

We do not have full information about arrests made under various provisions of the Defence and Internal Security of India Rules 1971 during the emergency. The same is being collected and will be placed on the Table of the House in due course.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Sanat Kumar Raha.

SHRI SANAT KUMAR RAHA (West Bengal) : Sir....

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS : It is lunch time now.

The House then adjourned for lunch at one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at five minutes past two of the clock, [The Vice-Chairman (Shri Lokanath Misra) in the Chair.]

**MOTION OF THANKS ON THE
ADDRESS BY THE VICE- PRESIDENT
ACTING AS PRESIDENT -----(Contd.)**

SHRI SANAT KUMAR RAHA (West Bengal) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, with 43 per cent of the votes polled, the people of India gave the verdict to settle the matter of formation of the new Government, and the Government has been formed. We welcome it. But I see the new Government is still unsettled in the saddle to give direction on the problems of the nation. So, there are statements after statements by the Ministers. Yesterday, the Prime Minister's broadcast was there, The day before yesterday, the External Affairs Minister gave some clarifications

regarding non-alignment and other foreign affair problems. The Rail Minister also gave some guidelines. Piecemeal statements are coming before the House to judge the policy of the Government towards the governance and administration of the country-Still, there is a lack of any comprehensive policy of the Government as 'regards its home affairs and foreign affairs. Going through the discussions, I see that this new Government has a rather negative attitude towards the performance of the former Government. Only they criticise the negative aspects but the positive aspects and achievements are belittled. So, whatever Government is present there, I would like the achievements to be really assessed and far greater achievements should be made for the progress of the country, Sir, the Presidential Address is a mere four-page document. When 600 million people of India are faced with innumerable national, cultural and social problems in their daily life, it is too insignificant for me on this occasion to speak on the document. The address does not give any positive and concrete direction towards our foreign policy and our traditional anti-imperialist stand and non-alignment and self-reliance. As stated in the Address, the term 'genuine non-alignment' can be interpreted in different ways by different parties and by different Governments. It should be clearly expressed in terms of a genuine anti-imperialist stand which India has so far taken towards non-alignment, towards freedom struggle and towards other proposals for peace and progress of the world, Sir, the Address does not also state our relationship with socialist countries and their aid to the development of the developing countries like ours. I think aid from socialist countries are different in content from the aid of imperialist country. The Address does not mention at all about the exploitation by the monopolists, both of international and national varieties. The people tested the principle of trusteeship towards wealth since the days of Mahatma Gandhi. Again this principle has been

[Shri Sanat Kumar Raha]

enunciated by our Prime Minister and, I think, it will be exploded very soon. The Address does not mention the need for the public sector as an instrument to command the economy of the country in the national interest' which the private sector cannot command.

The Address does not evaluate the performance of the public sector as well as the private sector so far as their functioning is concerned.

Sir, there was the battle cry of the Janata Party and the C.F.D. and others. The battle cry was mainly against the misrule of the Congress authoritarianism individuality cult, extra-constitutional authority and misuse of powers. It is against this background that the people have voted and 43 per cent of them have voted in favour of the Janata Government. That is how the Janata Government has come to power in India today to run the administration in the name of Janata. I do not know how far the Janata will be satisfied by the 'governance' of the new Government. This 43 per cent of the people who have voted in favour of the Janata Party and against the authoritarian misrule of the Congress Party hope that this misrule and autocracy will go and the progress and achievements made in the national and international spheres will be further increased in accordance with the urges and aspirations of the people. Sir, so far as the international policy of the present Government is concerned, it is vague and hazy. People want that the achievements made in the course of the last 30 years through democratic struggles should be safeguarded. I do not mean to say that the achievements made so far in this country are only due to the Congress rule. It is mainly the progressive parties, the leftist parties, the democratic parties which have achieved success after long-drawn struggles against the Government on the charter of their demands and have won their objects one after another. This way we had set up a tradition of democratic struggle in India. So, we must

I give our support, the traditional support, to all national liberation, struggles, democratic struggles, struggles for social justice and struggles for achieving higher standards of living. We will, of course, give our unstinted support to the attainment of socialism, which is our goal. These are all universally accepted principles and accepted by all sections of voters in this country. I think the basic foundation of the Indian national movement should be maintained and further strengthened.

Sir, the verdict of the electorate is a good lesson for us all to learn. It is good for the Government party, for the opposition parties and other parties, irrespective of their political ideologies. It is also a warning against the misrule and autocratic rule by any party which is in power.

Sir, it is wrong to advocate a two-party system of parliamentary democracy in India where various parties for various class interests are working, as for instance, the Janata-C.F.D., the Akali-C.P.M., the Congress-C.P.I.-R.S.P. League, etc. are working in coalition. For a country like ours the two-party system will not prove useful and the health of the nation will suffer. A two-party system, a bi-party democratic system is valued in capitalist countries like U.S.A. and Britain but not in India. In a capitalist society the two parties will come to power one after another as a ruling party but such a system is not beneficial to the interests of the working people of India.

Sir, the Address says that in the economic sphere the Government is pledged to the removal of destitution within a definite time-frame of 10 years. It does not say anything regarding the completion of land reform measures which are in the interests of poor peasants. More than 70 per cent of our people depend on agriculture and the implementation of land reform measures must be the first item on our programme and these reforms must be carried out within a definite period of time.

The Address does not say that monopoly and black money will be liquidated within the time schedule. Without under-taking these two major tasks, nothing can be done. Without these two major tasks, removal of destitutions and their co-existence with black money, it is nothing but an anachronism, that is, the monopoly and destitutions will co-exist.

Sir, if it is said that no achievement was made during the Congress rule, it will be grossly wrong. For safeguarding the achievements whatever made so far through the struggle of the people, and for further progressive achievements, necessary guidelines and directions have to be given. In that regard, the Address has failed to assure us. However, the Prime Minister, in his broadcast, admitted a happier position in foreign exchange reserves but he did not mention what would be the export policy of this Government, whether it would be based on the World Bank oriented policy of exports from India to developed countries in their interest only.

If trusteeship of wealth to business and industry would have been effective, there might not have been so much of closures, lay-offs and retrenchments of workers, and also so much of black money and such gigantic monopoly houses in India. This is the result of the trusteeship of wealth in business and industry. Ultimately, this logic resulted in the creation of monopoly houses and fattening of these houses at the cost of the people. Principle of trusteeship of wealth to business and industry is very sweet and melodious to hear. It demands change of heart of the vested class. The truth of the history is that only a democratic struggle can win the right and justice from the vested class. Trusteeship and socialism cannot coexist. The hypocrisy of trusteeship will again be exploded as it has been historically done in various countries of the world. Internationally, this theory of trusteeship * has been exploded on the U.N. platform

and in non-aligned conferences of developing countries. History of the progress is the history of struggle of have-nots against haves. This is the absolute truth in the social sphere, in the political sphere and also on the horizon of human civilisation. Neither our economic policy be oriented by the World Bank as they are trying on the theory of export-oriented economy in the interests of the developed countries, nor self-reliance can depend on foreign aid.

Sir, so far, the present Government has taken some piecemeal corrective measures of the legacy of misrule of Congress Government. But nothing fundamental is there regarding re-structuring of our socio-economic frame.

As regards the consumer industries, Sir, it has been apprehended that this industry will be placed at the mercy of the private sector. I do not know what would be the result of this private sector business. Ultimately, we shall be at the mercy of the private sector as we are so long at the mercy of the manufacturers, at the mercy of the private sector, at the mercy of the trader and black-marketeer. This situation must alter. So, I suggest that all consumer industries which are more essential for the people, should be under the control of the Government, both for production and for distribution so that the essential supplies reach the poorest of the poor in the villages at a cheaper rate.

As regards closures, lay-offs, retrenchments etc., the Address keeps absolute silence. I do not know why these glaring problems of the poor people in the country, both in the field of industry and in the field of agriculture, are ignored by the President in his Address.

In conclusion, I would say that the Government have failed to come forward with a definite policy in regard to our traditional anti-imperialistic stand on freedom struggles. We want that the Govern-

[Shri Sanat Kumar Raha] ment should adopt a proper attitude towards socialism and the socialist countries. The Government should also make international co-operation and friendship as the key-note for creating a peaceful international atmosphere. The attitude towards monopoly, both the national and the muHi-national varieties, should be clarified by the Government. The attitude towards the public sector as well as the private sector should be clarified by the Government. The Government's attitude towards industry and labour should also be made clear to the working people. They should also define their policy in regard to the distribution of the national wealth. A national income and wages policy should also be formulated. Measures to eradicate the black money, which is a parallel economy, should also be taken so that it would be curbed and ultimately eradicated. Finally, I would say that the President's Address fails to inspire the people by giving a proper direction to the teeming millions, the crores of people, who are living beneath the poverty line. They should be assured that the new Government would act according to the aspirations of the people.

SHRI SARDAR AMJAD ALI (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I was a little bit confused as to what type of approbation I would have to give in regard to the Address which the Acting President has delivered to the two Houses of Parliament. In my estimation, the President's Address is the key-note of the Government's policy as to what they are going to do in the future, what type of economic policy they are going to pursue and what type of social and political approaches they are going to adopt. It is very unfortunate that in this very lig[^].t-weight document, all these things are conspicuously absent, the things which are very important and with which the country sho'ild be concerned in the coming year. The President has not mentioned anything about these economic, social and political problems. As it has been said by hon. Members from this side and by some very "close to the treasury

benches, I would reiterate that the President's Address and the booklet w' ich has been given along with the President's Address are negative documents.

In the Address, the Acting President has simply mentioned what type of atrocities had been committed by the former Government. There are certain observations in the Presidents' Address with which I agree and w'-.ich he has very rightly made. For example, he has said that the last elections have revealed how the democratic process in India has been revitalised and the deep roots it has taken. It is correct that the people in this country, in the last election, have expressed their opinion against any arbitrary act on the part of any Government whatsoever and against any extra-constitutional centre of power. Sir, I am one of those who say that it is not fair to give encouragement to any extra-constitutional centre of power. But at the same time, when the President reveals in his Address the view-point of the present Government that they are very much against extra-constitutional centres of power, with all humbleness., I would like to know from the Leader of the House, for whom I have some reverence and regard, whether they are also not encouraging extra-constitutional centres of power.

When they say and the Prime Minister says that they will be very fair in running the administration, in running all sections and departments of administration, I would only like to know whether it was fair that the representatives of the people, even though they had declared that they would elect their own leader, will have some person above them who is not a representative of the people in the Central Hall of Parliament to declare as to who should be the leader of the new Government. The Janata composition invited him to the Central Hall to declare as to who should be the leader of the new Government. This is the question that the people of this country will ask : If any Tom Dick and Harry

abused the extra-constitutional centre of power, was it not the present Government which abused the extra-constitutional centre of power? While it has been very much said by the Prime Minister of the country that he does not, and his Government do not want, to intervene in the affairs of the State Assemblies, I would ask the Leader of the House whether he has seen the press report today that some gentleman from outside is advising the Government that these Assemblies will have to be immediately done away with. It is a simple question whether they have started from the very beginning the extra-constitutional centre of power.

Sir, in the President's Address I find that the Government swore that all the mass media would act independently. With reverence and regard I would like to know whether the Information and Broadcasting Minister will be fair enough to say, comparing it with the point of time when the Congress Government used to relay the public meetings of the Congress Party that that was wrong, that was bad, that had got to be abused, or whether the meeting of the Janata composition when it was relayed through the AIR and the Doordarshan was fair or not. I would like to know: Is this the type of fairness you want to show? When the debate on the Kashmir Assembly came up here, the All India Radio simply named the speakers from this side and not the narration of the [speeches or the observations which they made here on the floor of this House. I would like to know whether this should be the attitude or the fairness of the Government. When the prime minister made certain abusive remarks about the women of this country or about the women of the whole world, you will be surprised to know—I was tuning to the All India Radio that evening—in spite of the fact that the Prime Minister made a very sordid remark here, the All India Radio twisted it. They did not publish the actual language and utterance of the Prime Minister. Even then we believe that the

Government will function in a much more serene way and in the way which they expected others to do when they were sitting on this side. I believe there is no necessity of repetition of the saying that the Congress Party has greeted the expression, has greeted the judgment that has been given by the people of this country. We have so many faults of our own, we agree; but is it the way that only by narration of the misgivings, narration of the abuses which the Government has done, you are going to train up the people of this great country?

In this Address we do not find the achievement—neither of the Congress Government, nor of the Congress Party—of the people of this country during the last 30 years. If it is a fact that maladministration or abuse of power was a vital fault on the part of this Party and the Congress Government, I would only like to have from the present Government, in all fairness to reply to a question as to whether this Party has not given a lead to this country.

Has it not humbly worked with the people of this country to make it prosperous at least to a particular position which it is now? Sir, we want to be very much co-operative with the Government and we have assured that our constructive co-operation will always be with the Government. We are conscious of the fact that during the last 30 years, from the side where the Government is sitting now, we have enunciated the idea that the Opposition should be a constructive Opposition. In order to make the Opposition constructive, I believe some fairer view is also required from the side of the Government.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, we are aware that excesses have been done in the name of family planning and we hail and greet this Government that they are going to rectify them. We promise all co-operation from our side in this drive. We hail the Government when we find that certain

IS <5 ri Sanat Kumar Raha] officers are being sacked, or are being directed to go on forced leave. I do not hold any brief for any particular officer. But I believe the Government will agree that they could do it only because the foundation has been laid by the Congress Party. You want to restore individual liberty. Could you, in all fairness, say that you could do it unless the Congress Party had made an amendment to the Constitution saying that an officer who does not act according to the will of the people, or according to the will of the Government, can be dispensed with and he will have no right to go to the court ? You are very much an exponent of restoring individual liberty. Could you do that had there been this opportunity of some A, B or C, whom you have asked to go on forced leave, to go to the court ? Could you give them the right of going to the court and do this ? You could not, because this was the system by which they could forestall, could rather close the attempt any Government will make in the best interests of the people. Could the Government deny that they can have the restoration of certain rights so far as the financial position of the working classes is concerned ? How could you do that ? You could do that because you have been placed on a very sound financial footing. And that was an achievement— I don't say of my party and my Government *it* was an [achievement of the people. That is why you could restore these rights to them .

Sir, when this document was distributed to us and the President delivered, the Address before a joint sitting of the two Houses, we expected that in the Address, the President would at least refer to the achievements of the people made during the last 30 years. You deny ur previous Government. That is all right. But you cannot dencur the achievements of the people. If you believe that whatever achievements you will make, or under your leadership this country will make, will be achievements of the people, is I

that theory not applicable in our case ? If you think that with the cooperation of the Janata, the Government of the Janata composition can lead this country to a better future, is that policy not applicable to us ? Would you disagree with the fact that because of certain measures taken by the last Government, the coffers of this country were put in a stable condition ? Would you disagree that in spite of the fact that of abuses of the Emergency were here, the Government gave a lead to the people to check the price rise and the prices came down ? Sir, I have certain figures with me. I agree that there were abuses, I agree that there were atrocities. But in the face of those atrocities, is it not a fact that the Government could give a lead to the administration to make a collection of 5,490 million rupees in 1975-76, which is a rise of 35-6 percent over that of the previous year.³ We would have been very glad had they mentioned all these.

You restore individual liberty. It is all right. You restore individual liberty to Mastans and others. We do not grudge it. You may tell people with folded hands, 'For God's sake do not indulge in these acts which you have been doing for the last thirty years'. Some of the members from the Government side say that this could be done away with by taking recourse to the ordinary law of the country. Mr. Vice-Chairman, the ordinary law of the country has been applied many times. But what was the result ? The result was nil. Would the Government disagree that in spite of the fact that there were abuses, black money to the tune of Rs. 1,400 crores could be unearthed by the Government? We would have been very glad had there been a mention of this achievement of the people in this document.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, when the present Government was in the Opposition we had heard from them that there was no production or that sometimes there was

an industrial recession. Is it not a fact that in spite of the abuses, in spite of the atrocities, during the last year at least, industrial production went up by about 12 per cent more than in the previous year ? We would have been very glad had there been a mention of this achievement, not of the Government but of the people.

Sir, in his Address the President is completely silent as to what should be their attitude towards the backward classes, the minorities and the Harijans. Not a single word. But we do not feel proud about it. We only say humbly that in spite of the atrocities and abuses of the Emergency, 71 million people of this country who did not have even the shade of a tree on their heads have been provided with places where they could construct their own he uses (*Time-bell rings*). We have our hopes but the present Government is acting in a fashion such as to make the people completely forget their achievements. Therefore, Sir, I again come back to the statement made by the President in his Address :

"In the economic sphere, the Government is pledged to the removal of destitution within a definite time-frame of 10 years. Relative neglect of the rural sector has created a dangerous imbalance in the economy leading to migration of people from rural areas to urban centres. "

We agree that people migrate from rural areas to urban centres but is it a fact that the Government had completely neglected the agricultural economy and the agricultural sector? Sir, if they had completely neglected agriculture, then how is it that 120 million tonnes of foodgrains could be produced ? And that has definitely not been produced on the Rajpath in New Delhi or on the Chowringhee in Calcutta. It was produced in the agricultural areas, in the rural areas.

We were very much gladdened at the statement of the Prime Minister that within next 10 years there will not be a single soul in this country who will be unemployed. We want to see that blessed day.

We would be very happy and perhaps on that day there would be no necessity of hammering too much on the lungs of the Government Party to spit venom against the Congress Party. But, in which way ? No indication has been given in this regard. They have been saying so many things. They have been saying that the monopoly capital of this country is exploiting too much. There is not a word in the Address as to what would be the approach of the [Government towards the monopoly capital. But certainly we find that a game has already been started to give them concessions. Only yesterday, going through the parliamentary papers, I found that an official notification from the Ministry of Finance has been issued, under which an importer of cotton will not have to pay any tax. It has already been stated that, since they are silent about the public sector, the approach of the Government is very clear as to whom they are going to boost up. The people of this country certainly have expressed their view, but, in my estimate, Sir, that is a view of emotion and not a view of thinking. We have committed a mistake by indulging in some extra constitutional centres of power. I can only plead with the Government not to be a victim of the extra constitutional centres of power, as they have shown it on the floor of the Central Hall of Parliament in the case of Acharya J.B. Kripalanior Shri Jayaprakash Narayan. They may be your philosophical leaders, we agree. Though we do not concede that, we agree just for the sake of argument that they are your philosophical leaders. But a philosophical leader can guide a party, not a Government, and the moment a philosophical leader guides, I leave it to you to follow whether it becomes an extra-constitutional centre of power, or

[Sardar Amjad Ali] nit. Therefore, Sir, when as a formal thing we have to express our gratitude to the President while he makes an Address to the joint session, we would have been very happy if there had been any mention about the achievements of the people. I do not say that they are the achievements of the Government because a Government can only lead, a Government can only give direction, and, if according to that direction, the people have achieved something, the Janata composition could have taken a right stance and sent their greetings to the people through the highest dignitary of the land, which, unfortunately, has not been done.

