

[Sh. R. Jeevarathinam]

[Translation]

Government. But this has not yet been completed. Hence, the people of Arakonam find it difficult to go to Kanchipuram and Tiruttani. Also, the people on the other side find difficult to come over to northern side. This is causing a lot of hardship to the public. There is already an underway bridge but it is stagnated with two feet of water. As a result of this also, the people find it difficult to come from one side to the other side.

I request the union Government to direct the State Government to complete its share of work early. I also request to take necessary steps to make the underway bridge functional. (*Interruptions*)

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If you want to make an allegation against any person on the floor of this House, it shall have to be accompanied by a notice. An allegation was made in the morning. But no motion was moved. So, that does not go to the record.

1434 hrs

MOTION OF THANKS ON THE
PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS - *Contd.*

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: We will now take up further discussion on the Motion of Thanks to the President's Address moved by Shri Digvijay Singh. Time allotted is 12 hours, of which three hours and eleven minutes are already over. So, we have at our disposal eight hours and forty nine minutes.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Lucknow): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, President's Address is an important event in the Joint Session of the Parliament. This time the Budget Session started with the President's Address. I wished to be present on the occasion but could not. The reason is evident. At the end of his speech the Hon. President referred to democracy to be a living thing. He admitted that the country is faced with crises. He admitted that the country is faced with crises. He has also admitted that there have been remarkable levels of cooperation as also strong areas of dissent last year. He said that our democracy is very lively. I do not understand the extent to which the Hon. president's views and the Government's actions are complementary to each other. Is it not so that the President's Address is written separately and the Government acts differently.

My hon. friend Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar is not present here. Once he wrote in an article as to how he drafted President's Addresses. I do not know as to what procedure is being followed now and who prepares the Address. Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, it is true that we wished to be present at the time of Joint Parliament Session but we decided to abstain. Shri Advani wrote a letter to the Hon. President and informed that we are sorry that we are not coming and also clarified that it was not a disrespect to the office of the President. We do respect the office of President and since he holds the office we respect him. However, the Government is creating a situation due to which we would respectfully abstain from the Joint Parliament Session. We used the word "respectfully abstain." It is true that attention is not paid to minute things today, Sensitive matters are neither taken into consideration nor evaluated. Next day I read newspapers

and the news was that Bhartiya Janata Party boycotts the Joint Parliament Session. Though very minor but there is certainly a difference between the word "boycott" and 'respectfully abstain.' However, that difference is not being taken into consideration. We were very agitated. It was but natural for us to be agitated for the way in which our rally was banned. But we did not create any obstacle in passing the Railway Budget. The Government crossed all limits in controlling the rally. We also lost patience. But we did not create any problem while presenting the General Budget.

I have very long association with this House. I remember the days when Shri Morarji Desai used to be the hon. Minister of Finance. He was going to present the Budget but some of the communist Members were agitated. So they continued to raise a hue and cry while Morarji Desai continued his Budget speech. We could have also created such a situation. But we did not do so because our conscience did not permit it...

We want that democracy should prevail in the real sense and dignity of the House should be preserved. However, the dignity of the House is not preserved inside the House. Who knows what happens outside the House? Will the same not be reflected here? Therefore, when the Hon. President refers democracy to be lively, it could be reflected outside too. Farmers are holding a rally. What is the need to stop them? The Government asked them to hold the rally near the Red Fort. Cannot the citizens of the country gather in front of the Parliament and knock the doors of Parliament? All the rallies have been banned. Our leftist friends are also complaining, because there will be oppression. Everyone, big and small, will suffer. Therefore, oppression should not take place. The other day I had pointed out

that the hon. Minister of Home Affairs could hold talks. I read in the newspapers that farmers were given permission to hold their rally near the Red Fort. But we were not even asked whether we wanted to hold the rally at some other place. It is altogether different that we would not have agreed.

SHRI NITISH KUMAR: (Barh): On the top of Qutab Minar?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: We would make you climb on it deliver and our speeches.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the incident of 6th December, is the first reference in the President's Address. That was but natural. The matter has already been discussed and will be discussed again. I will say afterwards what I want to say with regard to it. However, I was going through the English and Hindi versions of the Address. Its English version is as follows:

[English]

"The basic premise of secularism and the rule of law has been threatened."

[Translation]

But in the Hindi version of these lines it has been stated that secularism and law have been threatened. What is the threat and who gave the threat is the matter of discussion. There is a lot of difference in it. But I am referring to the specific word. In English it is said that ours is a secular country and it should remain secular. There is no objection to it. But the difficulty arises only when the specific word is translated as 'Dharam nirpeksh' in Hindi. Not only in my opinion but in a common man's opinion ours is a religious country. To be religious or having good qualities mean to the same

[Sh. Nitish Kumar]

thing these days. However, emphasis is laid on to safeguard the 'Dharam nirpeksh' and I would like to submit to the so called custodians of secularism that 'Dharam nirpeksh' is not the equivalent of the word 'secularism'. It is creating confusion among the people. Is the Government anti-religious? Does the Government want to make the country non-religious?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I have already made a mention of it and today I would like to repeat the same. I am talking of the years 1949-50. When the constitution of India was formed there was no reference to the word 'secular' in it. Everybody agreed that our country should be secular. It was not at all a matter of controversy. Even after the formation of Pakistan, nobody ever raised the demand to declare India a religious state. However, the Constitution makers did not use the word 'secular' in the Constitution, because they were apprehensive that it might create confusion. When the word 'secular' is translated as 'Dharam Nirpeksh' it is certainly likely to create a confusion. Nehruji realised this problem in 1961. I am referring to Nehruji because most of the hon. Members refer to him again and again when they talk of secularism. Nehruji had written the preface of a book called "Dharam nirpeksh Rajya" by an M.P., Shri Raghunath Singh in Varanasi in 1961. The book is available in library and can be borrowed. I am reading out an extract from the book— "Perhaps the word 'secular' in English. Some people think that it relates to antireligion, and obviously it is wrong to have such a notion. It means that it is a statute which gives equal respect to all religions."

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, if taken in this context, India has always been and will remain a secular country and the incident of

6th December has not at all created a threat to secularism. Let us use the proper word. In the latest Hindi version of the Constitution of India, the word 'secular' stands for 'Panth Nirpeksh' and, not for 'Dharam-Nirpeksh'. India should follow the concept of 'Panth Nirpeksh'. The word religion is used in a wider term. If at all the people of this country have to be encouraged to move ahead, work hard and make as much sacrifice as possible, then religion cannot be isolated.

Shri Indrajeet Gupta is not present here. An incident referred to by Shri Durgadas in his book named "India from Curzon to Nehru" is worth reading. I would like to place it before the House. I quote. "I asked Gandhi how he would counter Jinnah's charge that his was a pseudo-religious movement likely to lead to a reactionary revivalism. Gandhi replied that his own idiom was the only one that the masses could grasp. Villager responded to his call, for they lived nearer to God than the townsfolk, and understood his message as a call to self-abnegation and self-purification. As for revivalism, Gandhi said he certainly wished to see among the Hindus a revival of spirit of resistance to evil and a shedding of their cowardice. Anyway, Hindu-Muslim unity was to him an article of faith and he could never be so foolish as to inaugurate a movement likely to harm this cause. The Muslim masses instinctively understood the religious issue and would feel brotherly towards non-Muslims who espoused their cause."

[Translation]

Today, it is said that religion and politics should be separated and that religion and politics have no relation. In order to convey the correct idea of it to a common man if we say that communalism should not be associated with politics and that religion should not be misused to fulfil the political motives-

I can understand the sense. But the Government does not say this. It says that religion has no relation with politics and those who try to bring religion into politics pose a danger to secularism in the country. A common man does not accept this idea. I have not, so far, been able to understand why stress is being laid on defining the word 'secular' as 'Dharam Nirpeksh'. Are we not able to make people understand by translating secularism into 'panth-nirpeksha' or 'sampradaynirpeksha'.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, firstly, before taking up other issues, I would like to submit a point in this regard. What is the identity of this country which we call as Bharat, Hindustan or India. Where are the life roots of this country. From which roots the nationality of this country gets the stream of life? No new nation was born in the year 1947. The nations which emerged in Europe after the second world war are in a process of disintegration at present. But this country has remained united for centuries. There were different states and they had some times used to indulge in wars with each other. Even then the country was one. What were the reasons for its unity? Please excuse me, I would like to state that at that time, Islam or Christianity had not reached to our country. The believers in Islam did not come with Ghori or Ghazni. First of all, the traders from Arab came here and constructed the first mosque in South India by taking permission from the hindu ruler there. Noone objected to the construction of that mosque and the ruler also permitted happily. Never before any such fight has taken place in the country. Is it not an evidence that this is an ancient nation? Only a new chapter was opened in the year 1947. Our intellectuals who are influenced with western education, will say that:

[English]

The concept of the nation is a modern concept.

[Translation]

So, they cannot accept our country as an ancient nation. If you do not want to accept it, it is your own wish, but no one can deny about its ancientness. I do not want to quote Nehruji again. He had also said "since thousand of years, a chain of life is continued and I am proud that I am also a link of that chain. I do not want to separate myself from that chain." Which is this chain? Is it not Hindu? But an objection has been raised on the word 'Hindu' after the independence or after the division of the country. Why the effort to give Indian colour to everything, after the independence was not fully successful. I have said it earlier also and would again like to repeat that we should discuss this question as to what is the national pride of this country. If this is not a Hindu country or if it is not integrated by the Hindu culture, then what other factors are responsible for the integrity of this country. Who were those great men who inspired the people for making sacrifices at the time of foreign invasions. It was Shivaji and not Autangzeb.. Why Maharana Pratap inspire the people of this country even today? I agree that the Muslims, who came from the other countries and settled here, became part and parcel of this country. They should also be treated equally. Our constitution provides such guarantee. There is a need to bring it into practice also. There is no difference of opinion in this regard, but people are being misled by creating imaginary differences of opinion. It is necessary to have clearcut opinions and we are ready for a discussion in this respect.

[Sh. Nitish Kumar]

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the hon. Home Minister stated that day that the R.S.S. members consider Hinduism as nationalism. He should understand that here Hinduism is not used as Hindu religion. Isn't it so? No adjective was used before religion. It was always preached to follow the religion. Later on, sects were formed and ways of worship were developed. But this land has enough strength to take everyone along, Why are we giving less importance to this strength? If it is said that politics should not be communalised, then this rule should be applicable to all. One should not adopt double standard.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I do not want to repeat the same points. I am expressing a point. I am happy that Shri Chandra Shekhar is present here. It is necessary to have clarity in thoughts. You accuse us of being communalists and responsible for dividing the country and we accuse you of dividing the country in 1947 and again you are doing the same. Thus, this discussion will lead us to nowhere. One should have clearcut views on this issue, we should have same opinions and should speak same language on the basic issues. It is true that we will always have difference of opinion with the persons who say that India is not a nation or India is a group of nationalities. Out Communist friends had been expressing their views till recently that there is no such thing like Muslim communalism.

[English]

There is no such thing as....(Interruptions)

[Translation]

Dada Bhupesh Gupta has given these

speeches in Rajya Sabha in my presence. I can quote those speeches.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY(Katwa): He would have been afraid of you.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: please do not say like this, I have a great regard for Dada. There is no question of his being afraid of me. I know when the Constitution was changed and the Word "secular" was included, Shri Indrajit Gupta was present there. He had said at that time as to why this word is being included. Out country is already secular.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA(Midnapore): The word "socialist" has also been included in it.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: No discussion was held on it. This motion was moved by S.Swaran Singh and he had said that the word "secular" means that there will be no religion of the state and it will have no system of worship and its attitude towards all religions will be equal. Some of the Members did not speak at all. But when Shri K.T. Dshh tried to get included the word "socialist" in the Constitution, Dr. Ambedkar did not accept it. The argument given by Dr. Ambedkar shows his farsightedness. In the drafting committee he rejected the amendment. He said that socialism is a hypothesis of an economic set up and I do not want to include it in the constitution because economic system and hypothesis keep on changing. A time may come when a better economic system than socialism may come into being and the same is accepted by the people. I do not want to put limitations for the future generations. To say at that time....

Today the ideas of Dr. Ambedkar is mentioned in parts only, while the need of

the hour is to see him in totality. I am not going to discuss that issue/

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am expressing a point of view. A discussion is going on seeds under the Dunkel Proposal. The Government is trying to defend the indetensible Dunkel Proposal. The root is more important than the tree and that root has come out from the seed. There is enough matter to consider, but please do not level allegations. You can accuse us and we can accuse you. Where this dialogue will lead us to?

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOUDHURY: We go upto genes.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Because you are materialistic. That is why, you go upto genes.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, a mention has been made in the President's Address about our relations with neighbouring countries. We all want that we should have good relations with out neighboring countries, but despite all efforts, our relations with Pakistan and Bangladesh are not improving. The incidents which happened in these countries after 6th of December give a serious warning to our country. It is a matter of grave concern. After all, the issue of Ayodhya is an internal issue of our country and it is our responsibility to solve it properly. We can not allow our neighbouring countries to make any interference in the issue and demolish temples, burn down the houses of Hindus making thousands of them homeless and burn our National Flag and all this has been done on the Government level. in Faislabad, a Minister of the Federal Government in Pakistan kept looking on and a temple was demolished before him. In Lahore, a temple was demolished through Bulldozer. This is totally wrong.

SHRI NITISH KUMAR: In 1984, the same has happened with the sikhs also.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Ballia): Sir, the thing is that the federal Government was responsible there and here the state Government was responsible for it.

15.00 hrs

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: And, who did so in Bangladesh?

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: There is federal set up there.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Neither the Federal Government nor the State Government did anything, but 490 temples have also been demolished there. Is it an ordinary incident? What did our Government do there? I am taking of only temples here, but shops and industrial units were set ablaze there. Should it not be mentioned? That is why the Prime Minister of India had to cancel his Dhaka visit and moreover threats are still being given that the Indian Premier will not be allowed to airdash in case he goes there to participate in the SAARC Summit.

A mention was made during his address by His Excellency the President of India that the talks with Premier of Bangladesh were held in a very cordial manner when the latter was on a tour of India. Tin Bigha has been given well, the Government may give something more if it wants so, but there should be cordial relations. Dialogue with neighbouring Countries is needed to be had firmly and in clear terms. We want that our relations with the neighbouring countries should improve. Now, the rest of the world have considerably changed, but the countries of West Asia are still entangled in tensions.

I had told you that we would solve the Ayodhya tangle, but we cannot allow any Islamic country to become the protector of Indian Muslims. It is wrong.

Mr. Deputy speaker, Sir, the immigration of people from Bangladesh who are coming in great numbers is yet another issue concerned with this issue. Many citizens of Bangladesh have succeeded in getting their names entered in the voters' lists even through a voice of protest was raised against it in Delhi. Their names should be deleted soon. Can it be called a communal demand? Should any country allow people from its neighbouring country to immigrate illegally?

