

a State-to-State basis there could be no question of some individuals coming in and receiving any amount.

The transfer of this money to a numbered account in Switzerland was, it is said, for the benefit of four individuals including Hinduja Bros. and an Indian Politician of that time.

It is also said that in all deals between the STC and Iran in sugar, cement, etc., these people were involved. Similarly, they and their new partners are said to have been involved in big projects like the Kudremukh, and the construction of the new rail lines which are being discussed between India and Iran.

It may also be recalled that it was reported that a telex message was sent by the Ministry of Foreign Trade during the previous regime to the Indian Embassy in Iran directing them to stop negotiations with other parties for the sale of cement and sugar and thenceforward to channelise such activities through the Hinduja Bros. The said Telex message must be laid on the Table of the House and the Government should also give the names of all the deals in which this party was involved directly or indirectly, as commission agents or as principals (buyers and sellers) with any Government company.

And most important of all, the Government should inform the House about the nature of the transfer of 10-11 million dollars to the Swiss Bank, about the party to which it was transferred and their findings in respect of the manner in which the Ministry of External Affairs was involved in it.

I wish the Minister of External Affairs were present. He told me that he had some other engagement but probably the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs will throw some light on it.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND LABOUR (SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA): At the moment the hon. Minister of External Affairs has some meeting with the Soviet Delegation. What the hon. Member Shri Shaymanandan Mishra has said will certainly be brought to his attention.

14.48 hrs.

MOTION OF THANKS ON THE PRESIDENTS ADDRESS—Contd.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The House will now continue its debate on the motion of thanks. Dr. B. N. Singh will resume his speech.

श्री फूल चन्द वर्मा (शाजापुर) :
अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं ने श्री नियम 377 के अन्तर्गत एक नोटिस परतों दिया था। मुझसे कहा गया था कि विचार कर रहे हैं।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय याचकी परवीजन नहीं दी गयी है।

श्री फूल चन्द वर्मा : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह सेन्ट्रल हाल का मामला है। एक व्यक्ति नऊका एम०एच०ए० बन कर आ गया था।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Matters which had been permitted, I had allowed.

DR. B. N. SINGH: (Hazaribagh): Yesterday while I was supporting the motion of thanks, I welcomed the Government's action in giving the country in record time freedom from abject slavery and terrible humiliation and Draculian terror that people had suffered during the nightmarish days of the Emergency and at the same time I pointed out that I could not understand or appreciate the sudden change in the thinking of the government which is now prepared to concede qualified respectability to the acts of the previous govt. which in

[Dr. B. N. Singh]

unequivocal terms it had stated as unmitigated evil. It is a somersault in the thinking of the government and this difference between precept and practice has put the people in a dilemma. If it is considered necessary that preventive detention laws should be there in the country and that ordinary laws cannot cope with the situation, the government should take the people into confidence and give cogent reasons for it before introducing any such legislation in the House.

Now I start from where I stopped yesterday. I would like to bring to the notice of the Government is a very important thing and that is regarding the economic emancipation of the suffering millions in rural India.

Political freedom and Democracy would become meaningless unless the Government can provide them with economic succour, jobs to the jobless and food to the hungry. The 'Garibi Hatao' slogan which yielded rich dividends to Indiraji during 1971-72 Election was the greatest fraud, in my opinion, played on the illiterate, innocent poor of the country, before whom Indiraji was painted by her sycophants as the greatest Messiah of the downtrodden. It is a shame that even our Gods and Goddesses were insulted when her courtiers equated her with Goddess Durga. What was the result? The percentage of persons living below the poverty line increased from 40 to 68 per cent during her so called progressive socialistic regime. It is these crores and crores of persons who need the immediate attention of the Government. For them liberty without food will be a cruel joke. It is a downright insult. We have promised to wipe out poverty and destitution in the next ten years. It is good that our Prime Minister and other Cabinet Ministers have been repeating this promise of eradicating poverty and unemployment in the next ten years. But how it is going to be achieved has not yet been clearly spelt out. Only broad outline

speeches are being made by the Ministers. It is a gigantic problem. One year out of the ten precious years given to us has passed and we are still in the planning stage. And the people do not know how this laudable objective is to be achieved. In my opinion, Sir, the Government should fix performance targets for itself and take the people into confidence and tell them how they wish to tackle this great problem yearwise. At the end of each year a review should be made of the achievements and failures and the shortcomings should be removed in the coming year alongwith the target fixed for that year. This is the only way we can convince the people of our honesty of purpose and remove the suspicion and frustration which has taken deep roots on account of being continuously fed on false promises during the last decade.

I come from a region where more than 82 per cent of the people live below the poverty line. This is the plateau region in the southern-most part of Bihar known as Chotanagpur and Santhal Parganas, which is, by and large, inhabited by Adivasis, Harijans and backward classes. Perhaps this is the poorest region of India though paradoxically the richest.

Chotanagpur is endowed with all the bounties of nature. 41 per cent of the mineral wealth of the country comes from this region. 87 per cent of the total reserves of rich coking coal and 25 per cent of the iron ore deposits are found in this area. Apart from this, this region abounds in other minerals and has an abundance of forest wealth. Is it not an irony of fate that the people of such a rich area continue to hovel in poverty? When our President visited Bokaro the other day, he said, in a periphery of 25 miles from this big industrial town, the area must be developed so that the people's economic conditions are improved and they are given employment. Precious little has been achieved in the last 36 years. The reason for this anomaly is not far to

seek. It is fully explained in the Thakkar Tribal Subcommittee's final report to the government dated as far back as 25th September 1947. The enigma has been fully exposed. I quote:

"The striking feature of this area is the feeling common among educated tribals and shared by non-tribals in considerable measure that Chotanagpur has little share in the administration commensurate with its area and is being neglected by the government, which is made up of elements interested mostly in the rest of Bihar... The extreme expression of discontent prevalent in Chotanagpur in the separatist movement which demands the formation of a new province of Jharkand... Unmistakably also the movement is gaining sympathy among the non-aboriginals... The separatist movement seems to be gaining strength as a symptom of discontent which is simmering, among all sections of the Chotanagpur population."

What was said more than 30 years ago is more fully relevant today. What was simmering then has developed into a burning and raging problem today. The feeling of agony, discontent and even anger at the continuing process of invidious discrimination has forced the people to forcefully press for their inherent and inalienable right of self-determination. Today there is near unanimity among all the elected legislators coming from this region including the Members of Parliament and Ministers from this area in forcefully voicing the demand of the people for a separate State of Chotanagpur and Santhal Parganas, in which alone lies their salvation. To pacify the upsurge of the people the Bihar Government, a few years ago, established the Chotanagpur and Santhal Parganas Autonomous Development Authority. The people soon realised that it was only an eye-wash at best a publicity rattle, in name only autonomous authority but in essence a

consultative committee, whose suggestions were more spurned at than accepted. Therefore, they rejected this autonomous authority. Things today continue to be the same and the strings of this autonomous authority are controlled and pulled from Patna. When Haryana, Punjab, Himachal Pradesh, Kerala, Nagaland, Tripura, Meghalaya and Sikkim can become viable States of the Union of India, Chotanagpur and Santhal Parganas cannot lag behind in viability. Given statehood, it promises successfully to compete with the leading States of the Union of India. The Founder of the Janata Party, Lok Nayak Jayaprakash Narayan and the great political maharishi, Dada Kripalani, have given their blessings. They want smaller States for better development and closer contact of the people with their ministers and also so that the indigenous genius may be pushed forward, which has been suppressed all these days.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: His time is up.

DR. B. N. SINGH: You are ringing the bell like Lady Macbeth, I feel nervous!

15 hrs

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Last time also you have taken some time.

DR. B. N. SINGH: My hon. colleague, Shri Dhanik Lal Mandal, in his recent tour of Chotanagpur felt the pulse of the people and in essence has accepted the demand for a separate State of Chotanagpur and Santhal Parganas. He said at a public meeting at Chandwa on the 15th January, 1978 as follows:

"I am not opposed to the idea of creation of a separate State for Chotanagpur and Santhal Parganas, though the idea could not be given shape at present due to various national problems being faced by the Central Government."

[Dr. B. N. Singh]

Our leaders are heard often repeating the words "Emotional Integration of India." This emotional integration cannot be achieved by merely chanting it as a political slogan or shibboleth. It requires for its basic fulfilment a realistic approach to things and a rational synthesis of the sentiments, aspirations and interests, economic and political, consistent with the integrity of India.

The Janata Party in its Charter to the people says, and I quote from the manifesto:

"A high degree of centralisation of power is inconsistent with democracy. The Party, therefore, believes in a polity that ensures decentralisation of economic and political power. This is essential for maximisation of individual initiative and popular participation in development and administration."

Government of and by the people can have no meaning if a population of nearly one-and-a-half crores of persons spread over an area of 70,638 square kilometres, having the wherewithal are denied their right of self-determination.

The recent result of the elections are a pointer that no Government, no party, smug in the feelings of popularity can suppress the feelings of the people. If it does so, it does at its peril. Therefore, I shall be failing in my duty if I do not make a fervent appeal to the Government to take appropriate steps under Article 3 of our Constitution in deference to the wishes and sentiments of such a large segment of people. Thank you.

SHRI DAJIBA DESAI (Kolhapur):
Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to make my observations before the House. The President's speech can be divided into three parts. The first 8 paragraphs deal with the restoration

of freedom. Next, paragraph 10 deals with Commissions and Committees. Paragraphs 20 and 21 deal with Family Welfare and Prohibition and paragraphs 22 to 27 deal with foreign affairs. When go through the Address, I find that the Government has taken no decision on any item of Government activity. Therefore, I can quote from the speech that they have appointed a Commission, that is, the National Police Commission, to deal with law and order or police administration. Then the Government has appointed the Minorities Commission, the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Commission and Backward Classes Commission. Para 13 says that the planning so far done was not correct and so a new plan is being thought of. In para 16 it is said that a committee has been constituted to study comprehensively the entire system of controls and make recommendations to reduce and streamline them. Para 17 talks of industrial unrest and says that a study group has been appointed to examine this difficult subject. In para 18 it is stated:

"My Government attaches great importance to the need of overhauling the educational system with a view to meeting the challenge of development as well as providing opportunities of public service to the students. The problem of illiteracy on such a large scale as prevails also requires to be given priority attention. We have thus to think of educational policies in terms of not only academic, but also adult education. In fact, if the country is to make accelerated progress towards the goal we have set before it, the spread of literacy on mass scale is indispensable. Various avenues of consultation with educational authorities have been explored by the Ministry of Education and as a result guidelines in respect of different fields of education, namely, university education, secondary education and primary

and adult education have been prepared and enhanced provision is being made in the Central and State plans."

It talks only about Committees and Commissions. Actually, the President's Address is supposed to give or indicate the policy and activities of the Government. According to this Address, the Government have only appointed Committees and done nothing else, especially in the field of education. Now the Government is thinking of consulting the educational authorities. May I say that education is a subject which deals with a vast population, not only students but also parents, teachers, public and private institutions? They are all concerned with education, but Government has not taken any steps to consult those people.

During the 1977 elections the Janata Party gave an assurance to the people, especially to the cultivators, that they will give a remunerative price for the agricultural products. Now after 12 months of thinking, consultation and other things, they have not come forward with any proposal for giving a remunerative price to the agricultural community. They are telling the people always that agriculture would be given the top place. They seem to think that by merely providing the inputs the agricultural production will increase. It is not so. Agricultural production is directly related to the prices fixed for the agricultural produce, and yet Government have nothing to say in regard to that.

During the last four or five years the prices of agricultural commodities have been continuously going down. At the same time, the price of inputs like manure and seeds has gone up. There is also great disparity between agricultural prices and industrial prices. In fact, the gap is widening day by day and year by

year. Unless the Government devise an agricultural price policy and give top priority to that, the problem of agricultural production cannot be solved.

Then I come to the question of borders between Maharashtra and Karnataka. Perhaps Members may know, though some Members are new here, that the dispute between Maharashtra and Karnataka started as a result of the reorganisation of States in 1956. As a result of reorganisation, the two States of Karnataka and Maharashtra were formed on the basis of language, but the Marathi population in the three districts of Belgaum, Karwar and Bidar constituting nearly ten lakhs of people have been forced to stay in Karnataka. There have been agitations etc., and all democratic processes have been gone though, but still the Central Government has not taken any decision. The previous Government had assured Parliament that before the 1977 elections the problem would be solved, but that Government also did nothing, they did not solve the problem. Now it is for the Janata Government to solve it.

The problem is quite typical. The Central Government's position up till now has been that the two States should come together and have a compromise. But this is not a question of a territorial dispute. It is a humanitarian question concerning ten lakhs of people having their democratic wish fulfilled. They are Marathi people living in an area contiguous to Maharashtra. Therefore, they should be included in Maharashtra. Actually, the remarks made by the Prime Minister in the election tour have created many misunderstandings in the minds of the people, and we find that in the Assembly elections the Maharashtra Ekikaran Samiti has won all the five seats that it contested. So, I request the Janata Government and the Prime Minister to take the initiative at least now.

[Shri Dajiba Desai]

Under the Constitution it is the responsibility of the Centre, it is not the responsibility of the States, and the Centre must evolve a formula, the formula that was applied in the Punjab-Haryana and Andhra-Madras cases, taking the village as the unit. That is the only formula which has been accepted by four States in the country. So, I will urge upon the Government to work on a decision on the basis of that formula and take a democratic decision.

SHRI K. B. CHETRI (Darjeeling): As a matter of fact, there is nothing of a rosy picture in the President's Address, there is not much worth noting and worth praising. The President puts it on record that in these eleven months' tenure of the multi-coloured party, the commissions constituted to enquire into the excesses of the emergency are engaged in a great task. I do not actually know what this great task is. It may be productive, unproductive or counter-productive. But the President has nowhere mentioned the fast deterioration of the law and order situation in the country and the mass killings of Harijans, industrial workers, plantation workers and innocent men and women, and the rise of crime and what not.

Even the hill areas, where the people are peace-loving, have not been spared. Recently in the district of Darjeeling eight tea garden workers were murdered by nearly 200 workers of the tea gardens alleged to be workers belonging to the CPI (M) at Sambiam Tea Estate.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Jadavpur): On a point of order. This matter is being looked into. This is a law and order issue of the State Government. It is not within the jurisdiction of the Central Government. Therefore, Sir, apart from strongly disputing this allegation, it is not a fit forum where this could be raised.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

SHRI K. B. CHHETRI: I made a personal and on the spot inquiry and found that 8 workers were brutally butchered by lathies, khukris, lethal weapons by the alleged workers of CPM. They picked up two workers, threw them into the running machines, killing one of them instantly and the other half-dead. So far, 13 persons have been arrested but the main culprits are still absconding. The West Bengal Government has not acceded to the hill people's demand to institute a judicial inquiry. We do not have faith in the local police and CID investigations as CID has completely failed to bring to book the culprits involved in one of the murder cases of Shri K. B. Lopchan, one of the most popular persons of Kalimpong town and the General Secretary of the District Congress Committee, Darjeeling, Shri Jyoti Basu, the Chief Minister of West Bengal, could institute a judicial inquiry in the case of a student belonging to the Student Front of the CPM, who was hurt in the lathi charge by Police in Calcutta recently, but he could not institute a judicial inquiry into such inhuman murders of tea garden workers belonging to the Congress Party when all the people of the hill areas including men, women and everybody insisted on a judicial probe. This murder case has become one of the blackest spots in the history of the left front Government of West Bengal. The hill people of Darjeeling do not feel secure under the present left front Government. I would like to urge upon the Central Government to kindly inquire into the matter and have a central probe in this connection so that the people there will be very much satisfied. The Union Home Ministry has also a great responsibility under the Constitution of India. The Constitution provides that it is the Union Home Ministry which is the custodian of the general law and order of the country. If any State fails to maintain law and order,

it enable, the Central Government to take action. Accordingly, the Central Government has to think in the matter seriously and take prompt action.

It is really surprising that on the one hand, Shri Jyoti Basu, the Chief Minister of West Bengal, is crying for more powers from the Central Government, on the other hand, when law and order is the State subject and he is all in all in the State, he is himself utilising his power according to the sweet will of his party. I do not have any objection to a national debate on the Centre-State relations as far as financial powers are concerned. But I am strongly of the opinion that the power pertaining to law and order situation should also be discussed and, if required, curtailed by bringing forward an amendment to the Constitution.

I am glad that the Minorities Commission has been set up by the present Government. But setting up of only a Minorities Commission will not be of much help if the enforcement of Constitutional safeguards is ignored. A Commission which has no legal or constitutional sanctity will not be of any help in protecting and giving justice to the minorities. The Government should recognise Nepali people of India as a minority class.

