearly 418 Harijans were killed in the other parts of the country. Can you not save at least the lives of, and remove the miseries of, the weaker sections of this country? What are your programmes? You have beautifully narrated here that you will establish not only a social order but also a peaceful democratic set-up, and all that. These are all only high-sounding words that you have put in this Address.

I now come to the agricultural front. You have said here about the record level of foodgrains production. You have claimed here that you have given remunerative prices to the farmers and also how you have organized distribution of foodgrains and essential commodities in this country. You have said:

"Government attaches great importance to speedy implementation of land reform measures... Upto November, 1978, 6.48 lakh hectares of land had been distributed to the landless..."

Land reforms in Karnataka have taken place, but you do not appreciate and also finance the States which are run by the Congress. You are attacking them as politically motivated, and all that. Where the land reforms are taking place in a systematic manner, you want to disturb such States. Your agents who are working in Karnataka have no respect for the Legislature; not only they are holding to ransom the Legislature, but outside also they are preventing the normal functioning of the democratic system which was established by the people of that State. Is this the manner in which you are running democracy in this country? How can people appreciate this Government? You do not allow the citizens to live peacefully.

About foodgrains you have said that you are going to increase the irrigation potential and increase food production. I would like to say a word about the surplus of foodgrains and other

[Shri K. Lakkappa]

agricultural commodities not only in the south but also in the northern areas. Cotton is surplus, sugar cane is surplus. Yes sugar is available, but at what price? What price you are going to give to the cane-grower? What is the remunerative price you have fixed? What is the incentive you have given? I would like to point out how lopsided is the policy the present Janata Government is pursuing.

15 hrs.

Sir, the Janata Government say they are going to boost agricultural production. How they are boosting—I would like to point out to you. Sulphur is a commodity which is needed by the fertiliser factories as the basic raw material. Now the MMTC, a government canalising agency under the Commerce Ministry not only did not heed the timely advice given by the producers of the impending shortage of sulphur in the world market but it has created a situation where the shortage of sulphur has become so acute that the user fertiliser factories were forced to ask for loan of the raw material from sister factories. The MMTC were expecting to get this material from Poland which has now backed out and they are now selling it to other countries at higher prices. Not only the MMTC has not done some advance planning to get the material and create a buffer and supply it to the user factories in spite of their warnings but they have allowed over 40,000 tonnes of sulphur lying unlifted in the Bombay port for the past four months over a dispute as to who is to pay the lighterage charges. This is the wonderful way the Janata Government is going to boost agricultural production. This valuable raw material should have been cleared promptly and distributed to the farmers but that is not being done. So, whatever has been stated in the Address is not only belied but makes the position of the government such that it looks that it is working for multinationals and other vested interests. Therefore, they have no right to say, 'We are bringing social order or social justice to the people.'

Then, Sir, what sort of discrimination, political discrimination they are practising? You want the rule of law to prevail. But is there any rule of law to-day in this country? You can make any rule, you can make any law you want. At the same time, whenever progressive legislation is enacted and with our support, it will not be mentioned in the Presidential Address. But, at the same time, on the question of wreaking political vengeance and witch-hunting of the previous government, even though they have done many good things and even though they have enacted many progressive legislations, you will not say a word about it but you want to scuttle and throttle the political atmosphere in the country by using your legislative power and bringing and getting passed by your bulldozer majority the Special Courts Bill which only consists of political vindictiveness against one individual of the previous government. But you know what happened in other countries where martial law was there and where such laws were enacted and the individuals of the previous regimes indicted? To-day they are facing the wrath of the people. Not only the whole world but people everywhere are asking for clemency to Bhutto. This is the example. Ours is a civilised nation. Why do you take a vindictive attitude? You must bring social revolution. You must bring social legislations. That you are not bringing. Are there any Special Courts for economic offenders? Are there any Special Courts for black-marketeers?