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, after an inquiry was conducted in Delhi, names of several thousand Bangladeshi were deleted from the lists of voters. The inquiry is still going on.

I had been to Assam recently. The proposed rally of our party to be held in Guwahati, was initially banned, however, it was allowed later on. But, I would like to submit that this House should pay attention to the situation arising in Assam. Issues are generally allowed to linger on. How matters are allowed to linger on for politics of votes was seen by us in Ayodhya issue. But another type of situation is emerging there due to the inflow of a large number of people from Bangladesh. The Election Commission no longer remains to be our institution but the Election commission has issued directives. Today the members of the Janata Dal and the left parties had raised the issue of Tripura. We agree with them on this score. If inquiry is not held in accordance with the directives of the Election Commission and if the officers in ques-

tion are not removed, will it then not tantamount to the mockery of the Election Commission? There is no justification of caretaker Government of the same State Government in Tripura.

It is being stated that the report of the Governor has not been received, but it is no secret that the union Government can get the Governor's report anytime and of its own choice. You got the reports from the Governors of the four States and dismissed those Governments. It means what you thing right is right.

The Central Government may be interested in allowing the corrupt State Government of Tripura to remain in Power. The Tripura Government which was indulged in electoral irregularities may be allowed to continue in power, even though the comments and the strictures have been passed by the Election Commission against the State Government. Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, yet another drama is being enacted in Assam.

An order to review the voters, lists throughout the country was given on the 25th November, 1992 by the Election Commission keeping the date of 1st January 1993 in mind. They had written in their report that foreign nationals have come to India in a large number and they have succeeded in getting their names entered in the voter's lists. The scrutiny of voters' lists should be made keeping in view the date of 1st January, 1993. The names of foreign nationals should be deleted from those voters lists.

Now I want to quote what the Election Commission has stated. I am having a copy of the entire directive given by it. The Election Commission has stated.

[English]

"AND WHEREAS, being aware of the presence of a substantial number of foreign nationals in some States in India the Commission, in full consultation with the Ministry of Home Affairs, issued a direction with its letter No. 23/92 dated 21 Aug., 1992 to all the State Governments and Chief Electoral Officers containing a special enumeration procedure for areas having a substantial presence of foreign nationals."

[Translation]

The Commission has also written that the direction being forward by it has been endorsed by the Ministry of Home Affairs that is to say the Ministry is agreeable to it. The Commission added that in accordance with the new procedure it is the responsibility of the State Governments to identify foreign nationals in every Assembly and at every polling booth. It was also stated by the Commission the work of identifying the foreign nationals and counting their number should be finished by 31st August, 1992. The Commission added that in case there was any doubt about the citizenship of a person, the district collector should decide it by 7th October, 1992, Later on, this date was extended from 7th to 17 of October.

But the Government of Assam did not comply with the direction. It said that the counting would be conducted as per the voters' list of 1990. Those who had come up to 1990 would not be removed, whether they are the citizens of India or not. This was the purport of what it said. The State Government made it dear that it was not ready to abide by the new direction. It also issued directives to its officials that they have to ensure this much whether the person whose name was entered in the voters list was of 18 years of age in 1990 or not. Now there is a

tug of war between the Government of Assam and the Election Commission.

Now I would like to shift your attention from the situation of Tripura to the situation of Assam. The Election Commission did not accept the objections raised by the Government of Assam. It again issued direction that it should be followed. The Ministry of Home Affairs also reminded the State Government of its responsibilities, but the Government of Assam adopted adamant posture. A meeting with the representatives of the Government of Assam was held in Delhi on 13.11.92 in order to persuade them to arrive at an agreement in this regard. Now I quote from order of Commission.

[English]

"It became further evident that the State Government had knowingly and without any plausible reason disregarded the direction of the Commission issued in full consultation with the Ministry of Home Affairs relating to this matter of grave importance."

[Translation]

The State Government is not ready to abide by it. The Election Commission has stopped the work of preparing new voters' lists in Assam what will happen? To make proper arrangements for holding of free and fair elections, to revise voters' list and to add new voters in the voters' lists, all come under the jurisdiction of the Election Commission. But the State Government is bent upon violating the directions of the Election Commission openly. It is also violating the directives of the Ministry of Home Affairs.

When I want to Guwahati I came to know that there are 105 such constituencies in which 10 percent population has increased

[Sh. Atal Bihari Vajpayee]

during the last one year. How can there be an increase of 10 percent of population in one year? But when the Assam Government takes any step, the vote-politics comes in the way and the matter concerning the security and integrity of the country is held up. This is really a serious issue. We do not want to make it an issue of Hindus and Muslims. People in large number have come from Nepal. They are creating a number of problems. The Government cannot accept illegal entry.

America is also not allowing the foreign nationals to settle there. In America when Mr. Clinton was fighting election, he declared that his attitude would be sympathetic towards the persons who were coming from Haiti to take shelter in America. President Bush had stopped their entry. Now when Mr. Clinton has assumed office, of the President of America, he says that he cannot be sympathetic towards them and that their entry will have to be prevented. That is on the Mexico border. America is trying its best to prevent illegal entry. But in our country every issue is given a communal colour and vote is linked with every issue. When the situation goes out of control, the Government makes desperate attempts to control the situation but eventually nothing happens.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir there was also a mention about the Ayodhya issue in the President's Address. That the case has been referred to the Supreme Court has also been mentioned. I do not know whether the Supreme Court would give any decision in such case or not. It can both reject the case or give its decision thereon. The decision may favour one side only and the decision may also lead to the state of indecision. Can this issue not be solved even

now through cordial talks outside the court of law? Can the Parliament not play any role in it? If the Parliament had played its role earlier, if the judiciary had been a bit fast in pronouncing its decision and if the political parties would have contributed to finding a solution rising above vote politics. (*Interruptions*)

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I have not mentioned the name of anybody.

SHRI MOHAN SINGH (Deoria): And you call it a mandate. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: There is a little change in the Muslim opinion. This is not so out of any fear. There is a change in them because they have come to realise that it is really a matter of deep sentiment of the people. Now I would like to submit that the Government should take advantage of this change in their attitude and make all efforts to find a solution to the problem. If the Government remains adamant there may be difficulties in finding the solution to the problem. There is enough time now and I wish what Chandra Shekhar ji had initiated should be taken up again. Later on, he lashed out at us.

Still there is time. If the court gives its verdict on the basis of the evidence, documents, inscriptions archeological material that there was a Mandir than the demand of mosque should be dropped. But it is a different question whether the court gives such a verdict or not. I am also presenting the other side of the picture. Whatever may be the verdict of the court one of the two sides would remain discontent. I do not want that this discontent should be there.

SHRI ABDUL GHAFOOR (Gopalganj): Many things can be tolerated you also know how we are exercising restraints.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am offering

a view point. You have to assess its weight. Still there is time all the people of this country have to live together. The politics of vote has disturbed the situation much. (Interruptions) We joined this game much later. The debate on the vote of thanks to the President's Address is providing this opportunity. (Interruptions)

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: The suggestion made by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee is a right suggestion. If a dialogue in the matter is to be resumed, will the Members of Bhartiya Janta Party and other people associate themselves with it. Will they take any initiative in it so that negotiations could be resumed again? I fully agree to their opinion that this problem cannot be sorted out through court and Government alone. It can be resolved through dialogue only. So could I would like to request Atalji to make their people prepared for it and pave the way of holding talks.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, if any such effort is made we are ready to participate in it but it should be done with a goodwill and with an eye for finding a solution to the problem. Till now many efforts have been made but each step raised a new problem so in disgust we suggested that the matter should be referred to the court. Now the matter is in the court. Heaving will start and verdict will be given. Whatever be the verdict, it would leave one side dissatisfied and that will not be an ideal one. But I think if any matter is not sorted out through mutual negotiations. We should approach the court and accept its verdict. But this a question of creating goodwill in the country and Shri Chandrashekhar can discuss this matter with his friends and find out a solution. We have been isolated. BJP has been..... a political.

[English]

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI, CHATTERJEE (Dumdum): Will that root be strengthened if you recognise Shivaji and Rana Pratap only and not Tipu Sultan.

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Sir, this is an effort to distort my version. I had raised a question. Please put it up in a correct way. It should conform to facts in history and thoughts of the minds. Things took an ugly turn because various aspects related dispute have been deal with separately. It is not enough to say that the Hindus and Muslims should live together. Who are our great men and what was their conduct? That is why I have raised a question and I would like to know your view in the matter. We do not want to leave anyone. We want to take all together but in this effort we do not want to distance ourselves from the main root. He made a reference to Rana Pratap and Shivaji. Please turn to earlier events. It is being said that the patriots had fought against Muslims but in reality they did not fight against Muslims. They fought against the regime. The problem arises when our Muslim brethren associate themselves with the aggressor of that time? What is the need to put Ram and Babar as rivals? What parallel is there between he two?

SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT (Ponnani) Nobody does so, it is wrong.

ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: It is so nice of you that you are not doing so. If we so into these details debate will become lengthy and would create a lot of bitterness. If you do not do, it is good.

SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT: Nobody does.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Sulaman Saitji you will also say that you do not oppose Vande Mataram.... (Interruptions) Please get up and say that you do not oppose Vande Mataram.

SHRI IBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT: Please stick to one point only. There is no use in complicating the matter. Why do you connect Babar with Vande Mataram.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I did not rise this issue. Our communist friends got up. Please be caution of them., they will continue to do such things.

SHRI SAFFUDIN CHAUDHARY: We had asked some other thing. Vajpayee ji, why it is necessary to cut the roots to take all together. Why does this thing arise..

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Where is the question of cutting the roots?

15.19 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have taken much time. There are many other speakers from my party. Kindly do not be strict to them. I would like to thank you.... (Interruptions) Mr. Speaker, Sir, you have come but after a long time, I would like to submit one more thing. I am going to conclude. A white paper has been published. The paper is white no doubt but whatever has been written contains no substance.

SHRI NITISH KUMAR: I would like to know for my own information. Why it is called white paper. It is written in black.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: We will do some research on that.

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Shri Advani can make you understand better. This is a Britain tradition. Sometimes papers of other colours are also printed. But I would like to submit one thing that it was charged that all that took place on 6th December was the result of a deep conspiracy and the Government said that it was investigating the matter. But the white paper does not throw any light on it. Therefore, it is clear that there was no conspiracy in it. If the Government wants to prove it by a CBI enquiry, we are prepared to wait for that also. But the white paper does not say anything in this regard. The various incidents that the Government has referred speak that there was no conspiracy. It was wrong.

DR. GIRIJA VYAS (Udaipur): Mr. Speaker, Sir,.....

SHRI MOHAN SINGH (Deoria): She was speaking in reply to Vajpayee's speech.

MR. SPEAKER: She is not speaking in reply. She is expressing her own views.

DR. GIRIJA VYAS: Mr. Speaker, Sir, Shri Vajpayee has called the President's Address on an incident. That is why he could prove that he was not able to be present in the incident. He has also clarified that his abstention was not a boycott. But when an hon. Member like Shri Vajpayee calls the President's Address - which is an integral part of the Parliamentary democracy an incident and tries to forget it. I have no question to ask him.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen many type of frenzies in this country, Whenever the point of frenzies and sentiments is made, I cannot forget what Bhagat Singh had said before being hanged:-

" Inhi Bigede Dimagon Maen ghani khushboo Ka Lachhe hain,

Hamen pagal hi rahena do, hum pagal hi achhe hain."

But today this frenziness and sentiments have taken this country to a cross-road and as Shri Digvijaya Singh said this frenziness did not stop with the assassination of Mahatma Gandhi. It gave birth to a new incident on 6 December which shattered the country's democracy and put a question to its existence. The question now posed to the country is that if this tendency is not checked where will it lead the country to.

The President's Address begins with his sensitiveness and his commitment to the country. He emphasised that if this country is not interwoven in the thread of unity and integrity, then not only this country will disintegrate but the very pride of the country will be shaken. He made a reference to the incident of 6th December. The entire world is terribly scared of the incident of 6th December because this incident is not only a fight for demolishing a structure or a fight between Hindus and Muslims but it is a fight to bring democracy to an end.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am happy that Shri Vajpayee has raised the issue of politics of vote. I am happy that he has said that political parties can provide something new to this country if they renounce politics of votes. But I ask this question from him. Had his party renounced politics of votes, the incident of 6th December would not have happened. Today the country is having all sorts of apprehensions because of this incident. Had this incident not happened, there would not have been any apprehensions in public mind. Therefore, I would like to request Vajpayee Sahib that he should stick to what he has initiated because its responsibility lies on his party. Let him think over it a little.

Mr. Speaker, Sir there were references to religion in the last Session and just now Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee as well as other speakers, who have just spoken, have also made a reference to religion.

SHRI DILEEP BHAI SANGHANI (Amreli): Will your party renounce the policy of appeasement?

DR. GIRIJA VYAS: I have asked a question whether you will stick to what you have initiated because all the political parties would be naturally concerned with votes but no political party has ever stooped too low for votes nor one can do so as this party has done. They must think over it a bit.

A lot of discussion has taken place on the definition of religion in Parliament as well as outside it. I would not like to go into the comprehensive definition of religion because the definition of religion has always been changed and modified in this country.

Hon. Vajpayee ji has raised a question that correct meaning of secularism should be sampra day dharm-nirpeksh. I am ready to accept it and would like to do so. but he should also accept that his party is not fighting for Hindutva, Hindu nation or Hindu religion but for a community. I have courage to say so because I remember the definition given by Jaimini on the pride of Hindu religion. (Asmita of Hindu Dharm) Jaimini said religion is what the Vedas accept. But this definition of religion could not be accepted in

this country because there were several anti- Veda cults and several philosophies. The other definition based on the Vedas was made again and again. Acceptance of the existence of God is religion. This definition too was not accepted. Several cults did not believe in God or in religion. So, the definition of religion kept changing. This country retains religion on this basis:

"Yo Lokan dharyati, ye na manav samajo dhritah as dharmah." This definition was made several times and it was accepted by the people.

I would like to submit to the House that the definition of religion has always been changing in this country. I need not be reminded of the definition of the religion in the need of the hour (Apart Dharma). The Bharatiya Janata Party regards Lord Ram as his goal.