The Nepali people of India have settled all over the country. Their aspirations have been ignored to a great extent. There is a constant demand to include Nepali language in the 8th Schedule of the Constitution. But with the emergence of Sikkim as the twenty second State, mainly with the help and cooperation of the Nepali people, the importance of Nepali language is left by everyone. But when the delegation of All-India Nepali Bhasha Samiti met the Prime Minister recently, according to the members of the Delegation, it is really surprising and shocking that they were not treated well. They were treated shabbily. As Indian

citizens, we have every right to fight for the cause of our language. How can the Prime Minister say, "I will de-recognise Nepali language from the Sahitya Academy" when it has already been recognised by the Sahitya Academy? There is not a single house from where the Nepali people have not joined the army. Can the Prime Minister say, "I will ban the entry of Nepali people of India to the Indian Army, the Navy and the Air Force" if they insist on the inclusion of Nepali language in the 8th Schedule? We are not beggars. We are Indian citizens. The Constitution has provided us safeguards. We have a fundamental right to demand the inclusion of Nepali language in the 8th Schedule of the Constitution. It is upto the Government to accept or not to accede to our demand. But the Prime Minister cannot say, "If you demand such and such a thing, I will withdraw some other facilities"? In no country, no sane Prime Minister can talk like that. This is very fantastic and a very unfortunate thing.

We can go on demanding for our rights as Indian citizens. No Government is permanent; no Prime Minister is permanent. The time will come when not only Nepali, Manipuri, Dogri, Konkoni but all languages recognised by the Sahitya Academy would have to be placed in the 8th Schedule. Language has become a very delicate issue. As such, the 8th schedule of the Constitution has also to be a complex one. If you do not want to recognise other languages, if you do not want to place other languages in the 8th schedule, why don't you scrap the 8th Schedule of the Constitution? Then there will be no headache at all.

I would like to speak a little bit about Sikkim which is a new-born State. It is just a child but it is a completely spoiled child now. It is a fact that during the regime of the Chogyal, the former ruler, there was no democracy there and the Nepali

[Shri K. B. Chhetri]

people who were in a majority had to face a great deal of trouble in exercising their franchise because the Chogyal had introduced the parity system of voting, that is, 50 per cent for Nepali people and 50 per cent for the rest whereas we are more than 70 per cent of the population there. In support of this, I would like to mention a few figures. According to the Gazetteer of Sikkim 1894, p. 27, out of the total population of 30,458, the Nepali speaking people constitute more than 19,000. That means, 84 years ago, the Nepali population in Sikkim was more than 60 per cent. Again, according to the Darjeeling Gazetteer of 1947, the Nepali population in Sikkim is 77 per cent of the total population. Mr. V. H. Goelho, a former political officer in Sikkim states that "of the present total population of 180,000, the Nepali people are 72 per cent." All this amply proves the long historical background of the Nepali people which is very much misunderstood by the Indian Government.

In Sikkim, there are Biharis, Punjabis and others, also but nobody is allowed to contest the election.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: The Government of West Bengal has passed a resolution that Nepalese should be included in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution. I have given a Bill for amending the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution to include Nepalese in the Eighth Schedule.

SHRI K. B. CHHETRI: The Government of West Bengal has adopted a resolution that Nepalese should be included in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution. In the Constitution of India, nowhere it is mentioned that 50 per cent or 80 per cent of the seats should be for a certain community. So, it is very fantastic. This parity system must be scrapped.

The other thing is that there is rampant corruption in Sikkim: lot of alle-

gations are there against the Government of Sikkim, so many representations have come to the Home Minister and the Prime Minister. There is no commission constituted against them. So, a commission should be constituted against the Government of Sikkim, against the Kazi himself. You have to satisfy the people. Otherwise, if you do not scrap this parity system, if you do not stop this rampant corruption in Sikkim, then I say you will be directly or indirectly creating a second Mizoram in the East. So, I would request the Home Minister to be very cautious about Sikkim which is a spoiled child of India. I have nothing to say much about it. I am very thankful to you for giving me this opportunity to say a few words about Sikkim.

I am sure, this Janata Government which has not brought any electoral reforms till today, has not brought any Anti-Defection Bill, will come forward with more progressive bills. There is already a warning bell for them and they will realise all these mistakes that they are committing.

श्री अब्दुल अहमद वकील (बारामुला)

जनाब डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, गुजस्ता तीन रोज से हम रा'द्रपति जम्हरिया के एड्रेस पर बहस कर रहे है। इस बहस में अहम नुक्कत उबारे गये है कांग्रेस की तरफ से, जनता पार्टी की तरफ से और दूसरे मुस्तलिफ छोटे छोटे ग्रुम की तरफ से। मैं दियानतदारी से इस मुकद्दस एवान में मुल्क के बहतरीन मुस्तकिल में चन्द बातें अर्ज करना चाहता हूं और मुझे उम्मीद है कि वर वक्त उन बातों की तरफ संजीदगी से गौर किया जाएगा।

मरकज और रियासतों के दरम्यान अखत्या-रात की हद्द मुक'र करने के मिलसिले में काफी कुछ कहा गया है और जनता पार्टी की तरफ से कुछ ऐसे इशारात भी सामने आए है कि यह स्टटर स्टट रिलेशंज का मसला चन्द एक मखसूस भादमियों की तखलीक है।

हकीकत यह नहीं है। प्रगर्भ रियासत जम्मू और कश्मीर की कानूनी और आईटी हैसियत भारत के आईन के अन्दर एक मखसूस दफा के तहत बजह की गई है लेकिन मुझे इस मुकद्दस एवान में यह कहने में जरा भी हिच-किचाहट नहीं है कि मरकज में कांग्रेसी हुकूमत और रियासत में कांग्रेसी हुकूमत के दोरे इकतदार में दफा 370 को मफलूज कर रख दिया गया था। उसको बेकार बना दिया गया है। और वक्त आने पर खुद कांग्रेसी हुकूमत ने यह तस्लीम किया कि 1975 में श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी और शेख साहब के दामियान अकोर्ड हुआ तो यह बात तस्लीम की गई कि कुछ हालात, कुछ कवानीन ऐसे बजा किये गये हैं जिन्होंने दफा 370 की बुनियाद को नुकसान पहुंचाया है। और यह अख्तियार कश्मीर की एसेम्बली को दिया गया कि जो कोई कानून दफा 377 के खिलाफ बनाया गया हो मरकजी हुकूमत उसको दुरुस्त करने में रियासते जम्मू कश्मीर के लोगों की ख्वाहिश की मुकद्दम रखेगी और उस पर अमल करेगी। उसी रिस्ट्रेट के तहत शेख साहब ने आवाज मिलाई कि सेन्टर स्टेट रिलेशन्स अजसरे नों देखे जायें और सियासी मामलात को बहस और तमहीज के जरिए हल किया जाय और इस उसूल के मुताबिक एक फ़ॉर्मूला बजा किया जा सकता है। अगर हम बुनियादी तौर पर देखें हम जिसआईन की कसम खाते हैं वह आईन भी बहस और तमहीज का ही नतीजा है, फ़ोर्स और दबाव का नतीजा नहीं है, बल्कि बाहमी डिस्कशन का नतीजा है, और मुल्क के हर हिस्से के नुमाइन्दे ने उस आईन को बनाने में अपना हिस्सा अदा किया है। अगर आपकी रियासतें मफलूज और कमजोर है तो पूरा हिन्दुस्तान कमजोर रहेगा। अगर किसी रियासत में पूरे 30 साल में दबाव और सक्ती से अख्तियारात कम किये गये हैं तो इससे तमाम हिन्दुस्तान को कमजोर किया गया है। इसी जज्बे के तहत हमने इस आवाज में यह आवाज मिलाई कि मरकज

और रियासतों के अख्तियारात के हुद्द को अजसरे नों मरसब किया जाये ताकि रियासतों और मरकज के दामियान एक खुशब गवार और तामीरी रिशता कायम हो। लिहाजा हमारी ख्वाहिश है और नेशनल कानफ़रेंस इस पर एतमाद रखती है कि हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर तमाम रियासतों और मरकज के रिशते को अजसरे नों तरदीब दी जाये और जहां जरूरत हो आईन में तरमीम की जायें।

15.32 hrs.

[SHRI DHIRENDRANATH BASU in the Chair]

मेरे ख्याल में इससे बड़ी खिदमत हिन्दुस्तान की और कोई नहीं हो सकती है। और इशूज की पोसपोन करने से कोई मसला हल नहीं होता है, बल्कि इशूज को ग्रैमिल करने से, उन पर सोचने से वह हल किये जा सकते हैं। मेरे दोस्त मेरे यह अल्फ़ाज कांग्रेसी भाई महसूस नहीं करेंगे, गुज्रिश्ता 30 साल उन्होंने हुकूमत की, और चार साल के अन्दर जो नेशनल इशूज उनके सामने आयें उन्हे-उन्होंने ताकत के बल पर हल करना चाहा। अंजाम आपने गुज्रिश्ता इलेक्शन में देख लिया। और आज वह अपना सर पीट रहे हैं कि क्या हुआ। अगर बलवक्त उन्होंने इशूज को मिल बैठ कर तय किया होता तो नतीजा कुछ मुश्तलिफ़ ही होता जो आज हमारे सामने है। उन इशूज की नेशनल इंटेरेस्ट के तहत हल किया जाता तो पोजीशन दूसरी होती। आज वह कहें भले ही, लेकिन उनके अख्तियार में नहीं है। लेकिन एक बात की हम इस एवान में यह कसम खायें, यह कोई फिरके-दारियत की बात नहीं है, अगर मैं कहूँ मरकज और रियासतों के अख्तियारात के हुद्द को अजसरे नों मरसब किया जाये तो एक खुशगवार माहौल पैदा होगा और इससे मुल्क की तरक्की और इत्तहाद आमने आयेगा। और ऐसा हो सकता है क्योंकि आपका

[श्री अब्दुल ग़हद बक़ील]

भाईन यह इजाजत देता है कि इसमें तरमीम हो। यह कोई आसमानी किताब नहीं है, बल्कि हमने बनायी है। 30 साल के वह निशानात और खतूत जो आपने मुरतब किये है, 30 साल में जब इन्सान हूदे इतिहा को पहुंच चुका है, जब सोसाइटी कई मनाजिल तय कर चुकी है, तब वह 30 साल का फ़लसफ़ा आज नहीं चल सकता है। इसलिये मेरी जनता पार्टी और कांग्रेस पार्टी के रहनुमाओं से दख़्वास्त है कि इस मसले को एक सियासी ममला बनाने के बजाय एक कौमी ममला समझ कर नेशनल इंटरैस्ट में सोचें कि रियासतों को जिन्दा रहने का हक़ है, और उसी से मरकज़ भी जिन्दा है। अगर निरयासतें टूट गईं, कमज़ोर हो गईं, मफ़नूज़ हों गईं तो आपका मरकज़ कितना भी मज़बूत क्यों न हो, वह मज़बूत मरकज़ नहीं कहा जा सकता है। लिहाज़ा इसी ज़बे के तहत शेख़ साहब ने इस आवाज़ के साथ अपनी आवाज़ मिलाई है। मुझे अफ़सोस है कि उस जानिब से शेख़ साहब के इन ख़यालात का ग़लत समझा गया और उसमें पोलिटिक्स लाई गई। ऐसी बात नहीं है। शेख़ साहब उन रहनुमाओं में से है जिन्होंने 50 साल अग्नी जिन्दगी के मुल्क की ख़िदमत में लगाय। यह वह मरक़स है जिसने कश्मीर में हिन्दू मुसलमान-सिख़ इतहाद का झंडा खड़ा किया और जब पूरे हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान में दीवानगी के आलम में इन्सान इन्सान को मारता था।

आज कोई अपनी मसलाहातों के तहत, अपने मक़ासद को हासिल करने के लिये, ख़तनूदी को हासिल करने के लिये कश्मीर के रहनुमा या कश्मीर के आवास को यह कहे कि वह बागी है, फिरकापरस्त है, तारीख़ जिसको ग़लत साबित कर चुकी है, तो तारीख़ उसको अरुद सबक़ सिखायेगी।

यह मेरी मुझदवाना गुज़ारिश है, यहाँ हमारे एक बज़ीर बैठे हुए हैं, वह मेरे तामुरात हुकूमत को पहुंचा दें, कि मामलात को सब मिलकर हल करें।

शेख़ अब्दुल्ला एक स्टेट के चीफ़ मिनिस्टर है, ज्योति बसु भी एक स्टेट के चीफ़ मिनिस्टर हैं, प्रकाश सिंह बादल भी एक स्टेट के चीफ़ मिनिस्टर हैं, तमिलनाडु का चीफ़ मिनिस्टर भी आपके एक वसी हिस्से का चीफ़ मिनिस्टर है, आप इनकी और इनके कांस्टीट्यूट्स की राय को ताकत के बल पर मुस्तरत नहीं कर सकते, और अगर आपने ऐसा किया तो इसके जो खतरानाक नतीज बरामद होंगे, उसकी तमाम जिम्मेदारी उन लोगों पर होगी, जनके हाथ में इस वक्त यह हुकूमत है, और जो मुस्तक़बिल का फैसला होगा वह वही होगा जो कांग्रेस का है।

लिहाज़ा यही गुज़ारिश है, खासकर जब हम यह कहते हैं कि पाकिस्तान के साथ काश्मीर के बारे में बात हो तो हमें पूछा जाये, क्यों कि मैं चाहता हूँ कि पार्लियामेंट का एक वसीअ डेलीगेशन काश्मीर आये और देख ले कि हम किस मुसीबत में पड़े हैं। पूरा काश्मीर का एक तिहाई हिस्सा पाकिस्तान की जानिब है और 2/3 हिस्सा हमारे जानिब है। 3 झंडे वहाँ हैं, तीन बार लड़ाई लड़ी गई। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप तशरीफ़ लायें, पूरी पार्लियामेंट तशरीफ़ लाये और अपनी आंखों से देखे कि हमारे बदकिस्मत लोग जो बार्डर पर रहते हैं, मकान उनका पाकिस्तान में हैं और ज़मीन हिन्दुस्तान में है, सन उनका पाकिस्तान में है और बेटी हिन्दुस्तान में है, उनकी क्या हालत है।

हम जब यह कहते हैं कि पाकिस्तान वालों के साथ बातचीत करनी हो तो हमसे भी पूछा जाये, वह इसीलिये कि जिसको कुछ घटा हो वही जानता है।

हम यह नहीं कहते हैं कि सेंटर का प्रख्यार नहीं, कांस्टीट्यूशन हमें यह प्रख्यार देता है। प्रिंजीडेंशल आर्डर, 1954 को पढ़ लीजिये, उसमें यह है कि रियासते जम्मू-काश्मीर के नाम को तबदील करना; या उसके किसी हिस्से को किसी के सुपुर्द करना आपके हृदे-प्रख्यार की बात नहीं है। वह तो उसी वक्त करा सकते हैं जबकि काश्मीर के लोगों की मंजूरी हासिल हो। कानून और आईन एक तरफ़ है, लेकिन कम से कम हम इस देश के रहने वाले इन्सान तो हैं। जब हम यह कहते हैं कि पाकिस्तान के साथ बात हो, तो उस से यह मतलब नहीं लेना चाहिए कि हम हिन्दुस्तान के खिलाफ़ हैं। इस वक्त हमें पूरी इत्तिलाआत है—और यह सही है—कि उस जानिद जो जो हमारा हिस्सा है, वहां के रहनुमा तड़प रहे हैं कि हम यहां के अपने भाईयों के साथ मिल जाये। लेकिन इस में कौन सी रुकावट है? इस में सियासत मुजमर है, जो हमें नजदीक आने से रोकती है। एक हौवा खड़ा किया जाता है। अगर मुसलमान बात करे, तो उसे पाकिस्तानी कहा जाता है। अगर हिन्दू बात करे, तो उसे जनसंघो कहा जाता है। हम इस मुल्क के रहने वाले लोग हैं। अगर हम बात न करें, तो और कौन करेगा?