You want to say that the country will have self-reliance. But the multinationals are coming. Your Civil Aviation and Tourism Minister protested that ITDC should have no collaboration with the Sheraton group of Hotels.

But, Sir, the licence was issued by the Industries Minister. Curiously enough, it was done. Then, a statement was made when there was an election in which he said that Government was going to change the location of the steel plant. The steel plant is a

matter of life and death for the people of Karnataka where the previous Government laid the foundation stone. Now you want to take that away from there. It is nothing but political vindictiveness. Politically you want to see that whatever was done by the previous government is undone you want to shift that plant from Karnataka. The Minister was pronouncing that he would shift the location of the plant from here to another place. Is there any policy in this? Is there any ideology or is there any principle? Has this Government got the moral authority to exist and rule this country? This is a question to be discussed to-day.

I would like to conclude by saying as to how the economy of this country is in shambles to-day.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Lakkappa, you have already taken twenty minutes. Your party has given me a list of ten more members.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: Please allow me ten minutes more.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am sorry. Then you will have to take your seat.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: Allow me only two minutes.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I will give you two minutes to conclude.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: I would conclude in two minutes. Sir, the President's Address has also failed to take note that the fascist forces have not only been organising themselves but also being supported internationally and, throughout the country, there is a large-scale violence. These activities are in the sensitive areas of our country. We have brought out the persons involved in that and how these fascist forces are raising their ugly heads in this country and how this Government is nurturing them. The lives of the minority sections, the harijans, the muslims etc. are not safe at the hands of the present Government. Is there anything mentioned in this Address? Does the Government want to see that

the people of this country are saved from such fascist forces which are not only throttling the very basic principles of democracy but also the heritage and culture of this country. They are now in danger. The President's Address has not mentioned anything in regard to these things. I may tell you that the people will rise in revolt against this present Government to remove such fascist forces which are not only conducive to this country but they are against the interest of the nation also.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Jethmalani.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI (Bombay North-West): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I have listened with rapt attention the three leading speeches delivered in opposition to the Motion of Thanks—one was that of the distinguished Leader of the Opposition himself, another of my young friend, Shri Saugata Roy and the last that of Mr. Lakkappa who has just concluded.

Not one of these distinguished gentlemen has found anything worth praising either in the President's speech in what the Janata Government proposes to do or what the Janata Government has done in the past. The performance of these three distinguished gentlemen reminds me of a book which was written about our country many many years ago by Miss Mayo. She wrote a book in which she found nothing worthwhile about India. She condemned everything that existed in this country. And the great Gandhiji, the Father of our Nation, had a very apt description to make; in his inimitable style, he called it the report of a gutter-inspector. If Gandhiji is not unparliamentary, I would suggest that that description aptly fits all the three speeches which have been delivered by these gentlemen on the opposition benches.

Sir, each one of them, particularly Mr. Saugata Roy, went to the extent of saying that there is no government at all. The Janata Government, he says, is not a government. For so long

[Shri Ram Jethmalani]

they have associated governments with anarchy, with autocracy, with rule of the police, with detentions without trial, with tortures in jail and with advancement of dynastic ambition that when they see real democratic government their memory fails and they are not able to recognise the government.

Sir, any honest person who reads the President's Address or who heard the President's speech will see that these gentlemen have done precisely what they accuse the distinguished President of doing, namely, to suppress the truth. With all their desire to suppress truth, they have not been able to suppress the very wonderful and dynamic achievements of the Janata Government about which they did not have the courage to say even one word. Can they deny I ask, that in 1977-78 we witnessed a growth of national income of 7.4 per cent against 1.4 per cent in the last year of Mrs. Gandhi's rule? Can they deny that an additional irrigation potential of 26 lakh hectares has been created and 28 lakh hectares additional capacity for irrigation is proposed to be created in the next year? Can it be denied—and I ask those who beat their breast about the fate of Harijans and landless in this country—that 6.48 lakh hectares of land were distributed to the landless half of whom were scheduled castes and scheduled tribes? Can it be denied that prices of essential goods and commodities have gone down?

