

Business	Time Allowed
4. Consideration and return of the Appropriation Bills relating to the following, after they have been passed by the Lok Sabha :	
(a) Demands for Grants (Pondicherry) for 1975-76	1 hour
(b) Supplementary Demands for Grants (General) for 1975-76.	1 hour 30 minutes
(c) Demands for Excess Grants (General) for 1972-73	1 hour
5. Consideration and return of the Finance (Amendment) Bill, 1975.	1 hour
6. Consideration and passing of the following Bills, after they have been passed by the Lok Sabha :	
(a) The Employees State Insurance (Amendment) Bill, 1975.	1 hour
(b) The Constitution (Thirty-ninth Amendment) Bill, 1975.	4 hours

The Committee recommended that the House should sit up to 6.00 P.M. daily and beyond 6.00 P.M., as and when necessary, for the transaction of Government Business.

The House stands adjourned till 2 P.M.

The House adjourned for lunch at two minutes past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at one minute past two of the clock. Mr. Deputy Chairman in the Chair

**STATUTORY RESOLUTION SEEKING  
APPROVAL OF THE PROCLAMATION  
OF EMERGENCY MADE BY THE PRE-  
SIDENT ON THE 25TH JUNE, 1975—  
CONTD.**

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Krishan Kant.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT (Haryana) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I rise to speak in great agony. The kind of fog which descended upon our country has naturally affected all of us. Many of our dear colleagues are missing from these benches of this august House. J.P.—one of the tallest living patriots and verily one of the

last representatives of Gandhian ethos is now suffering incarceration in independent India. This produces a vacuum in our hearts and feelings of loss and anguish. So, what I am speaking today is in search of truth rather than accusation.

A great silence engulfed the country on the morning of 26th June, 1975—the one which was never seen in our life time or Indian history witnessed for more than a century and even during the whole period of our freedom movement. I am reminded of the couple of Faiz, the Pakistani poet:

“ग्रा गई फसले मकू चाक गरेवां वालों  
मिल गये होंठ कोई जहम मिले या न मिले  
दोस्तो बज्म सजाओ कि बहार आई है  
खिल गये जहम कोई फूल खिले या न खिले।”

Why was this necessary?

We know that the arrests were made under MISA in the morning of 26th June 1975 even before the Emergency was proclaimed. In other words Government had all the powers to deal with any kind of conspiracy.

[Shri Krishan Kant]

It has been stated that they are only a handful of people. If only a handful of people were responsible, why the whole nation is being punished? If only a handful of people were involved, as the Government claims, then there is only one logical conclusion that Government has taken this action in panic and out of fear. No wonder the methods used by the Government are also those of panic and fear.

It is very difficult to associate my Congress colleagues Chandra Shekhar and Ram Dhan with rightist conspiracy. Chandra Shekhar has remained radical and leftist and a fighter for the poor. My friend, Ram Dhan, was elected Secretary of the Congress Parliamentary Party by defeating both the candidates of Socialist Forum and Nehru Forum who called each other names as extreme rightist and kit-adventurists inside the Congress. How can these two friends turn overnight right reactionary conspirators? I have always, been, Sir, a Congress Socialist, who believes that socialism in India has to be brought about by the application of Gandhian principles and value system. On a number of occasions, both inside the House and outside, I have analysed the situation in the country and the reasons why we were not able to make progress with our leftist professions. Before one of the AICC meetings, I had circulated an open letter to the Congress President and my colleagues and had warned them about the cancer of black money. It is dangerous, for it leads to black politics and black polity and which in turn leads to politics of murders and assassinations as in South American countries. Again, I wrote four letters for my AICC members analysing the maladies and the possible directions in which the Congress should move and the need! to re-learn Gandhi. I sent those letters to the Prime Minister. But I am sorry, till today I have got no reply.

Sir, nobody stopped the Congress Party from carrying out the radical restructuring-

ing of the economy of the country and taking measures to eradicate poverty. The rightists outside the Congress were too weak to stop us from carrying out the programme. It is certain forces in the party which were too strong to allow us to implement them. Today, unfortunately, it is not the obstructionist forces who have been arrested but Chandra Shekhar and Ram Dhan. Chandra Shekhar's leftism and nationalism is too visible to be recounted here. Ram Dhan, a leader of the weaker sections has been fighting for the cause of the poor and the down trodden. What prevented the Congress and the Government to follow up the 1971 nationalisation and the election manifestoes of 1971 and 1972 with vigorous measures? Which opposition obstructed the Prime Minister and the Government in 1971, 1972, 1973 and early part of 1974? Even though we had the biggest majority, yet we did not have the will to act and implement the radical measures. Besides passing some legislations on paper and making some amendments in the Constitution, what else have we done? Though we had amended the Constitution, we continue to pay high compensation to the companies and industries nationalised or taken over. We have passed land legislations. But they suffer from loopholes. How much land has been distributed on the ground and not on paper? How many house sites have been given to the landless? An honest assessment by Congressmen will itself reveal the truth. The wheat take-over was sabotaged—mostly from within. My warnings at Ahmedabad and Calcutta Congress sessions were ignored. We are now thinking of urban ceiling. What kind of ceiling will it be, we shall see. The Bangladesh war and drought did not stand in the way of implementation of these and other programmes.

I had been raising these questions from 1972 onwards. I pleaded that let us make such promises as we can fulfil. And when these are made after full considerations, they should be doggedly followed