Blamiki Ramayan puts this definition like this:

"Aradhana yah rashtrasya muchyato nasti maidhawa". It means, to me the service to my nation is above all and for this my family, my relatives and all other things are negligible. When Balmiki Ramayan can dare say so, then in the context of this changed definition, if the Bhartiya Janata Party wants to change the definition of religion, it may cooperate. As I have said, here the interpretation of religion may be some thing like *Apart Dharma*. In the circumstances of the day pride of the Hindu religion has been magnified that there can be Hindu religion in this country. The very idea was in the minds of those leaders who fought for freedom and they put forth the concept of secularism. They put forth this concept also that if there could be any religion in this country, acceptable to all, it could be the *Rashtra Dharma* (nation religion) alone. I don't want to go further into the details of the definition of secularism. I would like to submit only this much that the true and real meaning of secularism will be, to have regards to all the religions. If at all, there could be any religion in this country acceptable to all, it could be the *Rashtra-dharma* alone (nation religion) I have studied Lord Ram a Lot. Balmiki's Ram says that we should convey the mes-

sage that there can be nation religion in this country. I am talking of the Hindu religion. As and when perverse argumentation was exchanged, a new definition of the Hindu religion emerged. Everyone followed Hindu religion. I would like to refer to Jainism, Buddhism, religion propounded by Nanakji and Sufism and would like to seek your permission for that. Whatever any cult holds, but as and when narrow mindedness has crept into Hindu religion, it has been removed. Even if there is any narrow-mindedness now, I believe the cloud will disappear and the definition of narrow religion propounded by the Bhartiya Janata Party will hold no good and the definition of nation religion will dawn on the country.

It is mentioned again and again that the Congress Party is anti-religion. I would like to submit to the House that when the Congress was founded, its aim was spiritual. The Hon. Prime Minister had rightly said in one of his lectures that we have been able to survive because we never renounce our pride because it was our base and our base of secularism was our spiritualism. Neither the Congress Party renounced it then nor would it renounce it now.

15.30 hrs

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

Spiritualism does not mean here a few sects nor few narrow religions but it means a broad definition of religion. I need not explain it. When the country assimilated other religions and sects, the people led a movement but neither my politics nor Government nor dharm-gurus (religious teachers) interfered in it at any stage. People observed that once someone has come here from abroad and settled here, he has become part of our country. Such feeling developed on its own and the society and the Government accepted them as our part later on. We have accepted this doctrine, "Sangachchhah Sambardhah."

I was talking of the Congress because Congress was referred to time and again. Hon. Vajpayeeji has just now mentioned

about rally. Vajpayee Saheb, the Congress has organised a number of rallies but the demonstration, the rally and the entire movement organised by Congress Party before and after independence was aimed at protecting democracy and bringing about democracy. It was never meant for highlighting any religious narrow-mindedness and that is because the Congress existed and is existing even today and will continue to exist in future. I would like to submit to my colleagues that the Congress is the party emerged out of the factory from where people come out after taking a pledge to make sacrifices for the country. I need not be reminded about the sacrifices made by our leaders before independence, by Gandhiji soon after independence, by Indira and by Rajivji later on. We have made an endeavour to point out that we are even ready to make sacrifices for the sake of the country.

SHRI NITISH KUMAR: When was the Congress reborn?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let her continue.

DR. GIRIJA VYAS: We know how to sacrifice for the country. Please listen one thing more. The leader who makes sacrifice, we pick up his dead body later on. First of all pick up the flag fallen from his hand and move ahead to safeguard democracy. It has all along been an attempt of the Bhartiya Janata Party since independence to capture power, though whatever political nomenclatures it might have been assuming. It is because of politics of votes played by it that it has come in the Parliament in such large number. I have nothing to say on their politics of vote but I and millions of others like me think a political party bases itself on the single Programme of asking for votes in the name of religion without having any social, economic or political programmes, then it is reasonable to put a question mark on the future of such party and the future of the nation. So far as the Bhartiya Janata Party's attempt to propagate Hindu fundamentalism is concerned, I would like to refer to Islamic fundamentalism as well. Islam is a religion, like Indian philosophy and Indian religion to go ahead

with single philosophy. I would quote later on. I would like to say when Namazees face West, when they face East after prayer and pray for peace for all, then no fundamentalism can affect them. In a way, they always preach and propagate the dictum of happiness to all. Prapoti repeatedly enunciated that people are primarily of two kinds; good and bad. He did not try to divide people in the name religion and sect. I was going through some articles during the past few days and also listening to their talks. I am sorry to say that the Bhartiya Janata Party began with the argument that Vivekanand had talked of Hindu religion. I refute it and would like to cite three examples by placing some excerpts before you from the speech delivered by Vivekanandji in Detroit on 21st February, 1894. I want to quote.

[English]

He said:

"Of the different philosophies, the tendency of the Hindu is not to destroy but to harmonise everything. If any new idea comes into India, we do not antagonise it but simply try to take it in, to harmonise it, because this method was first taught by Our prophet God Incarnation earth. Shri Krishna."

15.33 hrs.

[SHRI SHARAD DIGHE *in the Chair*]

[Translation]

Secondly I would like to quote from the letter written by Swami Vivekananda to one Mohammad Sarfaraz of Nainital wherein he stated that:

[English]

"On the other hand, my experience is that if any religion approach to this equality in any appreciable manner, it is Islam and Islam alone..... It has further been said:

"For our own mother land, junction of the two great systems - Hinduism and Islam — Vedanta brain and the Islam body — is

the only hope."

[Translation]

Sir, I would also like to quote from the letter written by him to Swami Akhedananda, his colleague, where in the clearly stated that:

[English]

"You must admit Mohammadan boys too, but never tamper with their religion."

[Translation]

PROF. RITA VERMA (Dhanbad): Mr Chairman, Sir, one more thing. I would like to remind of the slogan of Swami Vivekananda, "Say with pride that we are Hindus" ("Garvse kaho Hum Hindu Hain").

DR. GIRIJA VYAS: Mr Chairman, Sir, first of all I would like to reply to my hon. colleague. I too move strongly say that say with pride that we are Hindus. however, who can dare to profess this? Only that Hindu who is prepared to respect other religions and has tolerance at the core of his heart and he should have equal regard for every place of worship whether it be a temple or mosque or any other religious place belonging to other religions.

SHRIMATI BHAVNA CHIKHLIA (Junagarh): What are your views about 'Vande Matram'?

DR. GIRIJA VYAS: I would like to tell the hon. Member that anyone who cannot respect all the religions on equal footing can never be a Hindu. In your narrow definition of Hindu, there is no Hinduism and tolerance. Therefore, if there is no Hinduism and tolerance in Hindu I would be the first Hindu to profess even in this very House that I am not a Hindu. I take pride of being tolerant and that's why I am a Hindu. I would like to respect other religions since I know that without respecting other religious faiths I can never be a true Hindu.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, regarding 'Vande Matram' I would like to tell the hon. Member

that it is a part of our glory and prestige. The B.J.P. is misquoting the facts and is presenting 'Vande Matram' in a distorted manner before the people. I take pride in saying 'Vande Matram'. This was the first song adopted by the Congress and the Congress workers happily sacrificed their lives for the country wily singing it. You people only have recently become crazy about 'Vanda Matram'. So there is the need to first understand it properly.

Mr Chairman, Sir, with these three quotations, I do not think anything is left out. I would like to clarify just one thing in response to the question raised by Shri Vajpayee regarding secularism. I have read many of his statements in which he has termed our policy of secularism as a Pseudo secularism. Since I have a great regard for him so I do not want to say a lot but I would like to remind him of the 1977 days when Imam Bukhari demanded banning of the R.S.S. At that time you tried to win his favour. Since then you are trying to woo Muslims to gain Muslim votes and when it has become clear that Muslim votes cannot be wooed, a new definition has been coined of secularism which is termed as pseudo secularisms. I would like to state that if anyone claims that our concept of secularism is a pseudo secularism, it is the B.J.P. alone and nobody else.

Sir, I would like to make a submission that our definition of secularism is not one of convenience but of true secularism. would like to quote Dr Karan Singh who categorically says that:

[*English*]

"Secularism was adopted by us not as a matter of convenience or as a sop of minority. It is an article of faith for us and a matter of our life."

[*Translation*]

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to tell the

hon. Members that those who talk of pseudo secularisms are in fact suffering from 'Convenience Amnesia.' I think that on this issue they must consult the doctor because the policies of convenience is their style of politics and not of ours. Congress never toed this line, it was never its endeavour and nor ever Congress made it a issue.

Sir, I do not want to enter into lengthy arguments on this issue.

SHRI NITISH KUMAR: Please elaborate a little the term "Convenience Amnesia"

DR. GIRIJA VYAS: 'Convenience Amnesia' is a kind of disease which prompts people to make convenience a basic for marching forward.

SHRI NITISH KUMAR: It means you need a pay chiatrist.

DR. GIRIJA VYAS: Not we but the B.J.P. is in need of it.

Mr Chairman, Sir, before concluding, I would like to draw the attention of the nation through you, that the B.J.P. wants to take the nation towards Fascism. Fascism could not succeed anywhere in the world and as the success of fascism in India, is concerned, it can never be a success here. It is the characteristic of the Indian culture that it takes the people of all hues together and its heritage though ancient keeps on adopting new things. however, I would definitely like to submit that the B.J.P. is adopting the fascism on experimental basis. India is not like Germany but if fascism makes a headway in India then it will mean murder of democracy in the country. All of must unite and ponder over as to how to tackle this menace of fascism effectively?

Sir, the Hon. Speaker put forth his views on the development of Rural industries, on the distribution system and on the economic policy. However, before expressing his views on these issues. I would like to

refer to Greek philosophy. All over the world women have tolerated a lot, even more than the mother Earth, and the example of 'Afigenia' is clearly etched in my memory. During drought in Greece the priests (Pundits) declared that by sacrificing a most beautiful girl, the drought can be successfully tackled. On search the 13 year old 'Afigenia' was discovered. While she was being taken to the sacrificial altar she was told that she was going to be sacrificed for the nation and the religion. Therefore, there is no need to ask for anything, but even if she has a last wish, she should tell the same. 'Afigenia' first of all refused to tell her wish but at the last moment turns back and says she has got something to say. She just said in future all the girls should not be treated like commodities but as human beings and then ends her life. I think the last wish of 'Afigenia' should be a guiding spirit for us that human beings should never be treated as commodities. I would like to make a submission that since beginning till date the Congress has paid much attention towards the lot of women. In his address the Hon. President made a mention of a 30 per cent reservation for women in Panchayats. It fulfills our demand to this effect.

Mr Chairman, Sir, I am distressed to say that despite our best efforts we have not been able to reserve required quota for women from the very beginning. I remember that percent age of women was 4.4 in the first Lok Sabha. In the second Lok Sabha it was 5.4 per cent. In the third Lok Sabha, it was 6.7 per cent. In the fourth Lok Sabha it was 5.9 per cent and in the fifth it was 4.2 per cent. In the sixth Lok Sabha it was 3.4 per cent. In the seventh it was 3.1 per cent. In the eighth it was 7.9 per cent, in the ninth 5.22 per cent and in the tenth Lok Sabha, it was 8 per cent only. The highest percentage of women was 11.4 in the Rajya Sabha during the tenure of the Eighth Lok Sabha. Keeping this phenomenon in mind Shri Rajiv Gandhi had dreamt of giving adequate rights to women and the Hon. President has made

a mention of these rights through his Address. I would like to congratulate him for this on behalf of the women society.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would also like to congratulate him for constituting a Commission to check atrocities on women these days. I think that women will get many benefits after the constitution of Rashtriya Mahila Kosh. But my submission in this regard is that we will have to think seriously in regard to its structure because if only the voluntary organisations are given this right, the suffering women would not be benefited much. On behalf of the women society I would like to submit that while deciding the structure the Government should be cautious and see that not only voluntary organisations but also individuals are benefited.

With these words I would like to conclude and while sharing my concern with the situation of unrest that has been expressed in President's Address, I would like to quote a couplet:

**"Ram Rahim mein fark nahin hai, baat samajh mein ayegi,
Man ka mandir, dil ki masjid, pehle tum banao to".**

[English]

SHRIMATI MALINI BHATTACHARAYA: (Jadavpur): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Sir.

I rise to oppose the Motion of Thanks on the Presidential Address.

I was rather amused to observe that Vajpayee ji, such a senior leader, who spoke for about 50 minutes and out of the 50 minutes, about 45 minutes were taken up not with the Presidential Address as such out, with the question of secularism and

[Smt. Malini Bhattacharaya]
 what it means and whether it can be translated as *dharam nirpekshata* or *panth nirpekshata*. Is it, perhaps, because Vajpayee ji has been feeling guilty about the incidents that took place on and after the 6th of December? Is it because of it that most of his speech was taken up with this issue? Is it the reason why, in his speech there was no mention whatsoever of the economic issues which have been described in the Presidential Address? I do not know. Maybe, I do not understand or maybe he agrees with what has been said on economic issues in the Presidential Address. This is just a question I am putting.

We found that he was talking of secularism and its translation as *dharam nirpekshata* or *panth nirpekshata*. I do not know what the translation in Hindi would be.

I can only say that if it was *panth nirpekshata* which led to the incidents of the 6th of December and led to the communal riots which followed in which about 1000 people died, then I am not with such *panth nirpekshata*. It is actually not *panth nirpekshata*, it is *sharm nirpekshata*.

Presidential Address, of course, is not the President's own speech but it is a statement of Government policy. And I feel very much surprised that the Government makes no self-criticism whatsoever through this Address of its own role in Ayodhya. There is no stricture in this Address on the Government for failure to act in Ayodhya. We find that according to Article 143 in the Constitution, a single point reference has been made to the Supreme Court. And, this has been mentioned in the Presidential Address. What is the meaning of this reference?

The question that the Government has asked through the President to the Supreme Court is whether or not a Hindu temple was

there at any stage before the building of Babri Mosque. All archaeological and historical evidence point to the contrary. Even if this was not so, even if there has been a temple at any time, how does it matter, how does it affect the communal situation which is prevailing in the country at this time? If this was indeed discovered, would it justify the destruction of the mosque or would it in any way lead to the solution of the communal problem, the communal disharmony that has been created in the country, taking this as an excuse? I do not think so.

I am also surprised to notice that in the Presidential Address there is not a single mention about the other fall-out of the Ayodhya incident, namely the riots and the people who lost their lives in the riots, the thousands of women who lost their husbands, their fathers, who were raped, who were humiliated, a who lost their property, the irreparable damage that was done to them and the traumatic experiences that they went through. There is no mention of them in the Presidential Address. This has surprised me.

One point that Vajpayeeji has mentioned in his speech was about Bangladeshi infiltration. No mention of it has been made in the Presidential Address. But the question is while infiltration of course is a problem which has to be tackled both strictly and from a humanitarian angle at the same time, is it an issue on which the communal divide has to be widened? Don't we know that taking the issue of Bangladeshi infiltration, the ever enthusiastic Mr. Khurana went and tried to put fear into the minds of people who were dwelling in the slums near Chittaranjan colony, who were by no means infiltrates? They were Hindus and Muslims. They were people from Bengal and other States. He tried to instill terror in their minds by raising this issue of Bangladeshi infiltration.

So far as the opening paragraphs of the Presidential speech is concerned, I found them totally inadequate in describing the present communal situation in the country. We find no honest assessment of the communal situation in the country in these paragraphs whatsoever.