Thank you very much.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI LOKANATH MISRA) : Shri Himmat Sinn not there. Shri Kalp Nath Rai ~ not there. Shri N. P. Nanda.

SHRI NARASINGHA PRASAD NANDA (Orissa) : Mr. Vice-Chairman Sir, I am not playing Antony to the leader who lost at the hustings ; nor do I hold any brief for the persons who are supposed to have committed excesses, of which much advantage was taken by the people who are now sitting on the other side of the House. But I would submit that the President's Address to the joint session of Parliament which came in the wake of a flood of enthusiasm on the other side, overflowing the banks, has really disappointed me.

This document which is supposed to give a sense of direction in all spheres of life to the new Government, sadly lacks exposure on the economic, social and other important issues with which we are vitally concerned. On the other hand, Sir, the Presidential address is a highly controversial document. History will judge whether the democratic polity of which it mentions and the other political and controversial statements which have been

made in it are correct. But, I would submit that in the election manifesto given by the so-called Janata Party the issues were too vague and certain things were said which were of a very general nature, and it is not on those that the people actually voted the Janata Party to power. It was said, Sir, that the choice was between freedom and slavery, between democracy and dictatorship, between abdicating the power of the people or re-asserting it. It was also said that the choice was between the Gandhian path and the way that had led many nations down the principle of dictatorships instability, military adventure and national ruin. I would submit, Sir, in the biblical language, that all this tall talk in the Janata manifesto is vanity of vanities, all is vanity. I would also submit that it is emptiness, emptiness, all is emptiness. Now, it is said that the Forty-second Amendment was introduced and passed hurriedly to regularise the emergency in the country. I for one, Sir, humbly disagree on this point of view. Before the Forty-second Amendment was brought before Parliament the Congress Party, in its 1971 election manifesto, had clearly said that the necessary changes in the Constitution would be made for readjustment of the dispute between Parliament and judiciary. Before the Amendment was introduced a national debate was raised. A large number of representatives received by the S. Varan Singh Committee. The Bar Associations all over India expressed their opinion, lawyers conferences were held all over India ; there were debates, seminars, discussions from one end of the country to the other end and people who were sitting in the opposition then also expressed their opinion on the various aspects of the Forty-second Amendment. I would respectfully submit that what the Forty-second Amendment of the Constitution sought to achieve was to reestablish the supremacy of Parliament over judiciary. There can be absolutely no doubt that there can be no agency

outside Parliament which can sit over the head of every one. I would submit that this was not a situation only in this country. In the American constitutional history also, you will find that during the regime of Roosevelt, there was a lot of controversy between the Supreme Court and the American Government and Roosevelt had to come out with certain changes in the constitution. Now, Sir, so far as the question of establishing the supremacy of Parliament is concerned I would submit that the Forty-second amendment is a milestone in the history of constitution-making.

Then, Sir, another important aspect of this Constitution Amendment was to give precedence to the Directive Principles of State Policy over the chapter on Fundamental Rights. Now, it is for you to judge whether the fundamental rights have been a road-block to social and economic progress in the country. I have been a member of the legal profession for quite a long time and I know that 99 per cent of the writ cases filed were on some trifling matters. In fact, in Calcutta when a road was being built to the Dum Dum airport, a certain gentleman came up with a writ petition saying that heavy trucks going on that road were affecting the very structure of his house and the High Court issued a writ prohibiting the Government from going ahead with that programme. And, therefore, for ten years that road could not be built. I can multiply instances of this nature. You [are aware, Sir, that the land reforms legislation was halted in various States by this process of law. There are «o many other things which" I can say, but I would submit that it has been our misfortune that in this country, the court of law has always been used by the vested interests, the people who belong to the land-owning" class, the industrial class and the other classes, as an instrument to prevent social and economic progress. Was it not

necessary to strike a balance and to see that the courts 'act within the limits of their jurisdiction ? I would, therefore, submit, Sir, that so far as giving precedence to the Directive Principles of State Policy over the Fundamental Rights was concerned, we were perfectly right and I am not at all apologetic about it.

Then, Sir, I would submit that in this country there was a struggle on behalf of a section of people, quite substantial section of people, to redefine the ideal of the State and we included the term "socialist " in the Preamble of the Constitution. I would submit that socialism was made the ideal of this country by the 42nd amendment. Now, some people say that this amendment was introduced only for the purpose of legalising Emergency. Well, a section of people have the right to take that view. I do not object to their taking that view. But we, on our part, reiterate our stand that the ideas of socialism, democracy and secularism, enshrined in our Constitution, have been strengthened by this amendment.

Another important thing which was done by the 42nd amendment was to introduce a new chapter —called "Fundamental Duties". People are now talking of Gandhiji. Gandhiji's ideas were murdered by the very people—I am not talking of the physical murder of Gandhiji, but I am talking of the people who committed murder of the ideas of Gandhiji, who are now occupying the Treasury benches—who are talking of Gandhian socialism without knowing who Gandhiji was or what socialism is. I would respectfully submit, Sir, that we, on our part, introduced a chapter on Fundamental Duties. Gandhiji said that rights flow from duties. There are always two sides of a coin. For the last thirty years we have been emphasising the rights of the people without considering whether we have a duty towards the

[Shri Narasingha Prasad Nanda]
 people or not. Now a chapter on fundamental duties has been incorporated. I do not know how my friend in the treasury benches are opposed to that. In the Presidential address you will find a blanket policy announced that the entire forty-second amendment will be scrapped. I respectfully submit that this is not the way of doing things. In that case whatever good we have done will be undone and if the Government go on undoing whatever good we have done in the course of the last thirty years, then it will be impossible for them to do anything positive from their side. Therefore, I submit that the Congress Party stands by the Forty-second Amendment Act. Of course, this does not mean we are not prepared to consider any specific proposal on merit. But as a whole, to say that just to legalise the emergency we have introduced this

Forty-second Amendment and bulldozed it, is not correct.

There is another point regarding the theory of direct action and total revolution. So long as my friends on the other side were occupying the opposition benches, they advocated this theory. Now that they are occupying treasury benches, I warn them against this theory of direct action and total revolution. There is a complete misunderstanding and misuse of the concept of this direct action theory. This concept was inherited from the freedom movement. In those days the concept of direct action and total revolution had some relevance. Now that we have a viable alternative and the people have voted for you, for God's sake, for the nation's sake divorce this idea of direct action and total revolution from your mind.

SHRI U.K. LAKSHMANA GOWDA
 (Karnataka) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, thank you very much for giving me an opportunity to say a few words on the President's Address. I have been carefully listening to the speeches on their

side of the House. After all, the President's Address is the usual formality and it only reflects the views of the Government, its policies and programmes. But in this instance, I find my friends from the other side, who are now in the opposition, taking the treasury benches to task for not enumerating their achievements in the past. Having taken over the Government only recently, I am sure they will understand that they will certainly not be in a position to enumerate the achievements they have been able to make and they have only tried to lay before the country certain of the policies which they intend to carry out in the discharge of their duty as the present-day Government. Sometime back, Sir, Mr. Raju while speaking on 3 p. m. this, said that the ruling party should be condemned for not having guided the President regarding the Address, in regard to the manner in which it should have been prepared and the manner in which he would have liked it to be prepared and he said that the new Government should have referred to the achievements of his government during the earlier period. But, Sir, you know it and I would also like to submit that it is the decision of Mr. Raju and his own party which is responsible for this, when they amended the Constitution to make it so firm and clear that the President had no other option but to say what the Council of Ministers advise him to say. What is the good of condemning the new Government which has taken over just now in this regard? It is his own mistake and unless that is rectified, perhaps the same thing will be repeated in the case of the President's Address when some other Government comes to power.

Sir, even though I do not want to make a speech saying much about the recent elections and the emergency and other things, a passing reference to these things is very necessary. When the emergency was promulgated, it was said that it was a shock treatment and it did achieve

certain initial benefits. I do agree. But, Sir, it certainly had outlived its usefulness and as it continued month after month, it only helped in developing authoritarian rule in the country and, as it is very widely called now, it helped in developing extra-constitutional centres of power and we all know what all happened during the last eighteen months or so. I would only request the supporters and the votaries of the emergency to pause and consider as to what would have happened if the emergency had continued for a year more. They themselves have admitted what the outcome of the emergency during these months has been and they themselves have said that they have been punished for it and that they have realised it now. So, it is not a question of the votaries of the emergency saying that all the achievements have been because of the emergency. Certainly not. But, at the same time, Sir, I also do not say that, just because something happened during the last two years, Mrs. Indira Gandhi's Government had not achieved anything during the previous nine years or so. It had considerable achievements to its credit and there have been commendable achievements which I do not want to deligrate standing here. Now, Sir, after the elections came, we know that the people of the country, even though most of them illiterate, were intelligent enough to see that there was need for a change in the thirty year's Congress rule. Whether they accepted the achievements or not is a different matter. But they really reacted to certain actions of the ruling party and they did vote for a change. We must remember here, when they effected the change, they provided the parliamentary democracy with something else which the thirty year's Congress rule or the parliamentary process during that period had not achieved. We must remember the fact that they have now provided a viable Opposition. Everybody has been asking for an Opposition, a viable Opposition. The Congress Party and also the other parties have been asking for a viable Opposition. That

has come about only during this election. I do not want to go into all those details now. But what is relevant now is that the people have given a new government now. Now, there is a new government and, at the same time, there is also a viable Opposition. Let me hope that as a basic requirement of parliamentary democracy, there will be cooperation between the two and both of them, the ruling party and the Opposition, will further cause of democratic government in this country and see that the nation progresses.

Sir, in the President's Address, references have been made to the liberalisation of the emergency and to bringing back the Press freedom. I do not think that anybody would object; it. Whether it is proposed by the Government which has recently taken over or not, when the Congress Party itself, in its last days, in its last minutes, removed and repealed the emergency, I am sure they had also in their own minds the idea that they would repeal all the inhibitory laws which restricted the freedom of the Press.

I am glad, Sir, that as mentioned in the President's Address, to a great extent that achievement has already been made, with regard to removing restriction on press freedom. Now we already see that in the Lok Sabha the amendments for repealing the two Press Acts are there and they will soon become Acts. Nobody sheds any tears for the repeal of those inhibitory laws.

In the same way, with regard to the MISA, whatever initial good things might have been when it was used against anti-social and other elements, it became a source of oppression, and what has been mentioned in President's Address has already been achieved in doing away with the MISA and other acts.

Sir, so far as other matters are concerned, I am glad that the new Government has made it very categorical that they are going to continue the foreign policy of the country, which is one of

acting *President*

[Shri U. K. Lakshmana Gauda]
 " non-alignment", and subsequent state
 ments by the Foreign Minister have only
 confirmed what the Government's
 policy is in this regard. Whatever the
 individual philosophy of the constituting
 parties might have been, Janata Party
 stands for [non-alignment and
 also continued support to the Arab
 I
 countries and the East European countries
 and the U.S.S.R. and improvement of
 relations with U.S.A. and the West. This is
 welcome.

Sir, so far as the development of
 agriculture in the rural areas is concerned, I
 welcome what has been mentioned here. I
 am not belittling the previous Government's
 achievement so far as land reforms are
 concerned. At least in the southern States,
 tenancy rights have been conferred, and
 even though the distribution of surplus
 land has not been substantial, yet some
 achievement has been there. But, at the
 same time, I stand by the new Government
 when they say that there will be further
 development in the rural areas and especially
 migration of the rural population to the cities
 will be checked which would considerably
 help to solve the unemployment problem.

In this context, Sir, I would like to
 submit what I have been saying many
 times in the past in this House that one of
 the causes, according to me, for migration
 of the rural population to the cities is the
 creation of very uneconomic agricultural
 units. If two or three acres of dry land
 is a unit for a cultivating family, will it not
 be attracted to go over to the cities where
 even a Class III employees in a public or
 private firm can get a higher income
 than the whole agricultural family with
 such small units. I have always stood for
 land reforms. But I have always stood
 for the abolition of uneconomic units. So
 far as the distribution of surplus land is
 concerned, it is much better to make it a
 viable holding rather than create more
 unecono-

mic Holdings. This is a matter which many
 times I have mentioned in this

House. So far as land reforms are con-
 cerned, I hope in future the new Govern-
 ment will give due consideration to this
 matter and see that in addition to start-
 ing new rural industries as they have
 proposed to start, they would give some
 consideration to ensure the survival of
 holdings and do away with uneconomic
 holdings and then improve the stan-
 dard agriculture. fi

Sir, one unfortunate thing that has
 happened in the campaigns in connection with
 the recent elections has, according to me,
 been that the family planning programme
 seems to have become one of the victims.
 Sir, the new Government also envisage
 their firm policy on family planning and they
 seem to give priority to it. But, unfortunately,
 as a result of some of the methods which
 were resorted to in the northern States, this
 programme has become one of the casualties
 and it is high time and very necessary that
 the new Government and the Health Minister
 should see to it that family planning is

given priority. Statements like " Sterili-
 sation is inhuman" will certainly not help
 in the progress of family planning. Of
 course, there are other methods like
 contraceptives. Along with those meth-
 ods, nobody can deny that so far as
 large families are concerned, sterilisation
 is one of the best methods. I do not mean
 that I approve of any of the compul-
 sions which were resorted to in the steri-
 lisation programme. But it is
 necessary that the Government should
 see to it that encouragements and incen-
 tives are provided for sterilisation. Other-
 wise, what has been achieved or what the
 Government proposes to achieve in
 order to provide a better standard of
 living for the people may be lost if we
 do not have a firm policy and give priority
 for the family planning programme.

Sir, so far as the mass communication
 media are concerned. I heard some re-

ferences from my friend, Shri Amja[^] Ali. But as an unattached person, I find quite a liberalisation with regard to mass communication media of the Government of India after the repeal of the emergency. Sir, it is common knowledge how the All India Radio and other mass communication media were functioning during the last 19 months. Probably my Congress friends will admit that they themselves did not know many of the things which were happening in the country. (*Time bell rings*). I am told that even the highest authorities in the Congress party had to admit that they were insulted against knowing what was happening in the country. Otherwise, perhaps they would have reconsidered emergency much earlier. It is one of the outstanding example of what happens when mass communication media are throttled like that. I am very happy that liberalisation is taking place. The present Government has started very well. They have agreed to broadcast the address of the Leader of the Opposition to the nation today. They have started very well. I hope that this liberalisation will continue and it will not be used purely for Government propaganda.

Sir, in general I find that the President's Address reflects the policy or the policies of the new Government which has taken over recently. Of course, they have yet to finalise most of their policies. With these words, I commend the Address for acceptance.

Thank you.

श्री गुणानन्द ठाकुर (बिहार) : उप-समाध्यक्ष जी, राष्ट्रपति जी के रूप में काम करते हुए उपराष्ट्रपति जी का जो भाषण सदन के समक्ष रखा गया है और इसके लिये जो धन्यवाद का प्रस्ताव कल मेरे मित्र शेखावत जी ने सभा के सामने पेश किया है, मैं उस के सम्बन्ध में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। जिस ढंग से राष्ट्रपति जी के मुँह से उन्होंने अपनी नयी पार्टी, जो अभी तक बन भी नहीं

पायी है, अपनी बात कहलवायी है, जिस झंडे के नीचे उन्होंने अपने को एकत्रित किया है और जो नारा लगाकर वे लोग यहाँ आये हैं, मैं समझता हूँ कि उसका अंजाम आने वाले दिनों में क्या होगा इसको वह स्वयं ही महसूस करेंगे और देख लेंगे। गुस्से में कोई काम करना, कोई बात कहना बिना किसी प्रोग्राम के और बिना किसी पालिसी के और वह भी राष्ट्रीय गाड़ी को आगे बढ़ाना कितना कठिन है इस बात को वह लोग स्वयं सोच सकते हैं। हमारे नेता ने कहा है कि हम सरकार को रचनात्मक सहयोग देना चाहते हैं। अगर वह हमारे सहयोग से निर्माण के काम करना चाहते हैं तो एक बात है और अगर वह केवल छीछालेदर करना चाहते हैं और शीशे के घर में बैठ कर पत्थर फेंकना चाहते हैं, उस की कोशिश करते हैं तो उसका अंजाम क्या होगा इसको वे देख लेंगे। पहले तो वह आपस में यह बात ही तय करें कि किस राह पर वह देश को ले जाना चाहते हैं। वह देश को गांधी जी की राह पर ले जाना चाहते हैं तो पहले ही वह गांधी जी की समाधि पर जब शपथ लेकर आये तो उनकी पहली बात को ही भूल गये। गांधी जी का सपना था कि इस देश का प्रधान मंत्री या राष्ट्रपति कोई हरिजन होना चाहिए, लेकिन जब एक हरिजन की बात आयी तो उलझ गये और आपस में लड़ पड़े। तो उनका गांधी जी का नाम लेना तो गांधी जी के साथ अन्याय करना होगा। उनकी समाधि पर कसम खाकर आये और यहाँ आते ही हरिजन को निकाल बाहर किया। उसके बाद सरकार में आते ही आप के प्रधान मंत्री जी को क्षमा मांगनी पड़ी। उस दल के नेता ने इस देश की महिलाओं पर हमला किया और उसका अंजाम क्या हुआ कि इस देश की ही नहीं बल्कि दुनिया भर की महिलाओं ने उन से नाराजगी जाहिर की। पहले तो इस पर उन्होंने कहा कि वे विदेशी महिलाओं से माफी मांगते हैं, लेकिन मुझे खुशी है कि कल यहाँ आकर उन्होंने स्वदेशी महिलाओं से भी माफी मांगी। तो माफी के साथ ही

[श्री गुणानन्द ठाकुर]