and persons in authority responsible for implementation should be made accountable. The Prime Minister, in her speeches in the Parliamentary Party meeting and elsewhere said that we have to see the difficulties of the Chief Ministers. Asking for implementation was dubbed as ultra-radicalism. In the light of the new euphoria for 20-point programme, I would like to ask—who amongst the Congress leaders have been punished for sabotaging Congress programme during the last few years? Only Krishan Kant, Chandra Shekhar, Mohan Dharia, Ram Dhan. Their only crime known to the people in the country was their total commitment to and continuous insistence upon implementing party programmes and policies both in letter and<sup>1</sup> spirit. If we agitated against malpractices and corruption, it was in the high tradition of the Congress—not only of Gandhi and Nehru but even of Feroze Gandhi whose valiant fight in Parliament against corruption is a golden chapter in Parliamentary history. We wanted Congress traditions and lofty ideals of Gandhi and Nehru to continue to be practised in the daily running of the organisation and functioning of the Government. Was this our crime that we aspired to be true to Congress ideals and as honest Congressmen, attempting in humble way to keep the flame of Congress tradition burning? Today, who are the supporters and enthusiasts of the 20-point programme? Read the censored newspapers. The daily retinue to the Prime Minister's house will show that the saboteurs of the Congress economic programmes are now the enthusiastic supporters of the Emergency. Those who have profited by inflation and sabotage of the Government policies have turned overnight into loudmouthed supporters of the 20-point programme. Let me warn you against such time servers who are supporting her programme as the noose supports the persons to be hanged—to borrow Lenin's terminology. The real reasons why these radical programmes did not get through was because those in power at various levels were not committed to it. have not thought an overall strategy to implement

the programmes, have not created party cadres. The party was not immune from opportunists, reactionaries and black-moneyed men. The vested interests who hailed the bank nationalisation as a radical measures went on to use bank advances for their speculative purposes. Those who hailed most vociferously the *Garibi Hatao* programme and thereafter built fortunes are once again loudly proclaiming loyalty to the 20-Point programme.

Let us face the question who are opposed to 20-point programme? Most of these programmes had already formed the basis of our demands during the national struggle. Jawaharlal Nehru emphasised them and one can read the Avadi resolution, the Nagpur Resolution and find out all these points there. The non-implementation of these programmes was due to the vested interests in the Congress itself and I may warn you that not only at the end of Emergency but even during the period of Emergency, the same vested interests are going to sabotage these national programmes. They were simply interested in creating a situation of confrontation in the country and enveloping the country in a fog so that their nefarious activities go unchecked and uncensored by the public.

I and my colleagues have been advocating dialogue between P.M. and J. P. so that the country could make a breakthrough in the stalemate in which the political and economic system had struck. The voice of sanity was drowned in the din and machination of vested interests. Since vested interests on both sides were pushing them on to the path of collision, we were afraid that if it was allowed to happen it would lead to the entire democratic process to a grinding halt. This is what seems to be happening.

Who will now criticise the non-implementation and rip open the designs of the saboteurs? There is no free press, no free speech in Parliament and these very vested interests at various levels threaten that

[Shri Krishan Kant] any criticism about non-implementation or against them is against the P.M. and the institution of Prime Minister.

A free press is the greatest strength of an efficient democratic system. When you stifle the flow of information to the people in this country you are blocking the channel of information to yourself. By creating an atmosphere of uncertainty and fear in the country, you are not going to increase the efficiency of the system. Rather you are robbing it of any efficiency it might have. We have heard Mussolini for the first time ran trains in time in Italy. We have heard of Ayub Khan bringing down the prices. Jawaharlal Nehru was not taken in by these gimmicks. He knew that these were not the ways of adding efficiency to the system. It is this darkness which is going to breed conspiracies in the country of which this Government will come to know only when it is too late. Till now, if the right reactionaries and left adventurists have not been able to launch on a path of violence in this country, it was mainly because of open society. It was our greatest insurance. Now this emergency and the accompanying blackout gives them the cover they need to hatch conspiracies. Those who brought about this emergency know not what grievous harm they are doing to the nation and to themselves.

It is being argued that the present steps are in the nature of shock therapy to bring the democratic system on rails. We in this country have learnt at the feet of Gandhiji that ends and means are inseparable, rather means are more important than ends. For, he said, that man cannot command results, he can certainly take recourse to right means. If the defects in the functioning of democratic processes are to be removed and brought to pristine glory, greater and wiser recourse to democratic means is essential. All constitutional means are not necessarily democratic and do not lead to the restoration of democratic institutions and processes. History is replete with bitter examples. It

must be realised that all steps have their inexorable inner logic. When you resort to undemocratic; and coercive methods, even with the best of intentions, they release forces with a chain reaction over which one has no control. The person releasing these forces becomes, inadvertently or may be innocently, a prisoner of such forces and does no more remain a free agent, and rolls down the steep precipice driven by these forces. Then a nation has to pay a very heavy price to save its soul.

I am not wedded to the Westminster model of democracy. I am prepared to look at various alternatives. But what we see happening before our eyes is on the one hand the hopeful dream of those who talk of a limited dictatorship becoming a nightmare of full dictatorship and on the other hand the death of parties resulting in a partyless system which was justifiably decried in this country. Any dictatorship which is not based on an ideology will not be the dictatorship of a leadership, will not be the dictatorship of a party or a class but will become the tyranny of the constable, the clerk and the petty official. Let us not be deluded by the sacking of a few petty officials. All this happened not once, twice but thrice in Pakistan, when Ayub Khan took over, when Yahya Khan took over and when Bhutto took over.

Indian freedom struggle has been a glowing saga in the world history. It blazed the trail of a non-violent path for the liberation of oppressed peoples. Many subject nations took inspiration from it. Gandhi and his ideology became a beacon light to Asian and African countries. Nehru tried to imbibe the spirit and establish the parliamentary system and lay the foundation of an open society. The whole freedom struggle was directed towards this end. It was because of the strong and correct tendencies built up through fire and travails that when many newly emergent countries of Asia and Africa, one after the other, fell under dictatorships, India stood as a great bastion of democracy and open society, envy of all developed and deve-

loping nations. My pride and faith has received a rude shock when I find people recommending the throwing away of this precious legacy and follow the examples of other Asian and African countries as a tailender where freedom of press and right of dissent and the right to move the court or the right to know the crime for which one is being punished, the very prerequisites of democracy, have been extinguished. If we are forced on this path, it would mean the negation of the last 75 years of Indian history. Would it not mean as if Gandhi never trod this earth and the whole fight we waged for the propagation of high democratic principles was just a freak unconnected with the past and future?