Then I move on to the subsequent paragraphs where the Government is congratulating itself on the supposed economic improvement that has resulted in the last year. These days in the newspapers sometimes you find a new term has been coined by journalists, namely Manmohnomics, Manmohan Economics. I do not think it is Manmohan economics that we have here, it is Manmohan Magic, it is Manmohan jugglery that we have here. It has been said that the rate of industrial production and of export has risen. Actually the sleight of hand that is there in this assessment is this. The rate of industrial production and of export rose only in comparison to the last year, namely 1991-92, which is the nadir of Indian economy. The economic situation had never been so bad. Anything would be good in comparison to that.

GDP is said to have risen by 4.2 per cent; except 1991-92, this rate of rise is the lowest since 1987-88. Industrial production is said to have risen by 3.8 per cent; again excepting the year 1991-92, this is the lowest since 1987. Actually, food grain production has dropped in comparison to 1990-91. So, the much-advertised improvements are not improvements at all. They are the result of the economic jugglery, economic trickery. So far as the inflation is concerned, again we notice a similar sleight of hands. The last week of December 1992 has been taken as the standard, leaving the other 51 weeks of that year, out of consideration completely. On the other hand, if we compare the infla-

tionary rates of April to October 1992, we find that the rate of inflation has certainly not come down to a single digit point. It is still at a level of 11.8 per cent. This again does not take into account the rise in administrative prices that was effected, only a couple of weeks back, just before the Budget. This hike in administrative prices is going to raise the inflationary rates higher; and it has been admitted in the Economic Survey.

Full convertibility of the Rupee which has been announced is going to cause further devaluation. There is likely to be a ten per cent decrease in the value of the Rupee to the Dollar; and that means that in the articles that we have to import like petroleum, fertiliser, etc. We find that as a result of this implicit devaluation, indirect devaluation - we will have to pay much greater prices.

The tremendous liberalisation of imports is again going to, not only jeopardise our indigenous industry; it would mean that these imported articles will, in fact, instead of enabling our exports to go up, decelerate the industry. So, actually when we are having a discussion on the floor of the House regarding the viability of the Dunkel Draft as to whether we should sign the Dunkel Draft or not, as a matter of fact, we find that the Government has already indirectly gone half-way towards signing the Dunkel Draft.

Nationalised banks are now being allowed to enter into the capital market. Last year, I has asked Shri Manmohan Singh a question as to whether the Industrial Development Bank of India is going to be denationalised, then he had said categorically that there was no scheme for denationalisation. Now, we find that the nationalised banks are being allowed to sell their shares in the capital market.

SHRI K.P.RADDAIH YADAV: (Machilipatnam): It is not de-nationalisation. Unloading of few shares to the public cannot be treated as de-nationalisation.

SHRIMATI MALINI BHATTACHARAYA: I do not know what else it is. I do not know, if this is not implicit privatisation, if it is not more and more entry of private and foreign capital into the banking sector, then what it means.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE (Dumdum): You are absolutely right. At this point of time, they will say only 49 per cent of the shares will be sold; but tomorrow morning, they will say that 49 per cent is not adequate, it should be 51 per cent.

16.00 hrs.

You have done so with foreign capital. Then, you will admit that these are the first steps for privatisation of the banking sector.

PROF. PREM DHUMAL (Hamirpur): This is a friendly intervention.

SHRIMATI MALINI BHATTACHARAYA: At the same time, I am only presenting you with some hard facts. In the first nine months of this financial year, Rs. 6,077 crores have come as credit. At the same time, we had to pay back Rs. 6,079 crore.

16.01 hrs.

[SHRI RAM NAIK *in the Chair*]

This means that what we are getting from foreign credit is spent in repayment. Why are we getting it? That is in order to pay back the debt. Not even the debt, the interest is being paid back which means that we are entering very fast into the debt trap. So,

I do not think that the Government has any need to congratulate itself on its economic achievements at all. This economic achievement has only been to push the country wide into the open mouth of this debt trap.

There has been a paragraph on the revamp in of the public distribution system. It is not revamping. It is actually progressive dismantling of the public distribution system. This is very evident from the fact that in the last few years, there has been a constant decrease in the actual procurement. The actual procurement is much lower than the target. This has been going on progressively. Now in his budget speech, Mr. Manmohan singh has actually stated that there is going to be a free movement of foodgrains right across the country. If this does not mean that the public distribution system is being altogether abdicated by the Government, then, what else it means, I do not know.

In all these ways, we find through this dismantling of the public distribution system. Through selling of public sector shares, the Government is gradually withdrawing from the economic sphere. The Government is abdicating its own responsibility. There is a folktale in Bengal about Kalidas, the great poet. It is said that before he became a great poet, he was a very stupid man. He was sitting on a tree. He was chopping off the branch on which he was sitting so that eventually he fell from his perch. I do not know whether eventually Saraswati will descend to give a boon to that side. But it is very clear that they are cutting the branch on which they are sitting. They are making themselves totally redundant. There will be no need for the Government to exist if this goes on.

What about the National Renewal Fund which has been announced as having been

set up? Well, this is another jugglery. First of all, you create poverty, you create unemployment. You take away people's entitlement from them. Whatever they have got, you take away from them and you make them paupers. Then you kindly give them soon alms. That is what the National Renewal Fund is about. It has been said that already 22, 000 workers in the NTC have been covered by it—covered by it indeed, covered by its shroud. All that is going to happen. They are going to be sent a sum of money and they are going to be retrenched. If there a National Renewal Fund, why not use this money to supply working capital to the public sector units? They are in great need of working capital and you are not giving it to them.

Then, Sir, I will come to the condition of women. I agree with Girijaji that the National Women's Commission has been set up and as a matter of fact this Bill was made into an Act after a long struggle by women's organisation. In 1990, when Shri Ram Vilas Paswan was the Welfare Minister during the regime of Shri V.P. Singh— that this Bill was passed. Again, it was only after a great many days of pressurising that we were able to get it implemented in this regime also. It is a matter of great concern for us that there is not a word in the president's Address about the alarming rise in the figures regarding violence against women. I am quoting from the Government's own figures. One rape every 54 minutes; one Molestation every 26 minutes, one Dowry death every one hour and forty-two minutes, one act of cruelty every 33 minutes, one criminal offence against women every seven minutes and so on. The situation is not very good. What is the reason? The reason is that it is because of the Government's policy. In spite of the fact that much has been said about equality of men and women in our Constitution, nothing has been done by the

Government so far to prevent devaluation of women's work and the marginalisation of women.

The structural adjustment programme is being introduced. It is going to increase the marginalisation of women. It is going to push women out of the organised sector wherever they are. They are going to be pushed into an unorganised sector. They are going to be pushed to the lowest depths of poverty, to the lowest depths of economic oppression and then you are going to present them with some alms in the form of help from Rashtriya Mahila Kosh. This is not the way in which you can solve the problem. This is only a merger palliative no more than that. The speech includes the subject of free and compulsory education upto the age of 14, as a Directive Principle of the Constitution. Of course, it has been a Directive Principle of the Constitution for a long time, but the question is what is being done to make primary education not only free but compulsory. Unless you can make it compulsory, it is no use making it free. Unless you make it compulsory, it is no use offering palliatives in the form of non-formal education. Think of the child labourers of India. Whenever you strike a match, don't you think of the bruised and blackened fingers of all those children working in Sivakasi. When you see a carpet in the shop, are not you reminded over the children eight nine year old children who work for 10-12 hours at the carpet factories. Of course, there is a law against child labour but you cannot implement the laws against child labour unless and until, you have compulsory education for all children. For that, of course, a much higher resource is needed than has been allowed in this Budget.

I am shocked to see that there is not a word about child labour in the President's Address. The how can we think that it is the part of the Government's policy to tackle this

evil? On the one hand, it is being said that the education will be compulsory and on the other hand it is being said that wherever children are not able to go to school for some reason or other, for economic reasons, non-formal education will be provided for them Is it possible? A child who works for 10-12 hours, after that to attend school, is it not a cruelty to that child? So, you have to eradicate child labour if you want elementary education for all. There is no other way. But in the President's Address, there is no mention of that.

So far as higher education is concerned, we find that there is continuous whittling down of budgetary support on this score and there is total disintegration of indigenous resconcil.

My last point refers to the paragraph on health and family planning in the President's Address. In fact, this has been given a great deal of importance in the President's Address; and we all know that in this sphere there has been massive injection of foreign assistance. But this foreign assistance has been given for some very specific programmes. What are these programmes? Firstly control of AIDS. So, on the one hand, malaria and kala-azar are taking toll of our population, on the other hand, you reduce assistance on that; on the other hand, you get crores of rupees from foreign sources to threat AIDS.

What is the condition on which you are taking this assistance? You have to buy equipment; you have to buy medicines from foreign sources at a very high cost on which you have no need at all. While your countrymen are suffering from all kinds of diseases whereas we cannot guarantee basic health for all, whereas we cannot guarantee basic

freedom from malnutrition for all at the same time, crores of rupees are being spent and you are showing on papers that we are much to health.

And for family planning, here, again, I think that family planning is very important thing in our country; it is being treated in such a way within the Government policy that it is very likely that Indian women will become guinea-pig for hazardous family planning drugs or family planning devices to be imported from other countries; devices and drugs which have not been sufficiently tested, the safety of which has not been sufficiently tested, and going to come in, going to be dumped in our country, and out women are going to be treated to that in the name of family planning.

The import of bulk drugs has been liberalised in the Budget; and this is in accordance with the review of drug policy which was circulated recently by the Government. This review of drug policy, I think, should not be, we part of it should be implemented without there being a full scale discussion in parliament. What have we here? We have a proposal to withdraw the system of compulsory licensing in the pharmaceutical industry; and this coupled with absence of any measures compelling the manufacturers to produce essential drugs will lead to further anarchy in the production of drugs. Liberalisation of technology, import in foreign currency would cause a complete destruction of self-sufficient technology; and these days, this bulk drugs import is going to cripple out small scale sector for which the President's Address has been so sympathetic. Most of our bulk drug production is in the small scale sector; and by this import, liberalised import of bulk drug, you are dealing a great blow on indigenous drug industry in the small scale sector.

These are some of the points that I wanted to mention about the President's Address; but these are only a tip of the iceberg; and the iceberg is still to be seen. And I think the fact that the points that I have mentioned have not been mentioned in the President's Address is entirely in tune with the total hole and corner manner in which the Government has been acting, the way they have been promoting certain policies, implementing certain policies without even discussing it in the Parliament.

So, I strongly protest against the content of the President's Address while expressing my respect for the President's Address. Thank you.

SHRI SOBHANADRESSWARA RAO VADDE (Vijayawada): Mr. Chairman, Sir, with due respect to the President of India, I rise to oppose this Motion of Thanks to the President's Address.

I have gone through the President's Address and I found it most disappointing, more so concerning to the agricultural sector. I am happy that hon. Minister for Agriculture is here. In this, on page 5 paragraph 16, I find that our plans for agriculture go beyond mere self-sufficiency. We see it as an area of great potential capable of yielding much higher incomes to farmers rural level. The Government may be having this intention but it has not been put into practice.

Sir, you will recollect, during the last Budget Session we were told that small Farmer's Business Agri Consortium will be set up to encourage the exports of agricultural products to earn more foreign exchange and at the same time to help the farmers directly, more so the small and marginal farmers of this country. But till now we have not heard anything. We do not

know where it is. In what cold storage it is kept, we do not know.

I am very sorry to say that the hon. Prime Minister after Tenth Lok Sabha elections after assuming the responsibility as the Prime Minister of this country said at Hyderabad that necessary changes will be brought in the comprehensive crop insurance scheme and it will remodel to take care of the deficiencies that have been observed to rally help the farmers in times of distress and really give relief. But till now no such scheme is being implemented.

We are really surprised that the Joint Parliamentary Committee on Fertilizer has given a report and immediately without losing any time, in a matter of week this Government has increased the price of fertilizers. But it does not care to implement the promises made by the Prime Minister of this country. That shows the interest of this Government towards the farmers.

I would like to ask this Government that you have come up with new industrial policy and economic reforms, but do you really want the reforms in agricultural sector. Are you not thinking that reforms in agricultural sector also very much necessary, where 66 per cent of the population is dependent on agricultural, both as farmers and agricultural labourers?

Only during the last day of the last Session, our friend Shri Balram Jakhar praised the agricultural policy draft. I have gone through that in detail but I am very sorry to say that it is nothing but a rhetoric. It has only contents and sentences which we find in the previous statements of the Ministers of Agriculture. It is far different from the initial draft prepared by the Standing Advisory Committee headed by Shri Sharad Joshi and in which Shri Bhanu Pratap Singh

[Sh. Sobhanadreeswara Rao Vadde]

and myself were Members, which has given the draft.

In this we found out why our agriculture has not made rapid strides. We are not going to really take the country forward in the matter of agricultural, while China with only 100 million hectares is able to produce 400 million tonnes of foodgrains.

But in our country, with 140 million hectares of cropped land we are not able to produce even 170 million tonnes of foodgrains. Unless we basically address our selves to remove these deficiencies, the Draft Agriculture Policy itself is not going to solve the problem.

In the Address, on page 5 in paragraph 15, it is said -

"Agriculture is the mainstay of the Indian economy and its people. As it is still essentially dependent upon rainfall, there was a drop in foodgrains production in 1991-92 by about nine million tonnes."

But what in the Government doing to change the situation? Now, 70 per cent of our cropped land is dependent upon the rain gods. What is it that the Government is doing?

It may be your experience also in Maharashtra, Mr. Chairman, that several irrigation projects that have been inaugurated along ago have not yet been completed. We have a bitter experience in our State, Andhra Pradesh. The late Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and laid the foundation stone of the Nagarjuna Sagar Project. He said, "These are the temples of this century." After 25 years, that great project, the

Nagarjuna Sagar Project is not yet completed, for your information. The reason is, in these 40 years only an amount of Rs. 25,000 crore has been spent on major and medium irrigation. How non-sensible it is. But a sum Rs. 12,000 crore has been spent on a single steel plant Rs. 12,000 crore; For the whole country the Government has spent only Rs. 25, 000 crore on irrigation projects.

Only day - before - yesterday the Minister for Water Resource, Shri Vidyacharan Shukla was giving an answer to my question. He said that during the Eighth Plan a sum of Rs. 5900 crores was being allotted to bring one million hectares of land under minor irrigation projects. Our irrigation potential in minor irrigation sector is 80 million hectares and till now we are able to harness only less than 50 per cent of it.

On the same day there was answer to a question, in which the Minister of Power was telling that Rs. 7,800 crore was going to be spent on a thermal power project in the State of Maharashtra.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have only two minutes at your disposal

SHRI SOBHANADREESWARA RAO VADDE: Please give me a few more minutes. Several Members have already spoken.

MR. CHAIRMAN: They have more time at their disposal.