यह सरकार शुरू हुई है। अब रही समाजवाद की बात। मैंने देखा है कि संविद सरकारें कैसे बनीं। राज्य में उनको देखने का मौका मुझे मिला है और उनमें काम करने का भी मौका मिला है। मैं जानता हूँ कि किस तरह से उनके विचारों में और कामों में मतभेद होता है। मैं तो कहूँगा कि जिनकी कृपा से वह सरकार बना पाये हैं वह जामा मस्जिद के इमामसाहब क्यों बीमार पड़े हैं इसकी छानबीन की जाय। किस तरह का व्यवहार उनके साथ किया गया इस को देखा जाये। लेकिन मैं इन सब बातों में जाना नहीं चाहता। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब आप सरकार में आये हैं तो आपको विरासत में बहुत सी चीजें हमारी नेता इन्दिरा गांधी ने दी है। आप को उन्होंने इतना अनाज दिया है कि आपको अगले दो वर्ष तक किसी की ओर देखना नहीं पड़ेगा। आपको इतना स्टील उन्होंने दिया है कि आपको सोचना पड़ेगा कि उसे आप किसको बेचें। जो आपको साधन मिले हैं वे बहुत काफी हैं। और जनतंत्र की बात जब ऐसे लोगों के मुँह से सुनते हैं तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि जनतंत्र का तो एक इतिहास है। किस पार्टी ने जनतंत्र के लिए लड़ाई की। किस पार्टी ने जनतंत्र के लिये पसीना बहाया। किस पार्टी ने जनतंत्र के लिये कुर्बानी की, इस सब का इतिहास लिखा हुआ है। मैं तो कहूँगा कि पिछले तीस वर्ष में हमारे ये विरोधी पार्टी के लोग विरोध करने लायक एक विरोधी दल भी नहीं बना सके तो एक अच्छे विरोधी दल की भूमिका भी इस कांग्रेस पार्टी को ही अदा करनी पड़ी और आज संवैधानिक ढंग से जो एक विरोधी दल आया है उस की भूमिका यह कांग्रेस पार्टी ही निभा रही है। किसी दूसरे को इसका मौका नहीं मिला। इसलिये उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, आज यह प्रश्न देश के सामने है। आज तो यह लोग जोश में हैं। कह रहे हैं कि हम यह करना चाहते हैं, वह करना चाहते हैं। हम बड़े गौर से देख रहे हैं

कि उनका आर्थिक कार्यक्रम कैसा होगा और उसे वह इस देश में कैसे पूरा करना चाहते हैं। मुझे यह देख कर तकलीफ हुई कि राष्ट्रपतिजीके मुँह से इस सरकार ने जो देश में हर साल बाढ़ और सूखा पड़ता है उस के बारे में कुछ कहलाने की कोशिश नहीं की। जो हर साल बरबादी होती है उसका इस अभिभाषण में कहीं जिक्र नहीं है। तुरन्त जो एक बाढ़ आने वाली है, सूखा आने वाला है इस संबंध में जो हर साल एक कहानी बन जाती थी, मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार इस संबंध में क्या करने जा रही है। इस बारे में सरकार का क्या ठोस कार्यक्रम है इसका कोई जिक्र इसमें नहीं किया गया है।

आज बेकारी का सवाल है। आज गरीबी को मिटाने के लिए 10 साल का वायदा किया गया है जब कि वोट मिले हैं पांच साल के लिये। इससे यह जाहिर होता है कि ये अगले चुनाव के लिये भी अपने आप को सुरक्षित रखना चाहते हैं। यह जनता पार्टी जब कहती है कि राइट टू रिकाल का अधिकार मिलना चाहिए तो कैसे यह उम्मीद करती है कि 10 वर्षों में गरीबी मिटा देंगे। आप यहां आए हैं बड़ी हिम्मत से जनतंत्र और समाजवाद का नाम लेकर आए हैं। आपको यह वायदा भी करना चाहिये था कि हम पांच साल में गरीबी मिटा देंगे और नहीं मिटा सके तो हम कुर्सी छोड़ देंगे। यह वायदा करके आपको आना चाहिये था।

मैं यह समझता हूँ कि यह जो लम्बी अवधि से हमारे एक से एक पुराने और प्रगतिशील मित्र आशा लगाए बैठे हैं; एक से एक महारथी बैठे हैं उनका किसी चीज में विश्वास नहीं है। उनको न समाजवाद में विश्वास है, न जनतंत्र में विश्वास है। किसी भी बात में उनका विश्वास नहीं है और अगर विश्वास है तो सिर्फ पूँजीवाद में। चार खम्भे केन्द्रीय सरकार में खड़े हुए हैं ये मजबूत खम्भे हैं। एक तो सब से मजबूत

विभाग है वित्त विभाग। मैं नहीं कहना चाहता कि जो पटेल साहब आए हैं उनकी पिछली क्या भूमिका रही है। वह स्वतन्त्र पार्टी में थे और उससे पहले शायद सरकारी सेवा में थे। उनमें कितनी जन भावना है वह स्वयं पटेल साहब बतायेंगे, मैं इस बारे में कुछ नहीं कहना चाहता। उनका क्या दृष्टिकोण है, वह किधर जाना चाहते हैं उनकी नीति अपने आप में स्पष्ट रही है इस सम्बन्ध में सर्टिफिकेट्रीने की जरूरत नहीं है। जहां तक प्रधान-मन्त्रि-दृष्टिकोण की बात है यह जरूर है सारी दुनिया जानती है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी दुनिया के किस खेमे के लोग हैं, कि घर जाना चाहते हैं और कौन सा साजवादी दृष्टिकोण है। विदेश विभाग के मामले में हमें खुशी है कि आपने नान-एलानमेंट की घोषणा की है। आपने कहा है कि पुरानी सरकार ने जिन आधारशिलाओं को रखा उनको निभायेंगे। पुरानी सरकार ने अंतर्राष्ट्रीय संधियां बगैरह जो की हैं उनको निभायेंगे। मैं इस डिटेल में नहीं जानना चाहता क्योंकि अभी आपका टेस्ट तुरन्त ही रहा है। आप यहां आए हैं और आपने आजादी की बात कही है। अब हमें आपको देखना होगा कि आप क्या करते हैं। अभी हाल में नेपाल के प्रधान मंत्री श्री बशेश्वर कुइराला के बारे में सुना है कि फ्रांसीसी की सजा मिल रही है। क्या उनकी गलती है? क्या उनका कफूर है? उस आदमी ने कितनी बड़ी जनता का प्रतिनिधित्व किया इसके लिए नेपाल की जनता माफ़ी है। आपके पास नेपाल के राजा वीरेन्द्र आए थे बातचीत करने। हम देखेंगे कि जनतंत्र की हिफाजत के लिये आप क्या करना चाहते हैं। पास में ही आपके बर्मा है और दूसरे देश भी हैं देखेंगे आप किस तरह से उनके साथ व्यवहार करते हैं। जनतंत्र के लिये भरत की क्या भूमिका होनी चाहिये इसके लिये आप अपनी पिछली सरकार से सबक सीखिये। आप श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी जी से सीखिये। जिस रोज बंगला देश की स्थिति आई यही संसद यही पार्लियामेंट और दुनिया की बड़ी से बड़ी हस्तियां देखती रह गई

और इन्दिरा गांधी ने उस मुल्क को आजाद करा दिया। आप अपने इर्द-गिर्द भी देखिये। मैं और बातों में न जा कर इतना जरूर निवेदन करूंगा कि उस महान जनतंत्र के सेनानी श्री बशेश्वर कुइराला आजादी के लिये जल गये थे। कम से कम उस आदमी के लिये तो रजा कीजिए। उन्हें मृत्यु दंड न हो, उनको मार न दिया जाये इसकी आप गारंटी लीजिए। हम नहीं कहते कि आप दूसरे मुल्कों के अंतरिक मामलों में हस्तक्षेप करें लेकिन भारत की जो परम्परा रही है उससे तो कम से कम निभायें? आप बड़े भाई की हैसियत से मध्यवस्थता तो कीजिए; बीच-बचाव तो कीजिए और कोई रास्ता निकालिए। हम याद दिलाना चाहते हैं कि जब चुनाव चल रहे थे उस समय जनता पार्टी के अध्यक्ष और आज के प्रधान मंत्री ने जो ब्यान दिया था उसको आप अपने ध्यान में रखें? मैं चाहता हूं कि आप लोग अपनी विदेश नीति के संबंध में अच्छी तरह से सफाई दें। आपने कुछ बातें विदेश नीति के संबंध में कहीं हैं। लेकिन जरूरत इस बात की है कि आप अपने दिमाग को इस दिशा में बिलकुल साफ करें। हमारे विदेश मंत्री ने विदेश नीति के संबंध में कुछ बातें कहीं हैं। लेकिन वर्तमान प्रधान मंत्री जी के विचारों के संबंध में सारी दुनिया जानती है कि व किधर जाना चाहते हैं और क्या करना चाहते हैं। मैं चाहता हूं कि भारत की जो प्रतिष्ठा पिछले 30 वर्षों में बनी है उसको आप धूमिल न करें। और दूसरे देशों की स्वतंत्रता की हिफाजत करने की जो नीति हमने अब तक अपनाई हुई है उसको आप आगे भी जारी रखें। मैं समझता हूं कि अगर आप ऐसा करेंगे तो यह आपके लिए भी कल्याणकारी होगा और देश के लिए भी कल्याणकारी होगा।

जहां तक आपके प्रोग्रामों का सवाल है; यह हम नहीं जानते। आप स्वयं इनको तय कर लेंगे। आपके साथ सी० पी० एम० और जनसंघ जैसी पार्टियों के लोग हैं। आने वाले समय में सारी दुनिया और भारत की जनता इस बात

[श्री गुणानन्द ठाकुर]

को देख लेगी कि आप कहाँ जाना चाहते हैं । हम चाहते हैं कि आप देश को आगे बढ़ायें । अगर आप ऐसा करेंगे तो आपके कार्यक्रमों के कार्यक्रमवन में हम आपको अपना सहयोग देंगे । लेकिन आप कहते हैं कि संविधान में संशोधनों के नाम पर जुडिशियरी को दबाया गया और यह भी प्रश्न करते हैं कि संविधान में संशोधन क्यों किये गये ? हमारा संसद में दो तिहाई बहुमत था । हम चुनावों में इस बात को लेकर आए थे कि संविधान में आवश्यक संशोधन करेंगे । इसी दृष्टि से हमने संविधान में संशोधन किये । आपको भी अगर यह अधिकार मिला है तो आप भी संशोधन कीजिये । लेकिन इस बात को ध्यान में रखिये कि एक संग न होऊ दोड़ मुआवा, संसाय, ठठाय बुकावा । आप अगर गरीबी हटाना चाहते हैं और समाजवाद लाना चाहते हैं तो इसके लिए आपको कोई नहीं रोकता है । लेकिन सबसे पहले आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि आप अपने दिमागों को दुस्त कीजिये और अपना एक रास्ता तय कीजिये । मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या आप सी० पी० एम० के रास्ते पर चलना चाहते हैं या जनसंघ के रास्ते पर चलना चाहते हैं या स्वतंत्र पार्टी के रास्ते पर चलना चाहते हैं अथवा आप गांधी जी की समाधि पर कसम खाकर हरिजनों के साथ अत्याचार करना चाहते हैं ? इस संबंध में इस सरकार को अपना दिमाग साफ करना चाहिए ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, कांग्रेस पार्टी ने पिछले 30 वर्षों तक इस देश पर शासन किया है । इस देश की प्रतिष्ठा को इस देश की महान नेता श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी ने दुनिया में प्रतिष्ठित किया है । उन्होंने भारत को आग बढ़ाया है, इस बात का साक्षी इतिहास रहेगा । इस संबंध में जो भी काम हुआ है उसको सारी दुनिया जानती है । मैं इस संबंध में इतना ही निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि आप गुस्से में कोई काम मत कीजिये । इस देश की महान नेता की प्रतिष्ठा को बदनाम करने की कोशिश

मत कीजिये । अगर आप उनको बदनाम करने की कोशिश करेंगे तो इसका दूसरा मतलब हो जाता है । आप के साथ भी ऐसे लोग हो सकते हैं जिनके बारे में कमीशन आफ इन्क्वायरी कायम की गई हो । अगर कोई दूसरा आदमी कोई राय देता है तो आप उसको सुनिये । मैं इस बात को मानता हूँ कि जनतंत्र के लिए यह आवश्यक है कि प्रशासन से भ्रष्टाचार समाप्त किया जाय । मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस प्रकार के जो मौलिक प्रश्न हैं उन पर आप गम्भीरतापूर्वक विचार करें । हमारे देश को इस समय विदेशों में जो प्रतिष्ठा मिली हुई है उसको समाप्त मत कीजिये । अगर आप ऐसा करेंगे तो यह आपके लिए अच्छा नहीं होगा ।

श्रीमन्, मैं छोटी-छोटी बातों में नहीं जाना चाहता । मैं सिर्फ यही निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि आप व्यक्तिगत बातों को छोड़ कर इस देश से गरीबी मिटाने का प्रयत्न कीजिये और देश को आगे बढ़ाइये । अगर आप गरीबी हटाने का प्रोग्राम बनाएंगे तो उसमें हमारा आपके साथ पूरा सहयोग होगा ।

[Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair]

उपसभापति जी, उपराष्ट्रपति जी ने राष्ट्रपति के रूप में जो अभिभाषण दोनों सदनों के सामने दिया है उसके सम्बन्ध में मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि उस अभिभाषण को इन्होंने बहुत जल्दबाजी में तैयार किया है । दो दिन की सरकार थी और दो घंटे का भाषण है और 60 करोड़ जनता के सम्बन्ध में सोचना है । ऐसा लगता है कि जैसे जल्दबाजी में सूत्र ही कुछ बदल दिया हो । इसको ले जाइये, फिर से री-ड्राफ्ट कीजिये और फिर गम्भीरतापूर्वक विचारिये । अपनी पार्टी की नीति तय करके, अपना संशोधन करके, जो राष्ट्रपति का अभिभाषण है, उसे देश के सामने प्रस्तुत कीजिये, इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इसको समाप्त करता हूँ ।

SHRI MOHAN DHARIA : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, it is with a feeling

of responsibility and [constraint that I have decided to intervene in the debate today. Sir, I have gone through the speeches made on the floor of the House yesterday and I have tried to follow the speeches made during the course of the day. On the one hand, I am happy to observe the flow of life for democracy from my friends of the Congress Party. On the other hand I have been trying to search where was that time when I myself was struggling for a dialogue, a national dialogue, to save democracy. Sir, we are thankful to those who have supported us. But I have not come across a single individual so far who rebelled against the leaders when a member of the Working Committee, Mr. Chandra Shekhar, and an erstwhile colleague; like me who was in the Council of Ministers, the Central Council of Ministers, were put behind the bars. What was done by the party? What was done by the Congress? I would like to ask those who say that they were behind us whether anybody raised his voice against this sort of atrocity towards the members of their own party who were fighting for democracy and a national dialogue and when there was nothing wrong in that. But Sir, even though I was behind the bars for

14 or 15 Months, I would like to make it clear.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal)
: Mr. Dharia, Dr. Radha -krishnan used to tell me in my younger days that there can be patience without anger.

SHRI MOHAN DHARIA : That is what I was going to say just now. Sir, even though myself and my colleagues like Mr. Chandra Shekhar and Mr. Ram Dhan have been behind the bars for nearly 19 months, I would like to make it very clear that while participating in the debate, I have no rancour in my mind. I have no anger against any individual. But certainly, there is anger against injustice. This is very much necessary. Those who have cannot get angry against injustice cannot protect justice. They can not do away

with this sort of system which generates injustice. To that extent, if I am angry, I hope and believe that this House will please appreciate it.

Sir, we are all aware that the Emergency was promulgated by the Congress Government, rather by the Prime Minister. Was it necessary? Several things were being said from one side. When I was in jail, I used to listen to the All India Radio and I used to read some newspapers which were made available, that too after a few months. Every time what I was reading was nothing but praise for the Emergency, praise from within the country and from outside. I felt that there must have been tremendous progress made in the country. But when I came out and when I looked at the youngsters in the rural areas, I found that the proportion of unemployment had not at all come down. On the contrary, unemployment had increased. When I looked at the problem of poverty in the country, I found it was much more than what it was before the Emergency. When I had the occasion to observe the disparities, whether social or economic, I found that the gulf had increased and not decreased. I can very well understand that the crop position was better. I do not know if it is the claim of the Party, the then Party in power, that the MISA was made applicable even to nature and that is why the rainy season was in order—that too two rainy seasons I was in jail at that time, but I do not know whether it is the claim of the Congress Party. It is because of the rains, it is because of the farmers. My learned friend, Mr. Gunanand Thakur, just now said :

**प्राइम मिनिस्टर इन्दिरा गांधी ने आप को इतना
अनाज आपके कब्जे में दे दिया है . . .**

It is not Mrs. Indira Gandhi. That is where you have gone wrong. It is not Mrs. Gandhi. It is the cultivators in the country who have produced. And when we think of democracy—it was a wrong notion that India is Indira and Indira is India, that continuance of Mrs. Indira Gandhi as Prime Minister was indispensable. Today I was happy to listen to Mr. Raju when he said that no biggest of the

[Shri Mohan Dharia] big-^could be equated with the country. My friend Mr. Raju is not present here. I would like to ask him where he was when it was said that Indira is India and India is Indira and when we people criticised that it was not consistent with the very dictum of democracy.

Sir, I asked some leaders—I would not name them—after the judgement of the Allahabad Court if it would not be in the interest of democracy to create new decorum and new norms for ideal democracy if Mrs. Gandhi stepped down for the time being.

Maybe, Mr. Jagjivan Ram, Mr. Chavan, Mr. Swaran Singh—there were many—could be the Prime Minister. On this argument of India is Indira and Indira is India, I also asked a question as to why they were not expressing a vote of no-confidence against themselves. But they had no reply. I am not going to name the individuals but I am may tell you that they had no reply.