I had pleaded in my four letters to the Prime Minister, referred to earlier for an ideology derived from the traditions of Gandhi and Nehru and the value system of the freedom struggle. Bereft of ideology, this nation is drifting towards a personality cult, into slogan shouting, gimmickry and into total immobilisation. Cabinet colleagues have not been taken into confidence, senior partymen who have spent their lifetime in the party are not with us today. The men dedicated to the values of Gandhi, Nehru and socialism have been put under arrest. In this situation who is going to implement the 20-point programme? The «State Governments, the same bureaucracy and the same PCCs whose failure is writ large. It is not accidental that this 20-point programme was announced as a justification after the imposition of emergency. Why was this programme not announced at any time before the emergency? This alone could have brought out the whole truth about supporters and saboteurs. Is it not ironical that even after the imposition of emergency the Government have suspended Articles 19, 20 and 21 regarding fundamental rights of freedom of speech and expression and personal liberty but not Article 31 relating to right of property? I leave it to the House and the country to judge the intentions of the Government and the direction in which it intends to go.

The emergency has its international implications. We seem to have betrayed the cause of the third world and I am ashamed to hear suggestions that we should follow the models of some less developed countries in Asia and Africa and betray the heritage of Jawaharlal Nehru. This parliamentary system, all its institutions and the democratic values are his gifts to the nation. It is our democratic system combined with socialistic objectives which made us anti-imperialist. If the democratic values of this country suffer, the imperialists have reason to rejoice. I can well understand why Henry Kissinger has asked his officials not to comment. He should be considering the current development a great victory for the American imperialism. Those who compare India to Chile insult this country, its democratic traditions and the memory of Allende. The present state of emergency, its uncertainty, the foginess, the purposelessness are in the nature of a gift by conspirators to the CIA in its efforts at destabilisation. I shall not be surprised if the idea of the emergency is traced to the brain of the CIA because CIA loves non-ideological dictatorships. No privileges of the privileged classes are being touched. They have been reassured. There is going to be no nationalisation of textile and sugar industries accepted by the Congress long ago. On the other hand the emergency will come down on the workers, on students, the intelligentsia and the fixed income groups. I would like to ask my friends if this is really a swing to the left or whether it is not, in fact, a swing to the right.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You have taken 20 minutes.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : I will finish.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I do not think you can finish it.

SHRI SALIL KUMAR GANGULI : Sir, please do not gag him.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I know what I am doing. I have given him enough time. I will give him a few minutes more.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : There was no real challenge to the Prime Minister in this country irrespective of what a few newspapers may have written, and certainly not from the Opposition. There was not a single person in Opposition who could have stepped into the office of Prime Minister. A week long satyagraha could not have been any more effective than Bihar or Gujarat or Telengana. This fear regarding Prime Ministership could have arisen out of subjective factors or owing to lack of confidence in the Party. The imposition of emergency appears to be gross over-reaction.

Some of the statements in the press attributed to the Prime Minister have alarming and contradictory implications. One does not know their veracity. But they create a picture of confusion and panic.

In one of the interviews to a foreign journal, the Prime Minister very correctly assessed that in this country no dictatorship can be imposed because dictatorship in this vast and multi-ethnic nation will break the country rather than keep it united. Another statement attributed to her says that nation is greater than democracy. These two are mutually contradictory. Another statement attributed to the Prime Minister says that the number of persons arrested is a very small proportion to the Indian population. One wonders if a Prime Minister—Nehru's daughter—can make such statements?

The imposition of an emergency and the climate created by these above statements creates a very unhealthy atmosphere. In fact, the imposition of emergency has increased threat to the Prime Minister because it has increased the chances of conspiratorial politics. It will make the people desperate.

The people to fear are not J.P., Chandra Shekhar, Ram Dhan or Krishan Kant, Goray or Tyagi, who believe in open politics and, in the language of Nehru, who work in the sun and in the light. They have nothing to hide and do not indulge in secret or furtive activity. The new

emergency and the blackout leads to the growth of two types of conspiratorial activities. One, by those who go underground to carry on terroristic activities taking advantage of the closed system. The other is more sinister conspiracies around the seat of power from within the palace circle, where unprincipled sychophants, rank opportunists and time-servers with each other to pronounce their loyalties. It would be pertinent to recall the advice given by Napoleon on the basis of his life-long experience at the time of abdicating, to beware of such deceptive people. He said: "The people to fear are not those who disagree with you but those who oisagree with you and are too cowardly to let you know".

Ho>" tragic it is to see that the sayings of Gandhi, Nehru and Tagore are beint censored in this country by a set of people who know little of the rich heritage they bequeathed to the nation. What the British imperialists could not achieve, the mindless bureaucracy has so successfully achieved today. They are attempting to defeat the unconquerable spirit of Gandhi. Nehru ano Tagore for we the 600 million people of our country have allowed their sayings and writings to be censored.

By taking JP away from the scene, and the way it has been done, it has given a great setback to the tradition of Gandhi. Ghandian techniques are not only relevant to the Opposition but also to the Government. This 20-point programme cannot be implemented without return to Gandhi. I make a strong plea to the Prime Minister to ponder over this point.

f would also appeal at this stage to reconsider this hasty step. In Inaia, we have all been brought up in a tradition of forgetting and forgiving. Even the greatest man of this century, Mahtma Gandhi, admitted his Himalayan blunder. Even if at this stage emergency is removed, normalcy is restored, J.P., the Congress and other Opposition leaders released, I have no doubt that this lapse in our traotion will be forgiven. This is the surest way of

ensuring implementation of any programmes. Continued persistence in the emergency will plunge the nation into politics of confrontation and conspiracy with grave consequences to our sovereignty, integrity and cherished values.

Thank, you.

SHRI UMASHANKAR JOSHI (Nominated) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, this is the most agonising moment in five years of my association with this august House. I came here as a poet and a Vice-Chancellor with what fond hopes and dreams. I thought it was possible for India—an ancient people, though a new nation—to achieve socialistic aims through democracy. One thought that India was cut out for this role, that it would achieve social justice through peaceful means. However yesterday our Home Minister came forward with a plea in favour of emergency, giving up all hopes for democracy in this great land.