SHRI SOBHANADREESWARA RAO VADDE: Rs. 7800 crore on a single power project and for the whole country only Rs. 5900 crores on minor irrigation sector. If this situation continues in future also, the levels of the farmers and the agricultural labourers are not going to improve. Unless the living conditions improve, unless the per capita

income of those people increases, all the efforts of the Government to industrialise this country, or to bring industrial development in the country are not going to bear fruit. Already the disparity of income between the average income of a person in the farm sector and one in the confirm sector, has grown. It was 1:2 earlier but has now increased to 1:4, very recently.

So, I request this Government to take all these factors into account and to give a go by to the policy which has been in practice all these years, giving a higher priority to industrial sector and a step motherly treatment to the agriculture sector.

I would like to draw your kind attention to the fact that the Chief Minister of Maharashtra has asked the Finance Minister of this country for permission to issue irrigation bonds to enable the Government of Maharashtra to collect funds from the farmers to complete the irrigation projects that are already taken on hand so that they can be completed before the year 2000 AD. But the Finance Minister refused. He said that they would not be given permission, that could not collect funds from the farmers for completion of irrigation projects. This Government wants all the savings of the farmers to go to the industries of Tatta and British of this country. The same Finance Minister who said that no permission could be given, and that the Government could not stand security for the funds collected by the Maharashtra Government, what did he do?

The same Government asked the States Governments to stand surety towards loan taken by the private individuals from foreign countries.

I request the Government to kindly think over on all these issues not only in the interest of the farmers but also in the interest

of the country. Unless the mistake is rectified, the Government is not going help this country and take it forward.

I would like to say one word on small scale sector. I am very happy that a delayed payments Bill has been brought in the interest of the small scale sector which is paying a very vital role. The small scale industrial sector is contributing 38 per cent of the total employment; 23 per cent of the gross cut put and 18 per cent valued added with only a fixed capital of 6 per cent in the industrial sector and its share in the export sector in 28 per cent. But, unfortunately, the excise duty limit which was enhanced from 20 lakhs to 30 lakhs is not at all sufficient because of the steep increase in prices of steel, iron, non-ferro alloys and ferro alloys during the last few years which are the important raw materials of small scale industry. This limit should be enhanced from 20 lakhs to 30 lakhs.

The economic policies and reforms which you have introduced here have not percolated to the State level. An entrepreneur is facing difficulties with urban land ceiling clearance regarding the land required for setting up an industry. Files are not cleared in time and because of which the entrepreneur continues to suffer.

Before concluding, I would like to say two points. Firstly, the Government should not act in a haste and appoint a Joint Parliamentary Committee to examine the implications of the Dunkel draft text which is going to adversely affect the agricultural and other spheres of our economy. Secondly, the Government must reconsider its stand regarding reference to the Supreme Court on Ayodhya issue under Article 143. I only urge upon the Government to reconsider and refer the matter under Article 138 subsection 2 to give the confidence to the

[Sh. Sobhanadreeswara Rao Vadde]

minorities of this country. The Government shall act as per the findings/decision of the Supreme Court after examining the whole are having discontentment and do not have belief on this Government cannot be convinced about the sincerity of the Government to resolve the issue.

With these words, I oppose it. I thank you very much for giving me an opportunity to speak.

SHRI ANIL BASU (Arambagh): Sir, I have something very important to bring to your kind notice. In the morning when the House was adjourned by the Speaker, we went to the Central Hall to have a cup of tea. Unfortunately, we have been threatened by one of the Central Ministers. The free and fair expression in the House has been threatened by one of the Central Ministers in the Central Hall.

SHRI SUDARSAN RAYCHAUDHURI (Serampore): The Minister has used the most abusive language. *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: What time has it happened?

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Basudb Acharia, let him complete what he wants today.

(Interruptions)

SHRI ANIL BASU: We ordered for a cup of tea. Shri Santosh Mohan Dev the Union Minister went there. We offered a cup of tea. At that time, Shri Nirmal Kanti Chatterjee, a senior Member of this House, came there. He took his seat. The conversation was a friendly conversation. *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would request you not to raise this matter in the House. It is not proper.

(Interruptions)

DR. VASANT NIWRUTTI PAWAR (Nasik): You do not allow them.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will decide it, you may not. Whatever the members do outside the House.....

(Interruptions)

SHRI SUDERSAN RAY CHAUDHURI (Sereampore): Sir, it is not outside the House. It is in the Central Hall, in Parliament. *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down first. When I am standing, you should sit down. You should not argue. This is not the way of behaving in the House. I am ruling that whatever happens outside the House....

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is outside the House. But they are the premises or precincts of Parliament. Whatever happens outside the House is not to be raised here. There are ways of raising it. You can even give a notice of breach of privilege. You can raise it tomorrow. When two Members do something, it is not a question for this House to discuss it.

SHRI ANIL BASU: It is not that. One Minister of threatened Shri Nirmal Kanti Chatterjee, a senior Member of this House. He used filthy language. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI ANIL BASU: Sir, he uttered the word.**

(Interruptions)

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: He should apologise for it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have suggested you to give a notice.

SHRI SUDARSAN RAY CHAUDHURI: Sir, he has used the most abusive language.

DR. VASANT NIWRUTTI PAWAR: Sir, I am on a point of order.

(Interruptions)

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE: (Calcutta South): Who knows whether you have threatened the Minister or the Minister has threatened you?

DR. VASANT NIWRUTTI PAWAR: Sir, my point of order is that anything which has happened outside the House cannot be raised in such a manner. Another point is that the hon. Member can give notice to the Chair and only with the permission of the Chair he should raise the issue. Right now the discussion on the Motion of Thanks to the President's Address is going on. They cannot interfere like this. My point of order is that under which rule they are speaking?

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA: The Chair has given permission.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Acharia, why do you stand again? I can decide it. You have raised your issue. Why do you not sit down? Please resume your seat.

SHRI ANIL BASU: Sir, you please see that the Minister apologises now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Pawar, whatever the Hon. Member has said, he said, with my permission. So far as the point which you have raised, it is proper and in order and the discussion on Motion of Thanks will continue.

Shri Acharia and Shri Basu, if you want to raise this issue again, you can give a notice tomorrow. Shri Janardanan to speak now.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please do not argue with the Chair. I have given my ruling. You can raise it in a proper way.

SHRI ANIL BASU: Sir, with your permission.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now no permission is being given. I said whatever I wanted to say. Shri Janardanan to speak now.

[Translation]

*SHRI M. R. KADAMBUR JANARDHANA (Tirunelveli): Chairman, Sir, I thank you for given me an opportunity to speak on behalf of All India Anna Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam on the Motion of hanks to President's Address.

The President commenced his speech with a stress on winning back the confidence of the people. Hence it is clear that this government has understood the prevailing situation that the people are losing confidence.

This government had failed to protect the mosque that stood as a symbol of the hope and confidence the minority community, (the Islamic Community) vested in the government. We have come to a passe only

*Translation of the speech unfinally delivered in Tamil.

[Sh. M.R. Kadambur Janardhana]

because of this. And I am constrained to point out this now. I would like to recall the address by our General Secretary and Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu in the National Integration Council. She expressed her views with the anxiety to avoid this kind of situation that has come upon us now. I also request this august House to recall the way in which some people tried to interpret her speech to suit their political ends to create wedges and differences. A definite solution based on legal points or historical facts could not be found in communal issues, especially on issues based on religious beliefs and faith. We believed that the aspirations and faith of both the majority Hindu community and the minority Islamic community should not be shattered, and their feelings should be respected. That is why it was impressed upon that the structure should be protected and at the same time the wish of the majority community to go head with the Kar Seva.

This was the view of All India Anna DMK and it was reiterated by our Revolutancy leader in the National Integration Council meeting.

How do you propose to wipe out the despair that has entered into the minds of the people ever after the incident that took place in Ayodhya on 6 December 1992. In order to wean away the attention of the people from this, what are the economic reform measures that you are going to take now? What are the steps you are resorting to towards alleviating the poverty conditions prevailing in the midst of downtrodden people, workers and farmers and millions of people who live below poverty line? This is the basic question now.

Hence we would like to ask the ruling Congress at the Centre whether you will provide a safety net to the poor. With the

new economic polity and with the economic restructuring programme you are carrying out certain measures. Will you be able to give protection to the poor, retaining the safety net provided to the poor by late Smt. Indira Gandhi and Shri Rajiv Gandhi? You are going in for revamping of the Public Distribution System. Revamping Programme should aim at rehabilitation. It should aim at benefitting the poor. Instead you have raised the prices of commodities sold through Public Distribution System which is to benefit the millions of people living below the poverty line.

From 1977 to 1987, the price of rice through Public Distribution System was increased to the tune of 89 paise per kilogram. But in the past two years, it has been increased exasperatively. The hike was 48 paise last year and 75 paise per kilo during the current year. It is only because of this, the ruling AINDMK in Tamil Nadu, resorted to rail roko agitation. It was to protect the interests of Tamil people. It was not a political clash. But it was to show our opposition to the government at the Centre. It was not for political mileage but for the benefit of people living in Tamil Nadu. I would urge upon this august body to understand our real intentions to take up the cause of the poor.

I have with me now a copy of a answer given during Question Hour this morning. In 1990-91, the economic cost of wheat was Rs. 386.50. In 1991-92 it was Rs. 390.79. In 1992-93 it is Rs. 490.79. And at the same time, if you look at the difference between this and the issue price of wheat, it is Rs. 116 in 1990-91, it is Rs. 139 in 1991-92 and in the current year 1999-93 the margin they get amounts to Rs. 216 per quintal. But we the rice eating population living in West Bengal, Tamil Nadu, Kerala, Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh get a margin only to the tune of

about Rs. 152. We are also Indians but we get only to the tune of about Rs. 152. We are also Indian but we get only lesser margin. Why this great difference between wheat and rice? It is 25% to the wheat and it is 10% to the rice. If we raise this question press would describe it as a clash between Congress and AIADMK. I would like to make it clear that the basis for our raising issues is entirely a different plane.

Yesterday, our colleague Shri Mani Shankar Ayyar recalled the Avadi Conference of 1954. He also reminded us of the Tirupati Session of AICC in 1991 after the demise of Shri Rajiv Gandhi. But I would like to tell him that there is no use in reminding us of Conferences. What is there in reality? When I entered this House in 1985, there were mere two members that belonged to BJP. How did they increase their strength this much in this House? He says it was due to seat adjustment. But he must accept a fact that a political party believing in democracy in India today cannot grow with the help of press but can grow only with the support of people. As far as our party is concerned, it had its growth with one massive support of people and not with the support of the press. Whether it was under the leadership of late C. N. Annadurai, or late M.G. Ramachandran or the present leader Puratchi Thalaivi Jayalalitha, our growth was with public support and not with press support. Press writes against us today. It will do the same tomorrow. Even if tainted picture of us is given we would not mind it. The same was explained to us today by our Senior leader Shri Vajpayee. He was pointing out the difference between the words "abstain" and "boycott". Evocatively he was pointing out the subtle difference. I do not know how the media in India will take it. I would like to cite an example. Till 1967, till the time he became Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu, no press had ever reported in full the speeches of

Thiru C.N. Annadurai. No Indian Newspaper had ever published his text in full. They would only report as 'Annadurai also spoke'. But our late leader Anna used to tell them "I can only speak but I cannot dance". I would like to impress upon you that we have come across such reportage and still we had grown.

Today I am speaking in Tamil. I who used to speak in English Prefer to speak in Tamil today. Because we have to express our feelings today. Language can arouse feelings more than a Ram Temple or a Mosque can. Because it is like food to our body and it is one with our being. If we want to do away with English in this great forum and remove it from India I must have a facility to listen to all the proceedings interpreted in Tamil. A member from Kerala should have a facility to listen to the House proceedings in Malayalam. Smt. Mamta Banerjee should have a facility to have interpretation in Bengali. Only when you make arrangements to have both-way simultaneous interpretation system in all the 15 languages, you can do away with English and abolish it from India. I would like to recall the day when the lady member from sikkim shedding tears to incorporate Nepali language in the VIII schedule of the Constitution. The entire House was visibly moved that day. More than religion, language is the greatest danger to the Unity of India. We should not forget that. When other Members have got the liberty to ask questions in Hindi, we do not have that opportunity to speak or to ask questions in Tamil and we are treated as second class citizens of India. Such a thing should not develop. I have with me now the text of the speech of His Excellency, the former President of India Thiru R. Venkataraman. Let me read a portion of it.

Sir, we have been given 13 minutes for our party. I have 4 more minutes to speak.

[English]

CHAIRMAN: You are the only speaker from your party?

SHRI M.R. KADAMBUR
JANARDHANAN: Yes.

CHAIRMAN: Good. proceed.

SHRI M.R. KADAMBUR
JANARDHANAN: Sir we are a disciplined party in the whole of India. Now let me read out,

"A close watch is being kept on the situation arising out of the Ram Janam Bhoomi - Babri Masjid dispute".

[Translation]

*This is the back which was given to us on 24 the February 1992 and this is the book given to us on 22nd February, 1993. While recalling this, we who are sitting in this X Lok Sabha will have to hang our heads in shame. When about 70 crores of the total 86 crores of people in India are suffering to make both ends meet and most of them find it difficult to manage next meal of the day, we are not thinking about them but we talk about something else. That is why I touched upon the Public Distribution System in the early part of my speech. The safety net for our masters, i.e. the voters, is the Public Distribution System. When Malini Bhattacharyjee was referring to it she was explaining how the policies never take shape to reach the poor. She was calling it Manmohan Magic. I am not going further into it. If you want to carry forward the new economic policy in a meaningful way you must take into consideration the villages as units at the grassroots level. What has this new economic polity achieved? Mr. Balram Jakhar is here. What do you do to enhance the living standards of rural people. There are rural farmers who pro-

duce cotton and paddy and other agricultural goods. Are they getting a better deal or do they get rehabilitation? You are doing something to promote Maruti Cars instead of promoting agricultural produce. Maruti price has come down by 15 thousand rupees. Ambassador car price has come down by twenty thousand rupees. Who cares for that? Not even half a per cent of our population has got car. What about bicycle and what about auto - rickshaw? Your TV is not saying anything about that. Only when you do something to the common people living in rural areas you can have a meaningful new economic polity. I dare to point out this lacunae. I pick up courage to point out this.

We have heard about representation to women in Indian body polity. What has AIADMK done towards this? What Anna and MGR did towards this? You are all talking about giving adequate representation to women in municipalities. Tamil Nadu Assembly has 27 lady members out of the total 234 members. We have 146 members out of which 27 are lady members. Can any Assembly in India can show that percentage? We are leading the nation showing the right path.

MAMATA BANERJEE: Your Chief Minister is also a Lady.

SHRI M. R. KADAMABUR
JANARDHANAN: Yes. After Indira Gandhi who was Prime Minister, our leader is the leading lady Chief Minister.