AN HON'BLE MEMBER: Of which commodity?

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Can it be denied that the security ques which existed at every shop do not deface our urban and rural landscape now? Can it be denied that industrial growth of 7 to 8 per cent has been achieved and target higher than that are set for the next year?

Sir, a brief reference was made by Mr. Stephen to the fact that district

industries centres have been set-up. But in a flourish of a joke he dismissed them as meaningless. He said they are not meant for the purpose for which they are supposed to be meant. I do not understand what exactly he wanted to convey to the House. We started these district industries centres on 1st May, 1978 to provide impetus and know-how and even wherewithal for promotion of small, village and cottage industries and generally to support the decentralised industrial sector. 399 districts exist in the whole of India and within less than a year we have succeeded in setting up 246 district centres out of which more than half have already become operational. Thirty-six thousand new entrepreneurs have been identified. Ten thousand project profiles have been prepared and twenty-two thousand new units have already been established out of which 40 per cent are small scale units located mainly in rural and semi-urban areas. Can it be denied that once these 23,000 units which have already been established get going to the fullest extent of their capacity these will generate employment opportunities?

It is true that in some sense there is a new factor which has created unemployment because a large number of people who were employed once upon a time in looting the nation are no longer looting the nation and are therefore unemployed today!

But, let me say this for the benefit of the distinguished gentleman from West Bengal, my angry, young friend, Mr. Saugata Roy. 10,000 sick units have been identified throughout the country, out of which 9,000 units were in West Bengal alone and these have been helped to get back upon their feet. But, Sir, somehow, gratitude is not something which one associates with these distinguished gentlemen of the opposition. I thought at least Mr. Saugata Roy should not have justified the jibe of the great Shakespeare who said:

"Blow, blow Thou Wintry Wind;
Thou are not so unkind
As man's ingratitude".

So, that is ingratitude. In one State to which he belongs 9,000 sick units have been put back upon their feet. And yet, the Janata Party has not received even one single word of praise from these gentlemen. Because, to give praise to their opponents is not their habit. Their habit is only to vilify their opponents and if possible to imprison them without trial.

Sir, the President's Address contains the greatest promise, which is of great relevance to this country and to the solution of our problems. The President's speech promises a new clinical, educational and legislative base for our family planning programme. We are not ashamed to take up family planning merely because the notorious heir-apparent of your spiritual leader was once upon a time associated with it. We will go on. We will vigorously pursue it. But we will not do it in the manner in which it was done before. We will first create a proper educational base and then create proper clinical and hospital facilities and then do this, not by executive fiat or the fiat of an extra-constitutional authority; but we will do it in the exercise of the legislative sovereignty of this Parliament by providing a proper statutory base for the family planning programme.

And, Sir, not one word of praise was given for our foreign policy, our mainly and vigorously pursued independent foreign policy in which we have not kept mum when those with whom we desire friendship have gone wrong.

Lately we have embarked upon the very exciting task of making peace with our neighbours because peace with us is an imperative necessity. Unless we reduce our defence expenditure on armaments and on the army we are not going to solve the problems of the poor people of this country. In pursuit of that noble objective we want to normalise relations with every neighbour of ours and even China which occupies a large chunk of our territory. And yet, while we were in the process

of normalising relations, when we found that they went wrong, we did not shut our mouth, unlike even the great Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, who shut his mouth when Hungary and later Czechoslovakia were attacked by our friends, the Russians. We have not kept mum even about the Americans. We have gone on record and we advised them about some of the things which they did in the international sphere. We have not succumbed to the pressures built up on us to sign the nuclear nonproliferation treaty. Even to our Russian friends for whom we have got the greatest gratitude and affection we have gently chided them for not having lived up to their obligation which they have recently undertaken, to observe the human rights in the shape of the Helsinki Accord of 1975. Even to them we have drilled into their ears that this is not something which would redound to their credit. Human rights will have to be respected.