He was pleased to lay the blame at the doors of opposition parties and certain happenings in our country. I belong to no party and I would take this opportunity to refer to one detail, about Gujarat. He was not holding this charge when the New Nir-man movement started in Gujarat. I would like to point out to him that in the beginning it was the Congress Party people themselves who saw the rebirth of Mahatma Gandhi in the Nav Nirman Youth. The Communist Party also, as far as I remember, was with the Nav Nirman Youth. It was a different story after the ouster of the Ministry. Why did this happen ? My plea is for a little self-searching rather than laying the whole blame at the door of the opposition. I have been crying hoarse that the ruling party like the musk-deer runs in vain all around for the opposition, for it is within its own self. The learned friends from the ruling party, the younger people, say that the emergency should have been clamped down on the country two years before or so. It would have been good if something had been done to implement the economic programme 22 RSS/75—3.

two years—I would say many more years — before. But that was not done and a political style developed which only hankered after having a huge majority, unmindful of heterogeneous elements which were counter productive and which would not allow forward-looking policies of the party to be implemented.

Sir, I do not want to enter into further details. But even if what the Home Minister said was right regarding opposition parties, does it behave of him to suggest that—If they, the opposition parties, are ruining democracy in our country, Why should not we ourselves deal a death blow to it ? That would be a tragic hour in the life of our country. George Bernard Shaw said that the English people did everything on principle. If they beheaded a king, they beheaded him on principle. Our learned Home Minister says that every thing is within the framework of the Constitution. So today, he will be able, with the majority that his party commands, to stifle the Constitution constitutionally. What does it lead to ?

A clamp-down of pre-censorship has never happened in India, not even under a foreign regime. We are afraid of truth. Where does this fear emanate from, fear which has engulfed the length and breadth of this vast land ? Wherefrom has emanated this dark cynical shadow of fear—I mean, terror—which shows its ugly face all around ? How many walls have been created after the 26th of June ? You want to see that the country is not disintegrated. With one stroke you have disintegrated the country, by switching off all information. Rumours run amuck and truth is strified. This is the fear of truth in a country which has a reputation of being a seeker after truth. This has damaged the image of India all over the world more than anything else.

I should like to press this point and to convey this through this august House to the Prime Minister that when Nehru and Shastri were our Prime Ministers, India, though a developing country trying to pull

[Shri Umashankar Joshi]

hereself out, almost by the boot-strap, from poverty, was a respected country. It held its head high. Nehru before laying down his pen, before writing 'Tamam Shud' to his book "Glimpses of World History" quoted from Tagore.

चित्त जेथा भयशून्य, उच्च जेथा शिर . . .

—where the mind is devoid of fear, where the head is held high, into that heaven of freedom let my country Sfcwake. As Nehru himself said, he was more intune with Tagore than Gandhiji. So long as he was on the world stage, even though his colleagues,- as some people observed, were just Tito, Nasser and Soekarno, he himself always stood taller by a head. He represented a country which held its head high. What will happen to our Prime Minister when she goes abroad ? She thinks very much of foreigners' opinions and rightly so, but the image has been damaged.

Things are doled out from one end and a whole people find themselves only at the receiving end. Sir, may I refer you to what I heard in Ahmedabad ? The message which Vinobaji gave is said to be not merely that this was "Anushasan Parva." It is again rumoured—I have not gone to Wardha and got it verified—that he is reported to have said: Release the leaders. Lift the censorship. —Even if one went to him he is observing Mauna. It is said:—

न तत् सत्यं यत् छलमभ्युपैति ।

It is not truth which takes resort to deception. This is what we have ground lis.

SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPA  
DKYAY: Deception also does Jiot go in the name of irulh.

SHRI UMASHANKAR JOSHI : In this the International Women's Year I would only listen to you.

If some leaders were found hatching a conspiracy, they should have been brought before a court of law. He may be J.P. He

may be Mr. Morarji Desai. He may be Mr. Atal Behari Vajpayee, whoever he may be. One cannot get information about all the persons, there is no mention of persons, there are now only unpersons. But why penalise the people, who the ruling party thinks are, by and large, with them ?

I would like to refer to a harrowing description given in the book of polity, in the Raja Dharma Parva, of the Maha-bharata. Rishi Vyas describes in very agonising terms—

ततो ब्रह्म ननाश है ।

Then was destroyed the vast truth of life. Perhaps in this country in its long history we have arrived at a point where the vast truth of life is being destroyed.

T appeal lo the Members of the ruling party because now there is only one partv. Already there are signs of their heading towards one party rule, towards Presidential type of Government, towards the destruction of the federal structure replacing it by the unitary structure. Already there are signs that the Gujarat and the Tamil Nadu Governments may find themselves in trouble sooner rather than later.

Not being a politician I do net want to enter into a discussion with the Home Minister, but how many Governments have been toppled by the ruling party? How many people have migrated from the Opposition parties even here in this House to the ruling party? We are Nominated Members, Independent Members, not belonging to any party. The ruling party on that side sucks from this side and whatever is left of the Opposition is perhaps the best of them. So put them behind the jail. Have a one-party rule. Have a Presidential type of Constitution. Have a unitary type of Government. This allergy for non-Congress type cf Governments tr.s gone a long way in the ruining of the Tndinn polity.

Yesterday my very dear friend Mr. Raju said that the Congress Party itself cannot



throw up an Opposition. The Opposition has become a sort of allergy with them. There is not much of an Opposition at all. People like me believe that Nav Nir-man would not have taken place in Gujarat if there was an Opposition party. Men like me who have not much time for politics would not have supported agitations or even taken part in agitations because the two parties would be taking care of themselves. This has not happened and that is why I appeal to the Members of the ruling party to do some heart searching. (*Time bell rings.*) I will be brief.

Younger men and women talk lightly of the freedom of the press. People like me who have fought as a young college student have other views in the matter. There are elderly people here. I find the Home Minister himself and white-bearded very revered writer of Punjabi. Shri Gair-mukh Singh Musafir and others are here. What have you been doing all these years? I ask. Excuse me for being so frank with you :—

न सा सभा यत्र न सन्ति वृद्धाः ।  
न ते वृद्धाः ये न वदन्ति धर्मम् ॥

What have you done for Indian democracy ? We are here today at a very crucial hour. Have you gone to the Prime Minister and said that you will be blown but you hold the ideas. Is the Prime Minister on talking terms with thinking people in this country? Now persons to whom Mr. Krishan Kant just now referred, bring people to her lawns whereas she is used to talking with the millions. They bring a few agriculturalists to the lawns in this country of agriculturists. This is a ridiculous phenomenon. Is this the voice of the country? I ask of you revered people in this Sabha:

न सा सभा यत्र न सन्ति वृद्धाः ।

That is not an Assembly where there are not elder statesmen न ते वृद्धा ये न वदन्ति धर्मम् And they are not elderly people—elders who do not speak out what is Right.