लेकिन मुझे अफ़सोस है उस जहूनियत पर, उन खयालात पर, जिन का यहां इजहार किया गया। जब हम यह कहते हैं कि काश्मीर का मुसला हमारी मर्जी से, हमसे पूछ कर, तय किया जाये, तब हमारा मतलब यह नहीं है कि मरकजी हुकमत को इस का प्रख्यार नहीं है। हम ने तो हाथ जोड़ कर, खुशी से, खले दिल से और कांशसली इस मुल्क के साथ रिश्ता जोड़ा है। इस लिए नहीं कि हिन्दुस्तान बड़ा देश है, बल्कि इस लिए कि यहां आदर्शी और उसूलों की हम-आहंगी है। लेकिन कुछ लोग रद्दे-अमल जाने बग़ैर गीएकशन पहचाने बग़ैर ऐसे खयालात का

इजहार करते हैं, जिससे काश्मीर और हिन्दुस्तान के दरमियान गलतफ़हमी पैदा होती है।

कांग्रेस के दौरे हुकमत में ऐसे हालात पैदा हुए, जब काश्मीर के रहनुमाओं और मरकज के दरमियान काफ़ी टकराव हुआ। लेकिन वह वेस्टिड इन्ट्रेस्ट्स का काम था। इसमें फ़ायदा किस का है? हमारे दुश्मनों का फ़ायदा है। इस लिए मेरी मुआदिवाना गुज़ारिश है कि जब कभी भी हम बात करें, तो जिम्मेदारी से करें, और ऐसे हालात को कतअन न पैदा होने दें, जिससे मुल्क और कौम का नुकसान हो। जिन को आप दोस्त बनाना चाहते हैं, उन्हें आप कुव्वत ताकत या फ़ौज से दोस्त नहीं बना सकते। आप उन को समझा कर, उन से मिल कर ही उन्हें दोस्त बना सकते हैं। इस लिए आप उन से मिलिये।

पाकिस्तान के कब्जे में जो हिस्सा है, वह हमारे आईन के मुताबिक काश्मीर का हिस्सा है। आप ने वह हिस्सा तर्क नहीं किया है। हमारे आईन के मुताबिक वह हिस्सा हमारा है और वहां के रहने वाले हमारी स्टेट के सबजेक्ट्स हैं जिन के लिए हमारी एसेम्बली में 25 सीटें मुकरर हैं। अगर आप हमसे पूछे बग़ैर इस बारे में कोई फ़ैसला करना चाहते हैं, तो सवाल यह है कि और यू पीओइंग टु डिसपोज़ आफ़ दंट टेरिटरी; इफ़ सो, अगेंस्ट वाट एंड टु हूम? ऐसे मामलात सियासी सतह पर ही निपटाये जा सकते हैं। श्री मोरारजी देसाई, उन के रफ़ीकों और उन की पार्टी के मेम्बरान से मेरी वह गुज़ारिश है कि वे मामलात को पोस्टपोन न करें, मामलात को तबालत में न डालें, बल्कि उन्हें निपटायें। हर रफ़ीक और दोस्त से, इस मुल्क हे हर रहनुमा से मिल बैठ कर वे यह तय करें कि मुल्क का मुस्तकबिल कैसे बेहतर हो सकता है।

मुझे यह कहने में ख़रा भी शर्म नहीं है कि हमारी स्टेट्स का दर्जा म्युनिसिपैलिटीज

[श्री अब्दुल अहद बकील]

से भी बहतर था। दिल्ली से तार हिलता था और चीफ़ मिनिस्टर डिसमिस होता था, या चीफ़ मिनिस्टर एपायंट होता था में मुबारकबाद देता हूँ कि गुजरात इलेक्शन ने इस मुल्क में एक प्राइमेटिव पोलिटिकल एटमास्फियर पैदा किया। उस को फ़ालो अप और मेनटेन करने की जरूरत है। कुछ लोग यह कहते हैं कि हम बात नहीं करेंगे, उस से यह एटमास्फियर डेस्ट्रॉय होता है। इस का नतीजा यह है कि जनता पार्टी इज इन डेजर। जनता का फ़ैसला आप के खिलाफ़ है।

Janata will remain but the Janata Party will go.

यह आप के लिये तम्बीह है। यह कुर्सी बफा किसी के साथ नहीं देगी। इकतदार बफा नहीं करता। आप के अक्ल क्या हैं वह तारीखी नोट पर है।

सेकेंड प्वाइंट—आप की मुकद्दम तरीन माइनारिटीज हैं। मैं यह इम अन्दाज में नहीं पेश करना चाहता हूँ कि मैं कम्पूनल हूँ; हम ने वक्त वक्त पर दिखा दिया है 1947 आज तक एक एक काश्मीरी ने—नाहें वह हिन्दू कम्पूनलिस्ट हो, मुसलमान कम्पूनलिस्ट हो, हम उसके खिलाफ खड़े हुए हैं लेकिन मुझे यह कहने में जरा भी झिझक नहीं आती है कि जब से हिन्दुस्तान आजाद हुआ है, आप अन्दाज कर लीजिए आप ने माइनारिटीज के बफा के लिए क्या किया है? शायद कांग्रेस वाले अब यह कहे कि हम हुकूमत में नहीं हैं। मैं जनता पार्टी के रहनुमाओं से अपील करूंगा कि वह एक वाइट पेपर निकाले कि गुजरात तीस साल में हिन्दुस्तान में माइनारिटीज के लिये क्या किया गया। क्या उन में हिम्मत है? . . . (अ्यबधान) . . . कहे आप कुछ नहीं किया। यह कहे कि कहां कहां फसादात हुए?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Member should address the Chair.

श्री मोम प्रकाश त्यागी (बहराइच)
आप की जानकारी के लिये मैं बता दूँ कि हम ने माइनाइरिटीज कमीशन बना दिया है।

श्री अब्दुल अहद बकील : मैं उम्र के मुताल्लिक भी बता दूंगा।

क्या क्या हुआ? गुजरात तीस सालों में माइनारिटीज के साथ आप का क्या हाल रहा? बैसे मैं कांग्रेसी हुकमरों की तरफ बहैसियत कांग्रेसी हुकमरों यह बात कह सकता हूँ लेकिन बहैसियत इस मुल्क के शहरी के, मैं हरएक से यह कह सकता हूँ चाहे वह समर गुहा साहब हों, स्टीफेन साहब हों या दूसरे साहब हों, किसी को भी मैं गिरेबां से पकड़ सकता हूँ कि हम ने क्या किया क्यों कि माइनारिटीज मुसलमान हों, हिन्दू हों, सिख हों, ईसाई हों, वह हुकमरों जमात की अमानत नहीं हैं, वह हम सब की अमानत हैं। अगर हम विश्वास करते हैं इसमें, अगर हमारे पास कुछ इंसानी उमूल हैं, अगर हमारा जेहन साफ है तो क्या माइनारिटीज का मसला जो इतनी देर से लटक रहा है वह लटका रह सकता था?

अब हाल ही में देख दीजिए, मुझे से जनता पार्टी के एम पीज ने कहा, बनारस में मुसलमानों के साथ क्या हुआ? कितनी उन की जायदाद तलफ की गई। एक सत्तर साल में बूढ़े को भी नहीं छोड़ा गया, उस को लथाड़ा गया अपने घर से और जेल में डाला गया। बच्चों को गोलियों का निशाना बनाया गया। औरतों को बेदरों से अस्मतदरी की गई (अ्यबधान) . . . मुझे अफसोस है कल भी एक मेम्बर साहब ने यह कहा कि यू पी में जो फसादात हुए उस में इंदिरा गांधी के कारतूनों का हाथ था और आज भी जनता पार्टी के एक साहब कह रहे हैं कि कांग्रेस वालों का हाथ था। क्या उन में यह हिम्मत है, क्या जनता पार्टी के उस एम पी में यह हिम्मत है कि वह जाय और रिपोर्ट करें और लोगों की निशान-देही करें? फिर हम देखते हैं कि उन के साथ कानूनी सलूग होता है या नहीं।

आप से जो कमीशन बनाया तो कमीशन बनाने से मसला हल नहीं होगा। कांग्रेसी में मकीला है कि जब आप की कोई मसला इल्लबा में डालना हो तो कमेटी बना दीजिए, या कमीशन बैठा दीजिए। . . . (व्यवधान)। मैं यह कहता हूँ कि एक व्हाइट पेपर निकाले आप की गवर्नमेंट। आप ने तेरह महीने के धरसे में क्या किया मुसलमानों को, कितने उन के मुलाजिम बने? यहां ग्रीकाफ के मिनिस्टर बैठे हैं, मैं कल आजादपुर मंडी गया था, वहां की मजिस्ट्रेट का हाल देख लीजिए, कुत्ते उसमें जाते हैं। क्या यह सलूक है? मेरे ख्याल में जब बोट का वक्त आता है तो हर एक शरस मुसलमानों को, सिखों की, माइनारिटीज को जाकर कहता है, उन के सामने जा कर दामन फलाता है कि आओ, मुझे बचाओ लेकिन जब कुर्सी के इकितदार पर हम बैठने हैं तो माइनारिटीज माइतारिटीज रह जाती हैं, उन की मुश्किलतात बड़ जाती हैं, उन के दुख दंड बड़ जाते हैं। लिडाजा मेरी गुजारिश है कि इस मामले की तरफ पूरी तज्जुह दे कर हकूमत एक व्हाइट पेपर निकाले कि तीस माल के कांग्रेसी हकूमत में क्या हुआ और आज आप क्या कर रहे हैं? कितने फसादात हुए? कज एक सत्राल भी पूठा गया और मावल वामस किया गया। खुलकिश्मती यह है कि स्पीकर साहब ने उस में यह रूलिंग दी प्राइम मिनिस्टर के इंटरवेंशन से कि ऐसे मामले उठाए जा सकते हैं। मैं किसी कम्पूनल एंगल से नहीं बोल रहा हूँ, हिन्दुस्तान के एक शहरी की हसियत से आप सब से अपील कर रहा हूँ। सिख हों, मुसलमान हों, हिन्दू हों, डाउन-ड्राउन हों, गरीब हों, ये सब हमारी मुकद्दस अमानत हैं और हम सब को चाहिए कि हम सब मिल कर उन की खिदमत करें, उन को आगे लाने की कोशिश करें। यह आप की कानूनी जिम्मेदारी भी है—अगर आप आईन के दायर-किटव प्रिन्सिपल को देखें तो आप पायेंगे कि आप पर बेशुमार ऐसी जिम्मेदारियाँ हैं कि आप छोटे-छोटे मुआमलात को छोड़ कर इन ज्यादा इम्पोर्टेंट मुआमलात को लेकर आगे बढ़ें।

हमारे प्रीजीडेन्ट के एड्रेस में हमें इस बारे में बतलाना चाहिए था कि हम क्या करना चाहते हैं।

After all the country as a whole is ours. Minorities are yours. Weaker sections are yours. Border areas are yours. Hilly States are yours.

इन्हीं गुजारिशात के साथ, मैं आप का ज्यादा वक्त नहीं लेना चाहता हूँ। मुझे उम्मीद है अगर मैं कहीं किसी दोस्त से खिलाफ़े-तबकका हुआ हों, तो मुझे माफ़ करेंगे।

श्री माधव प्रसाद त्रिपाठी (डुमरियागंज) : माननीय अभिषेठता महोदय, मैं राष्ट्रपति महोदय के अभिभाषण पर जो धन्यवाद का प्रस्ताव लाया गया है, उसके समर्थन में खड़ा हुआ हूँ। वर्तमान समस्याओं के बारे में घोषित नीतियाँ स्वागत करने योग्य है। पिछले तीस वर्षों में जो आर्थिक स्थिति देश की रही है, उसको देखते हुए इस सरकार ने बहुत क्रान्तिकारी कदम उठाया है। हमारे देश में 85 परसेन्ट जनता गांवों में रहती है। पिछले तीस वर्षों में क्या हुआ—35 परसेन्ट से बढ़ कर 60 परसेन्ट ऐसे लोग हुए जो गरीबी के स्तर में नीचे आ गये। बेकारी बहुत बढ़ी, असमानता भी बहुत बढ़ी। असमानता का तो प्रमाण यह है कि जब आजादी प्राप्त हुई थी, उस समय बिप-हाउसेज से बिड़ला साहब के पास लगभग 50 करोड़ रुपये की सम्पत्ति थी, लेकिन इस वक़्त लगभग 1300 करोड़ रुपये की सम्पत्ति है। यह कांग्रेस की आर्थिक नीति का परिणाम था।

हमारी सरकार ने जो क्रान्तिकारी कदम उठाये हैं—मैं केवल संकेत-मात्र करके ही छोड़ दूंगा—विकेन्द्रित अर्थ व्यवस्था के आधर पर हमारी जो ग्रामीण जनता थी, जिसकी प्रारम्भ से ही कांग्रेस सरकार ने उपेक्षा की थी और जिसका परिणाम दखिखत

[श्री माधव प्रसाद त्रिपाठी]

में हुआ, अब इस सरकार ने उसकी उपेक्षा नहीं की, बल्कि प्रामोन्मुखी अपनी नीति बनाई, खेती को प्राथमिकता दी। कितनी प्राथमिकता दी या कितना धन दिया, अभी जो बजट आया है, उससे स्पष्ट है और जब बजट पर बहस होगी, तब लोग उसके बारे में बतलायेंगे, लेकिन यह बिल्कुल स्पष्ट है कि खेती में, सिंचाई में, सड़कों, बिजली, इत्यादि, अनेक चीजों के लिये काफ़ी प्रावधान किया गया है। साथ ही उन्होंने यह भी सोचा है कि यह असमानता कम हो, लोगों का रोजगार बढ़े, लोगों को रोजगार मिले। उन्होंने गांवों में कुटीर उद्योगों का जाल बिछाने का विचार किया है। उनकी नीति यह भी है कि जो छोटे छोटे उद्योग हों, कुटीर उद्योग हों, जिनका सम्बन्ध ग्रामों से बहुत हो और खेत में पैदा की हुई वस्तुओं से जो सम्बन्धित हों, उनको संरक्षण प्राप्त हो। ये उद्योग जो माल पैदा करें उसकी बिक्री में बड़ी बड़ी मिलें कम्पीटीशन में किसी प्रकार की अड़चन पैदा न करें। मान्यवर यह मैंने आर्थिक स्थिति के सम्बन्ध में संक्षेप में कहा। जैसा मैंने प्रारम्भ में कहा इस सरकार की नीति प्रामोन्मुखी है, ऐसे उद्योगों का विस्तार करने की है जो खेती से सम्बन्ध रखते हों, ग्रामीण जीवन से सम्बन्ध रखने हों।

सरकार राजनीति में भी क्रांति लायी है। गत सरकार ने राजनीतिक विचारों में जो स्थिति पैदा कर दी थी वह, मान्यवर, किसी से छिपी नहीं है। उन्होंने देश में अधिनायकवाद लाने की पूरी साजिश की और उस पर अमल करने के लिए संविधान में संशोधन तक कर डाला। न्यायपालिका, कार्यपालिका और विधायिका के सम्बन्धों में असंतुलन पैदा किया। एकजीक्यूटिव और पार्लियामेंट को उन्होंने सब से ऊँचा बनाया। हमारी सरकार ने इसमें संतुलन को कायम किया और प्रजातंत्र को पुनः अपने स्थान पर

से जाने का जो कुछ भी प्रयास हो सकता था, वह किया। सरकार ने न्यायपालिका को स्वतंत्र किया, प्रेस को स्वतंत्र किया और 44वें संशोधन को यहां से पास कराया जिससे कि हर व्यक्ति कानून की निगाह में बराबर समझा जाए।

लेकिन इस के बारे में मेरा एक विचार है। मान्यवर, आपातकालीन स्थिति में जो पिछली सरकार ने किया था, उसके बारे में मेरा कहना है कि जनता पार्टी ने अपने इलेक्शन मैनिफेस्टो में 42वें संविधान संशोधन को निरस्त करने के लिये लिखा है और लिखा है कि हम इसको पूरी तरह से निरस्त करेंगे। उस समय वायदा करते हुए, आज की परिस्थितियों का ज्ञान जनता सरकार ने कर लिया था या जनता पार्टी ने कर लिया था। जब से जनता पार्टी सत्ता में आयी है तब से बराबर यह कहती आ रही है कि हमने अपने मैनिफेस्टो में जो कुछ कहा है, उसको पूरा करेंगे। अब समझ में नहीं आता कि क्या कारण है कि जनता पार्टी ने अपने विचार बदल दिये हैं। वह इस सम्बन्ध में हाफ हट्टेडली क्यों चल रही है? मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस के कारण जनता में बहुत क्षोभ है। जनता में यह आशंका है कि हम इसे निरस्त नहीं करना चाहते हैं इसी कारण से कांग्रेस से समझौता कर रहे हैं। उस पर प्रहार करके तो हम सत्ता में आये हैं। अब हम जनता के सामने किस मुंह से जाएं। वह कहती है कि 42वां संविधान संशोधन निरस्त नहीं हुआ है। राजनीतिक दृष्टि से यह अक्षम्य अपराध है। अगर हमने इसको पूरा रूप से निरस्त नहीं किया तो इसके अच्छे परिणाम नहीं होंगे। कांग्रेस पार्टी इसमें हमारा साथ दे या न दे, लेकिन हम इसको निरस्त करने का बिल लाना चाहिए। अगर वह हमारा साथ नहीं देगी, हमारे साथ सहयोग नहीं करेगी तो जनता जान जाएगी कि अभी भी ये प्रजातांत्रिक मूल्यों की कद्र नहीं करते हैं और वरप्रसन्न में आज

भी इनमें बदनीयती मौजूद है और ये चाहते हैं कि किसी भी तरह से 42वें संशोधन को प्रमल में लाया जाए। इसलिए मान्यवर, हमारा सरकार को सुझाव है कि वह इसको निरस्त करने का बिल तुरन्त लाए और पूरी तरह से निरस्त करने का बिल लाये।

16 hrs.