Let me come to another point. You talk about Secularism. We can see Dr. B.R. Ambedkar's statue in many places. You can see three statues in my constituency. I would like to say that, it was Periyar EVR, who worked hard for Secularism in this

country. He treaded the path of Mahatma Gandhi. Cong - I men are here. At times you talk of Periyar EVR too? Pariyar EVR was true follower of Gandhiji and worked for people till his last without occupying the seat of power and forsaking power. Can you show one statue of Pariyar? Who is a symbol of secularism for India, who is the real follower of Gandhiji? Can you show one statue of Periyar in North India?

Now we find normalcy returning in Punjab. It is not because of Punjab Chief Minister or Prime Minister Narashimha Rao. The Credit for this must go to the people of Punjab who have scarified a lot. After losing so many of their kith and kin, their beloved family members fathers, mothers, wives, husbands, sons and daughters, brothers and sisters, they were tolerant and patient. Such people live all over India. We must identify and encourage such people in Kashmir also. Parochialism and Sectarian interest should go. We must show unitedly that ours is India and that is one.

Our revolutionary leader Jayalalitha is following the foot steps of our late leader Anna. She speaks his language.

There was reference to relations with Sri Lanka. You are receiving the President of Sri Lanka here. But the plight of poor fisherman living in the coastal region of Tamil Nadu is pitiable. Every now and then our fishermen who go on fishing are held like chicken by the Sri lankan forces. This is a recurrent problem ever after we handed over the islet KACHATIVU to Shri lanka. I sincerely tell you that every week Sri lankan Naval Troops are lifting our fishermen, poor people like birds. During Mrs. Gandhi time the islet was handed over to them. It was due to such compromises that we find issues cropping up every now and then. Hence I urge upon this government to take up this

with the Sri Lankan government in a fitting manner.

I would like to reiterate upon you that the new economic policy could be a real success only when it could develop the living conditions of the poor in the rural areas. With this I conclude

SHRI KALKA DAS (Karol Bagh): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise not just to oppose but to criticize Government's document that the hon. President read out in the Central Hall on February 22. It is a document through which the Government announces its policy for the coming year. I have gone through the whole document carefully and came to the conclusion that the document is disappointing, directionless, unrealistic and anti - Dalit. It is a document through which the Government tends to deceive the poor, the backward people, the farmers and the labourers.

In the very beginning of the document, there is a reference to the incident of 6th December. There has been a lot of discussion both in the ruling party as well as in the opposition in this regard. However, in view of what has been stated in the President's Address with regard to the same incident, I would like to know from the august House as to who is to be blamed for the incident? Why did the incident take place? The Hon. Prime Minister while delivering his speech on 15th August said that mosque will continue to remain there. How far is it meaningful to announce from the rampart or the Red Fort that mosque will remain there when the matter was already being discussed and efforts were being made to find out a solution by both the sides? How far is it justified to call the structure a mosque when no "namaz" has been offered there at least for the last 50-55 years, rather the idols of Lord Ram are being worshipped and 'Akhand kirtan' is being performed at the place. Did

the incident not take place as an outcome of that announcement. The Hon. Prime Minister had assured the saints that the matter would be solved through negotiations within three months. However, no step was taken in that regard for four and half months; Was it not a test of patience of those who considered it a temple?

It is true that the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh the BJP ruling state had assured that every possible effort would be made to protect the structure and further steps would be taken as per the directives of the Supreme Court. Though the case had already been decided before 6th December, the verdict was withheld at the instance of the Government. Could not the verdict be given before 6th December? Was it not a deliberate test of patience of those who had faith in the temple? Who is responsible for the incident of 6th December? I say that the Congress Party is more responsible than any other political party for the demolition of that structure. The Congress party did not use its will power at all nor did it apply its political power.

It would be the lone example in the history when a Chief Minister resigned immediately on moral grounds. The Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh had assured that every possible measure would be taken to protect the structure. He refused to give permission to open fire on the devotees of Ram. When he failed to protect the structure, he resigned. The ruling Congress Government dismissed BJP Governments in four States just to make a political mubeage. One Government resigned. The Governments of Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan were dismissed over very minor incidents. But in Gujarat and Maharashtra where the Congress Party is the ruling party, there

have been continuous communal riots but the Governments of these States have not been dismissed will this partisan attitude let the people exercise their restraints? Not a single incident took place in Himachal Pradesh but the ruling party crossed all limits and violated ever the constitution to dismiss the BJP Governments in four states; and then they made an appeal to restore communal harmony. Who has spoilt the atmosphere of communal harmony. Is it BJP or the traders of votes. When talking Privately the Government appreciates our stand but publicly it gave an assurance from the ramparts of the Red Fort that the mosque would not be demolished and the structure would remain at the same place so that they may not lose their votes. Government is spoiling communal harmony.

What communal harmony will these people maintain, who call that structure a mosque. The idols of Ramlala are installed there for the last 50 years and akhand-path is going on. These people view this issue with an angle to capture votes..... (*Interruptions*)

AN HON. MEMBER: Why did you demolish the temple if the idol was there? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI KALKA DAS: To made it more grand. It will become grand and Ram lala is there today and he will remain there in future..... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please do not speak while sitting.

SHRI KALKA DAS: It has been said in this document that the basic premise of secularism and the rule of law has been threatened. It has to be restored, the document says but before that they have to make a self introspection as to who are they, who

have undermined the supremacy of the Supreme Court and the rule of the law? Is it an outcome of the 6th December incident? When the Shahbano case came before the Supreme Court and the Supreme Court decided in her favour, these people who are giving this document today said that the Constitution should be amended. When Shrimati Indira Gandhi was debarred from contesting elections for six years by the Allahabad High Court, these people has imposed emergency in the country so that no one could raise voice against them. They did not honour that decision. These are the people who did not take any action on the High Court verdict in regard to Narmada case. There are a number of such examples, but I do not want to go in to detail. There are several incidents where the Congress Party and the Congress Government defied court orders. Not only that, but also they had pressurized them and took decisions of their own. It is not only I, but also people of this country are saying this and they are saying us that we have lowered the dignity of the court.

It is like the case of thief threatening the policeman. You yourselves lower the dignity of law and allegations on us. Several judges of the Supreme Court were not given promotions, because they did not low line with the Congress Party. There are several examples and one of them was Shri Hegde, the ex Speaker of this House. He resigned his post and fought the election on our party ticket. We are proud of it. Bharatiya Janta Party is the only place for the persons who love justice. He was the Speaker of this House and his decisions are still quoted as notable examples.

It is true that our party and the Congress party are political rivals, but now they are non-pulssed. Just now, our hon. friend Dr. Girija Vyas said emphatically that she was

proud of being a Hindu. I am happy that at least they have understood. They know that the Hindus are very anguished. These are the people who called us communalists for uttering the word Hindu, because they had to get the votes of other community also. But they have become cautious now. They are afraid of the expression made by the hon. lady Member. They are aware of the consequences. Some of the Congress members now say that they are Hindus. Today they have become aware of the wish, the anguish and the youthfulness of the country and that the policy of appeasement will not work.

17.00 hrs.

Today our colleague declared that she is proud of being a Hindu. She also said that 'vande matram' was the slogan of the Congress party. It was not only the slogan of the congress party but of the entire country and of the martyrs who sacrificed their lives for the freedom of the country. But in this Government doubts were raised about 'Vande-matram' also.

It was once decided by the G.P.C. that the House will begin with the 'Vande-matram' and adjourn with the national anthem 'Jana-Gana-Mana'. I am talking of this Government when Dr. Girija Vyas was a Minister in it. A debate was held and objections were raised on 'Vande-Matram'. In consonance with policy the of a appeasement, the Government bowed to the objection and the issue was sidelined.

SHRI ANNA JOSHI (Pune): Who raised the objection?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anna Joshi Ji, please do not interrupt.

SHRI KALKA DAS: It is not clear from this document as to what direction it wants to give. There Government has stated that

[Sh. Kalka Das]

they are referring the Ram-Janam bhommi-Babri Masjid dispute to the Supreme Court under Article 143 for advice. The Bharatiya Janata Party has already suggested the Government earlier that if it wants, it can take advice from the Supreme Court under Article 143. But the Government did not accept the suggestion then. It said at that time that the matter will be taken up under Article 138. Now they are doing the same thing. Better late than never. We had given a right advice, but it was not accepted at that time. It is all right, if the Government accepts it now. I will again say that court is not a solution to this dispute. You are again committing a mistake. We should solve that dispute by sitting and discussing together. As Shri Vajpayee suggested that we are brothers, so we should respect each other's feelings and discuss it together. This is the permanent solution of that dispute. He also said that the issue of Ram Janam bhoomi.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Kalka Das ji only two minutes are left for you.

SHRI KALKA DAS: I will conclude in two minutes. This document is directionless. It has been written in the preamble of our Constitution that the people should get social, economic and political justice, liberty of thought, expression, belief, faith and worship and a quality of status and opportunity. But the document read by the Hon. President here gives no indication about where we want to take the country. That is why, this document is directionless.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Government also says to constitute a new trust. But this is also not a solution. The Government is again doing a wrong thing by misleading the people. This will not solve the dispute. There

is already a Ramjanam bhoomi trust, which should be asked to construct a grand temple. The trust has crores of rupees, given by the people for construction of the temple. This issue cannot be solved by partisan attitude. It can only be solved through a will power and with a clear heart. It cannot be solved through political gimmicks.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, the issue of Jammu - Kashmir borders was raised. The people of Pakistan and Bangladesh are infiltrating from across the borders. But the borders of Delhi are sealed so that the Bharatiya Janta Party cannot hold its rally. When this is the attitude of the Government, how the problems can be solved. The Government could have made arrangements. But they were scared and a force consisting of 70 thousand police men was deployed here to thwart the rally of the Bharatiya Janta Party.

Their doubt was baseless. The Bharatiya Janta Party had said that it would be a peaceful rally. But the Government had a political revenge to take and so they misused the police force. If they have the courage they can have a political battle with us, but they want to fight a war by proxy. (*Interruptions*)

It could have been something different, if it were a political battle between our two parties. But they brought the police force in between and thought that we will not be able to fight them.

What democracy is it where the freedom of speech has been sealed with the threat of police and bullet. The Constitution provides freedom of speech as a fundamental right. The Government has stated about the plight of the labourers. The down trodden people the farmers and the labourers of this country are steel wandering to each out a living. They have no employment and are

dying of hunger. News to this effect appears everyday in the newspapers. How does the economic development take place? The talk about small scale industries, but how they will grow. The Customs duty on imported goods has been lowered due to which imported goods are found in abundance in the country. Then how the small scale industries will grow. They talk about their development, but act in the opposite. The economic condition of the country is incomplete. (Interruptions)

SHRI CHIRANJI LAL SHARMA(Kamal): About two and half lakh people were starving in Ayodhya (Interruptions)

SHRI KALKA DAS: You are obsessed with it. I am talking of 90 crore people. You cannot see the farmer, the labourer and the Harijan living here. Your mind is obsessed, and it will remain so. When you will face the elections you will come to know that Kalka Das was right. Now, you are *pow* : drunk.

I am talking of those 55 per cent people of the country who are living below the poverty line poverty line and are virtually facing starvation and are bereaved of proper clothings, medicine and education..... (Interruptions)

SHRI RAJESH KHANNA (New Delhi): You are getting the two brothers - Hindus and Muslims fight together (Interruptions)

You understand the meaning of the term "Hum" we..... (Interruptions)

SHRI KALKA DAS: You are also included in it..... (Interruptions)

SHRI RAJESH KHANNA: 'H' stands for Hindus while 'M' stands for Muslims and the

two together makes a 'HUM' (we). The clash between them will lead to a total annihilation for both the 'H' and 'M'. You are starting the 'HUM' (we). I do not understand as to what you mean by brotherhood (Bhai-Bhai). You are separating one brother from the other..... (Interruptions)

SHRI ANNA JOSHI: There is no scope for delivering a cinema dialogue here (Interruptions)

SHRI KALKA DAS: You are delivering cinema dialogues here, you are new to politics..... (Interruptions)

SHRI RAJESH KHANNA: You may take it as a cinema-dialogue..... (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is not good, such things look good only occasionally. (Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI P.C. THOMAS (Muvattupuzha): Sir, I am on a point of order. When a Member has raised a point, is it correct to accuse him saying that is not to be told here and that this is not a film world or things like that I think that it is objectionable and that should not be allowed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So far as your point of order is concerned, you should know that a Member should first seek their permission. He did not seek the permission. If the shouting and counter shouting goes on, that is not proper.

But your point of order is valid in the sense that nobody should speak without taking permission. Mr. Kalka Das, you should complete now.

SHRI KALKA DAS: He is interrupting me..... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: What I told was applicable to everyone. It was also applicable to Shri Anna Joshi. Mr. Kalka Das may please conclude his submission in one minute. Mamta Ji will speak after him.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL (Chandigarh): I was not telling that your ruling is wrong.

[*English*]

What I was saying was that invariably people get up and make some points.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You should also make valid points at the same time.

[*Translation*]

Your turn is to come, so it is not proper that you also face interruptions like this.

SHRI PAWAN KUMAR BANSAL: Interruptions are actually posed from the Members of that side and not from this side.

SHRI KALKA DAS: I would like to submit that there has been a claim about substantial increase in agriculture produce in this document, but it is clear from the data that there was a fall of 90 lakh metric ton foodgrains during the last year. Farmers have been feeling harassed by the decontrol of fertilisers and by increasing the price thereof. The Government has failed in providing employment to the youth of the country through Jawahar Rojgar Yojna. The 72nd and the 73rd amendments in the constitution have been passed through a consensus in this House whereas the Government is

trying to take total credit for it. The opposition parties has been demanding for it for the last thirty years and now this has been passed through a consensus. The whole of the House is to be credited for that. A data of the population has been provided and according to that the population growth has decreased from 2.2 per cent to 1.14 per cent. The Government talks of decreasing the population growth but it does not talk of sending back the crores of Bangladesh refugees who have come to India by crossing the border.

I would like to make one more submission in the end. There Government has not implemented its scheme of liberating the scavengers. The Government has allocated only Rs. 125 crores for providing social justice to the people belonging to the scheduled castes and scheduled tribes. The total population of these people is, however, 25 crore. It is, therefore, clear that each person belonging to the aforesaid categories will get only five rupees for development. Can development be ensured to them in this much of amount? It is, therefore, only an eyewash. The Government also proposes to set up a foundation by the name of Dr. Ambedkar; the fact, however, remains that hundreds of statues of Dr. Ambedkar have been destroyed during the current year when we are celebrating the centenary of Dr. Ambedkar. And all this has happened during the tenure of the present Government itself. The work on the proposed Dr. Ambedkar University to be built in Lucknow has not been started so far. It was Late Rajeev Gandhi who had laid the foundation for it but the Central Government did not provide the required amount for the same.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, a concern to protect democracy has been expressed in the Address but I would like to tell those who talk of protecting democracy that no reference has

been made in the address about the fact that election has not been held in Delhi for the last 10 years. The Government should state as to when Assembly election would be held in Delhi in order to provide political justice to the one crore people of Delhi. The public of Delhi would never excuse the Congress Government for it. I conclude with these words.