Sir, before I conclude I would like to say one word . . . (*Interruption*) though

words have lost their significance. I am a votary of words. I cannot live without the word. I am a poet. I am an artist first and last. By chance I happen to be here. But what can word do to-day ? We have been brought to such a catastrophe. All around there is an unthinking conformism. an euphoria. I do not know how, which does injustice to their own selves and ultimately, to the Prime Minister and more important, to the country.

My appeal to the ruling party in particular and through them, to the leader is: Do not be in hurry to ring down the curtain on the First Republic.

SHRIMATI LEELA DAMODARA MENON (Kerala) : Sir, I would like to support this Motion. Yesterday the Home Minister explained in detail the conditions in this country which necessitated a proclamation of this sort. Yesterday the Deputy Leader Mr. Rain and to-day many of the hon. Members here also seconded the information that was placed before this House by the hon. Home Minister. To-day we heard Mr. Goray speaking in sincerity of the conditions in this country. He also asked with pain whether this is democratic. Sir, this morning Shri Amjad Ali placed before this House the progress that has been made in this country in the economic sector, in various spheres, in spite of the odds we had to fight against.

Now this proclamation has come. In this very House we have supported many proclamations of emergency," and the whole House had supported those motions. Put where it is a question of internal security and instability and an emergency is proclaimed, we do not expect the entire pie of this country to support it because there will be one section that has created that situation, and we cannot expect that section to support this action. Now we are glad that right-thinking people supported the economic measures that the Prime Minister has placed before this country as well as the proclamation of emergency. This morning Mr. Goray referred to the conditions in Kerala. He said that in

[Shrimati Leela Damodara Menon.J.

Kerala the elections are going to be postponed because the people of Kerala do not agree with this action. Sir, I wish to inform the hon. Member that he is quite wrong. I come from Kerala. I came here only last night from Kerala. I know that the people there have really heaved a sigh of relief. We could not send our children to school and mothers waited with agony for them to come back safely home because the conditions were like that. There was no study in the schools. Everything was on a rampage. Young people left schools and colleges and they were on a rampage. Factories did not work. Everything was "go-slow". They wanted more money, the trade unions vied with each other for demands, but no work was done. The prices were spiraling and there was nobody to look after it. Today the prices have come down to some extent. Children are going in peace to schools. Factories have started working with better production. Officers, staff and workers in the offices have come up with a slogan of not going slow and they have offered voluntarily to work for a longer period and for more production. This is the position in Kerala today. Sir, I want to inform hon. Shri Goray that the extension of the term of the Kerala Legislative Assembly is not because we cannot face the people in that State but because we want first, in this state of emergency, to give relief to the people and bring about a change in the conditions that were prevailing which were destroying the economic structure of the country. At the time when the emergency was declared, it was explained that the President was extremely Constitutional and democratic in issuing the proclamation. The Constitutional provisions are there. Why did the makers of our Constitution provide in their wisdom for such a clause in our Constitution? They provided for it because they envisaged such a situation and thought that a time might come in our country when the emergency provision would have to be used. The very fact that the provision is there indicates that it is a necessary thing. All the conditions for proclamation of emergency existed in this country. I would, therefore,

suggest that this question should be considered calmly and dispassionately. Not only the President has made this proclamation, but he has also summoned the Parliament where the representatives of the people of India could assemble and discuss the proclamation. I wish that we discuss it calmly and dispassionately and with patience.

This morning many Members spoke of what they thought was right. Shri Goray said that the emergency has come in the wake of very ordinary process of working of democracy. And he said that he was being earnest. I would ask him to honestly consider and see whether conditions in this country were conducive for the working of democracy. In the name of democracy and in the name of all the facilities and freedoms of speech, press and action that were given to the people including members of the opposition who wanted to sabotage democracy in this country, what was happening in this country? At a time when the nation was going through the worst economic crisis that we have ever passed through and when the Government was taking stern measures to break the powerful money groups who were building up a parallel economy in this country big enough to shatter the economic base of our country and the economic programmes to which the Government and the Congress Party are committed, these attempts were sought to be nullified by the concerted actions of money groups, antisocial elements, political adventurers, frustrated politicians and misguided opposition leaders. They should have shown their anger at the time of general election. But as has been explained in this House, it was not possible for them to get the confidence of the people. Therefore, they were building up a situation not all of a sudden, but for the last two or three years. It started with Gujarat. It went to Bihar and it was spreading throughout the country almost like a civil war. They started attacking all the established forms of Government and members of the legislatures. Shri Goray this morning asked whether it was not possible-

ble to demand the recall of members of legislature. The question of right of recall has always come up and it is a different matter. But today under the existing system, we have the right to go to the pells and at the time of the general election you can discard the Government. But you are attacking elected members and their families making it impossible for the legislatures to function. Is this the way to recall members of legislature? This is not a peaceful or democratic situation created by the members of the Opposition. And they now call for a total revolution. We also want a revolution in this country. We want such a revolution in the economic sphere; we want such a revolution in the cultural sector and we want such a revolution in the social sector because only then this country can rise to the great heights that we expect India to rise. What is the total revolution that they were wanting? They wanted a total revolution in the form of a phased economic programme and reorientation of political leadership. And what is the total economic revolution that they want? I think it was JP himself who said that he wanted a revolution-oriented economic programme and also a programme for economic, for political and for social leadership. These people have said that continued economic crisis is the revolution which they want. That is actually the revolution that they expect. Sir, in this country, at this stage, is continued economic crisis to be accelerated? That will be a fake economic revolution. And, Sir, what is the revolution in leadership according to these people? Sir, as has already been explained in this House, against the unparalleled leadership of our Prime Minister, who is not only the leader of the Congress Party, but is also the symbol of the hopes and aspirations of the Indian people, they have made a combination of the RSS, the Jana Sangh, the Marxists, the Anand Margis, the Naxalites and the other disgruntled politicians. That is going to be the alternative leadership and this is for the total revolution that they want! Sir, they have given a call now for another 1942 movement to change the course of history. If that is so, then, Sir, they have forgotten