एक म सा का कानून है। यह एक काला और दैत्याकार कानून है। मैं भी 20 महीने तक इसका शिकार रहा हूँ। हमने मीसा का नाम ले कर कांग्रेस की सत्ता पलटने में जनता से बहुत सहयोग पाया है। उत्तर प्रदेश में जैसी स्थिति थी, वैसी स्थिति शायद दक्षिण में नहीं थी। अगर वहाँ भी ऐसी स्थिति होती तो चुनावों में यह परिणाम न होता। मीसा एक ऐसी चीज जिसका घर घर में प्रचार है और हर आदमी इसका नाम नेता है। मीसा को हमने पूरी तरह से रद्द करने के लिए कहा था। यह एक काला कानून है। अब आप इसको सी आर पी सी में स्थान देने जा रहे हैं। आप दलील यह दिया करते थे जनता के सामने खड़े हो कर कि किसी भी रूप में मीसा को रखा जाना उचित नहीं है, हरी, लाल, काली, सफेद टोपी, किसी भी शकल में नहीं यह रहना चाहिए। अब आप कहते हैं कि देश में परिस्थितियाँ ऐसी उत्पन्न हो सकती हैं जैसे कांग्रेस पार्टी अव्यवस्था पैदा करना चाहती है जिस में दूसरे का में इसको रखना आवश्यक हो सकता है। इस वक्त आपने कहा था कि अगर ऐसी परिस्थितियाँ पैदा होंगी तो उनका मुकाबला करने के लिए हमारे पास पर्याप्त कानून है, आई पी सी में सजा देने का प्रावधान है, उसके लिए काफी गुंजाइश है लेकिन अब अगर आप इसको सी आर पी सी में स्थान देंगे तो इसका जवाब हमारे पास क्या होगा? मैं मानता हूँ कि एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव मशीनरी को हमको बदलना है। हमने पुलिस कमिशन बिठाना है। वर्तमान वातावरण में इसका बड़ा भय है कि मीसा के प्राव-

धानों का दुस्प्रयोग होगा। आप बताएं कि इस सब का हमारे पास जवाब क्या है? मीसा की हम दिन रात आलोचना किया करते थे। जाना ने तस्त हो कर हमको स्पॉट किया। अगर हम ने इसको किसी भी शकल में सी आर पी सी में रखा तो मैं समझता हूँ कि लोग हमें क्षमा नहीं करेंगे।

एक बात का मुझे खेद है। 17-18 बरस तक मैं लैजिस्लीवर में किसी रूप में रहा हूँ। मैं समझता हूँ कि कांग्रेस डिफेकशन कराने में माहिर था। किसी जमाने में हमारी बड़ी मैजोरिटी हुआ करती थी। मैं इंडस्ट्रीज मिनिस्टर था। इन्होंने चुटकी बजाते डिफेकशन करवा दिया और सरकार को तोड़ दिया। कितने थे माहिर थे इस किस्से को आप जाने दें, प्रदेशों में कितने हुए इसे मुझे गिनाने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। इन पर विचार करते ही दिल भर आता है। मैं आप से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि डिफेकशन के बारे में कानून कब बनेगा? हमने इसके बारे में वादा किया हुआ है कि हम इसको लाएंगे। हम अभी तक नहीं लाए हैं एंटी डिफेकशन बिल। इसको न लाने के कारण बड़ा धोखा हमें हो सकता है। अब इसके बारे में अगर जमता हम से पूछनी है तो हम क्या उत्तर दें? कल परसों तक हम खड़े हो कर कहा करते थे कि हम एंटी डिफेकशन बिल लाएंगे और हम कांग्रेस पर उंगली उठाते थे, जन संघ वाले, सोशलिस्ट पार्टी वाले और यह कहा करते थे कि ये लोग वाहवाही ले रहे हैं डिफेकशन करवा कर, और आज हम इसको नहीं लाते हैं और अपने वचन का पालन नहीं करते हैं तो इसका जवाब हमारे पास क्या होगा।

राष्ट्रपति जी ने अपने अभिभाषण में एक बात का जिक्र नहीं किया है और वह जस्टिस के बारे में है न्याय के बारे में है। मैंने कुछ दिन पहले अजबारा में पढ़ा था कि 18 हाई कोर्ट्स में 1 लाख 25 हजार

[श्री माधव प्रसाद त्रिपाठी]

केसिस पैडिंग है, सेशंज में भी इतने ही विचाराधीन हैं, मैजिस्ट्रेट्स की कोर्ट्स में 4 लाख 5 हजार हैं। हम ने घोषणा की थी कि हम सस्ता और स्पीडी न्याय गरीब जनता को देंगे। इसकी ओर कोई भी संकेत नहीं किया गया है। हमारी सरकार ने लगता है कि इस ओर ध्यान नहीं दिया है। इस ओर ध्यान देना अत्यन्त आवश्यक है। जिस प्रकार गरीबों के वास्ते, भोजन, वस्त्र, दवा आदिका प्रबंध होना चाहिये उसी प्रकार से जल्दी और सस्ता न्याय भी उनको मिलना चाहिये।

एक बात कहते हुए मुझे संकोच हो रहा है। मुझे पता नहीं कि यह बात मुझे कहनी चाहिए थी या नहीं? यह एक्वाइंटमेंट ऑफ जजिज के बारे में है। पिछली बार कांग्रेस सरकार ने सभी नियमों का उल्लंघन किया था। विचार मंथन के बाद और बृद्धि के अनुसार मेरे मन में एक बात उत्पन्न होती है। जो इस सरकार ने किया वह स्वतंत्रता और विपक्षता का प्रतीक था। ये सब बातें अपनी जगह पर हैं। जो मौलिक और संवैधानिक चीज है उसकी ओर आप ध्यान दें। अखबारों में अनेक प्रश्न आए। विभिन्न विचार व्यक्त हुए। यह भी उन में कहा गया कि सीनियारिटी के आधार पर जज को नियुक्त करना चाहिये। मैं कई दफा खड़ा हुआ प्रश्न पूछने के लिये, जिसका मुझे मौका नहीं मिला। मैं केवल सरकार का ध्यान आकृष्ट करने के लिये पूछना चाहता था। क्या कोई ऐसी परिस्थिति आ सकती है जब सीनियारिटी के आधार पर जज चुने जाने को रद्द किया जा सकता है? ऐम्पेचन हो सकता है जब कोई इनपेन हो जाय, कोई दुर्गुण आ जाय या संविधान को और सारी जनता की पैरों तले रौंद दे। उस वक्त हमारी तरफ से घोषणा हो गई कि सीनियारिटी के आधार पर ही किया जायगा। मैं एक मिसाल देता हूँ, इन्होंने कह दिया कि

सीनियारिटी के आधार पर सुप्रीम कोर्ट के चीफ जस्टिस को मुकर्रर करेंगे। आपने यह ऐसी घोषणा कर दी, मुझे भय है कि यह लीख न पड़ जाये, इसलिये एक बात कहना चाहता हूँ। अखबार में एक खबर पढ़ रहा था कि बंग साहब जा रहे थे तो उनका फ़ेयरबैल ऐड्रेस हुआ, जिससे मुझे कोई ताल्लुक नहीं है, लेकिन वहाँ यह बात आयी कि जिस एम० आई० एस० ए० में हमारे मौलिक अधिकार छीन लिये गये थे, देश में अपने जीवन को बचाने का भी कोई अधिकार नहीं था, हमारी लिबर्टी छिन गई थी जिसके लिये हम सालों लड़ते रहे और लड़कर प्रजातंत्र देश में कायम किया था, जो हमारे मौलिक अधिकार थे उनको चूसते थे, हम समझते थे कि ऐसे मौलिक अधिकार किसी संविधान में नहीं हैं, ऐसा संविधान किसी ने नहीं बनाया, उन सारे अधिकारों को ए० निर्णय द्वारा रौंद दिया गया। उसमें दो मन आपके सामने आये, एक जस्टिस खन्ना का आया जिसने रक्षा की सिविल लिबर्टीज की, हमारे फ़ंडामेंटल राइट्स की रक्षा की और अपना डिमेंटिव नोट दिया। लेकिन वह मजा खा गये। और आगे मैं कुछ नहीं कहता, आप स्वतः समझ सकते हैं कि दूसरा मन कैसा था। यह विचार करने की चीज है। अगर ऐसी परिस्थितियाँ आयें तो आप जिमको सुप्रीम कोर्ट का चीफ जस्टिस बनायें, जो संविधान का रखवाला होगा, डुमोकेसी का रखवाला होगा, या जिसे स्टेट से कोई मतलब नहीं है, किसी ने ठीक कहा है कि कुछ जजेज होते हैं

more executive minded than the executive.

जो ऐमा होगा उसी को बनायेंगे। लेकिन जो ऐमा नहीं होगा उसको बनाने में सोचेंगे। मप्रकिन है कि मैं अपनी भावनाओं को कह नहीं पा रहा हूँ। तो मैं अपनी सरकार का ध्यान आकृष्ट करना चाहता हूँ कि जब ऐसा मौका आये तो केवल लकीर के फकीर न बने। और आज तैसी घोषणा कर दी है कि केवल

सौनियारिटी के आधार पर करे, उस पर आपको विचार करना चाहिए।

तीसरी बात यह है, काफी मावनीय सदस्यों ने विचार व्यक्त किये हैं, और वह है बेकारी। इसके दां पहलू हैं। एक तो ऐसे बेकार हैं, हमारी सरकार ने कुछ कदम उठाये हैं, कृटीर उद्योगों का जाल बिछायेगी और सरकार मदद भी देगी, काफी रुपया भी दे रही है जो स्वागत योग्य है। इसे सरकार अमल में लाये। दूसरा पहलू यह है कि पढ़े-लिखे लोग ह, जिनको टेक्नीकल नालिज है, लेकिन उनके लिये कोई स्थान नहीं है। यूनीवर्सिटीज और कालेज ऐसे लोगों को हर साल निकाल रहे हैं। लाखों की तादाद में ऐसे लोग बेकार पड़े हुए हैं। तो टेक्नीकल एजुकेशन कमी दी जाये और किस प्रकार की दी जाये इस पर आप विचार करें और सोचें कि कैसे उनकी सेवाओं को देश के लिये लिया जाय, कैसे देश के निर्माण में वह सहयोगी बन सकने हैं। इस दिशा में सरकार को उतनी ही महत्त्वपूर्ण गति में विचार करना चाहिए, जितना कि किसी और पहलू पर। अन्यथा विस्फोटक स्थिति आ सकती है। लाखों की तादाद में अगर यह आपके सामने आयेगे, तो एक विस्फोटक स्थिति आयेगी।

एक बहुत चर्चित विषय हमारे जो कमीशन मुकरंर हुए हैं, उनके बारे में है। हमारे जो शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स और ट्राइब्ज कमीशन, माइनोरिटी कमीशन, बैंकवर्ड कमीशन हैं, यह अपनी रिपोर्टें देंगे। हमारे एक भाई ने कहा यह बदनीयती है। किसी चीज को रोकने के लिए माइनोरिटी कमीशन मुकरंर कर दिया जाता है, लेकिन इसमें बदनीयती मत लाइये। 30 बरस के पिछले जाल को 11 महीने में इस सरकार ने किस हद तक उखाड़ा है, वह कहने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। बदनीयती जब तक पावें नहीं, तब तक बदनीयती सरकार के सामने नहीं लायें। हां, माइनोरिटी कमीशन की जो रिक्मेंडेशन्स हुई हैं, आपके हितों की रक्षा के लिए सरकार ने

उस पर अमल किया है। ऐसे निराशा होती है कि सरकार ने कमीशन मुकरंर किया और कमीशन की रिक्मेंडेशन ताक पर रखी रही, चहे ला-कमीशन हो या पुलिस कमीशन हो या माइनोरिटी कमीशन हो। अमल में बहुत सी चीजें नहीं लाई गईं।

शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स के बारे में मैं इसलिए कहता हूँ कि अपने विद्यार्थी जीवन से ही मैंने सोच लिया था कि इनके साथ उठना-बैठना, खाना पीना रखूंगा, समता की भावना रखूंगा। इसके लिए मैंने 12 बरस तक अपने यहाँ एक भृत्य रखा जो कि इन्हीं में से था। अब वह चला गया है। मगर जब कोई बात मुनता हूँ तो मेरे हृदय में पीड़ा होती है। मैं उनकी भावना को समझता हूँ।

बनारस की बात भी कहना चाहता हूँ, वहाँ एक इमोडेंट हो गयी। आज कहने का अवसर इसलिए आया है कि उस दिन मुझे समय नहीं मिला। कांग्रेस की सरकार इसको कैपिटल बनाकर देश में आग भड़काना चाहती है। मेरी प्रार्थना है कि उसके हाथों में न खेलें, बल्कि इस दैत्य को दूर करने के लिए हमें प्रयास करना चाहिये।

बनारस में मेरा आधा परिवार रहता है, मैं जरूर बनारस का रहने वाला नहीं हूँ। बनारस संस्कृत यूनिवर्सिटी के लोगों ने यह काम किया था। ब्राह्मण रहे या कौन रहें, यह मैं नहीं जानता हूँ, मगर उसके पीछे कौन था, किस ने यह किया। उस मूर्ति को गंगाजल से नहीं धोया गया, वहाँ के विद्यार्थियों ने, दूसरे लोगों ने उसको पान के जल से धोया। कहा गया है कि वह इतनी अशुभ हो गई कि गंगाजल से धोया गया।

जब हमारे माननीय बाबू जी वहाँ गये, तो पहले से वाइस चांसलर वहाँ बैठे हुए थे, विद्यार्थियों और आचार्यों का गिरोह बैठा हुआ था जिसने दिखावटी पूजा कर के पवित्र किया। लेकिन उसके पीछे दूसरी चीज है। सन तो

[श्री माधव प्रसाद त्रिपाठी]

किसी न किसी तरह से निकल ही जाता है जैसे किसी ने किसी का मंडर कर दिया, लेकिन बाद में सुराग मिल ही जाता है जिससे सारा मंडर बर्क-भाउट हो जाता है। वहाँ पर नारे लगाये गए—“देश की नेता—इंदिरा गांधी, और इंदिरा गांधी जिन्दाबाद। तो यह क्यों हुआ। कौन सा इस जनता पार्टी का भ्रातृमी है जो कहेगा कि देश की नेता इन्दिरा गांधी? मैं यह बात अपने भाइयों से पूछना चाहता हूँ? उस दिन बोलने का मौका नहीं मिला लेकिन इस बात पर क्यों नहीं विचार किया जाता? हमारे भाई सामने बैठे हैं, वह बोलें। और सब पहलू ठीक हैं, जो उन्होंने कहे, लेकिन इस बारे में की करें।

एक इन्होंने स्टेटमेंट निकाला, विद्यार्थियों ने कि बाबू ज जी इन राम की छुई हुई मूर्ति को इसलिए पवित्र किया कि वह जनता पार्टी के मिनिस्टर ने छुई थी। दुबारा यह बात वकालत की तरह से साबित होती है कि वह करने वाला कौन था। वह कौन था कांग्रेस रंक का जिसने सुविचारित नीति और सुनियोजित नीति से यह किया?

आपने वाइसचांसलर, आचार्यों और छात्रों के खिलाफ क्या किया? मैं तो समझता हूँ कि जिस तरह से अनटचेब्लिटी एक्ट सामने आता है, कानून के रेंच के कारण हम वकील भी हैं, वकीलों की कारीगरी में छूट भी जायें, लेकिन सरकार क्या इस पर विचार कर रही है? कांग्रेस ने इसको कॅपिटल बनाकर हमेशा अपने बोट लिए और कहते रहे कि तुम्हारे रक्षक हैं। इस पर हमें विचार करना चाहिए।

जनता सरकार को यह सोचना चाहिए कि यह बड़े सौभाग्य की बात है कि शहरों के लोग शायद कुछ पीछे रहे हों, लेकिन ग्रामीण जनता ने, कृषकों ने, जनता पार्टी की झोली को बोटों से भर दिया, और उसे यहां बिठा

दिया। लेकिन उन लोगों के प्रति प्रशासनिक रवैये में कोई परिवर्तन नहीं हुआ है। हमारी यूरोपेसी में—इसके लिए मुझे कोई दूसरा शब्द नहीं मिलता है—ऊपर से लेकर नीचे तक कोई फर्क दिखाई नहीं देता है। इस सरकार को सत्ता में आये ग्यारह महीने हो गये हैं, लेकिन अदालतों में, मैजिस्ट्रेसी में, सप्लाय अफसरों में, किसी भी दफ्तर में, कोई फर्क नहीं मालूम पड़ता है। हम-लोग यहां जो कुछ कहते हैं, ग्रामीण लोग उसे समझ भी नहीं पाते हैं। लेकिन हमें यह दाव रखना चाहिए कि वे नीब की ईंट हैं। इसलिए मेरा निवेदन है कि जनता सरकार उन के हित और उन के संतोष के लिए कुछ सोचे।

यद्यपि प्रधान मंत्री जी ने एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव रिफॉर्म के बारे में कहा है, लेकिन इस अभिभाषण में उस का कोई संकेत नहीं मिला है। जब राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में सरकार की नीतियों का उद्घोष होता है, तो इस विषय में सरकार की नीति का संकेत दिया जाना चाहिए था।

अभिभाषण में पुलिस कमीशन बिठाने की बात कही गई है। अंग्रेजों के समय में 1902 में एक पुलिस कमीशन बैठा था। कांग्रेस सरकार ने इस तरह कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया, क्योंकि अंग्रेजों को तरह उसे भी केवल पुलिस के सहारे शासन करना था। अंत में तो उस ने कमाल कर दिया—मीमा लगा कर लाखों बेगुनाह लोगों को जेल में डाल दिया। लेकिन उस ने पुलिस के एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन और काम करने के ढंग में कोई परिवर्तन लाने का प्रयत्न नहीं किया। 1902 में जो पुलिस कमीशन बैठा था, उसको रीकमेंडेशन को भी उस ने कार्यान्वित नहीं किया, क्योंकि इट डिड नाट सूट दैस—यह उन के अनुकूल नहीं था।