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE(Calcutta South): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am thankful to you for you have at least provided me an opportunity to express my views..... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will name them , who talk while sitting here....

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE: This House is the greatest temple, the greatest Gurudwara, the greatest mosque and the greatest Church of our democracy. Here I rise to support the Motion of Thanks on the Presidential address. I have heard the speeches of several speakers on the Presidential address. I do certainly realise that there has been more discussions on the temple-mosque issue in this House than the issues concerning bread, cloth and shelter. Every religion is respectable for everybody and moreover, the people of different traditions and faiths live in this country, but the point is that such a situation should not have emerged. If the Construction of temple or a mosque can solve all the problems of the country, than I would support the construction; but the fact is that the construction of a temple or a mosque cannot solve each and every problem facing the country. That is why I want to talk about the policy. I witnessed the business of the past sessions and an witnessing the business of the current session as well, I have observed that 90 percent of total discussion held in the House centres round the temple mosque

issue. A particular political party picks up the Hindu card while the other picks up the Muslim card and there is yet another party that takes up the issue of Mandal Commission and it is quite unpredictable as to which issue would be picked up by which political party. Well, this way the country cannot be run. If we really want to do something then we will have to think in the interest of the general public. We should hold discussions about the problems of the poor. The general mass of the country is shocked by the fact that discussions are held only on the temple - mosque issue. I would, therefore, like to submit here in the capacity of a public representative that the business of the House has to be adjourned on several occasions following a regular discussion on the temple mosque issue, but nobody cares to hold discussions on the issues concerning the poor.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, I congratulate the hon. President for his Address, but at the same time I would like to refer to a few points that have not been mentioned in the address of the President. I do like to raise those issue from the core of my heart. Sir, an appeal to maintain communal harmony has been made in the Presidential address and all the Members present here agree to it. I hail from Bengal where the preaching of Ram Krishna Peramhans are very much in tradition. He was the greatest guru in our country. He said "Sarva Dharma Sambhao". He advocated for the building up of human relationship. But secularism has been betrayed. The incident of the 6th of December had a nationwide repercussion. Everyone was not a fault for this occurrence but a large number of innocent people had to lose their lives. Women has to face atrocities and children were orphaned. Those who dwell in slums got their houses and jhuggies burnt and they were looted. Those people have not been provided with any relief and no reference,

[Kum. Mamta Banerjee]

whatsoever, to this fact has been made in the Presidential address. A white paper regarding the communal harmony on the incident of the 6th of December and Ram Janam Bhoomi-Babri Masjid issue has been issued by the Government. I would like to submit that a similar white paper should also be issued about the relief meted out to the victims of the communal riots by the State Governments and the Central Government giving full details. The Government had promised that uniform policy would be formulated in regard to providing relief measures. But I know cases in my State where the houses were burnt, people were gunned down and only two thousand rupees were provided for each of the victim who did not have even clothings lift with them and moreover, even that amount was not equally distributed. Some persons got the amount whereas there are others who were denied that. We know as to what is the value of two thousand rupees. The Government should try to know as to how much relief has actually been provided to the victims of communal riots. We should also try to know as to what is the contribution of the State Governments as well as of the Central Government. It is actually not clear as to what has been done by the Government. Adequate relief measures have not been taken. In one state a sum of rupees one lakh was given for the family of the victim gunned down while for the same incident in some other state a sum of only 50 thousand was provided. I do not intend to get a political mileage out of this speech but I just want to raise the voice of the general mass who have certainly been hurt. I would like to submit that the Government should formulate a uniform policy in this regard.

Today common man of our country is in

a very pitiable condition. Though he is not guilty yet he has been looted by us. He is in a state of starvation today. Whenever riots take place, we take relief measures but what and how much relief can we afford at most some utensils, some quilts or some food material as cloth and rice. This is not a permanent solution to the problem. Therefore, the Government should take some long term measures to help the riot victims. My submission to the House is that State Governments and Central Government should take some steps jointly in this regard. We make disputes for Mandir and Masjid but we forget the people who have to sacrifice their lives. That is why I would like to draw your attention toward this problem.

Mr. Chairman Sir, there is a mention in the President's Address that there is need to reorganise the Public Distribution System. It is also a fact that a lot of new fair price shops under Public Distribution system have been set up but all the required food articles are not available on number shops. All the Members have talked about their own respective states I belong to Bengal and therefore I draw your attention towards the State of Bengal and would like to state as to what was the condition of fair price shops. There if rice was available then pulses were not, if pulses were available, wheat was disappeared..... (*Interruptions*) I do not belong to Hindi State, even then I try to speak in Hindi then why do you laugh? (*Interruptions*)..... If flour was available then sugar was not there. Our colleagues from Bengal are present here. They make very long impressive speeches but they do not pay their attention towards the fact that there is acute scarcity of food items at ration shops located even in their own State. I would like to submit that the Members should pay their attention towards this fact.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

I would like to draw your attention towards another very important matter which has not been referred to in the President's Address. Today the problem of unemployment is growing very fast in our country. The youth of our country is frustrated because there is no course of action before them. This is not political issue... (*Interruptions*) .. It appears that you dislike such discussions. That is why I would like to state that the number of unemployed persons in the country is growing alarmingly and plan of action has yet been prepared to face the problem. In view of all these things we are unable to say that we are doing something for the benefit of the people. That is why, I would like to draw your attention towards this issue. Central Government and State Governments should jointly chalk out some plans in this regard so that the youth of this country could be engaged in constructive channels. If the problem of unemployment is solved, many of the problems before the country would automatically be solved. I know that it is not easy to solve this problem but self employment scheme and small scale industries can do a lot in combating this problem, so we should our attention in setting up such industries and launching such schemes. Now the Banks do not provide them loans. Previously, under self employment scheme, a loan of Rupees thirty five thousand was available to them, and even a rickshaw puller could have brought a rickshaw through the bank loan, but now this facility has been withdrawn. Similarly women entrepreneurs were also given loans for setting up some enterprise, but now this facility has also been withdrawn..... I think withdrawal of these facilities has been linked with the Bank scam; but what is the fault of common men in this regard. Whatever action or decision,

J.P.C. constituted to look into the matter wants to take. In view of the situation, it may take, but the discontinuance of advantages previously being provided by the Banks has been causing concern to the poor who were the beneficiaries of these advantages. I wish that the Government should pay its attention to the problem and may take some corrective steps.

I would like to say something about fertilizers. In this connection, I would like to submit to the Minister of Agriculture that the farmers are facing a great difficulty due to withdrawal of subsidy. Since the subsidy either has been withdrawal of subsidy. Since the subsidy either has been withdrawn or had been reduced, the farmers of the country are in great distress. Many of the farmers came to see me and requested me that I should take up the matter with the Government for restoring the facility of subsidy on fertilizers. The hon. Minister of Agriculture can well understand the sentiments of the farmers and reasonableness of their agitation because he himself has been a Kisan leader. Therefore, I would like to request the Minister of Agriculture to reconsider this matter. In the interests of the farmers of the country Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri has raised a slogan 'Jai Jawan Jai Kisan.'. If the Government takes any step in improving the condition of the farmers, They will always be happy.

Participating in the debate on the President's Address. I would like to make one more request and I have already made a number of unsuccessful fight in this regard. My submission is that there are lakhs of unemployed youths who are unable to get any employment. Despite getting themselves registered in the Employment Exchanges, they do not any call. Besides this they have to face one more problem i.e. whenever they want to apply for any job under the

Central Government or private / Public Sector Undertakings, they are required to send Postal orders along with their applications. Some organisations stipulate the amount of Postal order for Rs. 100/-. Some stipulate the amount for Rs. 50/- or Rs. 30/- and in the absence of these postal orders, they do not entertain the applications. I have tried my level best to make the Government understand that if the Government can not provide the jobs or cannot send even the call letters to the unemployed youths, it should stop realizing the fee in the form of postal orders or in any other way. There are lakhs of unemployed youths who are not even in a position to deposit the amount of fee while sending their applications for jobs. Thousands of youths do not get even the opportunity for applying because of the fee system.

I have taken up the matter many times but I have always been give the same reply that this provision exists for scheduled castes and Scheduled Tribes but other are essentially required to send the Postal orders etc. alongwith their applications. Through you, I would like to urge that the Government should pay attention towards the unemployed youths and a provision should be made to this effect that no fee either through Postal Orders or through any other means is required to be sent alongwith the applications being submitted by the unemployed youth for any job. I think and I hope that each and every member of this House would agree to me and support my demand. I would like the Government to pay its attention towards this matter.

I have referred to only two - three issues which are the most important ones. I would like to submit only one more thing. Through you, I would like to draw your attention

towards the increasing atrocities as molestation, rape, eve teasing being committed on women. I would like to request the Central Government that it should have a discussion with all the State Governments in this regard and make such arrangements as may ensure the immediate registration of F.I.R. for the atrocities committed on women. The culprits in the case must invariably be prosecuted. I am aware of so many places where the police do not even register a F.I.R. Details of such incidents are usually published in the newspapers but no action is being taken in the matter so that I specifically want that the Government should pay its attention towards this problem.

Although a number of programmes for the welfare of the girl children have been launched yet there is a need to make a lot of improvement in it. There is a need, on the part of the Central Government that it should have a dialogue with the State Governments in respect of the arrangements for the education and vocational training of the girl child. We should make efforts in this direction so that the future of the girl child may be ensured.

Sir, I do not want to say anything more. Lastly I would like to congratulate the people of Meghalaya and Nagaland for the holding of peaceful elections in those States. Alongwith this it is necessary to hold the Elections in Tripura also because it is common tradition in the democracy that the President's rule should not be imposed in any of the States for a longer period. You cannot postpone the elections for a longer period; so the elections should be held in Tripura as soon as possible.

Lastly, I would like to request that we should not raise any controversy about Mandir and Masjid. If at all there is any relation and love left in the hearts of the

people, they should jointly celebrate the month of 'Ramzan'. In this connection I would like to quote following lines:

"Chandni chand se hoti hai, Sitaron se nahin,

Muhabbat ek se hoti hai, Hajaron se nahin"

Today, if there is any realign of our country, it is the democracy. Therefore, I request my colleagues to raise the issues which serve the public interest.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN (Kishanganj): Mr. Deputy - Speaker, Sir, I am very grateful to you for giving me an opportunity to speak in this debate. Sir, I have read through the President's Address but I regret that the document does not represent the objective reality that is India today. It seems that the shrieks and the agony of the people do not penetrate the stony wall of the Rashtrapati Bhavan, that the people living in the palaces of the Government are totally insensitive to the anguish of our people, to the travails of our people, to the social upheaval that is taking place before our very eyes, to the economic crises that we are confronted with, to the political instability that is staring us in our face and to the psychological wilderness in which we confine ourselves as a nation.

Sir, today, we are questioning some basic assumptions of our freedom movement. We have come to a cross road and we do not know where we are going. The caravan of our nation appears to have lost its way. We seem to have been surrounded by grey clouds which were on the horizon until yesterday. Today, they are on top of us. The ship of the state is now in the midst of a whirlpool. We do not know whether we shall sink or we shall remain afloat. At this moment of anxiety in the life of our nation,

the President's Address sounds like business as usual and all is well. The President ought to know what is the State of the nation.

With due respect, I would like to present to him a line from the great poet.

"Patta-Patta, buta-butahamara jane hai

Jani no jane too he na jane sara alam jane hai."

Sir, today, we are facing a big question mark. The nameless and the faceless Indian, not only the people living on the Malabar Hill, not only the Members of Parliament, that nameless and faceless Indian is a question personified. He sees all these happenings before him. He hears all the slogans and he is simply bewildered, he is confused and dot that man, we, who are now, sitting in the coziness of this Parliament and who are debating the state of the nation have nothing to offer. That is the unfortunate part. Today, we have lost ourselves, the entire momentum of our development has gone. If you read through the President's Address, it is a compilation of what was done and what is proposed to be done in the next decade. There is hardly any achievement that the Government has come forward with, except in the field of agriculture and that is due to the labour and the grace of our *kisans*. That is the only silver lining I see on the horizon.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee has gone away. He has raised a very important point. Indeed, if we want to re-define our nationhood, we have got to go through the exercise of debating what secularism means in the context of our country. It is absolutely essential and a national issue.

[Translation]

Had he been present here, I would have

[Sh. Syed Shahabuddin]

made an humble submission to him that the question is not of the redefining nor is it of challenging the idea of secularism but of certain assumptions. No religion allows disputes and quarrels but when you insist that you belong to Hindu religion and that all other religions are Panths then secularism means 'dharma nirpekshate' and not 'panth nirpekshata.' If you call yourselves Hindus, the others will certainly call themselves Muslims, Christians and Sikhs. I would like to emphasize that we all are Indians first. We are Hindus as well as Muslims and Christians and above all we are Indians. This is our common point and meeting point and it gives us strength and shows us light.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir the hon. President has hinted at the tragic incidents of 6th December. I would not like to repeat it here.

[English]

But one thing I want to place on record; and this I told the Prime Minister himself one day; and I said, Mr. Prime Minister, you beat all the previous Prime Ministers of the country, the historic four Prime Ministers of the country took 37 years to cover the distance; the distance they covered in 37 years - between 1949 and 1986 you have covered in flat 17 days; 17 days only. You have created a new reality under your own patronage. What is how the temporary temple was constructed under the President's raj; the canopy was put there under the President's raj. New idols were again installed under the President's raj; the canopy was put there under the President's raj; pooja was begun under the President's raj and the darshan was started under the President's raj.

Instead of taking a clean-cut, moral stand,

so far and no further, the disputed place is out of bounds for everybody, who is involved in the controversy; let the rule of law prevail; let the court decide. Only the final verdict, we shall open the area to anybody who has the right to it. Instead of that, you allowed a new reality to come up, which is binding us from all sides. And you have also made a promise to the world; it is not a promise made to the people of India to the Muslim community of India only that you shall rebuild the mosque; it is a promise that you have made to the entire world; the world is a witness to it; 40 governments in the world, 40 friendly governments have taken notice of this commitment, this assurance, this promise of the Prime Minister. How can he resile from it? How can we allow the Prime Minister of our great country, to resile from a commitment that he has made in his official capacity? We know the difficulty. I appreciate the difficulty and yet I am saying that instead of trying to resolve the issue, you have address put more knots into it.

On the Ayodhya question, the President has expressed his sorrow. But I would like to point out to you that his Government in the last three months have not moved one step from where we were on the 6th December.

They have issued an Ordinance. It is supposed to create a trust; it was supposed to have site plans for a Masjid and a Mandir; it was supposed to allot land. In three months, no trust has come into existence; no site plan has been prepared; no architectural plans have been prepared; no land has been allotted. There is no progress; there is total silence.

And if I recall the last statement of the Home Minister, he said, now, we shall await the opinion of the Supreme Court. This is supposed to be an independent exercise.