And, Sir, if the President's speech does not mention a few facts, the few facts which we have not mentioned, are facts of which the Janata Party and the government should be proud.

For 11 long years Mrs. Gandhi did not ratify the UN covenants relating to civil, political rights and the economic and culture rights. After 11 years we have resurrected those covenants from the Government's Archives in which Mrs. Gandhi, not wedded to democratic ways and the way of respect for human rights, had put it. Our Government has ratified those covenants in this very month and yet our President did not mention this in his speech. If we have kept back facts they are facts which are flattering to us. But, Sir, not a single fact which is against our interest has been kept back from the people of this country. This shows our great confidence in the free way of our society, that our society is an open society, that the way we treat our citizens is a matter for everybody to come and look into, if they want to: we have nothing to conceal because we propose to conduct our affairs in a manner in which every

[Shri Ram Jethmalani]

civilised Government is supposed to conduct itself towards its own citizens.

Since I am talking of foreign policy, may I say one word about the amendment proposed by Shri Banatwalla in respect of Mr. Bhutto? I do not accept of the attitude of my own Prime Minister or my Foreign Minister when in bald terms they said that Mr. Bhutto's fate is a matter of no concern to us. Their final conclusion may be right, but let me say this to correct them for the future that the way a Government treats its own citizens is really and primarily a matter for that Government alone and the doctrines of Panch Sheel do require that we do not interfere with the internal affairs of others, but when a Government denies basic human rights to any citizen—whether that citizen is a criminal or whether he is an innocent person—it is the privilege, it is the right, it is the international duty of every civilised Government to make a pronouncement upon the fate of that unfortunate citizen.

Having said this, let me say this about those who are beating their breasts about Mr. Bhutto, I wonder how many of them have cared to read the 500 page long judgment of the Lahore High Court and how many of them have cared to read the four judge majority judgements and the three judge minority judgements. We shall not allow ourselves to be overtaken by what Shri Banatwalla called the popular feeling in this country. Shrimati Gandhi or Shri Banatwalla do not reflect the popular feeling of this country and I make bold to say that there is nothing in the political career of Shri Bhutto throughout his whole life which evokes or deserves either the gratitude or the respect of any right thinking Indian. More than once he masterminded invasion of this country and when our plane was hijacked, like a common street loafer, he presided at the burning of that plane in the streets of Lahore: he presided at that ceremony. He is one person who had a chance to usher back

democracy and the rule of law in his own country, but he did not do so; instead he continued the martial law regime. Some people who are today talking about Shri Bhutto unfortunately see common characteristics between Shri Bhutto and themselves and perhaps they are also having premonitions of the common fate which awaits them. Both he and Mrs. Gandhi, for examples have already landed themselves in jail by reason of their political misdeeds committed at a time when they wielded political power in the two countries.

The distinguished Shri Stephen talked of the social tension of which President, according to him, has made no mention. Let me say in one sentence that the tensions of which he speaks will not come to an end unless the Chief fountain-head of those tensions is politically liquidated and no longer struts like a peacock on the political stage of this country. When a plane of the Indian Airlines is hijacked from one city to another by our own citizens, a thing which has never happened before in the history of this country, if a crime like this and a great and atrocious crime like this is committed, and if a Leader of an Opposition Party gets up and says that this is an innocent prank, then why do you blame people if they consider the murder of some socially inferior people as some kind of sport in which they indulge? It is your attitude to crime which gives an impetus to crime and unless you get rid of that attitude to crime, you are not going to remove the social tensions that you talked about.