that the British have gone out of this country and now it is a popular government that has been installed and that there are democratic procedures to send out governments. These great democrats use agitations, gheraos, attacks, murders, extortions, no-tax campaigns, violent upsurges, etc. to paralyse national life and they use character assassination and slander also. These are the big democratic programmes that have been undertaken. I would like to ask: Is not this sufficient, is not this a sufficient background, to declare a state of emergency to see that the ordinary national life is continued in a peaceful strain? Sir, they have said that ours is the biggest democracy in the world. To maintain that state of bigness, certain restraints have to be observed. Sir, Gandhi's name was again and again raised in this House to say what he thought of democracy. May I also say what Gandhiji had said? Gandhiji said that the highest form of freedom carried with it the greatest measure of discipline and humility. Gandhiji also said that unbridled licence is a sign of vulgarity, injurious to oneself and one's neighbour. Today, the liberty of some of our people had to be suspended because it had become a curse to the nation and it had to be suspended to mobilise the entire physical, economic and spiritual resources of this country for the common good of all. I can say that in this respect, the Government has taken the right step to save this nation.

Sir, Mr. Raju said yesterday that this is a shock treatment to the country and I agree with him. The crisis will pass and the emergency will go. But what we would like is to see the people disciplined who will be willing to co-operate in the implementation of the economic programme that has been placed before the country by the Prime Minister, by the Government and the Congress Party so that this poor country may rise to great heights. Many Members said that the Prime Minister has to be singled out because she is the Prime Minister. But what has the Prime Minister done? Sir, the Prime Minister has today made the common man in this country the hero of our national life and she has made

[Shrimati Leela Damodara Menon.J the rich people, the black-marketeers, the smugglers and other such people shake in their shoes and that is what she has done. And, Sir, what she has done has roused (he ire of those who want to unseat her. I believe that in this critical situation, when the peace and security of the people and the country were about to be destroyed, the Emergency has rightly been declared and I hope that this Emergency will be one of the things that will make the Opposition see reason and create a better climate so that we will be in a position to see that this country goes back to normalcy. Thank you. Sir.

SHRI DWIJENDRALAL SEN GUPTA (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir. the President has proclaimed this emergency. But the President has an obligation under Article 20, when he took the oath of office, to preserve, protect and defend the Constitution. I bring a charge of the misuse of power, abuse of power, and rape on the Constitution, by referring to the decision of Mr. Justice Hidayatullah who, as the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, had the occasion to make an observation in a constitutional matter, which is pertinent on this occasion. He said :

"The President cannot claim a total immunity for his acts from the scrutiny of the Court. Neither the paramountcy of the Grand Mogul who could give sube-darships to his generals as he pleased nor the paramountcy of the British Crown has descended to him."

Mr. Deputy Chairman. Sir, keeping that principle in view that the President has his own limitations, let us analyse, the background of the so-called trouble. T make it clear that I am only anxious, while making these observations of mine, to hand over to the posterity a Constitution and democracy in its masculine majesty.

Now, I would like to draw the attention of this House to page 3 of the publication, "Why Emergency ?". It is stated :

"There was a perceptible deterioration in the food situation in Gujarat from

about the beginning of December, 1973, on account of the inefficient food production during the Kharif season, coming on top of the crippling effects of the earlier droughts in Gujarat and several other parts of the country ... the student community was getting agitated over their rising food-bill. The resultant restiveness was exploited by some of the Opposition parties, particularly the ..."

Now, Mr. Deputy Chairman, you see that it was a purely economic problem, not political problem.

Then, turning to page 7, we find :

"The agitation in Bihar was primarily planned by the student community with the object of ventilating their grievances in regard to the soaring prices of essential commodities, inadequate supply of food-grains to their masses, the growing problem of unemployment etc."

It is a purely economic problem..So, both in Gujarat and in Bihar you find that the present agitation, which has culminated in this emergency, was essentially a local students' problem and economic problem too.

Now, will you. therefore, trace the history of emergency ? It was your creation. The Opposition did not create the food scarcity. They did not pave the ground for emergency .

#### (Interruptions)

Then, turning to page 8 you will find :

"The disturbances from March 18 to 20. 1974, resulted in the death of 27 persons and loss of considerable property. They spread to several other urban areas of Bihar and continued until March 27, J 974 . . ."

Mr. Deputy Chairman, will you see that till then Shri Jayaprakash Narayan was not in the movement either in Gujarat or in Bihar ? On the same page, in the last paragraph, we see :

"They were in search of new issues and new leadership. They approached Shri Jayaprakash Narayan and requested him to assume the leadership of the movement and in early April 1974, they succeeded in persuading him to agree. . ."

Shri Jayaprakash Narayan did not throw or impose himself as their leader. People requested him. They wanted a leader. In March there were so many killings and so many injuries. In April, Shri Jayaprakash Narayan came in the field. And Shri Jayaprakash Narayan came with a slogan : Complete non-violence : Your limbs should be tied and your hands must be tied. Unfortunately, none of the hon. Members of this House posed the question: To what extent Shri Jayaprakash Narayan kept the Bihar situation and the Gujarat situation under control and how this violent move-ment turned into a non-violent one? 3 P.M.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, we have tried to blackmail Jayaprakash Narayan and we have put him in Jail now. In page 23, it is written that Jayaprakash Narayan told the Delhi University students on 1-U-74 that society cannot change from Purli House. People would have to bring about a change. It was published in Statesman. I ask the veteran leaders of the Congress whether they believe in this theory or not. Do you want to change everything from here ? Do you want that nothing should be done from outside ? Jayaprakash Narayan only said that society could not be changed from Parliament House. People would have to bring about a change themselves. What is wrong in it ? People have to take a part themselves of social and economics revolution. Even the Communist Party literature is full of such things and perhaps in more stronger language. Then you will find at page 24 bottom that "while talking to students and youths of Kama-taka at Bangalore on May 6, 1975, he talked about this thing of total revolution." He says that "if you want a revolution, you must, by agitation or satyagraha, compel the Government to do what has not been done for years." Is it a crime ? This is your document. You say now that these are

the grounds for imposing or clamping emergency. Nothing can be more horrible than this.