मैं य० पी० से आता हूँ। वह एक बहुत पिछड़ा हुआ प्रदेश है और वहां बहुत कठिनाइयाँ हैं। मैं वहां कई बरस तक लीडर आफ दि

आपोजीशन था। नित्यप्रति यह बात सामने आती थी कि सरकार हमारी मदद नहीं करती है। स्थिति यह थी कि उस प्रदेश से पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू, श्री लाल बहादुर शास्त्री और श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी प्राइम मिनिस्टर थे और यह सोचा जाता था कि अगर वे यू० पी० के लिए कुछ करेंगे, तो उसे तरफ़्तारी समझा जायेगा।

मेरा ज़िला बस्ती है। वहाँ के 98 फ़ीसदी लोग बिलो पावर्टी लाइन रहते हैं। वह बिलो पावर्टी लाइन रहते हैं वह ज़िला मोवर-पापुलेटिड है—वहाँ की 32 लाख की आबादी है। ऐसे बहुत से ज़िले हैं। उत्तर प्रदेश के पूर्वी ज़िले और भी पिछड़े हुए हैं। पश्चिम के ज़िले कुछ आगे होंगे। इस अभिभाषण में इस बात का कोई संकेत नहीं दिया गया है कि यू० पी० जैसे पिछड़े हुए प्रदेशों को कैसे ऊपर उठाया जायेगा, कैसे रिजनल इम्बैलेंस और डिस्पैरिटी को दूर किया जायेगा।

वहाँ पावर की बहुत कमी है। हिन्दुस्तान में 22,000 मैगावाट बिजली पैदा होती है। मगर इनस्टाल्ड कैपैसिटी का केवल 50 परसेंट पैदा होता है। पावर के अभाव में वहाँ सारी व्यवस्था नष्ट हो रही है। अगर सरकार इस बारे में उत्तर प्रदेश की सहायता करे, तो वहाँ के पिछड़ेपन को कुछ हद तक कम किया जा सकता है।

यह बड़ी आयरनी है कि हमारे पास 22 मिलियन टन अनाज पड़ा है और सरकार दूसरों को कर्ज देती है, अगर हमारे यहाँ के गरीब लोग भूखे हैं। इस से मालूम होता है कि हमारी नीति में कहीं कोई गलती है। सरकार को इस पर विचार करना चाहिए।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं आप को पुनः धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि आप ने मुझे समय दिया, और मैं इस धन्यवाद प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करता हूँ।

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR (Gul-dhinagar): We are discussion the President's Address in the context of a critical, crucial and complex political situation, not less confusing either and I hope the discussions in this House and particularly the Prime Minister's reply tomorrow will reflect the anxiety and the doubts felt by millions of our countrymen at this time. The motion of thanks was very well moved by my friend Shri Gauri Shankar Rai and it was equally supported by Dr. Sushilaji. It was very refreshing to find after some years that both the Mover and the Seconder of this official motion were also very frank and critical of their government, of their own policies. In a way it is a departure from the normal established practice, and it does show to an extent the new mood that has crept into this House and in the new polity after the Emergency was over. I said that the present times were the most critical and confusing in which we were living. The situation has been further aggravated by this week's results of, what I may call, the mini general elections in five States and one Union Territory. And the results have startled us, shocked us. But I hope that they have also taught us some lessons. Are we going further down into the personalised politics, which is coming on the surface? Are we going to have a situation where fascist tendencies, either of the extreme right or extreme left will be allowed to have their free play in the sense that individuals will come out and say that they are the saviours of poor people and downtrodden people? All these problems of down-trodden people and poor people, I would not say that they have not been looked after at all by the previous regimes during the last thirty years; if that is to be said, that would not be clearly in tune with the facts; but the fact nonetheless remains that in the last thirty years of our independence, most of us, if not all of us, whether we belong to parties or not, we have talked about the poor people and then down-trodden people, but when it came to actual practice and

[Prof. P. G. Mavalankar]

action, not even an ounce of action has taken place; and therefore, the gulf between practice and precept has widened, and widened to the extent that now the situation has become almost explosive and volcanic. This is a challenge which we have to accept and therefore, I say that these are critical times.

I do not know why someone who wrote this address—all the more because it was delivered by Mr. Sanjiva Reddy for the first time after he became President—did not write in slightly better words, more moving, inspiring and challenging words, so that the country looks forward to such an address as a kind of a charter for the year to come. That has not happened. The address does mention some important points like basic reform in elections. I do not have time say about this in detail. In the beginning itself, on page 2 paragraph 5, the President says: "The people earnestly yearn for cleaner politics and cleaner administration at all levels." Before, however, the President's words were over, some unclean water already went into the Janata Party through defections of all kinds. I am glad that Dr. Sushila Nayar and my other friends in Janata Party also protested. I ask, it is necessary? I have asked this question of the Congress party also when it was in power. Is it necessary that you should be in power in all the States in the whole union? Can you not tolerate non-Congress people ruling some States? Similarly, I ask this Janata Party now, is it necessary that you must rule all over the place? Should not there be in a large federal country, some States governed by other parties so that we have a certain balance, certain equilibrium in the political, constitutional and general situation of this country? But that has not happened. Anyway, as I mentioned earlier, I am sorry to say that this address has been written in a very dull and drap

manner, it lacks the sharpness, the inspiration and the motivating power.

Apart from that—that is perhaps a matter of verbal thing—what is more important and what is more fundamental is that this address lacks in providing a pointer to the Government's actual, effective, concrete steps and measures to be taken. I have read this address like a true Professor again and again, and have underlined it with blue pencil and red pencil, and I am yet to find as to where exactly the steps and measures are indicated. It is all tall talk. The President's address under the Constitution is not meant to be a Presidential address to a formal gathering of distinguished nationals. It is an address which must contain the specific programmes of the Government for the year. My submission is that that programme is lacking. It is no use saying that we will remove unemployment in ten years. One year course, is a question—already one year has gone. Assuming that you will be in power for two terms that that of course, is a question—already one year has gone, let me be satisfied that the Government are taking some concrete and effective steps to eradicate unemployment. Where are these steps mentioned? In another place, the President says, we will do enough to reduce high prices—How? How long will the people have to wait? One year has gone, one more year will go, four more years will go and what will happen? Years may go, but people's anger may not get lessened. It will increase, it will aggravate and then the situation will be explosive. I am not worried whether this party goes out of power or that party comes into power. I am worried about the people's faith being shaken in the democratic structure becoming the agency for immense, massive, economic, political and social changes in the country. If that does not take place, people will resort to other methods, fascist, personalised dictatorial and authoritarian methods. Do we want this to happen? We do want this to happen, then in all earnestness, in all seriousness, I would ask,

this House whether it is not necessary for us to improve the condition of the people of this country. The people of this country are not only poor, but they are generous, charitable, large-hearted, tolerant; they are prepared to wait. But, in a sense, I am sorry that they have waited more decades than they should have.

They are prepared to wait, but not for too long. They must be given ample, concrete evidence of the government's intentions in the right direction and on right lines. That is not happening. The new Janata Government has completed one full year and I am glad many good things have happened. About constitutional changes they have done many things, although they have not gone the full way. As Dr. Sushila Nayar and some others have demanded why don't you get rid of the 42nd amendment lock, stock and barrel? That was my demand and that will remain my demand. The 39th and 42nd amendments of our Constitution are an affront on the dignity and constitutional normalcy of our country. We should not only remove them lock, stock and barrel but also go further in the direction of seeing that no government, no individual, no party dare dream of bringing this kind of draconian measures which Mrs. Gandhi brought during the so-called internal emergency. But is there any indication of the government thinking on those lines or do they want to take advantage of the lacunae and try to have the best of both the worlds? If they try too much to have the best of both the worlds, they will end up by having the worst of both the worlds, not only for them but for the country at large. Freedom have been restored and strengthened, the rule of law has been re-established and the draconian constitutional provisions have been removed. As the President has said, the dark spots have been removed. So far so good. It is good that the light has come, but mere light without the belly being filled will not remain for long. If the belly remains unfilled without

proper food at least once a day, if not twice a day, the light will not remain for long.

Coming to foreign policy, I am glad the leader of the Opposition is sitting here. As ex-Foreign Minister, he will agree that in the first year, the Janata Government has done tremendously good things in terms of foreign policy. With all our neighbouring countries—Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nepal, Afghanistan, Sri Lanka and Burma—and now with China gradually, our relationships are getting better and better. So far so good. But the teeming millions of India will not look at our good foreign policy to get consolation and satisfaction. Ultimately, they will look to their own bellies and their own economic interest. In spite of these vast achievements and good relations with a number of countries, when you come to the domestic front, what is the record? If I may be permitted to say so, the record is very dismal dissatisfying and very damaging to the new democratic climate that has appeared on the horizon, because when you have restored freedom, democracy and rule of law, if you cannot deliver the goods now, how are you going to deliver the goods otherwise? That is why the question I ask the ruling party is....

AN HON. MEMBER: You advise them!

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR: Who am I to advise? But I shall be failing in my duty if I do not satisfy my conscience by telling here what the people in the country at large feel about these matters. I may be an Independent Member, but I do reflect the angers and aspirations of the vast millions of the country from north to south, east to west. The Janata record is very dismal, and disappointing, especially in economic matters, in improving living conditions of the people and in looking after the Harijans. I sat through the entire debate last week on the Varanasi incident. I was not called and I did not press to speak on it, but I heard the speeches of my Harijan friends. The incident at Varanasi

[Prof. P. G. Mavalankar]

was not an affront on one individual, namely, babu Jagjivan Ram, but on the preamble of the Constitution, on the dignity, decorum and decency of the Constitution. That is why I say, the Janata Government, has failed to turn its hour of massive triumph into a moment of creative, meaningful opportunity for the millions of our countrymen. Even then, it is not late. One year is over, four more years are left. What will you do? That is my question. And, therefore, let this Government at least give an impression that they are now governing.

Again, I am sorry to say that—I do not want to speak something which may not perhaps lie good in the mouth of a small individual like myself, but I take the liberty of saying so—I feel very distressed when I see that there is no cohesive, purposive Government. There is no unity. Look at what is happening in Parliament. I can understand disagreement with the Prime Minister, I can understand disagreement with Ministers, I can understand a certain dissent, but I can never understand several Members of the ruling Party getting up and making it impossible for the Chair and many of us to understand what is happening. I am only suggesting this as an indication that when we had no democracy I fought for it and I said that we must fight. I was sitting in the last Parliament and I was fighting the Congress regime in those days. But I now say, let us not have too much of democracy. Just as having no democracy is bad, too much of democracy also can be equally damaging and destructive. That is my point. Therefore, I feel that cohesive Government, effective political administration and genuinely increasing unity of the ruling Janata Party are essential. But they still think in terms of this wing or that wing, Jan Sangh wing or BLD wing. What is this? After one year you are still thinking in terms of wings? People have no wings, people have only the picture of the whole country, the whole government and the whole Party I am sorry if my saying this is rather

disturbing and damaging. But I must speak the truth as I see it.

In conclusion, I would make only two or three very brief observations. I have already mentioned how and why the Forty-Second Constitution (Amendment) Act needs to be totally repealed. I repeat that point because even if that Act had some good points, and I am prepared to agree that there may be some good points, but they are good point brought about in a wrong manner in a bad manner, in a surreptitious manner and in an unconstitutional manner by a Parliament which was a captive Parliament and a Parliament which had no right to go beyond its five-year term. Therefore, let us get rid of that Act and then bring forward a new Bill.

One word about MISA. I am sorry that MISA which was sought to be removed by the Janata Party Election Manifesto—which was already broadly endorsed by me—still remains, and so I may ask you: Have you really endorsed and implemented your Janata Party Election Manifesto? Have you removed MISA completely. You have removed MISA from one side and brought it back from another side, and you have made it worse because you have made it a part of the criminal Procedure Code, and that is institutionalising it legally, constitutionally and politically. So I want to ask this question. I am glad that at least one Cabinet Minister has come here now. I want to ask him, and I hope he may convey it to the Prime Minister and the Home Minister: How can you have preventive detention in a democratic country? I can understand in the congress regime they had it because according to the Janata Party, and according to me, in many ways the Congress Party in those days did not believe in certain democratic principles. But now when the Janata Party says that they are wedded to democracy, that they are wedded to rule of law, how can you then justify preventive detention? My point is, preventive detention laws are repugnant to a free democratic polity. Nowhere in the

world,—take Australia, take Canada, take the United States of America, the large federal countries with democratic patterns—have they found it necessary to have Emergency powers and preventive detention. And yet in our country we are told that this MISA is necessary.

One more off-shoot of this is important and worth mentioning and that is, if they want to have MISA, under what law can they detain a detenué in prison? I want to ask. Not punishing him, not finding him guilty according to law, how can you put him in prison on par with criminals? At best you can detain him and put him in an honourable condition and give him all the facilities except that according to you he cannot function in a political manner. Even then also it is wrong of course. My point is that preventive detention has been misused—and I do not see why I should believe that because the Congress Party misused it, therefore the Janata Party will not misuse it. When this Party or that Party comes to power, something is better and something is worse. But when it comes to using power and using absolute powers arbitrarily, even the best of men have fallen and therefore, I do not believe the Janata Government at all if they say in a number of promises that they will not misuse these powers—that is what the Congress Government told us and we did not believe it, and we had suffered for that, you know it too well. Similarly, I am not prepared to believe this word of promise by the Janata Government. If you are sincere and so honest, then why don't you get rid of it? That is my question.

About the general economic situation, I will offer my comments on the general discussion on the general and railway budgets. But there are one or two small but significant points which I have to make.

One point is about Centre-State relations. I do not know why the Prime Minister has been telling publicly that he will talk with any individual but

will not have a dialogue. When the people suggest to the Government to have a dialogue, surely a Government which is responsible can never say "we will meet you individually but will not have a dialogue". Does it not amount to saying "we do not want any dialogue at all"?

Even as an individual I will tell you that the time has come for us to make a fresh review of the Union-State relations that obtains in this country, because I believe that the Union-State relations, which we have spelt out in the Constitution, should undergo a minute and candid appraisal, in the context of the experience gained so far and in view of the changed circumstances and new needs felt by several State Governments, and because all serious-minded thinking people have demanded it in the interests of genuine national unity. To say that the States must be strong is not to say that the Union must become weak. The States were made weaker in 1946—49 when the Constitution was on the anvil, in then Central Hall next door. At that time the country demanded a strong Centre, an effective Centre. Now that context has changed and the needs and requirements of the time are different. I do not think it is an unpatriotic attitude if people say: let us discuss particularly the problem of financial dependence of the States on the Centre. The moment there is dependence of the States on the Centre, all federalism becomes a nonsense. Because, the heart of federalism is that the States must have vitality, some independent financial powers, a capacity to stand up against the nonsense of the federal Government. But if the States depend on the federal government, then federalism becomes a nonsense.

Then, the time has come when we must get on with the job of doing things in the present today and tomorrow. Let us not dig up the past too much. The past has been dug enough by so many Commissions and so many enquiries. Let us expedite them. Because, if you do not expedite them,

[Prof. P. G. Mavalankar]

you will again make this commission process weak, legally and constitutionally. If you have any point of substantial value against those found guilty by all means punish them. The excesses of Emergency are bad, but the excesses of Commissions can be equally damaging. That is my point.

Then, the style and functioning of this Government must also change. I am sorry to say that I do not find much qualitative change. When we write to our Minister now, we get the same replies which we used to get from Shri Chavan or Shri Pai. In all sincerity they say "I am looking into the matter". But I do not know who looks into the matter and pursues the case. In the bureaucracy and the administration, there is diffidence, on one side and dominance on the other. I am worried more about dominance than about diffidence. Diffidence we can look after, but if there is dominance, if the Ministers cannot take decisions against the point or pressure of the bureaucracy, that is dangerous. That is why I say that the style and functioning of the Government must change.

We are talking of Mahatma Gandhi all the time. Why not then try to become simple in our way of life and do away with all the luxuries? In that case, even if we cannot do many things for the people, they will feel that we are also living like them.

I hope my friends in the Janata Government and the Party will take my comments and criticism in the spirit in which I have offered them.

SHRI YESWANTRAO CHAVAN (Satara): Mr. Chairman, I ought to have participated in this debate much earlier as the Leader of the Opposition, but I was out of Delhi because of the mini-general elections. Therefore, I had to see that some other members of our party spoke on our behalf. All the same, I thought that I should not allow this opportunity to participate in the debate to go by my side without

my participating in it. That is why I am speaking now.

The President's Address is a constitutional requirement and, therefore, it assumes great political administrative and constitutional significance.

The speech of the President is expected to be an analytical review of the past year as well as a very perceptive peep into the future at least for a year. And naturally, the speech of any President or any speech of any President will have to be judged by these two tests.