In a democracy, can it ever happen that individuals "become" much more than "the country." It happened here, during Emergency, with a person who had nothing to do either with the organisation or with the Government, becoming a super Minister? He stays in the residence occupied by the Prime Minister and functions like a super Minister. I have nothing personal against Mr. Sanjay Gandhi because only on one occasion, at one reception of Mr. Rajiv I had met him, that too casually. There is, that way, no personal relationship whatsoever — there could be neither bias, nor love. But it was surprising, I was stunned that when Mr. Sanjay Gandhi was going for the programmes of the Youth Congress or the Congress Party, he was being flown in special planes of the Defence. Mr. Sanjay Gandhi flew by special Defence planes and he was accompanied by the Defence Minister, Mr. Bansi Lai, or the Minister of State, Mr. V. N. Gadgil, to make it possible for Mr. Sanjay Gandhi that the expenditure should be well within the limits of the ele-

tion norms. Mr. Bansi Lai or Mr. Gadgil in their capacity as Minister in Defence Ministry were going like guards. I feel it is nothing but a stigma on democracy when Ministers should be utilized for such purposes. And not a single man from the Congress side had courage to ask what he was doing. Is it not an atrocity against the Government? Is it not an atrocity against democracy? Is it not an atrocity against the people? The way Mr. Sanjay Gandhi was being received by Chief Ministers, the way in which he was saluted by the whole paraphernalia of Ministers and others, it was equally astonishing. Is it not a personality cult? It was argued this morning that he was not having personality cult. What else was it? I would like to know from the Members of the Congress side why nobody could raise his voice against him. Sir, I can quote instances after instances. I am now occupying the position of the Minister of Commerce and Civil Supplies and Cooperation. I have tried to gather information from my own Ministry. I can quote illustrations where Mr. Sanjay Gandhi, though he was nowhere in the picture, had tried to intervene in a way as if he was a super Minister, more than the Minister himself in the Ministry. And it was accepted by the Minister. Are you prepared to accept this sort of functioning in the party and the Government? Then if somebody criticises, well, he becomes a reactionary.

Sir, it is most unfortunate. I belonged to the Congress Party. I have worked "as the General Secretary of the Maharashtra Pradesh Congress Committee for nearly 6 to 7 years—and, that too, as an effective General Secretary. While I was a member of the Rajya Sabha, I always felt proud of myself. While I was in the Union Council of Ministers, I was all the while insisting on politics of commitment and doing away with politics of convenience. The assurances came fourth but never the actions. The politics was always personality-oriented; it was never principle-oriented. Under the circumstances, are you not going to think in a quiet and dispassionate

the acting President

manner that something has basically gone wrong ? It is no use accusing the Janta Party. It is no use saying that these four parties have come together, it is a circus, they are like animals, heterogenous groups and all that, or how the Jana Sangh and the Socialist Party, or how the Swatantra Party and the Congress (O) can sit together. These questions could be put. But may I tell my friends that it is perhaps the then ruling party which was responsible for making these people sit together and think in the interest of the country; to forget what was wrong and to come together in the interest of the country ? Please don't forget that the Janata Party is not a heterogenous group of certain individuals or parties, or that we are different parties. All parties are not going to merge in the usual way. Every party has decided to dissolve itself and it is a new force emerging in the country. The basic tenets of the Janata Party are absolutely clear. This party stands for the sovereignty and integrity of the country; this party stands for democracy; this party stands for secularism and this party stands for the creation of an egalitarian society based on socialist Gandhian principles. This is the basic objective of the party. There is no difference whatsoever so far as this party is concerned. But I can very well understand the criticism that nothing has been mentioned in the Address of the acting President. But may I draw your attention to what the acting President has said in his Address ? It has been very clearly said :

"My Government pledges itself to fulfil in every way the mandate given to it by the people. In doing so, it will not take the people for granted or assume that they know nothing and that the Government alone knows all answers and solutions".

But in the Congress Party, unfortunately, it was not even the Government alone but only one person who was supposed to know everything and the others had, as if, mortgaged all their wisdom and conscience. The very people who fought in the name of conscience at the time of the presidential election—I am speaking about the presidential election of Mr. Giri Vis-a-vis Mr. Reddy—forgot that very conscience. Why ?

And, Sir, the acting President has made it very clear afterwards, He said :

"Honourable Members, the new Government has taken charge only three days ago. It has not had the time to work out the details of the various measures it intends to adopt." Then, again, he has said :

"My Government will announce at the time of the presentation of the final budget later this year the details of the economic programme that is proposed to be followed."

Nothing has been hidden. Perhaps, here, we might have accepted the advice of Mr. Sanjay Gandhi—Work more, talk less—but with some amendment—work more talk less, but talk sense. That is very much there in this Presidential Address.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : That you are hoping for a new age.

SHRI MOHAN DHARIA : I am not hoping for a new age; I am talking about it. I am thankful to Mr. Bhupesh Gupta-----

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : That is exactly the heading.

SHRI MOHAN DHARIA : Great men think alike. I am prepared to follow Dada, to some extent. So far as your occasional wisdom is concerned, I am prepared to follow it.

What are the basic problems before the country today ? I am not going to burden this House with a long speech, but I would like to bring to the notice of the House my own book, "Fumes and Fire". It contains several documents, several letters that I had written to the then Prime Minister. It contains my views and also my important speech at Ahmedabad which was delivered on 1st March, 1975. Immediately after returning from Ahmedabad I had to quit the Ministry in a very unceremonious manner. Again, I have no anger if I had to quit the Ministry or quit the Congress and was put in jail. The basic question is

(interruption) Yes, It was a journey. from the Central Government to the Central Jail and from the Central Jail back-I to the Central Government.

SHRI MOHAMMAD YUNUS SALEEM (Andhra Pradesh) : And with a higher promotion.

SHRI MOHAN DHARIA : I tell you whether it is a promotion or not is immaterial. But I have no doubt that in the hearts of the people I have been elevated and I feel proud about it because I have been joined with them and I shall always stand by the people.

Much has been alleged against Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan without trying to understand what he said. Even the President of the Congress Party went to the extent of calling Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan a traitor. And how many have raised their voice against it that it was wrong? How can you say such a thing? Is it not Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan who, in 1942, broke the Hazari-bagh prison? While pistols were being fired at him, he had the courage to go out and it is Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan who inspired youngsters like me in 1942. It is he who taught us to take pistols and bombs in our hands and fight against the Britishers in that movement of do or die. Sir, he has never been a member of any Legislative Assembly. Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan has never been a Member of Parliament nor has he been a member of a municipality or a gram panchayat. He has been only a soul who inspired this country, and that inspiration was for moral values. That inspiration was for patriotism. It was always for service to the people and service to the society. That we have forgotten today and some go to the extent of calling him a traitor. Is it the way of treating the patriots in the country? Those who have nothing to do with the movement of Independence, many of them, join in the charge as if it had become the fashion of the day and just go on repeating what their leaders say and in their masters' voice. I felt so sorry.

What was the say of Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan? He insisted that corruption had taken roots in the country and because of this corruption the Administration, the whole of this country, our society has gone corrupt and we cannot progress until this corruption is uprooted. What was wrong

the acting President

in it? Sir, Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan insisted on the involvement of youngsters in this whole process of development. He felt that employment along with development should be the motto, that it should be the way of our planning. What was wrong in it? And if friends like me insist on or suggest a dialogue with Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan, it becomes a crime.

Sir, this afternoon I was happy to learn from Mr. Raju that a dialogue between the political parties is very much necessary. I am happy that, after that much of trial, at least that realisation is there in my friends like Mr. Raju that there would be a dialogue. Even today I want to make it clear that my party believes in dialogue. It believes in democracy. My party believes that every person should have the right to criticise and that all have the right to have their own association and.... (*Interruption*). I am coming to that.

SHRI MOHAMMAD YUNUS SALEEM : It was yet to come into existence.

SHRI MOHAN DHARIA : It will take some time for you to understand. That I can understand. But the point is _____

SHRI MOHAMMAD YUNUS SALEEM : Let us understand each other.

SHRI MOHAN DHARIA : It requires some time for my friend to understand, but even then he understands.

Sir, my party believes in civil liberties; my party believes in humanitarian values. And here I am reminded of what has been said on a tablet on the House of Commons. It is from Voltaire. It is said; "I have the greatest detest for your opinion; however to preserve your right to utter that opinion, I shall fight unto death." And what did we witness during the time of the emergency? I had suggested, while opposing the emergency that a tablet should be fixed on our Sansad Bhawan : "we have the greatest detest for your opinion and to destroy and demolish your right to utter that opinion we shall fight unto death Indira Gandhi, D.K. Borooah, and I had

[Shri Mohan Dharia] also attached the name of S.A. Dange—my friend Mr. Kalyan Roy will forgive me. But that was the attempt—the attempt to kill democracy. It has been said that those who were the murderers of Gandhiji are in this party. Sir, the Jana Sangh came into being in 1952. The Jana Sangh had nothing to do with it. It was not even in existence at the time when Mahatmaji was murdered. That is one thing. And if Gandhiji was murdered by a few individuals, then the philosophy (*Interruptions*). I have already condemned it. I am here to condemn those who murdered Gandhiji or the trend which murdered Gandhiji. But I must also say that while a few individuals murdered Gandhiji, the Congress Party has murdered the cause of Mahatma Gandhi. Why do you forget that ? Why are you forgetting that during the course of the emergency..... (*Interruption*).

SHRI MOHAMMAD YUNUS SALEEM : Those persons who were responsible for the murder of the Father of the Nation, we have no right to say that they are Gandhian and that they are going to introduce the principles of Gandhism in this country. You should understand that there are some persons who are responsible for the murder of the Father of the Nation. Who are they and where have they gone? You know that they are from your own city from where you have been elected.

SHRI MOHAN DHARIA : Yes, I know it very well. There were a few individuals who were involved in this. No organisation had any relationship whatsoever so far as Mahatma Gandhi's murder is concerned.

SHRI MOHAMMAD YUNUS SALEEM : Have the RSS disowned it ?

SHRI MOHAN DHARIA : Yes, they have. For your information, I am not a spokesman of the RSS. But, as per my information, they have denounced and condemned these actions. And, Sir..... (*Interruptions*). Just a minute. The honourable Member who is shutting so much, where was he at the time of the Hy-

derabad struggle, and what was he doing ? What does he think of himself? What was he doing in Hyderabad when the Hyderabad struggle was there ? It is better that we understand our position very well.

SHRI MOHAMMAD YUNUS SALEEM : I know more than what you know about what happened in Hyderabad.

SHRI MOHAN DHARIA : Sir, I am not yielding.

SHRI V. B. RAJU : Do not go into personal matters.

SHRI MOHAN DHARIA : Why should they ? I can understand that in a democracy individuals get converted. I am here to say that democracy stands for dialogue because through dialogue one can get converted and one can form a good view. Today, when you look at Mr. Morarji Desai, when you look at Mr. Atal Behari Vajpayee, when you look at Mr. H.M. Patel, when you look at Mr. Mohan Dharia, you may rest assured that they are all changed persons. And we are changed. We are changed in the interest of our country and society and in the interest of democracy. You should feel happy about it, instead of condemning. You are not going to gain anything. You would get no privilege. I can say frankly that I am thankful to Mrs. Indira Gandhi and her followers who kept us behind the bars for months and months. They have given us an opportunity. If something had basically gone wrong, should we not think about it ? And, I would like to assure this House, as the Prime Minister, Mr. Morarji Bhai, declared—and I would like to reiterate that our party stands for dialogue with the opposition. We feel that the party-in-power and also the opposition parties, both, should behave in a responsible way because we cannot forget the responsibility that is cast by 60 crores of people on our shoulders. Sir, in the Rajya Sabha and the Lok Sabha how many of us are there ? We are about 800. And, it is we 800 who are to guide the destiny or to formulate the destiny of this country, and it is in this context that I appeal to all sections. What are the challenges that are facing the country today ? Sir, I feel that so far as the

[Shri Mohan Dharia]
challenges are concerned, they are serious. The situation is alarming. Therefore, I would say that we should not have personal attacks here and there. I submit I had to reply in the same way because they forgot what they had committed in the past. But, even then, I am here to say I am sorry. There should be no individual attacks and counter-attacks. Therefore, as I said in the beginning, whatever might have happened to me in the past, I am not here to speak with any anger, out of any personal bias or any personal prejudice; I am here to speak with some sense that is in the interest of the country and democracy. And, therefore, friends, I think that today while the country is passing through a critical situation, every one of us shall have to think what has happened in the course of the last 130 years, and if we, everybody of us, think along those lines, I have no doubt that perhaps it may be possible for us to construct new bridges of dialogue and it may be possible for us to have these new bridges so that the barriers are not widened but they are narrowed to a great extent. And, that is the need of the hour.

Sir, much has been said regarding the programmes of my party. The election manifesto of my party is very clear. It is divided into three parts: One contains the political charter, the other contains the economic charter and the third contains the social charter. Sir, I am not going into a political discussion about my party in this House today. But, I can assure you that taking the whole history of the past 30 years into consideration, we have decided that the emphasis shall have to be laid on rendering justice to those who are down-trodden.

SHRI GAIN CHAND TOTU (Himachal Pradesh) : Sir, on a point of information, my honourable friend has just referred to the manifesto. May I ask him whether it refers to hill areas at all?

SHRI MOHAN DHARIA : Sir, that manifesto very much reflects the backward areas which include hill areas. Sir, I would request my friends to read this manifesto. It is very clear. Do you

want me to read it out? I am prepared to take this responsibility—I am not speaking as a spokesman of the party, but as a friend—I will see that a copy of the manifesto is made available to every Member of Parliament in this House as well as the other House.

4 P. M.

I have made these copies available to the officers of my own Ministry. I distributed about 150 copies of the manifesto. And I have made it clear that I do not want officers of my Ministry to be members of my party. But these are the commitments made by the party in power, these are the commitments of the Government in power, these are the commitments of their own Ministers. Naturally I want to fulfil the commitments and my officers should be well aware as to what those commitments are and to that extent, they shall have to be loyal in implementing these commitments made to the people.

SHRI V. B. RAJU : Will you allow me to interrupt you for one second? Can we get a clarification whether this Government is a Janata Party Government or a coalition Government? And if it is a coalition Government, have you got a common programme?

SHRI MOHAN DHARIA : It is a good question. Sir, this Government is not a coalition Government. It is a Government of the Janata Party. Unfortunately it so happened that we wanted some time. You know, the constituents as they stand, may be the Jana Sangh

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE (West Bengal)?: What about the CFD? We are talking about the CFD and the Akali Dal.

SHRI MOHAN DHARIA : I am coming to it. (Interruptions) If you want to say something, I am prepared to give you the floor. I am prepared to give the floor to everybody provided I get back the floor again.

श्री सुलतान सिंह (हरियाणा) :
घरिया जी, मैं थोड़ा सा सवाल कर
दूँ।

[श्री मुलतान सिंह]

मैं राजू साहव को सप्लीमेंट कर रहा हूँ। जिस तरह आपने जनता पार्टी का मैनीफेस्टो अपनी मिनिस्ट्री में बाँटा तो क्या श्री प्रकाश सिंह बादल को अकाली मैनीफेस्टो उनकी मिनिस्ट्री में बाँटने की इजाजत दी जायेगी और क्या श्री बहुगुणा को अपनी मिनिस्ट्री में सी०एफ०डी० का मैनीफेस्टो बाँटने की इजाजत देंगे ? इतना सप्लीमेंट करता हूँ।

SHRI MOHAN DHARIA : I am sorry. Perhaps had the hon. Members taken some care to go through the newspapers, they might have known that this is Janata Party in parliament where the Akali Dal and even the CFD are our constituents, and they have all joined on this manifesto.

श्री प्रकाश महरोज (उत्तर प्रदेश) :
मैनीफेस्टो अलग-अलग हैं कि एक ही हैं।

SHRI MOHAN DHARIA : They have all joined on this manifesto. Sir, before I complete my reply to this question, may I say (Interruptions) If you do not allow me .. (Interruption) I am prepared to have any questions, any supplementaries. You know my nature, I am not prepared to flee away. I am prepared to face any question.

So, Sir, what happened ? We very much wanted to form this Janata Party earlier. But before we were released from jail, you know the elections were announced. At that time, many of the leaders were behind bars. There was no time even to convene conferences of the parties to get dissolved. According to the constitution of the Congress (Sangathan), they are under obligation to give notice of a specified time if any change is to be effected in the party constitution. Naturally there was no time. Therefore, they could not get it dissolved. But all have agreed to form this party. Technically they will have to hold then-conferences and it will all happen before the 1st of May. But so far as the Janata Party is concerned, it was in the jail itself that the Congress Government provided us the opportunity to come closer, to think about the programme, to think how we

should behave. So if at all this party has taken its birth, it is not outside but like Lord Krishna it has taken birth in the jail itself. And just as Lord Krishna will take care of the Kamsa which has attacked democracy in this country. We shall see that those dictatorial trends do not again come in this country in any manner.

So, it is one party which stands by this philosophy and programme. There is no divergence whatsoever. But unfortunately many people have not been able to understand this distinction between one party in Parliament and different parties outside. The tragedy in the country was—I am not happy to say that—first the intra-party democracy in the Congress was first destroyed and an attempt was made to destroy democracy in the country as well. My salute goes to the people of this country because it is they who have revived democracy in the country. Otherwise this country would have gone to the dogs. To quote one instance, the Chief Minister of Maharashtra came to my constituency in Pune for doing election propaganda. He was touring all over Maharashtra. This is what he said : "Those who are behind the bars should thank Prime Minister Indira Gandhi because they are alive. In any other country they would have been shot dead." These were the utterances of a very responsible Chief Minister. I thank him because such utterances helped us in going to the people and asking them : Do you want such Chief Ministers with dictatorial trends ? Why did ...

SHRI V. B. RAJU : Did he not clarify it?