Then I find at page 25 Jayaprakash saying that the constitution that is being framed is totally adverse to my ideals. As soon as there is a proper atmosphere for it, we shall take a referendum of valid votes of the people and frame a new constitution which will be fully socialistic and truly democratic in spirit. What is wrong in it ? Let us see what Dr. Ambedkar said. I am quoting from the Constituent Assembly Debates, Vol. IX, pp. 1662-63. He said :

"Sir, it may be true that this Assembly is not a representative Assembly in the sense that members of this Assembly have not been elected on the basis of adult suffrage, I am prepared to accept that argument."

This is what Jayaprakash Narayan said. Sir, let us see what this emergency is for. With all the respect for the Prime Minister, I should say she has done a wrong, she has tarnished her image. I consider her as one of the great statesman. But even great statesmen err and take decisions which are tangle both for them and the country. I wish the Government takes thing, in that spirit. This has been a public wrong coupled with public confusion. It has been ill-timed emergency. On the 12th of June, Prime Minister's party faced a debacle in Gujarat. On the 12th of June, she suffered a personal defeat in the High Court of Allahabad.

Within a fortnight what has happened that the people will accept that this Emergency was for the national reason and it was for the reason of the Opposition ? I want data. This book does not give the data. What happened from 12th of June to 26th of June ? The only thing was that on the 25th of June, there was a meeting in which 29th of June was declared to be a day for Satyagraha before the Prime Minister's House. I confess, the Opposition overplayed their cards. There was no business to go to the Prime Minister's House. I

[Shri Dwijendralal Sen Gupta]

may accept that charge only against the Opposition and nothing else. They could have waited for the Supreme Court's decision. Is that the ground for declaring Emergency? I want to know from the Minister who will be replying. If you could have peaceful election in Gujarat in the first week or second week of June—there was a very peaceful atmosphere and there was no national emergency—what happened in the course of one fortnight? You accept the fact that you became terribly afraid of the Opposition and from that hysteria you declared this Emergency. It was a pure hysteria and nothing else. And those who have advised the Prime Minister to declare this Emergency are certainly reaping the harvest. They were non-entities. Now they have become somebody. You create a crisis and make a harvest out of it. Will the Prime Minister retrace her step, will understand the mistake? She cannot implement this 20-point formula. The 20-point programme of her is a very old and stale programme. She could not get anything done in the course of her Prime Ministership from 1966 to 1975—in ten years. She does not know the magic. No Opposition party opposed her in any of those items, rather they were trying for them. Now, you want to hoax the people to create confusion among the people. It is adding insult to the injury.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I am here to defend the Constitution. I am here to defend the sense of democracy that was very much cherished in our Constitution. I will say that these are the facts on the basis of which you could not have declared emergency, however provision in the Constitution might be, it becomes fully mala fide. Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am reading again from the Constituent Assembly proceedings—Volume I, pages 99-100. Dr. Ambedkar said :

"The declaration of the rights of man has become part and parcel of our mental make-up. These principles have become the silent, immaculate premise of our outlook."

Pandit Nehru says at pages 465-466, and I quote:

"A fundamental right should be looked upon not from the points of view of any particular difficulty of the moment but as something that you want to make permanent in the Constitution."

And that is now endangered. What Dr. Radhakrishnan said on that occasion was given in Volume II, page 273, and I shall read it:

"This declaration which we make today"—that was in regard to the declaration of the fundamental rights of man—"is of the nature of a pledge to our own people and a pact with the civilized world."

By this civilized world, he meant certainly the western democracy where these civil liberties are guaranteed, not the liberty as understood by Mr. Harsh Deo Malaviya. He was telling yesterday the countries which have supported this Emergency. They were Soviet Russia, Yugoslavia and Vietnam and Iran. What is the type of democracy there? Are we going towards that democracy. Are we going in for that type of democracy? Is that our cherished goal? Let them declare that. What do the western people say where it has under gone an experiment for over 200 years? (*Time bell rings*) Sir, I shall take only one minute.

Dr. Radhakrishnan, a great son of India, who was the President of India and who adorned the chair of this House as the Vice-President of India had said that 'this declaration which we make today is of the nature of a pledge to our own people and a pact with the civilized world' and that pledge is betrayed, that pact snapped by this emergency and that followed as ordinance and control one after the other.

Edmund Burke had said :

"The people never give up their liberties but under some delusion. The

true danger is when liberty is nibbled away, for expedients, and by parts."

Sir, I want to remind this House that those who sacrifice remain immortal and they do not perish. Those who try to

crush, perish. This is the lesson of history. I quote Lord Byron before I finish "They never fail who die in a great cause" Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Mohan Singh. Not here.

شری محمد عثمان عارف (راجستھان): ڈپٹی چیرمین صاحب— صدر جمہوریہ نے جو اعلان ہنگامی حالات کا کیا ہے اس کے سلسلے میں جو تجویز تائید کی رکھی گئی ہے میں اس کی تائید کرتا ہوں اور اس سلسلہ میں اپنی ایک نظم پیش کرتا ہوں۔