I would like to make one more point here. Fortunately, and incidentally, the debate on the President's Address has extended so far this year that, while participating in the debate, one has the advantage of having had a look at the Government's Economic Review and also the Budget of the year, which normally never happens. When I am participating in the debate now, I have got fortunately, as every one else, the documents of president's Address the Economic Review and the Finance Minister's Budget speech and his Budget proposals. So, one can see whether they satisfy the test of a peep into the future and give some projections about the future.

If we try to judge the President's Address from these criteria I must say that it is a great disappointment. I do not want to use more flowery language to condemn it, but it is a very deeply disappointing speech. About its language etc. I share what Mr. Mavalankar has said. It is not only written in uninspiring language, unfortunately it is not written even in a readable language. It is very unfortunate. I know the process by which the President's Address is formulated, having been in the Government for many years. Possibly some draft paragraphs from different Ministries have been put together to make this a speech. Therefore, it does not contain any analysis of the past, it does not give any projections for the future. This unfortunately seems to be the

position though some body might have co-ordinated these paragraphs. This is what the speech looks like.

It is interesting to try to find out what they are trying to say, and whether it can stand the test of scrutiny or analysis on any particular ground. Naturally, the speech contains a review of certain incidents. This reference to Lakshadweep and Andhra Pradesh, the devastating cyclone's effect etc., is all right, and, I think it was very necessary that such an important incident should be mentioned, and it starts with that. But then, the following paragraphs look like just a review paragraph from the Ministry of Law and Justice as to what Act they want to introduce. There, also, they are not fair. For example, Paragraph 3 contains two parts, and this is about constitutional amendments. The first part mentions what constitutional amendments have been passed, and the other part is about the Bill that is under preparation. I think they ought to have been more generous and fair to the Opposition in this matter. This is the tendency I see in this Janata Government and the Janata Party itself, that they would like to take credit for everything that is happening as something new, for themselves. Nobody as if, has done anything so far in India before, and it is for the first time, after thousands of years of history, that they are writing the a-b-c of the history of India. This is the impression that they are trying to give.

Here, in the first part they say:

"One of the first tasks to which the Government addressed itself in terms of its mandate was the removal of the authoritarian provisions that had been introduced into the Constitution. The Constitution (Forty-fourth Amendment) Bill, which has been passed by both Houses of Parliament..." etc.

I think it was very necessary and I would like to say that they ought to have mentioned the co-operation extended to them by the Opposition in

this particular matter. Mention is made about the discussions with the Opposition for the Bill that is yet to be introduced, but the Act which was passed could be passed only because the Opposition parties, and particularly my party, even though it might be divided into two now, gave complete understanding support to it, not only in Parliament but also during the discussions before it came to Parliament. But it does not fit in, in the manners of Janata Party to recognise the cooperation, friendly cooperation that we offered. It was as if only they wanted it and other parties were against it. So, the review which the President's Address is expected to be, should be full of truths, but, unfortunately it contains half-truths. I thought I should mention this thing because we had certain role in the passage of that Act. We had deliberated and in the discussions that took place with the Government in the matter, we had supported the amendments.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI MORARJI DESAI): I have acknowledged it publicly.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: I know that. Thank you very much. But I am discussing the President's Address. If I were to discuss your Address, possibly I would speak differently. I approve one part of it. I just forgot to mention about the President's Address ceremony. The President used to come to this House in a ceremonial manner and so far, we have always seen the President coming in a feudal buggy with all these things. Personally to me, this presidential buggy is a symbol of feudalistic remnant in India. This time—I must give credit either to Government or to the President himself—they have given up that practice and did not resort to this buggy. If they do the same thing on the occasion of the Republic Day, that would be much better. That is my personal view.

What I was trying to say is that most of the paragraphs that followed,

[Shri Yeshwantrao Chavan]

really speaking, mention what law was to be passed, how it had been examined and how it had to be looked into and there the question of MISA comes in. I entirely agree with my hon. friend who spoke before me—this is the view of my party also—that 'repeal of MISA', the words used in the Address may be technically true, but then Government has seen to it very carefully that the minimum necessary legal sanctions in the interest of security and defence of India, maintenance of public order and all services and supplies essential to the life of the community, etc. are retained under the ordinary law. It is true, we had the preventive detention law and the first preventive detention Bill was moved in this House by our great Sardar Patel and it was accepted by our Parliament then. A series of amending Acts were introduced after that. But Government was always apologetic about it that they were doing it for a certain temporary period—two years, three years normally—which used to be extended from time to time. But this time, now a Government which claims that it stands for civil liberties, democracy and what not—I do not want to use flowery language, I cannot use it—are coming out with a proposal to make it a part of the permanent ordinary law of the land. So, the independence and liberty of the citizen is permanently damaged. Such a provision in the hands of some tiny officers sitting in some district or taluka or tehsil kechehri who give a report which normally is taken as a Bible by those who are supposed to give final sanction. This is how the MISA or any Preventive Detention Act operates. You condemn so much the previous Government for that and you got all the due or undue credit for it. Now, you yourself try to bring about MISA in a different form. I personally think, this is a breach of faith with the people of India. This is, again, a promise made through their own manifesto. Apart from that, what is the general mood of this House? This House elected in 1977, is a different House. I would

like to say that it has gone through the fire of experience and it holds, certainly, some definite views about the liberty of the people. We may have our own different party loyalties. But, certainly, we have gone through the fire of experience and we hold certain views today. What about that? This reality is completely ignored. This is one thing that I would like to emphasise.

Making this MISA provision as a part of the ordinary law of the land is something completely contrary to our concept of personal liberty in this country. I know it and I understand it because the governance of the country requires defence of India etc. But sometimes these terms are rather misused. Certainly, when the country's independence is in danger, Parliament will completely come to their aid, whatever may be the difficulties. Why then make it a part of the ordinary law of the land?

Then, credit is being taken for having appointed a National Police Commission after so many decades, etc. It betrays a complete ignorance of what was happening in the States. I happened to the Home Minister of this country and also of my own State when our Prime Minister was the Chief Minister there and, I think, after consulting him, we had appointed a Police Commission in our State. I remember, at that time, there were half a dozen Police Commissions functioning in the country. It was thought that "police" was a matter for the States, and, therefore, many States appointed Police Commissions. Certainly, they can appoint a National Police Commission. There is nothing wrong in that. I only say that the manner in which it is mentioned that nobody in this country had thought of this great thing of appointing a Police Commission and that this Government has tried to do that gives a wrong impression. This is the main point that I am making in this regard. This is what the Address tries to show that something has been done which no-

body thought of doing before. As if this is being done for the first time in the history of this country which everybody ought to have done before but nobody did it and therefore, they are trying to do it.

Certainly, this Government will have the credit for appointing only the Commissions. If after 10 years somebody writes history and gives some name to the Government, this Government will be called as "Commission Government." I have read in some newspaper—I have not myself made any research in that—that so far they have appointed about 49 commissions and committees. It would be very interesting to find out the expenditure involved. Somebody ought to put a question about that and ask the expenditure incurred on the commissions. A newspaper has made an estimate of the likely expenditure on the commissions because the commissions are such commodities, are such birds—I do not use the word "animals" because that becomes controversial. (*Interruptions*). Commission itself is an omission sometimes.

So, I am told that they are going to spend something like Rs. 900 crores on these commissions because the work of a particular commission would never be finished within a given time. It is said that this commission is expected to submit their report within six, eight or nine months, which they would never be able to do it. No commission has ever done it, as far as I know. Normally, they take 3-4 times more than what was given by the Government. So, the expenditure. I am told is going to run into crores. I do not know. But I would like the Prime Minister to look into it and find out how many commissions he has in the course of last 11 months and what is the expenditure that, they are likely to incur. I was told that on these commissions—if you go on working in the normal manner—they would like to spend something like Rs. 900 crores. If that is so, then in addition to this year's collection of taxes possibly another year will have to be added to it. This is rather a humorous thing.

I would genuinely request, Morarji-bhai to find out how many commissions are appointed.

AN. HON. MEMBER: There will be next commission of Jyotirmey Basu.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: I give that authority to you if you want. Now I come to the important paragraph regarding the economic situation of the country. As I said, we have the advantage while discussing the President's Address to have a look at the budget and the economic review. You see page 4 of the President's Address. It says:

"Inflationary pressures have been brought under check. While the price rise in the previous year was about 12 per cent, the current level of prices is no higher than the level at the end of March, 1977."

This is how this is full of, I won't say untruth, but half truth. But half truth is worse than untruth. Instead of offering my criticism, it would be better if I read out something from the Economic Survey. This is on page 18 of the English version. It says:

"How ever, the price situation does not call for any complacency. Although the index of wholesale prices rose by only 2.3 per cent over the year ending January 21, 1978 the increase in some groups was much higher. Foodgrains stand higher over the year by 8.6 per cent, largely on account of pulses whose prices have advanced by as much as 38.4 per cent, eggs, fish and meat by 15.5 per cent and condiments and spices by 28.3 per cent. The prices of milk and milk products, too, are slightly higher than a year ago. "*Economic Review*."

So, this is the story. This is what you say and you are trying to cover it by one sentence in the Address that it is not higher than last year. So, it gives the impression that everything is all right. Is this an honest review—I

[Shri Yeshwantrao Chavan]

mean the President's speech? If the office of the President is used to tell the half truths then this is something that is a very serious happening in the country and we cannot just sit quiet about it.

17 hrs.

This is what is happening in the economic picture. The feeling is given that every thing is all right, every thing is improving, there is nothing to worry about; the prices are fine. But the Economic Survey, when it tries to deal with the question of price starts with this that this is not a question where you can be complacent about. This is a very grave warning coming from an expert body of persons functioning in the Finance Ministry about the economic situation, about the price situation. And what does this President's Address say? It says:

"While the price rise in the previous year was about twelve per cent....

It gives a comparison with the previous year—that was the bad Government's performance and this is this good Government's performance, there is no price rise, every thing is all right. This is misleading. The President's speech must not be at least misleading. This is my presentation about it.

Again this is what they are complaining:

"The Government inherited an economy in which poverty and unemployment were acute, particularly in the rural areas and in which the development of the past 30 years had not benefited large numbers."

This is their common theme; this is what the Janata Government has been saying, 'Nothing was done in the last 30 years'. This is a repetition of the same thing. I tell you, whatever you are able to do now is because of what we achieved in 30 years. Do not forget this. Do not be disloyal to the history. What has been given to you, you yourselves have admitted; for example, I

find in the Budget speech that the Finance Minister himself agrees. It is a very interesting thing that I came across. I am not coming to figures, etc. He has admitted one very important thing. It is a good thing when such an admission comes. When a person tries to deal with facts, truth has to come out. Here is that truth. On page 29 while explaining the fiscal strategy of his Government, the Finance Minister says:

"The fiscal strategy underlying my proposals...."

I have got many differences with the proposals, but I am now talking about his strategy, the strength that he got for that strategy; that is what he was referring to:

"The fiscal strategy underlying my proposals seeks to take advantage of the favourable food and foreign exchange situation for generating fresh expansionary impulses in our economy."

This 'favourable food and foreign exchange situation' was a gift from the previous Government. Do not forget this. If at all you are honest to yourselves, you must say that. This was the gift from the previous Government. Do not forget this. You were not given this Government only with this empty chair; it was given with a big stock of food and a very big treasury of foreign exchange. Do not forget that. Now you are basing your basic strategy, the strategy of your fiscal policies on these two important factors. You forget about it and here you say that, when you came to power, there was nothing here but acute unemployment, and so on.

Talking about unemployment I was making this point—Morarjibhai, I must tell you very honestly—in this campaign; I was making this criticism of your Government publicly, and I would like to make it here because sometimes election speeches outside are forgotten. This was a very severe criticism that I was making. This Government's claim is that they are rural-biased, and that they are very

much worried about rural employment, rural investment, and so on and so forth; for the first time in the history of this Century, this Government is doing something good for the rural areas so far they were neglected. This is the pathetic tale that they are trying to tell us. My criticism was this. If at all you want to do something about rural areas, according to me, the fundamental problems of India are three. One is poverty, another is inequality—both social and economic—and the third is, possibilities and efforts for modernising our manpower or technology with the help of science etc. These are the basic, fundamental problems of this country. A Government which has no basic policies about these fundamental issues, regarding these three basic issues.... (Interruption) —I say social inequality is untouchability, I referred to the social aspect also I did not say merely economic, I said the social aspect is also there; so untouchability is part of it—a Government which has no basic policies to give on these three fundamental issues has no moral right to govern this country. That Government only has a right to govern this country which has got something very fundamental to give as a matter of policy, for administration and for policy-making. They alone can have the right to govern.

Now, what have you done for the rural areas? Talking about unemployment and poverty and merely telling us that you have provided additional Rs. 400 crores more for agriculture—is that enough? Some pilot scheme has been sanctioned and Rs. 24 crores have been symbolically provided—is that enough? I come from a State where they had said that they want to give a guarantee to the worker, to the people unemployed in the rural areas of work. We merely give them the right to vote. That is not enough. That way democracy is incomplete. Along with the right to vote, if you give them the right to work, then alone will democracy be complete. There are hundreds of thousands of people in the rural areas who are just willing

to work. They have two hands to work with, but they have no work. I think they have got a right to ask for work and if you do not give them work, it is your duty to give them two meals a day.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Why did you forget it?

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: We did not forget it. We in Maharashtra passed this Act, but so far this Government has not even had the courtesy of sanctioning it. They have not asked for money. Shri Mavalankar was discussing the question about economic responsibilities and facilities for the States. It is a very very important question he was raising. I am coming to that point also. But here is something that was done. They are providing it for their own purpose. But this Government has not even had the courtesy to sanction it. What is the reason? I do not think they have so far given any reason. I hope I will get some answer to this from the Prime Minister when he replies to the debate. I do not want him to say, 'You are the only State doing it. Therefore, I cannot do it.' Why cannot you do it? If some good work is done by a few States, at least let there be a good word of appreciation, and let not obstacles be put in the way of their functioning. This is one important point I wanted to make about this. This is about the economic problems. I do not want to go into it further.

Another thing is concerning industrial policy. The impression is being given that every thing is all right with industrial production. Everything is not all right with industrial production in the country. The *Economic Review* gives a very disturbing picture. The 4.5 per cent growth that has been shown is because there has been a good monsoon this year so far as agricultural production is concerned. Because of the good agricultural performance, the general growth rate is somewhat statistically arranged. If you go into the individual industries field, the *Economic*

[Shri Yeshwantrao Chavan]

Review is full of facts. In vital sectors, the industrial economy is stagnant. They have used the word 'stagnant'. But here you are trying to give the impression that everything is all right. Everything is not all right, either on the prices front or on the growth front. This is a matter I would like this Government to consider very carefully, if at all these policies are to be taken care of.

I would like to make a very important point here, not as a criticism of the Government. In any developing country, where economic issues dominate the political problems or as a matter of fact, political problems follow the economic situation—this is the situation even in developed countries, I would say—in a developing country where we have to plan our economy properly, unless we evolve a viable wage, income and price policy, that Government has no chance of succeeding in the economic field. Let us take it for granted. Unless we have got a definite answer for this, no Government is likely to succeed, but there is no effort being made on the part of the Government. We want an assurance about it. In the budget speech, the only part which reads well is where they have given the five fundamental principles of taxation, which the Janata Government has accepted as a policy direction. That reads well. One of the principles is that the taxation policy must look to the distributive social justice and when we come to the distributive social justice, what is the assurance in the budget speech or in the President's Address? Nothing, excepting certain investments here and there and ultimately saying that there is going to be a deficit of more than Rs. 1000 crores. I think, this is a record deficit that any Finance Minister has shown so far and we have been told that this is going to be reduced by selling the Government gold holdings at the international price. The deficit is of Rs. 1000 crores and the Reserve Bank

Governor tells us today that the entire gold holdings of Government are worth Rs. 500 crores only. What about the remaining Rs. 500 crores? Where are they going to come from? Is it going to be left to the Government to look after as a deficit and ultimately the people to take the burden on them?

I would like to maintain that this is not the right way. This gold also is a Government assets, you are wasting it, It is a deficit. That gold is not something which you have earned. This accumulation of gold is of years together, which has to be used in the days of emergency. Apart from the RBI gold, Government holds gold which is to be use for emergency. It includes gold which was collected for use at the time of war etc. Perhaps this was collected at the time of the Pakistan war or the Chinese war. This is what you are using for meeting the deficit in the budget. Is this the way of running the economic administration of this country? And we are told that everything is all right and you are trying to do thing far better. I would like to say that nothing is better...

AN. HON. MEMBER: It is worse.

SHRI SAUGATA ROY (Barrackpore): There is a total chaos.

AN. HON. MEMBER: What were you doing during the last thirty years?

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Idukki): Five hundred crores of rupees worth gold is also because of the last thirty years.

SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR (Pondicherry): At the time of Pakistan war, my leader, MGR contributed a gold sword to the Government.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: The last few paragraphs in the President's Address deal with the External Affairs and I am very glad that the Minister for External Affairs is present here when I am talking about this matter. I am only making a reference to those portions which I have seen in the President's Address. I am not talking on the External Affairs as a whole,

I would certainly like to participate in the External Affairs debate and offer my comments later. What is said here certainly shows and rather gives some sort of a glimpse of what is working in their minds. It is said in the Address:

"The Government has based its relations with the Great Powers on the firm belief in a commitment to genuine non-alignment...."