SHRI MOHAN - DHARIA : It was not clarified. It was twisted clarification. My own daughter, a student of journalism, took down *verbatim* what he said. And what was the clarification? I do not go into all these. Why should we forget history ? History shows that several dictators have come up and they have ruled through bullets. Again history tells us that those dictators who tried to rule through bullets were victims of bullets at the end. Is it the way to rule the country ? We stand for democracy. We stand for dialogue. I would like to make

[Shri Mohan Dharia] one thing very clear. Much is being said about the inquiry into various atrocities, excesses, inhuman behaviour and inhuman treatment meted out to lots of people who have done these crimes deserve to be penalised. And our Government is determined to inquire into these matters and to have, if necessary, a special commission. It is through the Commission that the inquiry shall have to be made. If at all anybody is to be penalised we shall not put anybody behind bars without trial. If anybody has committed any crime beyond all norms of decency and democracy, he deserves to be penalised. But he will be penalised through the judicial process. One of the Ministers of Maharashtra said : The jails of Nasik and Pune are waiting for the opposition leaders. I said in public meetings that the hon. Minister is not aware that it is not we who shall be in the opposition; but it is the Congress party which will be in the opposition. I said at the public meetings that we shall gain power, but we shall not put anybody behind bars without trial. We stand for civil liberty and we shall not put behind bars any Congressman or other opposition leaders arbitrarily and unjustly because we stand for justice. If one wants to render justice, many a time one has to digest injustice, which we have done. When we claim that we shall go according to Gandhian ways, this is the approach that we would like to adopt. Sir, so far as the other points are concerned, I would not like to detain the House. But I would like to assure the House that we would like to see that we have decentralisation of power and decentralisation of economy.

SHRI KALYAN ROY : Demonetisation also ?

SHRI K. K. MADHAVAN (Kerala):
What do you say about the trusteeship theory ?

SHRI MOHAN DHARIA : Sir, I was just saying that we would like to have decentralisation of economy and decentralisation of power and this House will appreciate that decentralisation of power and the functioning of the economy will help

in strengthening the democratic processes and the democratic forces in the country and these two will stabilise our democracy. Please do not forget the principle that decentralisation of power and decentralisation of economy would help the democratic processes. At the same time, Sir ...

SHRI KALYAN ROY : Mr. Dharia, in all humility, I would like to put only one question. Would you also decentralise the big monopoly houses, the big industrial house in the country ?

SHRI MOHAN DHARIA : Yes, in our manifesto we have made it very clear that we would not like to see the monopoly houses going on exhibiting the country as they have been doing; so far and to that extent all possible steps will be taken.

Sir, I was making the point that science and technology have been developing in the world very fast and if we want our country to be at the helm of prosperity, we cannot forget the fact that science and technology have to be developed in our country too. There are certain areas where huge investments are called for. Take, for instance, fertilizer factories. Naturally, it will not be possible for any individual to start a fertilizer factory and the public sector will be very much necessary. Mr. Raju was asking a question: "Will they take proper care of our public sector." Yes. We shall take special care of the public sector so that the whole of the country's economy is put under proper control and no such monopolistic trends are allowed to grow. It will be a balanced approach. We have taken into consideration our experience in the past and we have to take into consideration the experience of the other countries in the world also including the socialist countries. When I visited East Germany, I could see that about five thousand industries were such that the Government had directly gone into partnership with private individuals in these industries. I am speaking of East Germany and not about West Germany. I am here to submit—I am not going into a discussion now—that this country cannot forget the experience in the past and the experience of the other countries also and it is on the basis of the

experience of this country and other countries that we shall have to think of our society, think of our ideals and here I would like to seek the co-operation of all sections of the society. Sir, if we want this unity to fringe ahead, it is the sixty crores of people and the hundred and twenty crores of hands that will have to work together. There are various areas where we can work together and that was my philosophy and that was what I was insisting upon. I was saying : Let us have a dialogue, let us have a national code of conduct, let us have a national programme of action in which all the parties, even the parties having different political ideas, could participate. I said that all of us could come together and work together and that was what Shri Jayaprakash Narayan was also preaching. But, unfortunately, power had gone so much into the heads of those people that they were not in a position to think about what he was speaking. It is most unfortunate that certain things happened. Whatever has happened has happened and I do not want to say anything now on that. Now, so far as the President's Address is concerned . . .

SHRI K. K. MADHAVAN : Do you agree with the trusteeship theory that was mentioned by the Prime Minister?

SHRI MOHAN DHARIA : Wherever it is possible, I do agree. So Sir . . .

AN HON. MEMBER : It is a matter of convenience.

SHRI MOHAN DHARIA: The whole monopoly of convenience has been given to the Congress Party. So, how could it be with us ? Sir, the point now is this : I would like to appeal to this House to appreciate that so far as the President's Address is concerned, there was not enough time to consider that. We had practically no time. Even as far as our party is concerned, we were just out of jails and we did not have any time at all. There was not enough time even for the party to think about the various socio-economic and other programmes. Of course, we did apply our minds to those things in the jails and we could bring out a good manifesto which contained by and large our

thinking. But sir if there are good suggestions coming forward even from the other side, we are not here to say that only one leader is India and India is one leader. We feel that as 800 Members of Parliament we are all leaders who are to lead the country, and naturally let us have that approach, a responsible approach, a constructive and creative approach, on the part of both the ruling Party and the Opposition.

I would very much like to commend that this Motion proposed here should be accepted unanimously by the House. I am grateful to the House for the patience it has shown.

SHRI MOHAMMAD YUNUS SA-LEEM : Before my friend sits down I want, through you, Sir, to seek a clarification. I could not hear him on account of noise when he raised certain points. He said something about Hyderabad, perhaps reflecting on my behaviour, on my political behaviour. I did not quite hear him at that time. I want to hear from him what he said so that I can give him a reply, so that I can give a personal explanation. He has cast aspersions on my character. I want to hear him on that so that I can give a reply, a befitting reply.

SHRI MOHAN DHARIA: I want to know from the hon. Member, did he ever oppose the atrocities committed by the Razakars in Hyderabad ? Let him say so, and I am prepared to withdraw my remarks.

SHRI MOHAMMAD YUNUS SA-LEEM : At that time I was in Government service. I was Standing Counsel for the Income-tax Department right from 1945 to 1949. My services were terminated in 1949. The police action had taken place. Till then I was in Government service. Therefore, the question of my taking part in politics never arose . . .
(Interruptions)

SHRI MOHAN DHARIA : But the whole Government connived at the atrocities committed by the Razakars. And if you want to have a list of the atrocities committed by the Razakars, I am prepared to give it to You.....(Interruptions).

After this explanation, I am not prepared to withdraw my remarks.

SHRI MOHAMMAD YUNUS
SALEEM : There may be lists -----:

(Interruptions)

श्री भैरों सिंह शेखावत (मध्य प्रदेश) : आप उस समय हैदराबाद में क्या कर रहे थे ?

SHRI MOHAMMAD YUNUS SALEEM : I entered into Government service before that. Therefore the question does not arise at all. I expected the Minister to be a little bit responsible in his statement....

(Interruptions)

SHRI SARDAR AMJAD ALI : Sir, on a print of order. If there is any remark by any Member against any other Member of the House, either on this side or on that side, perhaps the procedure is that the Member gets an opportunity after consulting the proceedings of the House to make a clarification. I believe that if there is anything, to be said by my colleague, Mr. Mohammad Yunus Saleem, or the other hon. Members, it can only be done after verifying the proceedings.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Now the matter is over, anyway. Mr. Dhabe .. He is not here. Mr Shahi.

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपसभापति महोदय, मैं सब से पहले राष्ट्रपति महोदय को उन के भाषण के लिये बधाई देना चाहता हूँ कि उन्होंने कर्नाटक प्रान्त के होते हुए भी अपना भ्रमण इस देश के इतिहास में प्रथम बार राष्ट्र भाषा और देशी भाषा में दिया। श्रीमन्, आज से चार, पांच साल पहले भूतपूर्व राष्ट्रपति श्री गिरि जी से हम लोगों ने निवेदन किया था कि वे अपना अभिभाषण विदेशी भाषा में न करें। इस पर मुझ को पार्लियामेंट से निकालने के लिये इसी पार्लियामेंट में प्रस्ताव आया था। बाद में उन प्रस्तावकों ने उस प्रस्ताव को वापस लिया, 6 महीने के बाद जब उन को यह महसूस हो गया कि वह गलत रास्ते पर हैं। इस लिये मैं राष्ट्रपति महोदय को बहुत-बहुत बधाई और धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि उन्होंने अपना अभिभाषण हिंदी में दिया।

श्रीमन्, कम से कम अब हम को दलीय हितों से ऊपर उठ कर राष्ट्र के हित में साफ-साफ बातें करनी चाहियें। दलीय हित हम को उतनी दूर तक न ले जाएं जिससे कि राष्ट्र का अहित हो। यह बात छिपाने की नहीं है। जनता ने इस पर फैसला दे दिया है कि आपातकालीन स्थिति की घोषणा जनता के हितों के विरुद्ध थी। उसकी घोषणा नहीं होनी चाहिये थी। यह फैसला जनता के सर्वोच्च न्यायालय ने दे दिया है। अब उसके बाद दलील देना कि आपातकालीन स्थिति की घोषणा ठीक थी यह वाजिब नहीं। लेकिन श्रीमन्, मैं चाहूंगा कि जनता पार्टी के लोग इस फैसले को अपने पक्ष में फैसला न मानें क्योंकि जनता ने जनता पार्टी के पक्ष में फैसला नहीं दिया है। जनता ने कांग्रेस पार्टी के बुरे फैसलों के खिलाफ फैसला दिया। चुनाव शुरू होने के दो-चार दिन पहले मेरे पास गांव से मेरी पार्टी के कुछ कार्यकर्ता आए, मैंने पूछा, भई, क्या हाल है। उन्होंने कहा कि जनता पार्टी तो पीछे है और जनता आगे है। उस गांव के कार्यकर्ताओं ने बताया कि कांग्रेस के मुकाबले में जनता पार्टी का कहीं नामोनिशान नहीं है। यह जीत जनता की जीत हुई है, जनता, पार्टी की जीत नहीं हुई है, इसलिये जनता पार्टी के लोग मद्दहोश न हों और जिस जनता ने कांग्रेस पार्टी को उखाड़ने में 30 साल लगा दिये और अगर जनता पार्टी के लोग मद्दहोश हुए तो वही जनता उनको 30 महीने का समय भी नहीं देगी। आप इस बात को भूलिए नहीं। श्रीमन्, मैं चाहूंगा कि आपातकालीन स्थिति में जो जनहित विरोधी कानून बनाये गये हैं उनको शीघ्रताशीघ्र समाप्त किया जाए, जैसे कि संसद की कार्यवाही का न छपने देना ...

डा० राम कृपाल सिंह (बिहार) :
बिल आ रहा है आपको मालूम होगा।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : जैसे कि बार कौंसिल एकट को अमेंड करना । इसमें यह प्रोविजन था कि बार कौंसिल का चेयरमैन इलैक्टड होता था सत्ता के नशे में इस तरह का संशोधन कर दिया गया कि केन्द्रीय स्तर से लेकर जिला स्तर तक सरकारी वकील बार कौंसिल का चेयरमैन होगा । हमारे जैसे लोगों ने इसका विरोध किया था लेकिन किसी ने सुना नहीं । इससे ज्यादा काला कानून और क्या हो सकता है कि डेमोक्रेसी का नाम लेने वाले इस तरह का कानून बनायें कि सभी संस्थाओं के अध्यक्ष सरकारी वकील होंगे, सरकारी अफसर होंगे । यह काला संशोधन था और मैं चाहूंगा कि इसे जल्द से जल्द संशोधित किया जाये और उसके स्थान पर देश के लोगों के अधिकारों को प्रतिस्थापित किया जाय ।

श्रीमन्, राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण में यह जरूर कहा गया है कि हम को बहुत कम समय मिला इसलिए विस्तार से बातें नहीं कही जा सकी हैं । लेकिन कुछ ऐसी बातें तो हो सकती थी कि जिनकी पूरी पूरी जानकारी जनता पार्टी के नेताओं को भी होगी । आप जानते हैं कि इस राज्य सभा में पैसे के बल पर लोग चुन कर आते हैं और सदन को कलंकित करने हैं । बिहार से आते हैं, उत्तर प्रदेश से आते हैं । आप इस बात को भी जानते होंगे कि श्री के० के० विरला लखनऊ में कार्लटन होटल में ठहर करके और लाखों-लाख रुपये खर्च करके इस सदन में आने का प्रयास करते हैं और यह व्यक्ति हमारे विधायकों को बदनाम करके उनकी नैतिकता को भ्रष्ट करता है और यहां आ कर हमको कलंकित करता है । आज भी सदन में कुछ लोग हैं जो रुपये के बल पर यहां आकर बैठे हुए हैं । इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि आम संविधान में संशोधन करें तो इस बात का ध्यान रखें कि संसद

में कोई रुपये के बल पर आकर बैठने न पाये । अगर आप ऐसा नहीं करते हैं तो विवश होकर मुझे यह कहना पड़ेगा कि आज हमारे श्री मोरारजी भाई वही पुराने मोरारजी भाई हैं । उनमें कोई तबदीली नहीं हुई है । श्रीमन्, हमने इस चुनाव में यह देखा कि एक एक उम्मीदवार 5 लाख, 6 लाख, 7 लाख और 8 लाख रुपये खर्च कर रहा है । ये रुपये कहां से आए ? किसानों ने चन्दा नहीं दिया, मजदूरों ने चन्दा नहीं दिया । विभिन्न पार्टियों ने इन चुनावों में जो रुपया खर्च किया, मुझे मालूम है कि यह रुपया उम्मीदवारों को चेक के द्वारा नहीं दिया गया । आप जानते हैं कि आज से 15-20 साल पहले जब इस प्रकार के चुनाव होते थे तो पार्टियों के खजांची उम्मीदवारों को चेक द्वारा रुपये भेजा करते थे । शायद आपको भी इस प्रकार के चेक मिले होंगे । लेकिन इस बार उम्मीदवारों को नोटों की गड़्डियां बांटी गईं । लाखों-लाख रुपया इस प्रकार से बांट दिया गया । ऐसी हालत में क्या कोई साधारण व्यक्ति चुनावों में आ सकता है ? मैं समझता हूँ कि कोई भी ईमानदार आदमी चुनाव लड़ने की हिम्मत नहीं कर सकता है । यही नहीं, आज स्थिति यहां तक पहुंच गई है कि पार्टी के गलत फैसलों के खिलाफ कोई अपनी आवाज नहीं उठा सकता है । हम सब लोग ब्लैक मनी बन्द करने की बात करते हैं । लोगों के स्टार्कों पर छापे मारे जाते हैं और लोग पकड़े जाते हैं । 10-10 और 15-15 हजार रुपयों पर रेड की जाती है, लेकिन इस प्रकार से जहां से करोड़ों रुपयों की और लाखों रुपयों की गड़्डियां बांटी जाती हैं वहां पर रेड क्यों नहीं की जाती है ? इसलिए मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या कानून में और संविधान में इस प्रकार का संशोधन होगा ताकि कोई भी आदमी पैसे के बल पर चुनाव न लड़ सके ? मैं यह भी पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या आप

[श्री नानेश्वर प्रसाद शाही]

पिपुल्स रिप्रेजेंटेशन एक्ट में इस प्रकार का कोई संशोधन करेंगे ताकि साधारण आदमी इस बात की हिम्मत कर सके कि वह संसद् और विधान-सभाओं का चुनाव लड़ सके ? आज लोग इस बात के लिए विवश हैं कि वे पार्टियों की गलत बातों को भी मानें । मैं अब चाहूंगा कि कुछ लोग जो कांग्रेस के खिलाफ बोलते हैं, उनको कांग्रेस के खिलाफ बोलने की हिम्मत नहीं होनी चाहिए इसलिये कि पिछले कई चुनावों से जनता ने तो बहुमत से आपको बोट दिया था, मगर आप अपने को काबिल सिद्ध नहीं कर पाये, नहीं बैठ सके । आप उसके लिये कांग्रेस को क्यों दोष देते हैं, जब उत्तर प्रदेश के पिछले चुनाव में आप इस बात के लिये लड़ते रहे कि चौधरी चरण सिंह चीफ मिनिस्टर हो या श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी । जनता ने आपको 60 प्रतिशत वोट दिया था परन्तु आप अपने को योग्य साबित नहीं कर सके । इस बात का श्रेय केवल एक ही व्यक्ति को जाता है, जिसने आपको इकट्ठा कर दिया । कांग्रेस पार्टी के किसी आदमी को इस पर दुख नहीं होना चाहिए कि आज आप सरकार में आ गये । क्योंकि डेमोक्रेसी का यही तरीका है कि सरकारें बदले, कम से कम 10 साल के बाद अवश्य बदले । मगर मुझे भय है कि आपकी कलाई शायद 6 महीने में खुल जाय । अभी चुनाव होने के दो दिन बाद आपने जो तमाशा दिखाया और आपने जिस पद लोलुपता का प्रदर्शन किया, आपके ऊंचे नेताओं ने जिस पद लोलुपता का प्रदर्शन किया, उसे जनता ने देख लिया है कि आप कहां हैं । हमको समझने में तो बहुत दिन लगे मगर आपको तो दो दिन में ही समझ लिया कि आप क्या हैं । ऊंची ऊंची बातें चुनाव के दौरान होती थीं कि आप सेवा के लिये आये हैं । लेकिन दो दिन में ही आपने जाहिर कर दिया कि आप केवल अपनी सेवा के लिये आये हैं ।

श्रीमन्, जयप्रकाश नारायण जी का बहुत रिफरेंस किया गया । उनके प्रति हम

सब लोगों को श्रद्धा है । उन्होंने अपना आन्दोलन शुरू किया भ्रष्टाचार समाप्त करने से । आपसे हम उम्मीद करेंगे कि आप भ्रष्टाचार समाप्त करने का प्रयास करेंगे । मैं पिछले एक हफ्ते से देख रहा हूँ कि जितने भी ब्लेक मार्केटियर्स और स्मगलर्स थे, आज वह कांग्रेस की ओर से खिसक कर आपकी ओर जा रहे हैं । मैं कल गोरखपुर से आया । जिस हवाई जहाज से उतरा, उसी से श्री महामाया बाबू भी उतरे । एक गुप्ता नाम का व्यक्ति जो पहले गोरखपुर में एक सरकारी कर्मचारी था और दस साल पहले वह कई लाख रुपये का गवन करके दिल्ली भाग आया, और यहां लोहे की एजेन्सी लेकर बहुत मालदार हो गया । मैं उसका नाम नहीं बताऊंगा, उसने मुझे नमस्कार किया । मैंने पूछा भाई यहां कैसे । कहने लगा कि मैं महामाया बाबू को रिसीव करने आया हूँ । इस से पहले वह कांग्रेस के मिनिस्ट्रों के यहां देखा जाता था और कल मैंने देखा कि अब वह महामाया बाबू जी को रिसीव करने आता है । आज से 4, 5 दिन पहले मैं ट्रेन से गोरखपुर जा रहा था । बम्बई के एक सेठ जो कपड़ा बनाने वाली एक मिल संचुरी की गवर्निंग बाडी के मेंबर है, ने मुझे बताया कि हमारी गवर्निंग बाडी ने फैसला किया है, गवर्नमेंट फार्म होने के दो दिन के बाद यह फैसला किया है कि संचुरी मिल के कपड़े के दाम 8 प्रतिशत बढ़ा दिये जाये । वह मारवाड़ी था । मोरारजी भाई को यह लोग समझते हैं कि 'अपना आदमी कुर्सी पर बैठ गया, अब जो चाहो करो' । इसलिये मैं कहता हूँ कि यह जो असर हुआ है उसको आप रोको । आज पूंजीपति यह समझने लगा है कि अपना आदमी कुर्सी पर बैठ गया, अब जो चाहो वह करो ।