My friends talked of being lack of oneness in the country. The people of this country are one; it is only politicians, hungry for power, who seem to divide the people of this country. I have travelled in the South. I have encountered nothing but affection and respect whenever I have talked to the people in the South. It is politicians who seek to

drive a wedge, and it is politicians who wish to divide this country for their own nefarious political purposes and their political ends. And they will meet the Waterloo that they deserve; and the people of India shall survive and they shall survive as one single unified entity for the admiration of the whole world, and to the utter consternation of those politicians who think otherwise. It is true that there is some difficulty about the language problem; but I wish to say this, that the people in the South are not opposed to Hindi at all. People in the South want Hindi, but..

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN (Badagara): Who says so?

SHRI K. GOPAL (Karur): Who said it?

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: On the other hand, let me say to those of my friends who want Hindi to spread as the national language of the whole country, that a language, and a national language, grows upon the tongues of the people. It grows in the hearts of the people. It cannot be artificially manufactured in a linguistic laboratory and then pushed down the throats of other people. The less we talk about the spread of Hindi, the more speedily is it going to spread. I have no doubt that one day, if we stop talking about the spread of Hindi, it will come to occupy the rightful place—which belongs to that language.

My friend Mr. Stephen talked about smuggling and the growth in the volume of black money. Let me say this to him, that at the heyday, at the peak of smuggling, an expert committee reported that Rs. 500 crores worth of smuggling took place every year. And yet—I hope I am not betraying any official secret—recent investigations have disclosed that corrupt public servants, protected by the previous regime, have looted this country in one single transaction, in one single deal, of more foreign exchange than all the smugglers of

India put together could loot the country in one, whole year. The House may await with interest the results of these investigations which will cause surprise to those who are talking of smugglers, but do not talk of those great dacoits who have looted this country systematically for a long time.

One of the tensions that were talked, about, was the tension between the urban and the rural areas, and between industry and agriculture. Our Government believes that industry and agriculture, under the policy of our Government constitute the facets of a single economic unit; the city and the village can grow in economic inter-dependence alone; and the prosperity of one is the necessary condition for the prosperity of the other.

When I think of the kind of criticism, and the kind of critics which exist, of our Government—we are all for a strong Opposition and I have such great respect for the intellectual attainments and the lively imagination of these three distinguished gentlemen whom I have mentioned—I wish I could muster a little respect for their adherence to truth and to facts. The quality of their criticism—to criticize is easy, and to destroy is easier; but to construct something and to suggest a solution to the country's problems is much more difficult—convinces me that they act like a legless man who wants to teach others how to run. And it is critics like you who made the pope say, about all critics in general:

“Hot, envious, noisy, proud
the scribbling fry;
Burn, hiss and bounce,
waste paper, stink and die.”

That is true of my 3 learned friends who have just spoken.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think we will take up now, the Private Members' Business, although we have

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

still one minute to go. Mr. Gomango will now move the report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions.

15.29 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

TWENTY-SEVENTH REPORT

SHRI GIRIDHAR GUMANGO (Koraput): I beg to move:

"That this House do agree with the Twenty-seventh Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 21st February, 1979."

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That this House do agree with the Twenty-seventh Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 21st February 1979."

The motion was adopted:

SOIL CONSERVATION BILL*

SHRI D. D. DESAI (Kaira): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the protection of land resources against soil erosion, and for other purposes.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the protection of land resources against soil erosion, and for other purposes."

The motion was adopted:

SHRI D. D. DESAI: I introduce the Bill.

CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL*

(Amendment of Article 19)

SHRI SAUGATA ROY (Barrackpore): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India."

The motion was adopted:

SHRI SAUGATA ROY: I introduce the Bill.

PREVENTION OF BIGAMOUS MARRIAGES BILL*

श्री रामजी सिंह (भागलपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं प्रस्ताव करता हूँ कि द्विविवाह के निवारण का उपबन्ध करने वाले विधेयक को पुरः स्थापित करने की अनुमति दी जाये।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the prevention of bigamous marriage."

The motion was adopted:

श्री रामजी सिंह : मैं विधेयक को पुरः स्थापित करता हूँ।