They are more worried about the relations with the great powers. They have also said about mutual relations with the neighbouring countries. In fact this is also one of the very important forums but this is not something special which you have done. This is something which every country has to do and this has been a very important feature of our foreign policy all along and for the last 30 years even before Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee started visiting the neighbouring countries. We have also followed the same policy because ultimately the neighbourhood in which we live and the relations with them are very important for us. Therefore, one cannot say that this something very special for which one needs to be complimented. But this is the only thing you though it worth saying—relations with great powers and the genuine non-alignment. I am afraid and this is my fear I am expressing. So far they have kept non-alignment and kept the old foreign policy by and large in a straight line as far as possible, but there are some of the indications which are disturbing. This use of the words, 'genuine non-alignment'—here I am afraid a new type of alignment is concealed behind this 'genuine non-alignment'. This my fear. Sometime something will come out of it.

Some things are worrying me. For example, it is said, 'It is our hope that notwithstanding the differences which we might have had in the past, we can now foster these relations to a new level, I am talking about the relations with the great powers, particularly, America and the western democracies. They say, 'We might

have had in the past some differences. Have those differences completely disappeared? I would like to ask this straight question—when we discuss the question of the Indian Ocean being a zone of peace, what happens in Diego Garcia is a matter fundamental differences with the American imperialism and we will have to say very firmly about it. If you give an impression that the past differences are disappearing how could they disappear? As long as the military base in Diego Garcia stands, our differences with America will be there. Merely telling that those two big countries are likely to discuss the matter and then alone this question will be solved, is a very wrong approach to the problem of the Indian Ocean being a zone of peace. You cannot merely depend on the talk between the Soviet Union and USA. We will have to say categorically. I know your idea of not taking a lead in calling a conference. I can understand it. I appreciate it also. It is all right, but the culprits must be brought before the public eye and they must be brought to the limelight that they are the culprits and if they try to bring back the military bases in the old colonial areas, it means that they have not forgotten their past and we cannot forget our past and we must protest and tell them, 'You are the villains who are doing this. We will have to create the public opinion about this. We may not have any big diplomatic manoeuvrability about it. I know we may not have that. We may not have many other pressures to use against them. But creating a public opinion, creating public opinion and the human element about it is much more important. One the contrary you are giving them an impression that our past differences are disappearing. Are they disappearing? Have they disappeared? Has part of Diego Garcia disappeared?

Well, I would like to say that dealing with and trying hard with the American Press and their leakage of the taperecorded 'Cold and blunt' attitude, thanks to that leakage and thanks to

[Shri Yeshwantrao Chavan]

the Press, I would say some corrections were introduced into this relationship and the visit went off very well to that extent. I am not against it. I am only mentioning this. You have specially mentioned about your relationship with America and the Western democracies and try to give an impression that differences are disappearing. Well, differences should disappear. I do not want that differences should be there, but if they disappear, you tell that. But there are many causes of differences which cannot disappear as long as Diego Garcia and the military bases in the Indian Ocean are there. Please do not tell us that your differences are disappearing. Please do not tell us that the inherent contradictions between the global interests of any imperialist power and the national interests of India are disappearing. There is contradiction. It is there that we have to be very careful in this particular matter.

I submit Sir, I went through the speech and found out some of the inconsistencies, half-truths and what not . . . (Interruptions) Untruths? I would not say it is completely untrue, but half-truths, yes and I consider half-truths more dangerous. They are very highly dangerous. I am very sorry that our great dignitary, the President of India, was made an instrument to disclose these half truths before the Parliament. This is my worry. This is my sadness. So, this is my criticism. This Presidential Address is a great disappointment, as a deep disappointment. This speech is nothing more than that. We expect a little better speech, because Presidential Address, as I said is a statutory requirement. Constitution has made it compulsory. This document must be the one which will give correct, truthful analysis of the past year and future projections of what the Government proposes to do mostly in important industrial economic and social matters. I have done, Sir.

PROF. P. C. MAVALANKAR: He made a point in his speech that he

will mention about the Centre-State relations.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: Yes, I said. I will like to make a mention about it.

I personally consider that we need a very reasonably strong Centre. There is no doubt about it and we cannot ignore the Centre. But at the same time any strength to the Centre at the cost of the State is something which we do not welcome. The State's strength is also equally important. Now, particularly, most of the developmental activities and responsibilities are with the State Governments. There are some States which are poor. Some States are small. Some States have not got any possibility of having flexibility of resources and, therefore, it is certainly very essential that this matter of financial viability of the States capacity to look after the complete developmental programme be seriously discussed from year to year, not only once. It needs to be discussed at the national level. I would like Parliament to take some special time and discuss this matter because merely making autonomy an abuse is not enough. We would certainly want the Centre of a reasonable strength. We do not want weak Centre. We do not want to weaken the Centre. But strengthening the Centre at the cost of the States would certainly be against the interest of India, because this will certainly work at the very root cause of the unity of India.

The speech of the Finance Minister, the other day, expressed his disappointment that he could not do anything about taking away the Sales Tax from the States. That is the only tax which is somewhat expansive and flexible which is giving some sort of resources to the States. Abolition of Sales Tax is part of their manifesto. This shows the party's character and policy. They cannot do it and they will never be able to do it because Sales Tax is a very important source of tax in the States. They should not take away the Sales

Tax. But I know the trading class in the country is very much worried about it. It becomes rather inconvenient to them. It is their interest they want to protect. They have, therefore, put it in their manifesto. Finance Minister is sorry that he cannot do away with it now. But he is asking us for patience. Well, I would like to say that we are showing patience, that is good for him. Once we start showing impatience about these wrong approaches to these problems, I do not know where the country will be.

श्री रणजीत सिंह (हमीरपुर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, राष्ट्रपति जी के अभिभाषण पर जो धन्यवाद प्रस्ताव प्रस्तुत हुआ है, उसका समर्थन करने के लिये मैं खड़ा हूँ। मेरा यह सीभाग्य है कि मुझे ऐसे मौके पर बोलने का समय मिला है जब कि अपोजिशन के लीडर ने अपना वक्तव्य इस अभिभाषण पर दिया है ।

उन्होंने जो एक बात खास तौर पर जोर देकर कही है, उसका मैं जरूर जिक्र करना चाहूँगा। उन्होंने कहा है कि अभिभाषण में आधी सच्चाई का उल्लेख है, जो कि बहुत खतरनाक है। मैं यह समझता हूँ कि आज से पहले जो सरकार हमारे देश में शासन को चला रही थी, वह पूरा ही झूठ बोलती थी। इसीलिए ये आधी सच्चाइयाँ उनको खासकर अखरी हैं।

राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में सब से पहले इस बात का जिक्र है कि हमारे देश में जो अतंक का वातावरण था, जनता सरकार द्वारा उसे मूलतः समाप्त कर के एक मुक्त वातावरण पैदा करने की कोशिश की गई है। इस के लिए जनता ने हमारे देश में एक इनक्लाब लाया। जिस विश्वास को ले कर उस ने इस सरकार को सत्ता दी थी, इस सरकार ने उसे सही सिद्ध किया है और अपने वचन को पूरा कर के देश में जम्हूरियत की बहाल किया है। जम्हूरियत की बहाल

करने के रास्ते में जो भी रोड़े हैं, उन्हें एक एक कर के, आहिस्ता आहिस्ता, निकाला जा रहा है, और देश में एक ऐसा वातावरण बनाया जा रहा है, जिस में निर्भयता हो, और सब लोग दिल खोल कर देश की परिस्थितियों के बारे में अपनी भावनाओं को अच्छी तरह से व्यक्त कर सकें।

पिछली सरकार के अखिरी दिनों में इस पार्लियामेंट हाउस में भी एक ऐसा वातावरण था, जिस में शासन में बँटे हुए लोग भी अपनी भावनाओं को व्यक्त करने से डरते थे। मुझे खुशी है कि आज उन्हें यह हक हासिल है कि वे पूरे जोर और निर्भयता के साथ इस सरकार की नुकताचीनी कर सकते हैं।

विपक्ष के सदस्यों ने कटाक्ष किया है कि नई सरकार में ही ऐसे लोग हैं, जो उसकी नुकताचीनी करते हैं। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि इस देश में हर नागरिक को यह अधिकार है कि वह अपने खयालात को अच्छी तरह से जाहिर करे और वह जो कुछ भी महसूस करता है, इस सदन में उस की अच्छी तरह से अभिव्यक्ति हो। पिछले एक साल में इस पार्लियामेंट हाउस में उस की अभिव्यक्ति बहुत अच्छी तरह से हुई है, इस बात का जिक्र राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में किया गया है।

हमारे देश में पिछले सालों में जो बुरी बातें हुई हैं, उन्हें अपने देश के सामने लाने के लिए कमीशनो का गठन किया गया है। इस बारे में भी बहुत बड़ी चोट की जाती है कि यह कमीशनो की सरकार है। तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ जितने भी जम्हूरी मुल्क हैं उन जम्हूरी मुल्कों में कमीशनो का गठन होता है क्योंकि जब तक सरकार की जो बुराइयाँ हैं और जो लोग सत्ता में आते हैं उन सत्ताधारियों की जो बुराइयाँ हैं उनको

[श्री रणजीत सिंह]

रेकार्ड नहीं किया जायगा और अच्छी तरह से उन का विश्लेषण करके उन को जनता के सामने नहीं लाया जायगा तब तक जनता को उस की जानकारी नहीं हो सकती है, जनता के अन्दर जागृत नहीं आ सकती है और देश के अन्दर जम्हूरियत की जड़ें मजबूत नहीं हो सकती हैं। इसलिए जनता सरकार ने ऐसा कर के पिछली सरकार की जो बुराइयां रही हैं उन बुराइयों को इन कमीशनों के द्वारा जनता के सामने लाने का जो प्रयास किया है उस के लिए वह बधाई की पात्र है। पिछले सालों में आप न देखा होगा अमरीका में भी वाटरगेट जैसे बहुत बड़े काण्ड हुए और उन के ऊपर भी बहुत बड़ी बड़ी एन्वयरीज बंठीं। उस के जरिए सारी अमेरिका की जनता को ही नहीं, बल्कि सारी दुनिया की जनता को इस बात से अवगत कराया गया कि उस सरकार में जो लोग सत्तारूढ़ थे उन्होंने अपनी सत्ता को बनाए रखने के लिए क्या कुछ किया। इस तरह कमीशनों का गठन अपने देश की जम्हूरियत को पनपाने के लिए, उस की जड़ों को मजबूत करने के लिए और जनता को जागृत करने के लिए बहुत जरूरी चीज है और उस का मैं पूरी तरह से समर्थन करता हूँ। इस तरह से अगर नहीं किया जायगा तो जनता पूरी तरह से अवगत नहीं होगी। जो हुकूमत में बैठे हुए लोग हैं चाहे वे इस पक्ष के हों या उस पक्ष के हों, लेकिन ऐसा काम करने वालों के कारनामों को जनता के सामने लाना जरूरी है और वही काम यह सरकार कर रही है। जैसे अमेरिका में वह सारे काण्ड दुनिया के सामने लाने के बाद बुरा काम करने वाले प्रेसीडेंट निक्सन को माफ कर दिया गया उसी तरह से जो पिछली सरकार में लोग बैठे हुए थे उन लोगों के जो गुनाह हैं उन को रेकार्ड करने के बाद अगर यह सरकार चाहेगी तो उन को माफ किया जा सकता है लेकिन उन कारनामों को जनता के सामने

लाने में मैं समझता हूँ कि कोई बुराई नहीं है। यह सब से जरूरी बात है।

17.33 hrs.

[SHRI DHIRENDRANATH BASU in the Chair].

मैं इस सरकार की ए. इस बात की भी सराहना करूंगा कि रेडियो का प्रसारण को पहले एक पार्टी के लिए ही हुषन करता था, उस प्रसारण में अब सभी पार्टियों को मौका दिया गया है कि वे अपनी पूरी विचारधारा को जनता के सामने रखें। इस तरह से एक नये काम का सूत्रमत्त इस सरकार ने किया है जिसका उल्लेख माननीय राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने किया है।

इसके साथ साथ मैं इस बात का भी जिक्र करना चाहता हूँ कि बहुत देर से एक बहुत बड़ी मांग चली आ रही थी। हमारे देश के अन्दर बहुत सारे पिछड़े लोग हैं और हमारे समाज के अन्दर बहुत सारी सामाजिक बुराइयां हैं। उन में सबसे बड़ी बुराई तो छुआछूत की है जिसका उन्मूलन करने के लिये हमारा संविधान प्रोवाइड करता है कि ऐसे कमीशन का गठन किया जाय जिसके द्वारा समाज के अन्दर से ये बुराइयां खत्म हों। तो हमारी सरकार ने शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट और शेड्यूल्ड ट्राइब्स का ही कमीशन नहीं बनाया है बल्कि माइनारिटी का भी कमीशन बनाया है जो कि आज तक इस बात के लिए बहुत कोशिश करती रही है कि उनकी तकलीफात को देखने के लिए भी किसी कमीशन का गठन होना चाहिए। इसी तरह से सरकार ने एक और बड़ा कदम उठाया है, बैंकवर्ड-क्लासेज कमीशन का गठन किया है। हमारे समाज में जितने भी पिछड़े वर्ग हैं, चाहे शेड्यूल्ड कास्ट्स और शेड्यूल्ड ट्राइब्स हों, माइनारिटीज हों, बैंकवर्ड क्लासेज हों—इन तमाम पिछड़े वर्गों के लिए, उनके साइडिफिक तरीके से विकास के लिये, उनको ऊंचा उठाने के लिए बहुत बड़ा कदम उठाया है। मैं आपके द्वारा इस काम के लिये सरकार को बधाई देना चाहता हूँ।

लेकिन इसके साथ ही मैं एक और निवेदन भी करना चाहता हूँ—हमारे देश की जनता यह महसूस करती है कि आर्थिक ना-बराबरी को दूर करने के लिए हमें इस बात का भी ध्यान रखना होगा कि जो लोग इन तमाम कमीशन्स के तहत नहीं आते हैं—उनके बारे में भी सोचा जाए। जिन कमीशन्स या बर्गों का मैंने जिक्र किया है, उन के अलावा भी कुछ और लोग हमारे देश के अन्दर ऐसे हैं जो आर्थिक तौर पर बहुत पिछड़े हुए हैं—उनका भी हमें ध्यान रखना होगा। आज भी ऐसे बहुत से लोग हैं, जो गरीब हैं, जो पिछड़े हुए हैं, उनके लिए भी जब तक ठोस कदम नहीं उठाया जायेगा, उन को भी कॅटेगरीज़ नहीं किया जायेगा, उन को भी सहूलियतें नहीं दी जायेंगी, जिन सहूलियतों के जरिये उनकी आर्थिक स्थिति सुधर सकती है, तब तक हमारे देश में जो विषमता फैली हुई है, आर्थिक ना-बराबरी की, वह दूर नहीं हो सकती है। जब भी हम गांव-समाज में जाते हैं तो गांव-समाज के लोग हम से सवाल करते हैं कि जो लोग इन कॅटेगरीज़ में नहीं आते हैं, जो पिछड़े हुए हैं, आर्थिक तौर पर जिनकी हालत बहुत खराब है—उनकी हालत को सुधारने के लिए सरकार क्या करना चाहती है? हमारे पास उन के इस सवाल का कोई जवाब नहीं है। इसलिये ऐसे तमाम लोगों की आर्थिक दशा को सुधारने के लिए हमें कुछ ऐसे कदम उठाने होंगे, जिनके जरिये उनकी आर्थिक दशा सुधरे।

सभापति महोदय, मैं आपके माध्यम से सरकार के ध्यान में यह बात भी लाना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे देश के अन्दर बिजली की बहुत कमी है। हमारे देश में इण्डस्ट्रियल रेवोल्यूशन लाने के लिये, इण्डस्ट्रीज़ को चलाने के लिये, फैक्ट्रीज़ को चलाने के लिये बिजली को बहुत आवश्यकता है। बिजली की तरक्की पर जब तक हमारी सरकार का ध्यान पूरी तरह से नहीं जायगा, तब तक हमारे देश में इण्डस्ट्रियल प्रोडक्शन