श्रीमन्, राष्ट्रपति के इस अभिभाषण में विरला और टाटा के ऊपर कन्ट्रोल करने का कोई इशारा नहीं है । 300 करोड़ रु० का बिड़ला 1000 करोड़ रु० का हो गया है, एन्टी मोनोपोली ऐक्ट के होते हुए भी । और

एन्टी मोनोपोली ऐक्ट पिछले चार-पांच साल में जितना डिफाई हुआ है उसको क्या कहा जाए ? उस एन्टी मोनोपोली ऐक्ट की आत्मा का हनन किया गया है और उन्हीं मोनो-पोलिस्ट को बार बार लाइसेंस दिए गए जिनको रोकने के लिए एन्टी मोनोपोली ऐक्ट बनाया गया था। लेकिन आप क्या करेंगे, इसका कोई इशारा नहीं है, और जनता को शक है कि मोरारजी भाई की सरकार क्या करेगी इसके बारे में।

और अब मैं पूछूंगा सोशलिस्ट भाइयों से जो डा० लोहिया के अनुयायी हैं, कि उनका वह नारा कहां जाएगा जो डा० लोहिया कहते थे कि जब तक करोड़पंथी खत्म नहीं होगा तब तक कंगाली की खाई नहीं पटेगी? क्या कहीं कोई इशारा है करोड़पतियों को खत्म करने का? कोई इशारा राष्ट्रपति के अभि-भाषण में नहीं है और जब तक विड़ला, टाटा बने रहेंगे, डालमिया सिंहानिया बने रहेंगे, देश की गरीबी नहीं जाएगी। मुझे शक है श्रीमन् कि जिस तरह से हमने कह दिया था वोट लेने के बाद कि कोई जादू की छड़ी थोड़े ही है जो गरीबी तुरन्त खत्म कर देंगे, आप भी वही कहने वाले हो। मैं उस दिन का इंतजार कर रहा हूँ जिस दिन मोरारजी कहेंगे कि कोई जादू की छड़ी मेरे पास नहीं कि गरीबी खत्म कर दूँ।

श्री नरसिंह प्रसाद नन्द : कह चुके हैं अपने अनाऊन्समेन्ट में। आलरेडी सेड। उनका ब्राडकास्ट पढ़िए तो।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : हम लोगों के आदरणीय नेता बाबू जयप्रकाश जी ने आज से दो दिन पहले अपना वयान दिया—असेम्बलियों को भंग कर दो। क्यों भंग कर दो, उन्होंने कहा, कि जनता ने जनता पार्टी के पक्ष में वॉइकट दे दिया है, क्योंकि केन्द्र में जनता पार्टी की सरकार स्थापित हो गई है इसलिये राज्यों में भी जनता पार्टी की सरकार

स्थापित होनी चाहिए। क्या अगर असेम्बलियों में कांग्रेस की सरकार बन गई तो दिल्ली में लोक सभा भंग कर दी जाएगी? तो इस तरह का तर्क समझ में आने वाला तर्क नहीं है और मुझे दुख है इस बात का कि जयप्रकाश जी ऐसे नेता भी आज के इस फेडरल सेटअप में इस तरह की बात करते हैं और कहते हैं कि असेम्बलियों को भंग कर दो।

(Time bell rings)

श्रीमन्, मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार ने बड़ा मैसिक् मैनेजेंट दिया है आपको। मगर उसका मतलब यह नहीं होना चाहिए कि उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार को उसी तरह से इग्नोर किया जाए जिस तरह से पहले होता रहा। आज से 4 साल पहले मैं एक कमेटी के साथ तमिलनाडु गया था, मेरे साथ तमिलनाडु के एम० पी० भी थे। मैं वहां के गांवों में तरक्की देख कर आया था और मैंने कहा यहां तो बड़ा डेवलपमेन्ट है, हमारे यहां इतनी बिजली का फैलाव नहीं है, बड़ी परेशानी हमारे यहां के गांवों में है। तमिलनाडु के एम० पी० ने कहा :

You can't have both the Prime Minister-ship and development.

अब मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इन लोगों से :

Now we have given up the Prime Ministership and we want development. U. P. and Bihar want development. आज जनता ने आपको जो मासिक् मैनेजेंट दिया है वह इसलिए दिया है कि आपसे डेवलपमेन्ट की उम्मीद करती है। रेल मंत्री जी बैठे हुए हैं। मैं खास तौर पर कहना चाहता हूँ कि उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार में जो रेल की स्कीमें चल रही हैं उनको बन्द करने की कोशिश न की जाय इनफ्लेशन रोकने के नाम पर क्यों कि राष्ट्रपति जी के भाषण में है कि जो स्कीमें इस समय जारी हैं उन को फिर से तैयार करने और कार्यक्रम को फिर निर्धारित करने की संभावना पर

[श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही]

भी विचार किया जायगा। वित्त मंत्री साहब ने यह हिदायत तुरन्त जारी कर दी है कि जो नयी स्कीम हों वे रोक दी जायें और जो चालू हों उन को धीरे चलाया जाय। मैं सरकार से और विशेष तौर से रेल मंत्री जी से कहना चाहता हूँ कि पूर्वी उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार में जो स्कीमें चल रही हैं उन को अगल आप ने रोकने की कोशिश की या स्लो-डाउन करने की कोशिश की, इनफ्लेशन रोकने के नाम पर तो वहाँ की जनता उसे बर्दाश्त नहीं करेगी। जनता ने आप को मॅन्डेट दिया है अपनी गरीबी से परेशान हो कर।

रेल मंत्री (प्रो० मधु दण्डवते) : आप ऐसे बोल रहे हैं जैसे आप ने मॅन्डेट दिया हो।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : मैं ने ही मॅन्डेट दिया है प्रोफेसर साहब।

श्री नरथी सिंह (राजस्थान) : जनता में ये भी शामिल है।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : मैं भी उसी जनता में से हूँ जहाँ से आप लोग जीत कर आये हैं। इस लिए मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार के साथ अन्याय करने की कोशिश न की जाय। बिहार ने आप को चुन कर भेजा तो इस लिए नहीं कि बिहार के लोगों को इग्नोर किया जाये।

श्री श्यामलाल यादव (उत्तर प्रदेश) : बिहार के लोगों ने इन को कहां भेजा।

श्री उपसभापति : कृपया जल्दी समाप्त करें।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : समाप्त कर रहा हूँ। वहाँ की जनता ने आप लोगों को चुन कर इस लिए भेजा कि उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार की विशेष समस्याएं हैं। मैं इस से और ज्यादा नहीं कहना चाहता।

श्रीमन्, मैं एक शब्द और कहना चाहूंगा विदेश नीति के बारे में क्यों कि इस में जिक्र है। जो रूस हमारी इमरजेंसी का समर्थन करता था उस ने हमारे द्वार जाने के बाद कहा था कि इन्होंने बड़ा गलत काम किया। लगातार दो साल तक उन का मीडिया समर्थन करता रहा और जब चुनाव मे हम ने सी पी आई का सहयोग नहीं लिया तो उन्होंने कहा कि इन्होंने बड़े ब्रुलम किये थे। मैं विस्तार में नहीं जाऊंगा। दूसरी तरफ मैं अमरीका की बात करना चाहता हूँ जहाँ के लोग बड़े खुश हो गये हैं कि मोरारजी भाई प्रधान मंत्री बन गये हैं। अमरीका केवल पाकिस्तान को ही हथियार नहीं दे रहा है, पाकिस्तान को हथियार पहुंचाने के लिए ईरान में उन्होंने 10 हजार करोड़ के हथियार डम्प कर दिये हैं। ईरान को किस से खतरा है? ईरान, टर्की और इस तरह के तमाम मुल्कों को अमरीका जो हथियार डम्प कर रहा है वे वार के समय पाकिस्तान भेजे जायेंगे। वे सीधे पाकिस्तान के पास पहुंचाने की जगह ईरान और टर्की के पास पहुंचाते हैं। 65 और '71 में साबित हो चुका है कि जो अमरीकी हथियार ईरान और टर्की में रह जाते हैं वे पाकिस्तान पहुंच जाते हैं। इसलिए अमरीका की खुशी से हम को खुश नहीं होना चाहिए। मैं जनता पार्टी से विशेष निवेदन करूंगा कि हमको जब जब मौका पड़ा है तब उसने अनाज हम को दिया और हथियार पाकिस्तान को दिया। इस बात को इग्नोर नहीं करना चाहिए।

श्रीमन्, एक बात मैं अर्थनीति के बारे में कह कर अपने भाषण को खत्म करूंगा। वाजपेयी जी यहीं से चुनाव लड़े थे। बड़े जोर से तमाम मीटिंगों में वे ऐलान करते थे कि इनकम टैक्स दस हजार के उपर लगेगा, लेकिन कल जो विधेयक आया उस में दस हजार भूल गए। मैं जनता पार्टी के नेताओं से कहूंगा कि वायदे कृपया कम किया करें जो वायदे करें उन्हें पूरा करने की कोशिश किया करें।

PROF. RAMLAL PARIKH: That was the old thing. The new Budget is yet to come.

SHRI NAGESHWAR PRASAD SHAHI: What about the Finance Bill -was discussed yesterday?

श्रीमन्, गल्ले के दाम के बारे में मैं जरूर कहना चाहूंगा, इसलिये कि इस से किसानों का संबंध है और हम सब लोगों का संबंध है। 105 रुपये दाम रख कर किसानों को विश्वास किया जाता है कि वे व्यापारियों को 85 रुपये और 95 रुपये में अपना गेहूं बेचें जबकि तमाम चीजों के दाम बढ़ते जा रहे हैं। इसी सदन में बाबू जगजीवन राम जी जब कृषि मंत्री थे तो हम लोगों ने यह सवाल पेश किया कि किसानों की जरूरत की चीजों के दाम बढ़ते जा रहे हैं और गल्ले के दाम आप घटा रहे हैं, तो उस के जवाब में उन्होंने हम लोगों को कांग्रेस की हिस्ट्री बताना शुरू कर दिया। चूंकि वह बुजुर्ग हैं इसलिये उन को बात को हम लोगों ने सुन लिया और उस के बाद वह बैठ गये। लेकिन अगर हम लोग गुनहगार हैं तो उन सब गुनाहों में बाबू जगजीवन राम जी भी शामिल हैं। लेकिन आज तो सब साफ हो गया, सब माफ हो गया और उन के सारे गुनाह खत्म हो गये। वह उधर से उधर चले गये और इस से ही इनके सारे गुनाह माफ हो गये। लेकिन मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि किसानों के गल्ले का दाम हर हालत में बढ़ना चाहिए। और भारत सरकार के जो हैडलिंग चार्ज हैं, जो उस का फूड डिपार्टमेंट है वह तो लूट डिपार्टमेंट है, दुनिया में सब से ज्यादा हाइएस्ट रेट है उस के हैडलिंग के, और इसलिये अगर आप इस के हैडलिंग चार्ज को ही आधा कर दें और उन को दुनिया के दूसरे देशों के हैडलिंग चार्ज के मकाबले ले आयें तो उस से ही कम से कम दस पैसे फी क्विंटल किसानों को ज्यादा दाम मिल सकता है ?

श्री उपसभापति : माननीय सदस्य ने बहुत समय ले लिया है।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : मैं अब खत्म कर रहा हूँ। मैं समाप्त करता हूँ लेकिन इसके पहले एक बात याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ। बोनस के सवाल पर हमारे श्रम मंत्री ने बयान दिया है कि 'बोनस इज ए डिफर्ड वेज'। इसी तरह का बयान आज से तीन, चार साल पहले भूतपूर्व श्रम मंत्री श्री खाडिलकर जी ने दिया था कि 'बोनस इज ए डिफर्ड वेज' और उस का नतीजा बाद में यह हुआ कि सारा बोनस ही समाप्त हो गया।

एक माननीय सदस्य : इमरजेंसी के दिनों में।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : एक बात बता दूँ कि मैं सोशलिस्ट कंट्रीज को भी जानता हूँ। कल्याण राज जी चले गये। रूस और ईस्ट जर्मनी की बात भी जानता हूँ। दुनिया के किसी भी मुल्क में बोनस प्राफिट और प्रोडक्टिविटी से अलग नहीं है। सोशलिस्ट कंट्रीज में भी बोनस को संबंधित किया है प्रोडक्टिविटी और प्राफिट से आप अगर अपने यहां बोनस को प्रोडक्टिविटी और प्राफिट से अलग कर देंगे तो आज नहीं तो 6 महीने के बाद फिर आप उसको रिवाइज करेंगे। पिछले दिनों सी० पी० आई० ग्रुप ने जो कांग्रेस पार्टी में था उस ने जोश में आ कर बोनस को डिफाइन किया था और बाद में जो कैंट्रिस्टाफी हुई, रेल हड़ताल के समय जो ज्यादाती हुई, रेल कर्मचारियों के साथ उन की हड़ताल को तोड़ने में और बाकी सारे मजदूरों के साथ उन का बोनस छीनने में, वह कोई मिसाल नहीं रखती। इसलिए मैं जनता पार्टी की सरकार का इस तरह के जल्दबाजी के ऐलान का विरोध करता हूँ। जल्दी में कोई घोषणा न कीजिए। जल्दी में किया गया अनाउंसमेंट खतरनाक भी हो सकता है, लेकिन

[श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही]
देश के लिये ज्यादा खतरनाक हो सकता है।
जो कुछ भी फैसला कीजिए सोच-समझ
कर कीजिए। (*time bell rings*). इन
शब्दों के साथ . . .

श्री उपसभापति : बिना शब्दों के समाप्त
कीजिए।

श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : मैं राष्ट्रपति
के अभिभाषण के संबन्ध में अपनी बात को
समाप्त करते हुए यह जरूर कहता हूँ कि
जयप्रकाश जी का आंदोलन जिस भ्रष्टाचार
से शुरू हुआ था उस भ्रष्टाचार को समाप्त
करने का प्रयास कीजिए वरना कोई नीति
सफल नहीं होगी। जो भ्रष्टाचारी इधर
चिपके हुए थे वे आपकी तरफ चले जा रहे
हैं। धन्यवाद।

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : Mr.
Deputy Chairman, Sir, at almost the fag end
of the day, I am grateful to you for having
given me the opportunity to take part in the
discussion.

Sir, I was listening to the intervention by
the hon'ble Commerce Minister, Mr. Mohan
Dharia, and I expected that I would get some
clarifications in respect of certain points
which, at least, to my mind are really
confusing. But, I am sorry to say that I have
been more confused by his observations when
he said that already he has started by distrib-
uting the manifesto of the Janata Party to the
civil servants to make them committed. And
naturally when a clarification was sought
whether this Government is a Government of
the Janata Party or a coalition Government,
consisting of the CFD and the Akali Dal, and
what would be the actual position of the
Government if the members representing the
CFD and the Akali Dal also started
distributing their election manifestoes to their
civil servants and try to commit them, the
state

of affairs on that point was not clarified. Two
hon'ble Ministers of the Council of Ministers
are here. I hope they would try to at least
throw some light whether all the members
belonging to the Council of Ministers have
accepted the programme of the Janata Party
as their own programme and whether they
have already, like Mr. Mohan Dharia, started
distributing the manifesto of their parties to
convince the civil servants and to make them
committed to the programme of the party in
power.