And what the question for that opinion? Again you have put a question before the Supreme court in a very motivated manner, in a very deliberately directed manner, which I call a leading & added question. And I know the game; we fully understand the game; everyone of us understands the game; P.M. only wants to rob the BJP of the credit of building the Ram Temple; And that is about all.

But I would like to know are you not bringing into question the very sanctity of the judicial process, the last support for democracy in this country? You are forcing it into a situation where, whatever its opinion, it shall be questioned; because the question that you have put to it is so vague, so loaded and so wide that any answer can be given.

Now you have introduced a CBI enquiry. I would like to know what the CBI has done in the last three months. How many people gave been arrested? How many have been charge-sheeted? How many cases have been launched?

You have put a ban on some organisations. We know what sort of a ban it is. A friendly match. A sort of a shadow boxing that is going on. We know all the leaders are practically free to give interviews, to talk to the Press, to issue statements. We do not even know how many are under arrested. How many were there arrested and how many have been released right away.

Sir, this is a game of deception. Deception will not resolve the issue. Negotiations may, the rule of law will. But deception will never resolve the problem as controversial as this an the game of deception goes on, which has been going on for the last so many years.

You can deceive some people for all times, all people for some time but you cannot deceive all the people of India for all the time and you cannot try to create a permanent state of hostility between the Hindus and Muslims of this country. If that happens, that will be striking part at the very root of our nation Rood.

[*Translation*]

The court will give opinion not the decision. The Government will decide it.

[*English*]

I told the Prime Minister that please allow the rule of law to prevail because in this country a political decision, a political award never works because people always feel that given a little pressure one could have decision in one's own favour. But a judicial verdict has got a moral quality of its own. It can stand the test of reasons and therefore, it can apply. What you have done? You have brought the Supreme Court into it for an opinion and then said that on the basis of that opinion the Government shall decide what to do with the disputed land. This is not the way.

I would like to make one thing very clear. The Muslim stand which is universal throughout the country is very simple. We are prepared to accept the final judicial verdict but it has to be a judicial verdict on the substantive issues. We cannot otherwise to sing away the site of the Babri Masjid. The assense of the Masjid is the site and no Muslim individually or collectively can sign away the site of a Masjid. And therefore, there is no way you can presswise or the Muslims of India to accept the handing away of the Babri Masjid site for the construction of the proposed Ram Temple.

You can take it away. You may take it by force, against our will, against reason, against law, against morality, by virtue of majority but you cannot win our hearts. You can of course take something by force and by coercion and then say, all right take your seat or else.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, therefore, I want to caution the Government that the Muslim minority in the country today is in a state of psychic seige, psychic seige I am using, they feel insecure not only physically and I am not only complaining about the violence that has been raging for the last two months. That violence as I said the shrieks of the people do not penetrate the corridors of power. Women are raped, men are killed, children are butchered and then burned, property is destroyed. In Bombay alone Rs. 4500 crores worth of property, Mr. Deputy Speaker, has been destroyed. It is a loss for the country.

A foreign dignitary came to see me the other day. He said, "we did not know much about Ayodhya but we were horrified by the burning of Bombay and by all the arson and massacre that took place there." That has created atmosphere of tremendous physical insecurity. As far as the promises to the minorities there is supposed to be a Prime Minister's programme for the welfare of the minorities. The Parliament has never seen the balance sheet. We are supposed to have passed, Mr. Deputy Speaker you may recall, with great fanfare an Act to establish a national commission for minorities. That Act is yet to be put into effect. We were promised a minorities financial development corporation, it is yet to see the light of the day.

Mrs. Gandhi had established a high power panel on the economic status of the

minorities. That report came and was shelved, it has not been acted upon, it is not even remembered. The Muslims particularly are rather unhappy about their representation in Government employment. Today there is talk of reservation in the air. What does the Muslim community get?

It is only one to two per cent in public employment at all levels. A gentleman who had served as the Minister of Information and Broadcasting in the Government of India, told me that he made a survey when he was a Minister of the *chaprasis* and drivers in his Ministry who were Muslims and he found that in the entire Ministry and in all the attached and subordinate offices put together, there were only two Muslim drivers and *chaprasis*. The Muslims today are asking for reservation, finally. I am happy that the Janata Dal has taken a position on that. I am grateful as a member of that deprived community. But something needs to be done, it has to be looked into.

We have been talking about the reorganisation of the Police machinery, for the last so many years. So many years. These recent incidents have brought into focus the partiality, if I may say so the wickedness, of the Police system as it exists and there is no mention about reorganisation of the Police Force, the decentralisation of the Police Force bringing Police under social control, making it into a composite force, deploying it in a composite manner, because that alone is the answer, a composite force deployed compositely, as was done in West Bengal. That is the only answer for seeing to it that the Police does not act as a partisan force as a communal force as a criminal force, but really to protect the life and liberty and happiness of the citizens of the country.

There is massive violation of human

rights. We may take a shelter rough. We are a global vilage living . Behind the plea of domestic jurisdiction. The world has seen what is happening and the world will ask us questions and we will have to answer them, whether the Government likes it or not, whosoever sits on the sets of power, will have to answer for massive violation of human rights which is reaching now the proportion of genecidal dimensions.

The hon. Minister of Welfare promised us a wakflaw two years ago-rather one and a half years ago. Every session he tells us so and the previous Minister also used to tell the same thing. "In the next session we are going to introduce this Bill". But so far, I tell your, five years have elapsed and the Bill is yet to see the light of the day.

It the Wakf properties are properly utilised for the educational uplift of the Muslim community, that would change the face of the community. But that is not being some. I do not know why it is not being done.

Similarly the Haj Act was to be amended since 1960. When I was a Joint Secretary, I drafted a new Haj Act. It is yet to be labour in the House, although Shri Narasimha Rao, when he was the Foreign Minister, said in Parliament that the Bill would be presented soon.

The three language formula has been distorted in a manner that the children of the linguistic minorities do not have the opportunity to learn their mother tongue. Mother tongue has been removed from the primary, from the position of first language. That is a loss for the linguistic minorities. If their children do not become proficient in their mother tongue, they shall never be able to realise their full potential. They will never be able to apply their mind intelligently to the other subjects. This is what the psycholo-

gists say and we have of couse, now this problem of re-writing of text books. I am happy that the Minister of Human Resource Development has taken up the matter. But the pace of revision is entirely slow.

On the political from whatever we gain in Kashmir, we lose with everyact of atrocity. I do not want to remind you about the copor. But all I want to tell you is that if the Governement is really sincere in trying to normalise the situation in Kashmir and to revive the democratic and the political process it has to come to terms with reality speak with the people there, as their aspirations to find out a *via media*. We cannot compromise on our sovereignty and itegnity. But surely, Kashmir cannot but have a specials places within the Union of India.

By mutual interaction by talking frankly and sincerely we can determine the line , we can draw a new line for autonomy, find the quantum of autonomy that would be mutually acceptable.

On the question of Punjab, I would like to request the Government that they must now apply their mind to take out the long forgotten Rajiv-Longoval Award from the closet, dust it up and see where it can apply, and then implement it. Punjab is now coming to a point where perhaps, the Accord in its entirety can be suitably and sincerely applied and that will itself win the hearts of the people of Punjab and resolve the Punjab problem.

In the North East, I am afraid, some forces who had raised the foreigners' question ten years ago are again reviving it today. I would like them to apply themselves to the census data. What is the rate of increase of the total population of Assam between 1971 and 1991 and of each community of Assam therein. Does the rate materially and sub-

[Sh. Syed Shahabuddin]

stantially differ from the rate of growth of the population of the entire country or from the rate of growth of population of each end of those communities in other parts of the country? Is it does not surely there cannot be a case for massive infiltration. Infiltration cannot be a checked. In an open border, there will always be a certain humnseepage. But let that not become a political issue; let that not become an issue to create another war another cause of hostility and another war of separation between one community and the other.

We have passed the Panchayat Law and the President has referred to it in his Address. But, I would like to know what has happened after that. Has the Prime Minister even given a directive to the States even these ruled by the Congress that they must immediately revise their Panchayat laws and hold the Panchayat elections wherever they are to be held? He has not done it.

Reservation issue is being used as football, kicked by one side to the other. Nothing is happening and the Government is not clear when it must be clear that when the Supreme Court gave that order on the 9th November, 1992 from that date, the reservation in favour of the backward class to the extent of 27 per cent exists and must be implemented. Every case of public employment, whatever the panel; whatever the service; whatever the grade, must have this 27 per cent quota. That quota may be left vacant for the time being. But, it has to be filled only by the backward class and by no one but the backward class. This position has not been stated cater serially by the Government on the floor of the House and they are again messing up the question. That is now a decided question; that is a national consensus. Therefore, I would say

do not take shelter behind this creamy layer business; do not take shelter behind this question of finalisation of the list of castes; apply it and give a categorical assurance that all public employment that takes place after 16 November, 1992 the OBC's will have an assured quota of 27 per cent.

I do not have to say much on the economic front. But the picture which is projected here is not realistic. We are passing through an economic crisis. We shall have a detailed debate when we discuss the Budget. I would like to say that I find a peculiar twist the economic policy of this Government. Are they budgeting the country in the interests of the top hundred million people only. Are they trying to divide the country between the elite and the massess? That seems to be the entire motivation to support the alike and paper and Pander to their whims and fancies, cater to the artificial and consumerism which has been generated and which is sought to be generated by foreign interests in our country. They are pandering to that consumerism. That is my basic objection. Planning have new been reduced. The President himself had talked about indicative planning. In dicative planning means good by to planning. Therefore, we are not going to have any planned economic development. And more but be subject only to market forces.

I spoke about agriculture being the silver lining on the horizon. But industry in a state of stagnation. Our GDP has in ordered by 4.5 per cent and cur population has increased by 3 per cent. So, you can see that the real increase is only 1.5 per cent. In the case of power we are in doldrums. This morning in Delhi in the security area, there were two or three electric short circuits. Our poverty stand still at about 35 per cent for the last so many years. Our unemployment level has reached a recorded figure of need

by two crore and the real figure may be something of the order of 4 crore. Our import is rising at 16.5 per cent and our export is rising at 3.4 per cent, which means that this year at the end of March, We should be prepared for a deficit of something of the order of Rs. 20, 000 crores. On foreign debt, we have already taken up on ourselves a debt of something like Rs. 225000 crores. The Finance Minister told me the other day in a letter that in the year to come, 1993-94, he thinks that on the repayment alone the country will have to fork out Rs. 38, 000 crores. If you look at the inflow and the outflow, the net inflow this year is something of the order of Rs. 5, 000 crores. We taken a great pride here on our foreign exchange reserves. If the NRIs are to take away their money, we will be back in the red.

I. M. F. of course is a good customer. They will go on giving us something.

On inflation, we have been told that we have brought inflation under control, the rate now is not in double figures. But every day the price is rising. The rate of inflation is going down. But inflation is going up inflation is going up and the rate of inflation is going down. It is going up with less and less speed. It is going up all the same. The housewife and the common man had to face the differences.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE: May I just inform you? Because of the Rs. 20, 000 crores of additional imports that you are resorting to the rate of inflation is so. That is the tragedy of the situation. You should either have a deficit in the balance of trade or a rise in the inflation rate.

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: As far as the liberalisation campaign that we are talking about, When is the foreign investment. We say we have sanctioned and approved so many thousands of crores worth of proposals. But if you ask them as to how many

crores have actually come in during this period, they have no answer to give you.

The Ayodhya episode has cast a shadow on everything. That is accepted. It has cast a shadow on foreign investment. It has cast a shadow on our investment. It has cast a shadow on NRI remittances to India. It has cast a shadow on our distribution. It has cast a shadow on our distribution and our commerce. But, be that as it may, we have got to fight that situation.

I would like to raise one single point about defence. I have raised that with the hon. Minister. Why should our regiments continue to have sectarian or caste names? Why can we not have a really modern army which is homogenous and in which every region of the country finds equal fulfilment? Why can the recruitment not be from each region according to the population? Why cannot every area of the country, every State in the Country be represented in every limit of the armed forces?

Finally, I am sorry that I do not have the time - I want to say a word about the external affairs. I would just like to end by saying that the postponement of the SAARC summit is a very serious event. It reflects the state or affairs within our South Asian community.

I have always believed that whatever be the political lines and political boundaries, between the great Himalayan are of icy mountains and the blue waters of the Indian Ocean, there is completed God given unity and the lines are drawn by man and the lines are effected by time. But this SAARC business and why this happened should ring a bell that whiled we aspire towards the unification of the sub- continent the unification of the sub continent will demand some basic changes in the way we are acting within our own country.

Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, we are living

achievements and suppresses its failures, and the failures outnumber achievements.

in a global village. We cannot hide things from the peoples eyes. When an ancient historical monument is demolished continuously for six hours and it is televised across the globe, you cannot ask the world to shut its eyes. They put us to shame. And then even friends will begin to tell us that we have got to do something about it.

Sir, a time has come for us not to take shelter behind these *goody goody* phrases; behind platitudes, or behind *Naseehat*.

Sir, such as I respect and admire the President of the country, I think a time has come for us to understate an agonising appraisal of all that we have been doing for the last so many years and to have the courage to set the caravan back on the path and once in motion. I think the destination we will reach very soon.

[*Translation*]

SHRI ASHOK ANANDRAO DESHMUKH (Parbhani): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, we have listened to his eloquent speech. Shri Shahabuddin Saheb has not said anything about population control. If we bring a Bill about population control, will be support it?

[*English*]

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN: I believe in responsible parenthood and realistic population policy for the country. (*Interruptions*)

PROF. K. VENKATAGIRI GOWDA (Bangalore South): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I stand to speak on the Motion of Thanks to the President for his Address to the Joint Session of Parliament on 22nd February. (*Interruptions*) The Address was prepared by the Government and was delivered by the President. The Address highlights Government's

The country is faced with several crises — political, social, economic and educational. The president has not made any reference to all these crises in his Address. He said that the basic premise of secularism and the rule of law has been threatened. It is alleged by the Congress Party and other political parties that the BJP demolished the Babri Masjid in Ayodhya. But it is not so. It is not the BJP but the kar sevaks who were over enthusiastic, that brought down the mosque. Therefore, we cannot blame the BJP or the VHP or the RSS. Some members of the Congress Party and others said that BJP is fascist, BJP is communal, BJP is unsecular and BJP is fundamentalist. The Congress Party says that the BJP is dangerous to the country. But it is not so. They referred to 'Sang Parivar'. But what is dangerous to the country is not Sangh Parivar, but 'Singh Parivar'.

Now the country is faced with several crises in the political field, in the social field, in the economic field and in the educational field.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Prof. Gowda, tomorrow you can continue.

PROF. VENKATAGIRI: Not today?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You have already started your speech and you can continue it tomorrow.

The House stands adjourned to meet tomorrow, the 3rd March 1993, at 11.00 a.m.

18.01 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, March 3, 1993 / Phalgun 12, 1914 (Saka).