नहीं बढ़ सकता है। मुझे इस बात को देख कर दुख हुआ है कि बिजली की कमी की वजह से हमारे देश में इंडस्ट्रियल प्रोडक्शन कम हुआ है। इसलिये सरकार को उन क्षेत्रों की तरफ जहां बिजली का प्रोडक्शन बढ़ाने के लिये बहुत काम हो सकता है, ध्यान देना चाहिये। मैं, मिसाल के तौर पर, हिमाचल प्रदेश का उल्लेख करना चाहता हूँ। हिमाचल प्रदेश में बहुत बड़ी बिजली पैदा करने की क्षमता है और आज तक जो नेशनल सर्वे हुआ है, उस नेशनल सर्वे के मुताबिक 8 हजार मेगावाट बिजली पैदा करने की स्कीम प्रोपोज हो चुकी है। सारे देश में कुल मिलाकर हाईडल के जरिये से जो बिजली पैदा करने की क्षमता है, उसका आधार उत्पादन केवल हिमाचल प्रदेश में हो सकता है। इतना वहां पर पोटेंशियल है। इस पोटेंशियल की अगर एक्सप्लायट किया जाए तो मैं समझता हूँ कि अकेला हिमाचल प्रदेश सारे देश के लिए इस कमी को बहुत हद तक पूरा कर सकता है। इसलिए मुझे इस बात का दुख हुआ है कि बजट स्पीच में जो प्रोपोजल्स हैं और उन में जिन प्रोजेक्ट्स का जिक्र किया गया है, उन में हिमाचल प्रदेश के लिए एक भी प्रोजेक्ट का जिक्र नहीं है। यह बड़े दुख की बात है। जिस क्षेत्र में सब से ज्यादा हाईडल के जरिये से बिजली पैदा करने की क्षमता है, उस के लिए एक भी स्कीम नहीं रखी गई है। यह हिमाचल प्रदेश का नुकसान नहीं है, यह सारे देश का नुकसान है। इसलिए मैं समझता हूँ कि ये जो सारे प्रोपोजल्स हैं, इनको अगर दोबारा रिवाइज करके हिमाचल के प्रोजेक्ट्स भी किए जाएं तो हमारे देश के अन्दर जो बिजली की कमी है, उसको दूर किया जा सकता है और इससे इण्डस्ट्रियल प्रोग्रेस भी बढ़ सकती है। हिमाचल प्रदेश के अन्दर जो बिजली पैदा

[श्री रणजीत सिंह]

होगी उसको नेशनल ग्रिड के द्वारा देश के किसी भी कोने में पहुंचाया जा सकता है।

इसके साथ ही, सभापति महोदय, मैं इस बात का भी जिक्र करना चाहता हूँ कि हिमाचल प्रदेश के अन्दर जो प्रोजेक्ट्स गवर्नमेंट आफ इण्डिया की तरफ से चलाए गए वे जैसे भाखड़ा डैम, सतलुज व्यास लिफ्ट और पोंग डैम वे प्रोजेक्ट्स कम्प्लीट हो चुके हैं। यह इस माननीय सदन को और आपको भी पता होगा कि 1970 में सतलुज, व्यास और पोंग डैम प्रोजेक्ट्स पूरे हो गये हैं और इनके कम्प्लीट होने के कारण हिमाचल प्रदेश में जो 24 हजार आदमी काम करने वाले थे, वे बेकार हो गये हैं। 24 हजार फ़ैमेलीज इससे इफेक्टिव हुई हैं और 35 लाख की आबादी हिमाचल प्रदेश की है। इतनी आबादी में से अगर 24 हजार फ़ैमेलीज इफेक्टिव हो जाएं, तो आप अन्दाजा लगा सकते हैं कि उस प्रदेश के अन्दर कितना असंतुलन पैदा हो गया होगा। इसलिए भारत सरकार का ध्यान मैं इस तरफ खींचना चाहता हूँ कि कोई न कोई प्रोजेक्ट्स वहां पर चलूँ करवाएँ ताकि उन प्रोजेक्ट्स के जरिये जो लोग बेकार हुए हैं, उनको एम्प्लाय-मेंट दिया जा सके और देश के लिए बिजली का उत्पादन किया जा सके।

इसके साथ ही साथ, आपके माध्यम से दो मिनट में मैं एक बात का उल्लेख करके अपना स्थान प्रहम करूँगा। मैं सरकार का ध्यान इस ओर भी दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि इमर्जेंसी के दौरान देश के अन्दर जबरी नसबंदी के जरिये बहुत लोगों पर अत्याचार हुए हैं और कई लोगों की तो जान तक चली गई है और बहुत सारे जो खेत के मजदूर थे या कारखाने के मजदूर थे जो मेहनत मुश्किल करने वाले लोग थे, उनकी सेहत पर बुरा असर पड़ा है। आज बहुत सारे देहातों में

ऐसे लोग हैं, ऐसी बहुत सारी फ़ैमेलीज हैं कि वे लोग मेहनत का काम नहीं कर सकते हैं। इस कारण मैं सरकार का ध्यान इस तरफ भी खींचना चाहता हूँ। मैं ऐसे परिवारों के उन आदमियों की तरफ, जो अपने परिवार का केवलमात्र सहारा हैं और मेहनत, मशकत करके अपने परिवार को पालते हैं, सरकार का ध्यान ले जाना चाहता हूँ। यह ठीक है कि सरकार ने जबरन नसबंदी बंद कर दी है और इसके लिए सरकार बधाई की पात्र है। लेकिन जो दरखास्तें उन लोगों से मांगी गयी थीं, उनकी इन्कवायरी के लिए उन्हीं लोगों को भेजा जाता है जो कि इस जबरन नसबंदी के लिए जिम्मेदार है, जिन्होंने इस सारे काम में बड़-चड़ कर हिस्सा लिया है। इसलिए इस सारे मामले में इन्कवायरी ठीक नहीं हुई है। यही कारण है कि ऐसे लोगों की सही खबर सरकार तक नहीं पहुंची और सरकार ने उनके लिए ऐसा कोई काम नहीं किया जिससे ऐसे परिवारों का रिहैबिलिटेशन होता। इसलिए मैं सरकार का ध्यान इस ओर आकृष्ट करना चाहता हूँ और सरकार से प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि वह ऐसे परिवारों के लिए जिनकी इस जबरन नसबंदी के कारण आर्थिक दशा खराब हो गयी है, कोई ठोस कदम उठाये जिससे उनका पुनः रिहैबिलिटेशन हो सके।

सभापति महोदय, हमारे देश के अन्दर जनता सरकार के आने के बाद, पहले जहां नसबंदी होती थी, वहां अब नशाबंदी पर जोर दिया जा रहा है। इस पर तरह तरह के लोपों के खदाल पड़ने, सुनने और देखने को मिलते हैं। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे देश के लिए नशाबंदी बहुत अच्छी चीज़ है। कोई भी आदमी जो शराब पीता है, बड़ होश में नहीं रहता और जो आदमी अपना हाथ खो बैठा है, वह आदमी अपनी, अपने परिवार की, अपने समाज की और अपने देश की सेवा नहीं कर सकता है। किसी इंडीविजुअल की सामने रख कर हमें

इस नशाबंदी की नहीं लेना चाहिए। दुर्भाग्य की बात है कि हमारे देश के अन्दर जो जागरूक और पढ़ा-लिखा वर्ग है, वही इस शराबखोरी की बीमारी का सब से ज्यादा शिकार है और यही वजह है कि वह वर्ग आलोचक है। अगर इसके लिए वोटिंग करायी जाए, लोगों की राय जानी जाए तो बहुमत नशाबंदी के हक में आयेगा। लेकिन जो लोग राजनीति में हैं, या सत्ता जिनके हाथ में है, वही इसके खिलाफ जाते हैं। ये ही लोग नशाबंदी के प्रयत्नों की खत्म करने के लिए आंकड़ें बेश करते हैं और कहते हैं कि देश का इतना आर्थिक नुकसान होगा। मैं आपको एक मिसाल देना चाहता हूँ। चीन की आप जानते हैं। चीन में जब पीपुल्स गवर्नमेंट आयी तो उसने सारे देश में अफीम खाना बंद कर दिया। पहले वहाँ के लोग अफीमबो कहे जाते थे। जब से चीन में अफीम खाना बंद किया गया है तब से वह देश इतना शक्तिशाली हो गया है। लेकिन आजादी के बाद से हमारे देश में कोई इस तरह की कोशिश नहीं हुई। तीस साल के अन्दर शराब पीने का रोग बहुत फैला है। पहले कोई शराब पीता था तो छिप कर पीता था और पीने के बाद भी छिपाये रखता था। शराब पी कर समाज के सामने आने में उसे शर्म महसूस होती थी। लेकिन तीस साल के शासन के बाद आज देश के सामने बिल्कुल उल्टी ही तस्वीर है। आज उस व्यक्ति को नफरत की निगाह से देखा जाता है जो शराब नहीं पीता है। शराब पीने वाला कोई शर्म महसूस नहीं करता है। जो शराब पीता है उसको समझा जाता है कि वह सोसायटी के काबिल है। इसलिए सरकार को इसकी ओर ध्यान देना चाहिए। प्रचार के जरिए ऐसा माहौल पैदा किया जाये कि शराब पीया हुआ आदमी यह महसूस करे कि देश के लिए तथा अपने परिवार के लिए भी वह एक बुरा काम कर रहा है। ऐसा वातावरण पैदा हो ताकि शराब की

इल्लत खत्म हो जाये। इसके बारे में जितना व्यापक प्रचार किया जायेगा, जितना व्यापक काम किया जायेगा उतना ही अच्छा होगा। प्रोहिबिशन कानून के जरिये से नहीं हो सकती हैं। इसके लिए लोगों का सहयोग लेना होगा और सामाजिक कार्यकर्ता जो इस काम में लगे हुए हैं उनको सरकार को पूरा समर्थन देना होगा। अगर उनकी पूरी मदद सरकार द्वारा की जायेगी तो नशाबन्दी को देश में लागू किया जा सकता है और हमारा बेश भी उसी तरह से शक्तिशाली हो सकता है जिस तरह से चीन हो गया है और हमारे सामने एक मिसाल बन कर खड़ा हो गया है।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस धन्यवाद के प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करता हूँ और आपको समय देने के लिए धन्यवाद देता हूँ।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Venugopal. The time allotted to your party has already been exhausted by your friends. You may conclude in 5 or 6 minutes.

SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR (Pondicherry): Other parties have taken three times their entitled time. Even the Janata Party has taken more time. It has not been strictly according to the party strength. He may be given some more time.

*SHRI VENUGOPAL GOUNDER (Wandiwash): Hon. Mr. Chairman, on behalf of my party the All India Anna Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam, I rise to express my views on the President's Address. At the very outset, I would like to thank you for giving me an opportunity to participate in this discussion.

The President in his Address has stated that the independence of judiciary would be secure in the hands of his Government. The President has also asserted that there will not

[Shri Venugopal Gounder]

be political interference in the administration. He has mentioned that his Government attaches great importance to the purity of public life and practical and reliable safeguards through legislation are on the anvil. We welcome unreservedly and wholeheartedly these high-falutin and admirable democratic ethics expounded by our President. In fact, these are the cherished ideals of my party the All India Anna D.M.K. and our great leader Thiru M.G.R. has vowed himself to translate these ideals into administrative and public norms.

While referring to the claim of the President that his Government has restored the Courts to their pristine purity and has enabled them to regain their powers, I would like to say that 90 Commissions have been appointed and nearly 90 crores of public money have been squandered on them. With great fanfare such high judicial probe bodies are appointed and any amount of tax-payers' money is spent on them. I am sorry to say that neither these Commissions are honoured by the Government accepting and implementing their verdict nor the people are enabled to derive any benefit in view of their hard-earned money being spent on such Commissions. Even after the Commissions have proved beyond doubt that certain political leaders have committed malpractices and misused their official position for personal aggrandisement, it is unfortunate that not only no action has been taken against them but the very political leaders get rewarded with high public offices again. They are appointed as Ministers. Is this the way to respect the decisions of judicial bodies? After having spent people's money, as if to add insult to injury, their life and honour are entrusted to the care of the very same criminals. Is it not proper to demand that all of us, sitting on the Ruling and Opposition Benches, should ponder over the

people's predicament living in this polluted environment?

I have no hesitation in saying that serious thought must be given before constituting such Inquiry Commissions. What happens when an Inquiry Commission gives one judgment and the general public give another judgment? For example, an Inquiry Commission has concluded beyond doubt that a certain public man has misused his office of power and also the trust reposed in him by the people. But the people give their verdict that he is an honest man. I want to know whose judgment will be honoured by this Government—the Inquiry Body's judgement or the people's. I would in particular refer to the Grover Commission—I am not pleading the cause of any political party by referring to this—which has stated that Shri Urs is guilty of the charge of misuse of power. But the people of Karnataka have elected him with greater majority than he had previously to rule the State. That means the people of the State have their hope in him and they have placed him on the high pedestal of Honesty and Justness. Now the Government at the Centre must be between the devil and deep sea. I would like to know whether the Central Government would respect the wishes of the people of Karnataka or the judgment of the Grover Commission. That is why I said initially that the Government must think twice before constituting commissions of inquiry. I would also say that there should not be any political considerations or political vendetta which should influence the appointment of such Commissions. In the matter of constituting inquiry commissions, political motivations must yield to a sense of impartiality and fair-play. In this matter there cannot be any room for double standards, especially when political personages are involved.

Sir, some people actively engaged in the public life of Tamil Nadu made certain allegations of misconduct and

misuse of power on the part of men in high offices. The Sarkaria Commission was constituted and irrefutable evidence was placed before the Commission. The Commission gave opportunity for the accused to contradict the allegations. Yet they did not avail of that opportunity. The Sarkaria Commission has given its Report proving beyond doubt that the allegations against the men in Office were true. This judgment is before all of us. Yet the Government has developed cold feet to the Report of Sarkaria Commission. No action has so far been taken against the proved offenders. I wonder how this Government is going to reconcile this contradiction between the judgment of the Commission and the judgment of the people. Secondly, political views should not be the criteria for constituting an inquiry Commission. Thirdly, when the duly constituted Commissions of Inquiry give their verdict, should there be any hesitation on the part of the Government to take required action on such a verdict?

Within the shortest time available to me, I will refer to certain other important issues. I would like to know what is the language policy of Janata Government. The people of Tamil Nadu are greatly agitated on this question. The late-lamented Jawaharal Nehru solemnly assured the non-Hindi speaking people in the country that Hindi would not be imposed on them so long as they did not want it. I am pained to see that the assurance of Pandit Nehru has been violated by Janata Government. The Circulars and Communications from the Central Government to the States are sent in Hindi, especially to non-Hindi speaking States. We do not hate Hindi and we want Hindi to grow and assume national importance. Yet what do we see in this House? The hon. Members on the other side, whose proficiency in English and other languages can be verified from the University Degrees they have acquired, they insist on speaking

in Hindi, even when they know that their own colleagues in the House do not understand that language. It seems that they are keen to kindle the passion of non-Hindi speaking people. It seems that they are intent on intensifying the hatred of non-speaking people towards Hindi. It seems that they are keen to exhibit their Hindi fanaticism and Hindi imperialism to the people of non-Hindi speaking States through the forum of this House. Does this mean that we in this House are not equal to the Hindi-speaking Members? Are we second-grade citizens of the country that we should submit to this humiliation of being unequal on the floor of this august house? I know English very well. I can talk freely and fluently in English. Just to retaliate I am speaking in Tamil. We have inherently no hatred, no animosity against any language including Hindi. We want to extend our hands of co-operation. Why do you spurn them by your snobbery? Why do you want to offend our susceptibilities by insisting on speaking in Hindi which we do not understand? Article 14 of the Constitution ensures equality before law for every one. Similarly, 14 languages of the country have been enshrined in the Constitution with the laudable objective of developing all the fourteen languages equally. I wonder why should Hindi alone grow at the cost of other languages. If you look at the financial statistics trotted out by the Government you will find enormous amounts have been spent in developing Hindi and only niggardly sums have been expended on the growth of other national languages. I can say without fear of contradiction that Tamil has been treated flip-pantly by the Central Government and very little has been spent for its development. This partisan approach sows the seeds of regionalism in us. The behaviour of friends from northern States nurtures the tender plant of separatism. The attitude of the Centre allows it to grow a giant tree of resentment and anger. I say this with full sense of responsibility

[Shri Venugopal Gounder]

that the Central Government should bear this in mind before formulating and implementing its language policy.

18 hrs.

Coming now to the important questions of Centre-State relations, he founding fathers of our Constitution made it neither federal nor unitary—it was a mixture of both. Now over the years it has become purely unitary. Why should the States demand more powers? The principal reason that they are the nearest organisation to the people and they want to ensure expeditious development of the State. The State Government wants to be an effective instrument in the dispensation of social and economic justice. If the State wants to divide a district on the consideration of its economic viability or if the State wants to add to a district the contiguous areas in the interest of economic development, it has to obtain the sanction of the Central Government. The permission of the Central Government is necessary even if a small hamlet is to be given a particular name.

The Central Planning Commission is not a creation of our Constitution. It has also no legal backing behind it.

It is purely a body of bureaucrats. Yet it bosses over the revenues of the entire country. It is the final arbiter of even State plans. It is inexplicable to me why this Planning Commission should sit over the judgement of the duly elected State Governments and their Chief Ministers who know better the needs and requirements of the States. The Planning Commission's Report must be discussed on the floor of this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Venugopal, you conclude your speech.

SHRI VENUGOPAL GOUNDER: Is it not contrary to democratic ethics propounded by our President that a body created by the Central Government should sit over the duly elected State Governments, which reflect the hopes and aspirations of the people living in the States.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow; Mr. Lakkappa will speak tomorrow and then Mr. Sathe.

18.04 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, March 3, 1978/Phalguna 12, 1899 (Saka)