Sir, for almost two weeks since the
declaration of the results, so many analysis
are being made of the election results, of the
debacle of the Congress Party, the glorious
success of the Janata Party and so on and so
forth. But yesterday when I was listening to
the broadcast of the Prime Minister of the
country, I was really surprised to listen-
though I saw him on the TV itself that this is
a revolution. He started his speech by saying
that this is a revolution of the people, for the
people by the people themselves, I don't
know what is the concept of this revolution.
Some of the fire-brand revolutionaries are
sitting on the treasury benches. They can
throw some light on the concept of revolution
to which the Prime Minister referred in the
beginning of his broadcast to the nation. If by
revolution he means replacement of Mrs.
Indira Gandhi by Shri Morarji Desai, if by
revolution he means the combination of parties
receiving the support of people to the extent
of 43.5 per cent, if by revolution he means
the combination of a party consisting of those
very persons, at least three of whom were
sworn in as members of the Council of
Ministers in 1971, being sworn in as such in
1977 after the declaration of the results of the
General Election, then I don't know what is
meant by revolution of the people, by the
people for the people. Or if it is just euphoria
through which we are passing today, I have
no comment. But I expected at least from the
members of the Council of Ministers that
they will

try to analyse the situation in an objective manner. I can understand the journalist friends when they try to depict the 24th of March as a day of liberation or as equivalent to the 15th of August but I cannot understand it when the Prime Minister of the country wants to characterise the change-over of power through General Election as a revolution of the people, by the people and for the people when the same combined ruling party commands, 43-5 per cent of the total votes polled during the election. Perhaps in the moment of excitement they have forgotten that in a parliamentary system changes take place. Almost in every country where the parliamentary system prevails, through ballot boxes transfer of power takes place. That is nothing unusual. Even in our own country, it may not be in the Central Government, but in the States the same thing took place. I do not understand how it could be called a "revolutionary change". Even when Mr. Mohan Dharia made his observations, he went to the length of saying, "As Lord Krishna was born in prison, the Janata Party was formed in prison" and that they are going to kill another Kansa. I do not know what he means by "Kansa". It would be my humble suggestion to the members on the Treasury Benches to come to reality. Nobody is denying the fact that the Congress Party has been rejected by the people, at least by the majority of the people, because they disapproved of some of the policies and programmes of the party. But, at the same time, they should not forget in their excitement, when they say that in the last thirty years nothing has taken place in this country, that they are casting aspersions on their own colleagues. As has been very correctly pointed out by Mr. Shahi, Mr. Jagjivan Ram or Mr. H. N. Bahuguna, Mr. Mohan Dharia or Mr. Morarji Desai or Mr. Biju Patnaik who are adorning the Treasury Benches today were Congress Ministers and they were not Ministers for a short spell like Mr. Madhu Dandavate or Mr. George Fernandes who have just

entered the Council of Ministers. They were Ministers for almost a decade, if not more. At least some of them were Ministers for two or three decades taking the State Administration and the Central Administration into account. Therefore, when you inserted a clause in the Presidential Address condemning the atrocities committed by the past Government, perhaps you conveniently forgot one of your distinguished colleagues who was going to be sworn in. I do not know whether he was consulted when the Presidential Address was drafted. In all probability it was not so because he was sworn in later on. You had very much 5 P. M. in your mind that by adhering to this particular clause you were going to cast an aspersion on Babu Jagjivan Ram whom you were going to appoint the Defence Minister of the country. I do not know what his position is in the Council of Ministers, whether he is No. 2 or No. 3. It is a joint responsibility. It is a collective responsibility. If Mr. Fernandes says that in respect of what has been done by his colleagues in the Ministry of Finance, he has no responsibility, then I would say that they are just going to shatter the fabric of the entire parliamentary structure. Therefore, if today Mr. Jagjivan Ram claims that for what happened between 26th June, 1975 and the 2nd February, 1977, the date when he resigned, he has no responsibility, I am sorry to say that it would be a travesty of truth and it would perhaps be the most irresponsible task, and it would be an attempt to strike at the root and concept of the collective responsibility of the Cabinet. Therefore, it would be my humble suggestion to the Members of the Treasury Benches through you, Sir, to keep in mind that the stage of euphoria is over. You have won the elections. You have received the people's mandate. But we are not interested to listen to what the Congress Ministers did or what they did not. If you have evidence against them, just go ahead and prosecute them, start appointing inquiry com-

missions, but do not try to divert the attention of the people from the real issues with which you are really confronted and talk a cheap, populist thing like 'We are going to institute inquiry against Mr. X or Mr. Y' You have the power to do so. By all means, you do it. What is the use of hammering it ? When day in and day out you tell it, I may tell you that you are just trying to "show your weakness. Nobody is interested to listen fr^m Mr. Mohan Dharia that he has taken the vow of killing *Katisa*. I do not know who is *Kama*. Democratic rights have been established. If you want to bring an amendment to the Constitution, you are entitled to do so. It has been clearly pointed out by us that on each issue we shall render co-operation to you on merit. Nobody is standing in the way of disc' argirg y urr 'spor.sibi-lities, for which you have been voted by the people to power. But we are interested to know what line of action you are going to adopt. I can very well understand if there is no mention in the President's Address about your policies and programmes because just three days back you got to know the final results announced and you took over the power. But almost two weeks have now passed. No doubt, some Ministers have made some policy statements. Only yesterday, the Prime Minister had also made a policy statement. I do not know what would have been the reaction of Mr. George Fernandes or Mr. Madhu Dandavate if Mrs. Indira Gandhi had made a policy statement in that way when Par-liament was in session and whether they wouldi.ve.i!,owed Pariiamntto function. But we have allowed Parliament to function only by raising a small protest that perhaps parliamentary decency and decorum require that when Parliament is in session it would be desirable for the Prime Minister or a Minister to make a policy statement on the floor of the House. We are not inter-Sted to know, the whole country is not interested to know, whether Mr. Sanjay Gandhi became a super Minister. The whole country is not interested to know

whether you are going to institute an inquiry against him or not. If you decide to institute an inquiry, if you think that certain wrong things have happered and some persons have committed them, by all means, you take action against them. You have the authority to take action; you have the moral support of the people to take action. But what is the use of telling these things day in and day out? Who prevents you from taking action? We are interested to know what concrete measures you are going to take to implement your policies. The other day the Industry Minister came forward with a policy statement and a small rejoinder is being issued by the Department that the policy staten.in will be announced later on. We are interested to know what you are talking of because there are apprehensions and there are reasons to believe that you are trying to divert the attention of the people from the real issue. What you are talking about ?

I am sorry to tell you, I fail to understand or to get the idea of the direction in which you want to lead this country. In Industrial and financial policies Mr. H.M_

Patel is not a new man; he was one of the most important civil servants in the Finance Ministry. Mr. Morarji Desai presided over this Ministry not once but twice and he had a very long experience. The whole economy of the country is in his grip. How much time do you take to formulate your policy ? At least give a general idea. The other day I read in the proceedings of the Lok Sabha that you will be dealing with economic offenders under the normal laws. May I put a very simple question to Mr. Morarji Desai who was the Finance Minister of this country? Is he convinced that he would deal with the economic offenders of this country under the ordinary laws of the country ? If he is convinced, can I not put a vary simple question ;o him ? What measures did he take to curb the economic offences in this country while he presided over the Finance Ministry net cnee lut

twice and also as the Deputy Prime Minister of the Country once ? Today you are trying to eulogise that it is a revolution. This revolution could have taken place if Mr. Morarji Desai could have managed to get the support of a few top leaders of Congress in 1966 he could have sat on that chair which is being occupied by Mr. Advani today. That would not have been a revolution. It is not a revolution. Don't try to eulogise. You have won the battle. You have won the election. 43-44 per cent of the total electorate supported you. That is why you are in the treasury Benches- We are expecting that you will discharge your duties as responsible Minister-. I am sorry to tell you that attempts are being made at cheap stunts. People are not interested in seeing you in the secretariat in the chair or anywhere else. People are not interested in seeing whether you take class IV staff to cafeteria and take tea with him. These are cheap stunts. For God's sake don't resort to it. I am coming from the state of West Bengal where we found that when the Congress Government was replaced by the United Front Government the United Front Ministers resorted to this cheap stunt. And what price they had to pay for it ? You will have to solve the basic problems of this country. We expect that at least we should get an idea of it. Yesterday, when I listened to the policy statement of the Prime Minister, I expected that at least we would get an idea as to what extent he was going to solve the economic problems of the country. When he was the Finance Minister ..

SHRI G. LAKSHMANAN (Tamil Nadu) : This Government, I think, will take action against the economic offenders but they will not take such an action against the politicians also. They mixed economic offenders and the politicians. This Government will take action against economic offenders only.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : I hope you have not joined the Treasury Benches. My questions are pointed to the members of the council of Ministers. I do not know whether you have joined it At least I have not read it in the news.

papers. My point is not mixing up. For God's sake please listen to me. I am not mixing up the issues. I wanted to know whether under the ordinary laws of the country you can deal with economic offenders.

SHRI G. LAKSHMANAN : You put handcuffs on politicians, We will not do it. We know who are the economic offenders. You put handcuffs on Viren Shah.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : What I want to know is, it has been pointed out by the ruling party that they are not going to resort to extraordinary measures to deal with the economic offenders and that they can deal with the economic offenders under the normal laws of the country. My point is the present Prime Minister presided over the Ministry of Finance which deals with the economic offenders. He was aware of the situation. Is he convinced that he can deal with the economic offenders under the normal laws ? And if he is so convinced, I would like to know what policies and programmes they are going to take to deal with the economic offenders. Today I read in the newspapers that the smugglers have decided to surrender to Jaya-prakash Narayan. I do feel that J. P. has moral power. He has achieved some success in respect of the dacoits of Chambal. But I can tell you, from my own experience as a junior Minister in the Ministry of Finance, that men of this type are much more heinous than the dacoits of Chambal. Therefore, when they decide to surrender to J. P. they do so with an ulterior motive. From my experience as a Minister in that Ministry for 1\ years, I know how much influential these people can be, what tremendous force these persons' money bags have and what social status they have assumed during all these years.

SHRI SANAT KUMAR RAHA : They are trustees of wealth.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : That is your concept, Mr. Raha.

SHRI HAMID ALISCHAMNAD: The Congress office of Cannanore district...

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Mr. Schamnad, you have forgotten that at least half a dozen people sitting in the Treasury benches today were Ministers for three decades. When I was playing football wearing half-pants, I used to read the names of some of the Ministers who are now in the Treasury benches today. Do not forget that. If something wrong has been done, they have to share the responsibility equally. Do not think that if some people cross the floor from here to that side, they can shirk responsibility. We are not shirking responsibility. Therefore, this point should not be forgotten in the moment of euphoria and excitement. Now, what did we expect? We expected to have a policy direction from the Government at least after two weeks. When Mr. M. Rajji Desai went to make his broadcast to the nation, we wanted to know what type of economic programme will be followed in future. Somebody said that at the time of the Budget, you will come forward with a statement. This is natural. But at least you can give some broad outline as to what would be the policy so far as industrialisation is concerned. Mr. Mohan Dharia said today that they would like to see that the public sector retains the commanding heights so far as the economy is concerned. And what did your Industry Minister say on the other day? We are interested to know what economic measures you are going to take to generate demand to meet the stagnation which has taken place so far as the demand in the people is concerned. You were saying that nothing has taken place in this country. Your Finance Minister does not even know what he will do with the foreign exchange reserves. The Prime Minister at least has admitted that we are in a happier position today so far as foreign exchange reserves are concerned. You are trying to oversimplify the problem. Otherwise I wonder how a responsible Minister can say that whatever growth we have achieved in the agricultural sector is mainly because of good rains.

[The Vice-Chairman (Shri V. B. Raju) in the Chair].

He has forgotten that during all these 30 years, we have developed the technological base on which industrial production and agricultural production to this extent have been achieved. It is not merely because of the good rains or bad rains. They have forgotten that while making these observations, they are practically criticising their own men, their own colleagues. Otherwise I do not know how he could forget his own speech on the floor of the Lok Sabha. While he was making his last speech after resignation, he said that he made efforts to persuade Shrimati Indira Gandhi to open a dialogue with J.P., but he said he still had unflinching faith in the leadership of Mrs. Gandhi. Prof. Madhu Dandavate or anybody can verify it from the green book of Lok Sabha proceedings...

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: One minute. You have been consistently raising the issue as to how is it that even after two weeks of assumption of power, the Government has not clarified its economic and financial policies. I would ask a counter question. In 1971 Shrimati Indira Gandhi assumed the reins of power when again there was a vote on account and the session was very small. Do you remember that elaborate policy statement regarding economic and financial policies of the Government did not come in the first sessions but only in the budget session that followed a comprehensive statement on economic policies was made? We are faced with the same difficulty, probably greater difficulty than Shrimati Indira Gandhi Government faced then. Therefore, it is but natural that elaborate, comprehensive economic and financial policies would not be put forward in a session that started a few days back and which is to end on the 7th. That is the difficulty. It is only limitation not in space, but in time. I hope you will take note of

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I am thankful to Prof. Madhu Dandavate. I am not on the point of vote on account which was produced by the Finance Minister and this was our own creation. But there is a basic difference between Mrs. Gandhi's government in 1971 and Shri Morarji Desai's government in 1977. We do not expect that all the Ministers will come forward with policies concerning their respective departments. We expected a broad outline from the Prime Minister of the country at least when he went to the people yesterday. We expected that instead of accusing people on dead issues and instead of spending time and energy on those issues we would get a broad idea of what he was going to do because when a new set of rules come...
(Interruptions)

SHRI G. LAKSHMANAN: One clarification ...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): No please. That will take time...
(Interruption's)

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Instead of that, you are talking of unrealistic and unreal things. If there is corruption, you are in a position to rectify it. You are in a position to penalise the corrupt elements. Therefore, I am suggesting to you that instead of spending your time you should take action because you are in a position to take action. You have already indicated the issues to the people. My point is, what is the use of harping on these on which you can take action. You are in a position to take action. Is it fair Prof. Madhu Dandavate, that you assume charge and immediately come and say that after examining the files you find that your predecessor was directed and guided by a super-Minister who was in the centre of extra-constitutional power? Is it fair? If you find something like that, you institute an inquiry commission and you penalise that Minister for anti-constitutional activities. If you say that from the files you find that somebody was guided and

advised by someone who was not in the Government, are we in a position to defend ourselves? Are the files accessible to us? Therefore, on the basis of records can we say that it is not true? Is it not one-sided? You have just started that cheap game. That is my apprehension. My suggestion to you is to concentrate on the real issue. So far as we are concerned, we have already expressed that we are prepared to lend co-operation to you. When we are talking of President's Address what would have happened if it had said, as the Prime Minister had admitted, that in certain aspects of the country's economy, we had done well in the past compared to the previous years. Heavens would not have fallen if you had mentioned a few words on that. When you say that the previous Government resorted to atrocities, how would you reconcile to it because one of your distinguished colleagues, sitting with you, was a party to them? Did he not contribute to it? Do you mean to say Shri Jagjivan Ram had no responsibility for this or Shri Bahuguna had no responsibility for this between 1971 and 1974 or Shri Mohan Dharia had no responsibility for this between 1971 and 1975? Would you like to say that during the thirty long years there was the misrule of the Congress? Then, are you not contradicting yourself? Are you forgetting that during those thirty years, Mr. Morarji was there for 23 years, that Mr. Biju Patnaik was the Chief Minister, that Mr. Dharia also was a Minister and Mr. H. N. Bahuguna was a Minister? Therefore, on these matters, Sir, I would like to suggest one thing: For [God's sake, let them behave responsibly. It has to be kept in mind particularly...

SHRI G. LAKSHMANAN: It has to be both ways.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Yes, both ways. I have learnt the lesson and I hope you will also learn the lesson. I thought you would have learnt it by now because you also shared power, not for one

piiri rranab Mukherjeel year, but for eight years. Therefore, it would be my suggestion to the honourable Members on the treasury benches that instead, of diverting the attention of the people to the unreal issues, they should concentrate on the real issues. Let them come forward with clear-cut programmes and policies and let them not create an impression in the outside world that whatever has happened during this period, from 1971 to 1977, is something which has never happened in any part of the world. You have scored your point and you have got the verdict of the people and you have vindicated your stand. Now you should concentrate on real issues and think of what you are going to do next. What is the use of repeating all these things inside and outside? So, this is my simple suggestion. On all these points, Sir, I wanted to be clarified. But I am sorry to tell you that I have not been given any clarification at all.

Sir, I would like to draw the attention of the Members on the treasury benches to another issue because that is also a disputable point. When we were sitting on the treasury benches we never claimed we had done something miraculous on the economic front. But, at the same time, you will have to admit that there were some achievements and these achievements have been recognised even by the World Bank and even by the IMF. Today, when the Finance Minister will be sitting at the meeting of the Committee of 20 or will be presiding over the meetings of the developing nations, if he reflects these views, if he reflects what you are saying today from a political angle, then, I am sorry to tell you that you will not be depicting a very good and bright picture, not even a realistic picture, of this country. Therefore, these are the moments when you shall have to reconcile your position with your new assignments and this would be my humble suggestion to you all, to the Members on the treasury benches, that instead of concentrating your attention on unreal issues, you should concentrate on

real issues. We have accepted our position and we have accepted the verdict of the people and nobody is going to raise any dispute about it and nobody is going to say that you have not scored your point. It is because of that only that you are there. So, what is the use of saying that Mrs. Indira Gandhi was a dictator? If she were a dictator, would there have been any election at all? If she were a dictator, would she do that? Will a dictator order elections unless he or she was sure that he or she would come back to power after the elections? Can you cite an instance from any country in the world? Hitler did it. People might say that Hitler did it. But he had made all arrangements to see that he came back to power and that he won the elections. Was any election declared by Franco in Spain? Was any election ordered by Salazar in Portugal? Therefore, do not raise these issues at all. Indian people are democrats.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: The assessment given by the RAW was not correct. That was why the gamble went wrong.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I am sorry, Mr. Dandavate, I do not know what the assessment of the RAW was or at least I am not in a position to tell you now because you are now there. You are talking about the views of the Research and Analysis Wing. But what I am talking about is the political things. After all, the elections were ordered. The points which you wanted to highlight, have been highlighted and the points which you wanted to settle have been settled. Thereafter, what you are going to do next, we are interested to know. Sir, with these words, I am concluding.

I am sorry to tell that it would not be possible for us to lend support unconditionally to the Motion moved by Shri Shekhawat. But, at the same time, I would like to expect that in future perhaps

it would be better if it is done differently. I do not know whether some mechanism could be evolved as somebody was suggesting. Of course, President's Address is the prerogative of the Cabinet which view is shared by the Opposition also. But on certain issues where there may be completely divergent views, a system or mechanism could be evolved through which we could exchange our ideas to arrive at a compromise formula, because the treasury benches will have to keep in mind that for the first time since Independence, a real opposition has come to exist. The country is taking a good shape so far as Parliamentary democracy is concerned. It has concentrated on bipartism. That is why I welcome the use of that phrase in the President's Address. For the first time an organised opposition has come to exist in this country. Prof. Madhu Dandavate—as a professor and as a learned man—must recognize the fact that the Congress provided the ruling party for long thirty years, and it is the same Congress which is providing the opposition [today to strengthen the democratic system of the country.....(Interruptions). At the same, Sir, perhaps you will agree with me that this party has the capabilities and the potential to produce Prime Ministers and Chief Ministers in the States who belong to the Congress Party this time or at other times.....

(Time bell rings)

My Communist friends may not like it. But, unfortunately, either the CPI or the CPI(M), if they are to identify themselves with democratic forces of the country, have to identify themselves with either the Congress or the other democratic parties. This point also has to be reckoned with, which has been amply recognized by the people of the country and which all of us have accepted.

With these words, I conclude, and at the same time I congratulate the new gov- I

ernment and wish them all success in the coming years.

Thank you, Sir.

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJTI): Mr. Viswanatha Menon.

SHRI VISWANATHA MENON (Kerala): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, after Independence, Mahatmaji said that Congress should be dissolved. But those Congressmen who got into power did not do it. Now the history has come to the surface and the distintegration of the Congress has begun, although Mr. Pranab Mukherjee was vocal about providing an opposition as if there was no opposition for the last thirty years. I sympathise with his anxiety about becoming an opposition.

Sir, we in our party have got our own conditions. For example, on the question of bi-party system, that is not in good taste, because there are other parties in this country which provide the necessary leadership to the downtrodden.

Sir, yesterday I was listening to the speech of the Prime Minister. Although Mr. Pranab Mukherjee is complaining that he has not said anything about the economic policy, my complaint is that the Prime Minister in his hasty speech has brought out the old, traditional concept of trusteeship. Mrs. Indira Gandhi was also saying the same thing. But at least Morarajibhai is honest in saying that the stood for trusteeship. Sir, I am not prepared—my party is not prepared—to agree that the private sector can become trustees for the working class. We are not prepared to accept that. We will fight it, whether it is said by Morarajibhai or it is said by Mr. Pranab Mukherjee or Mrs. Indira Gandhi. The working class in this country is the most important factor and the working class, the down-trodden, are not going to give their life to some of the trustees like the Birlas and the Tatas He has metnioned that point in his speech

yesterday. We cannot agree to that. However, we welcome wholeheartedly the stand that has been taken in the President's Address for individual liberty and against the repressive measures. This Government has come up for civil liberties. The Indian people have given them votes for the sake of civil liberties and individual freedom and not for trusteeship theory. I want to stress that point. It was not a negative vote. It was not anti-Indira vote. It was a positive vote. It is for certain policies. The Congress had put in jail a number of leaders. They were harassed. Workers have been harassed. Thousands were jailed. Many were murdered and killed. Such an atrocious rule was here for 20 months. It was against this rule that a mandate was given by the people and that mandate has to be respected by the present Ministry. That is my humble submission. I am getting horrible news from my State. One boy, an engineering college student, was arrested during the emergency. I have raised that point in Rajya Sabha. His name is Mr. Rajan. The then Home Minister, Mr. Karunakaran, wrote to me to say they were thinking of releasing him. Now he comes and says in the Assembly that that boy was never arrested.

SHRI K. K. MADHAVAN: That statement of the Chief Minister has not been questioned in the Kerala Assembly.

SHRI VISWANATHA MENON: Such atrocities have been committed in this country. *(Interruptions)* My humble submission is that the State Governments have got their powers. I do not want to intervene in this thing. But such things have happened all over India. They must be looked into. How were the prisoners treated? Comrade Pin-narai Vijayan an M.L.A. at that time also was maltreated. His leg was broken by beating. Shri Sankar Kutty who is now an M.L.A. and who was not an M.L.A. at that time was kept in the lock-up without any food or drinking water. He has been elected on the

Janta ticket. Such things must be looked into by this Government. A Commission should be appointed to go through all these things. I expect that the Government would do it. I congratulate Prof. Madhu Dandavate and Mr. George Fernandes for coming out and stating that they would take back the workers. I think they have to rectify another wrong. In 1968, there was a one-day token strike by the Central Government employees. Many are suffering even now. Their promotions have been affected because of break in service. Even leaders like Padmanabhan, the P&T leader of Kerala, are out of employment even now. Such things must be rectified as early as possible.

Coming to compulsory retirement, many officers were asked to go out of employment because the Government did not like them. Those things must be rectified. Each and every case must be looked into and they must be taken back. I mean those who suffered during emergency.

Coming to the point of bonus, I am sure that the Government and the Labour Minister have declared that they consider bonus as deferred wage. That is the correct approach. Till the workers get a full wage, bonus is deferred wage. Even the INTUC leaders may agree with us. Bonus Act or whatever nonsense they have passed must be scrapped, Sir, the old Bonus Act must be brought back. About the CDS also, it must be scrapped and it should not be dragged on like this. It must be scrapped as early as possible and the money should be given back to the employees. Such a thing must be done. On the question of the MISA, Sir, I am not happy about how it was dealt with. The MISA should be scrapped. It is enough to say that we have suffered a lot. Many people have suffered. Let us scrap it. Without the MISA, if you cannot rule, then do not rule. Without the DIR, if you cannot rule, then do not rule because people are fed up with such kind of things.

[Shri Viswanatha Menon] a person <s arrested, he must have a right to go to a court of law to fight for justice. Mr. Prarub Mukherjee was saying that w'thout the MISA, the smugglers would do hivoC You can fight smuggl'ng under the ordinary law. My humble suggestion is that the MISA should be scrapped and such repressive measures should be thrown out.

S'r, I do not want to say anyth'ng about the Congress rule. In these 20 imnths, when these present Mm'sters were 'n ja'l, I was the lone person fight'ng here and even people l'ke Mr. Om Mehta shouted at me.

SHRI K. K. MADHAVAN: What about the K'nth Schedule wh'ch your leidir M^ Nimhoad'r'pad promised to repeal ?

SHRI VISWANATHA MENON: I w'll come to that.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): Do not add to h's list.

SHRI VISWANATHA MENON: Do not try to d'vert my attention l'ke that.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): Please let h'm speak.

SHRI VISWANATHA MENON: S'r, unfortunately, >n the present pattern—yau hive already mentioned that—there is this k'nd of majority, brutal majority, on that s'de. Formerly, when they were the rulers of th's country, 't was bad. Now, when they have come along w'th us to the Oppo5'tion, they have become worse. That 's the difficulty _____ (Inter

rptions) Formerly I was alone and you all shouted. At least, g've me my chance BOW to speak...

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): Please come to the subject.

SHRI VISHWANATHA MENON: Now your days are over and you are in a minor'ty today.

SHRI NRIPATI RANJAN CHOU-DHURY (Assam): S'r, he 's unnecessarily quarreling. He is welcome to th's s'de. I know he is com'ng here very soon.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): Mr. Menon and Mr. Choudhury, order, please.

SHRI VISHWANATHA MENON: S'r, I am always an obed'ent servant of the Cha'r. I always act according to your direction. But, unfortunately, when these 'people are detracting me...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): You are a senior Member and you should not be detracted. You should go on w'th your speech.

SHRI VISWANATHA MENON : All right, S'r, please try to control your own party men.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU) : Not m'ne. I am >n the Chair.

SHRI VISWANATHA MENON : Sorry , S'r. I amend it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU) I will control the House. Please go on with your speech.

SHRI VISWANATHA MENON : The basic point is that the Congress is frustrated and they are fight'ng w'th each other. They want a scapegoat. Somebody is saying, Mr. Sanjay Gandhi. Somebody is saying, Mr. Borooah. You are fighting with each other

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU) : You are getting out of the t ack.

SHRI VISWANATHA MENON : S'r, you should control these friends.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU) : Go on with your speech. Your t'me is over. I can allot your party time for you.

SHRI VISWANATHA MENON : Then, g've me one or two nminutes, St. usually speak w'thin my own time. I

[Shri Viswanitha Menon]

never asked you for more time. That is why I am appealing to you to control the Congress trends. They are now in the Opposition.

Coming to the question of bank nationalisation, Sir, it was considered to be good ideologically and theoretically too. But in practice, what happened? After the bank nationalisation, whatever benefits were there, they were given to the big monopolists.

On the economic front also a strong stand has got to be taken and big monopoly houses have got to be controlled. What the stand of the present Janata Government is, has to be made clear. We are not prepared to consider the Birlas or the Tatas as trustees. That is the main point that I want to stress.

Sir, I then come to multinational corporations. These multi-national corporations are creating havoc in this country and we have always been talking about them. You know about this piper Company and the International Harvester. You must have read about them and known how they came into the picture. Now, Sir, my humble submission to the Government is that it should take a strong stand on all these things and the influence of the multinational corporations on Indian politics must be put an end to.

Coming to the external affairs, Sir, yesterday when I was listening to Mr. Morarji's speech, I heard him talking about 'genuine non-alignment' policy. What this wonderful thing is, I cannot understand. Such vague terms should not be brought into Indian politics. We should be against imperialism, against all kinds of terror which are threatening our country. We should be on the side of people's aspirations. That is non-alignment. That attitude must be taken. Why call it 'genuine non-alignment' and all that? If it goes in favour of American imperialism, it will be a very bad dry for this country.

Coming to another important point, Sir, namely, the scrapping of the 42nd Amendment, somebody was telling why should it be scrapped, the word 'Socialism' has been added in the Constitution by it? But, that is the only thing that they have added, rest of it is all autocratic. The Congress Party with its majority in this House should try to help us in scrapping the 42nd Amendment. That is what I want because if the Government wants to get a two thirds majority in this House it will be only possible with the support of the Congress Bench and, I am sure, under your able leadership, the Congress opposition will help us to scrap the 42nd Amendment. Then coming to another point...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU) : Kindly make your last point.

SHRI VISWANATHA MENON : I want to say a few things about the emergency, who were the people who were responsible for the excesses, inside the lock up, outside the lock up, sterilisations, and all that? These things must not only be looked into but all the officers, all the people, who are responsible for these things must be punished. Otherwise, if the present Government is also going to run its show according to the whims and fancies of the bureaucracy, the history will be repeated. It should not be allowed to happen. They should rise above these bureaucrats. That is my request.

Sir, I now want to say a few words about the All India Radio. I agree with your criticism as to how the All India Radio has been misused even by the Janata Government. Before coming to power of the present Government, we were hearing all over the country that it is not All India Radio but All Indira Radio. We do not want to make it All Morarji Radio or All Janata Radio. It should be an independent institution. The Janata Party meeting at the Ramlila Grounds was telecast. It is all bad. The officers will try to do these things. At

[Shri Viswanatha Menon]

least the Janata Ministers or the Ministers of the Janata Government should have the courage to oppose it. Such a thing should not be repeated. Today Mr. Chavan, the Leader of the Opposition Party, is speaking over the Radio. I welcome it. Such an opportunity must be given to all the party leaders and arrangements should be made in such a way that opinions of all the parties are known through radio and television and an independent status must be given to them. For achieving this end, I would request the Government to make or convert the All India Radio into a corporation. The employees of the All India Radio have also made such a demand.

Regarding the Samachar also I have got a similar request to make. If you go through the Samachar reports till yesterday it was Om Mehta and Indiraji. Now it is only the Janata Ministers and all that. That attitude must be changed. Everything should get equal coverage. Let the people decide. People must be given a chance so that the democratic sentiments expressed by the President are given effect to.

Sir, I request the hon. Ministers who are present here to take the initiative in all these matters. With these works, I conclude, Sir, and I thank you.

SHRI S. W. DHABE (Miha-ras't'a) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, in the Address, although some policy matters are mentioned, one of the important questions which requires consideration by the Government is—coming from my State of Maharashtra—the border dispute between Maharashtra and Karnataka which has been pending for a long time. In spite of many efforts, such a long pending dispute has not been solved and Marathi area people Marathi Parishad are demanding for a long time that this problem should be settled. I think this Government with its massive majority which they claim, should be able to solve this problem between Maharashtra and Karnataka.

Another thing about which I feel very strongly is that Goa is not given statehood up till now. Goa is a Centrally-adminis-

tered area and the power of the Council of Ministers is equal to the power of the Chief Commissioner. The Public Service Commission there is controlled by the Union Public Service Commission of the Central Government. Sir, the Public Service Commission is for the State; they can select their officers. But that situation does not prevail there. Sir, smaller areas have been given statehood with lesser population. Sir, Goa, Daman and Diu have got a population of 8.58 lakhs while Nagaland has got 5.16 lakhs and Manipur about ten lakhs. Sir, the unanimous demand of the Goa's ruling party and the opposition has been that it should be given statehood. They even have not got a seat of High Court. Only the Judicial Commissioner is there. Sir, Goa, Daman and Diu deserve statehood and because they do not have the statehood, they do not have representation in the Rajya Sabha I hope, Sir, in formulating their policy, the Government will consider the aspirations of the people of Goa and agree to the unanimous demand that Goa should be given statehood.

Sir, there is a mention in the Presidential Address, at page 3, there is a policy statement, to amend Article 352 and also the relevant articles about emergency and President's rule, with the objectives mentioned in the Constitution and not for extraneous purposes. I would like to state that this is a great fallacy. In fact, Part XVIII which deals with Emergency provisions says that 'If the President is satisfied that a grave emergency exists whereby the security of India or of any part of the territory thereof is threatened...' by external aggression or internal [disturbance.. The matter is so clear and it has been specifically stated that the power is given to the President and Proclamation comes before the Parliament for approval. Sir, under these circumstances, it is difficult to say what the Government wants to do by amending Article 352.

Sir, another Article to which a reference has not been made directly but it seems to be in the mind of Government under 'relevant provisions' is about the President's Rule under Article 356. Sir in a demo-

[Shri S. W. Dhabe] cracy it can always take pi ce that one party will be in power at the Centre and another party will be in power at the Statelevel. Therefore, Centre-State relations are to be governed by this Chapter under Article 356. Sir, there is no blanket power to the Central Government to say or direct— as has been stated now in the press by a Messiah of Janata Party—that elections should take place in the States.

There is no power with the Central Government to dissolve any State Assembly. In fact, our being a federal Constitution, this House is very much interested because this is the Council of States. We represent the intrests of the States in this House. Under article 356, the power is limited and it arises only when the President is satisfied that a situation had arise in which the Government of the State cannot be carried on in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution. There is no power under article 356 to dissolve any State Assembly. I, therefore, warn the party in power that if they want to take the drastic action of dissolving the State Assemblies for political purposes, it will be not only against the Constitution, but it will also land then in very great trouble. Article 356 ensures the autonomy of the States, the right of the people to elect their own representatives and to carry on the Government so long as they enjoy the majority support. Action can be taken against the State Governments, as it had happened in the case of the D.M.K. Government, which was dismissed, only when they do not comply with the directives or did not follow the provisions of the Constitution while carrying on the Government. Under the circumstances, there is no power with the Central Government to dissolve the State Assemblies and they have the right to carry on their Governments in their own right. In this connection, I would like to invite the attention of the Government to what had appeared in 'The Times of India' on the 3rd April, 1977 ___ It says:

"The Janata Party and the Congress for Democracy, which together won 298 seats in the recent Lok Sabha elections, polled 43.17 per cent of the popular votes, the highest for any group, an analysis of the results shows."

It aslo says :

"In the South as a whole the Congress however, retained its pre-eminence, polling 41.37 per cent of the votes. Those voting for the Janta Party in the South represented only 24.26 per cent of those who turned out at the hustings."

Therefore, it is very clear that this Government is a minority Government. This is not a majority Government in the sense it has not been able to secure even 50 per cent of the votes. In fact, in the South, they polled less than 25 per cent of the votes. Under the circumstances, I do not think any mandate has been given either in regard to the Forty-Second Amendment or in regard to revoking whatever has been done by the previous Government in the interest of the country. I was surprised to hear the speech of my learned friend, Mr. Menon, the previous speaker, who said that the Forty-Second Amendment should be scrapped. In this connection, I would like to point out two provisions of this Amendment. Does he accept them or not? One is in regard to the question of workers' participation in industry. The Janata Party, in its election manifesto, has also said that workers should be partners in industry. Workers' participation in in-industry is very helpful for progressive management and increased industrial production. The second thing, the most important thing, is in regard to the supremacy of Parliament. The question is whether this House, whatever may be the party enjoying the majority support, has got supremacy or not. Do not the decisions taken by them in regard to the amendments to the Constitution or to any other provisions of the law have finality? The question is whether their will should prevail

[Shri S. W. Dhabe]

or not. Or, is it that, as has been rightly said by the jurists, the third chamber, the Supreme Court, will decide what amendments can be made to the Fundamental Rights and what should not be the Directive Principles? Who will decide the basic structure of the Constitution?

Whether the Parliament will decide or the judiciary which is nominated by the President will decide or some few judges have the right to over-ride the will of the people, that is exactly what has been defined early in the 42nd Amendment of the Constitution. This is a very important milestone in my opinion in the 42nd Amendment of the Constitution, wherein the supremacy of Parliament has been established and the governing principle of direct relation between the people and the representatives in this country has been accepted. Nobody has a right to say that the amendment made to the Constitution—whether the judiciary or otherwise—was not proper, was not in the interest of the people. A majority of the people have given a mandate to a particular party. Certainly, we accept the majority rule. But it has got no right to amend the Constitution. It can be an election issue if the powers of Parliament are questioned. I think the 42nd Amendment has done a great service to the country.

The third point which has been accepted relates to the regional parties, the Shiv Sena in Maharashtra, other Senas in other parts of the country. At one stage, the Chief Minister described himself as the Prime Minister of Tamil Nadu, as if there were two Prime Ministers in the country. It is all given in the report. So, this Constitutional Amendment has stated that we accept national integrity—one nation. Under these circumstances, I feel that those who want to repeal the 42nd Amendment will be making an erroneous approach to the Parliament powers. It has to be considered if any aspect is wrong.

'Regfirdiaf ; the e. Presidential Address I - fiad given certain amendments—amnam'ertts-Nifcc 132ft. 135, and 136. All these amendments relate to two problems. One is about the bonus and CDS and the other relates to the national wage policy and improving the lot of the agricultural workers.- Nothing has been said here or outside whether the 20-point economic programme was a wrong programme. Nobody has said that family planning is a wrong programme. The only thing which they have stated is about its implementation. One of the 'cardinal and important programmes which was taken up related to enhancement of minimum wages for agricultural workers and in the last one year the agricultural wages have been increased. If the Government thinks that this is a welfare measure, I really feel sorry that in the Presidential Address not a single thing has been stated about what would be their attitude to the labour problems and what they would do about agricultural workers. I Agricultural workers today do not have job security. Only in one State they have got the service conditions. Neither they get Provident Fund nor paid-holidays. In order to raise agricultural production, is it not necessary to give a serious thought to the problems of agricultural workers? On page 3 the statement which has been given relates only to the problems of farmers, peasants and cultivators. I do not understand how they could not formulate a policy about rural workers like about farmers and peasants. It would have been more prudent and proper if they have said something about agricultural workers.

Lastly, all are demanding that for payment of bonus, the amendment made in the Bonus Act should be scrapped, the CDS should be scrapped, but it is important and it is high time that the national wage policy is defined at this stage.

6 P.M.

It is high time that the national wage policy is defined and minimum wages are assured to all the labourers. I hope the

question about the national wage policy will be denned and stated clearly. I, am sorry that the Address is silent on this very important and significant aspect.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI
V. B. RATU): The debate will continue

The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M.
to-mocrow.

The House then adjourned at twa
minutes past six of the clock till
eleven of the c:oc< ou Wednesday,
the 6th April, 1977-