### ہنگامی حالات کیوں؟

آندھی رکی غبار چھٹا روشنی ملی راحت ملی سکون ملا کچھ خوشی ملی  
مایوس غم زدوں کو کرن آس کی ملی جو گن رہے تھے سانس انہیں زندگی ملی  
حسن عمل نے کس کے اجالا سا کر دیا تاریکیوں کا گویا صفایا سا کر دیا  
لیڈر خلاف جو بھی تھا کیا بد دماغ تھا آمادہ فساد تھا فتنہ مزاج تھا  
بربادیوں کا دور تباہی کا راج تھا جمہوریت کا نام تھا مقصد نراج تھا  
کرتوت تھے نا ان کے کسی بھول چوک سے دیوانہ ہو گئے تھے حکومت کی بھوک سے  
سازش یہی تھی فکر یہی ان کو صبح شام کل کارخانے بند ہوں رک جائیں سارے کام  
چیزیں نہ ملنے پائیں ہوں بیزار خاص و عام مفلوج کر کے رکھ دیں حکومت کا سب نظام  
بے باک جمع خور ہوں آزاد تسکری پھیلے تمام ملک میں ہر سمت ابتری  
ھڑتال بند خون خرابوں سے کام تھا تلوار تیر لائھیوں بھالوں سے کام تھا  
سوداگروں سے سازتھا لالوں سے کام تھا ہر طرح ان کو اپنے نوالوں سے کام تھا  
اس سے زیادہ اور تو کوئی ستم نہیں مفلس غریب بھوک سے مر جائیں غم نہیں  
معصوم نوجوان کو بھلانا رات دن دنیائے دل فریب میں الجھانا رات دن  
علم و عمل کی راہ سے بھٹکانا رات دن تخریب توڑ پھوڑ پہ اکسانا رات دن  
بوڑھوں نے اپنے بھوں کو انعام یہ دیا ہو کر بزرگ قوم کو پیغام یہ دیا

[شری محمد عثمان عارف]

ہانون کی حدوں کو کرو پار توڑ دو جتنا نے جو چنی ہے وہ سرکار توڑ دو  
 سر اسکا جو کرے 'انکار' توڑ دو انسانیت کے جامہ کا ہر تار توڑ دو  
 کتنا ہی اچھا کام کرو وہ فضول ہے  
 ہم کو بناؤ صدر تو سب کچھ قبول ہے  
 وہ فوج عند جس کی وفا کا نہیں جواب جس نے کیا ہے ملک کو ہر وقت کامیاب  
 چمکی ہے جس سے دیش کی قسمت بہ آب و تاب کہتے تھے اس کو لائے وہ تقریبی انقلاب  
 اچھا کیا تھا کام کہی وہ بھی مٹ گیا  
 دانشوروں کی عقل کا دیوالہ پٹ گیا  
 بدنام کیسے کرتے ہیں مذہب کا نیک نام رکھیں چھری بغل میں تو لب پر ہے رام رام  
 غارتگری کی چھوٹ نہیں قتل بھی حرام کتنے شریف لوگ ہیں دیکھو تو ان کے کام  
 کیسا حسین فریب تھا دعو کا تھا جال تھا  
 بھانسا اسی کو جو بڑا صاحب کمال تھا  
 ملتا نہیں جہاں میں ان کا کوئی جواب انسان کی کھوپڑی میں پٹیں عیش کی شراب  
 چاروں طرف ہے جنکے سرا سدری شباب ہر شرہاں کا حیر ہر اک عیب ہے ثواب  
 سادھو کو سنت پیر کہ ایسا امام ہے  
 اس کو نمستے دور سے اپنا سلام ہے  
 فرقہ پرست فتنے اٹھانے چلے تھے جو امن و امان کی شمع بجھانے چلے تھے جو  
 جمہوریت کا نام مٹانے چلے تھے جو دستور کے پرچم اڑانے چلے تھے جو  
 اک شیر دل نے ان کو ٹھکانے لگا دیا  
 فتنہ گروں کو ان کی جگہ پر بٹھا دیا  
 آگے بڑھے گا ملک بڑی آن بان سے رکھیں گے ہم عزیز اسے اپنی جان سے  
 کانٹے جدا کریں گے سب گلستان سے لہرائیگا ترنگا یونہی عزو شان سے  
 اس ملک کو جہاں میں بقائے دوام ہے  
 جمہوریت پہ امن پہ جس کا نظام ہے

† [श्री मुहम्मद उस्मान आरिफ (राजस्थान) :

हिन्दी चेयरमैन साहब, मदर जम्हूरिया ने जो  
 एलान हंगामी हालात का किया है, इसके मिलमिले में  
 जो तजवीज ताईद की रखी गई है मैं इसकी  
 ताईद करता हूँ और इस मिलमिले में अपनी एक  
 नजम पेश करता हूँ :-

हंगामी हालात क्यों ?

आधी ककी गुच्चार छटा रंगनी मिली

† [ ] Hindi Translation.

राहत मिली सुकूं मिल। कुछ खुशी मिली  
 मायूस रामजदों को किरन आ सकी मिली  
 जो गिन रहे थे मांस उन्हें जिन्दगी मिली  
 हुस्ने अमल ने किसके उजाला मा कर दिया  
 तारीकियों का गोया सफाया मा कर दिया  
 लीडर खिमाफ जो भी था क्या बद-दिमाग था  
 ग्रामादाये क्रमाद था, फितना मिजाज था  
 बर्बादियों का दौर, तबाही का राज था



जम्हूरियत का नाम था, मकसद निराज था  
करनूत थे न उसके किसी भूलचूक से  
दीवाना हो गये थे हुकूमत की भूख से  
साजिश यही थी, फिर यही उनको सुबो-शाम  
कल कारखाने बन्द हों रुक जायें सारे काम  
चीजें न मिलने पायें, हों बेजार खानो ग्राम  
मफ़लूत करने रख दें हुकूमत का सब निज़ाम  
बेबाक जमाख़ोर हों आज़ाद तस्करी  
फैले तमाम मुल्क में हर मिन्न घबनरी  
हड़ताल बन्द खून खराबों से काम था  
तलवार तौर लाठियों भालों से काम था  
सोदागरी से साज था लालों से काम था  
हर तरह उनको अपने निवालों से काम था  
इससे ज्यादा और तो कोई मितम नहीं  
मुफ़निम गरीब भूख से मर जायें गम नहीं।

मासूम नौजवां को बहलाना रात दिन  
दुनियायें दिल-फरेब में उलझाना रात दिन  
इल्मो अमल की राह में भटकाना रात दिन  
तग़नीब तोड़फोड़ में उकसाना रात दिन  
बूढ़ों ने अपने बच्चों को इनाम यह दिया  
होकर बुजुर्ग कौम को पैग़ाम यह दिया।

कानून की हड्डी को करो पार, तोड़ दो  
जनता ने जो चुनी है, वो सरकार तोड़ दो  
मर उसका, जो करे इन्कार, तोड़ दो

इन्सानियत के ज़ामा का हर तार तोड़ दो  
कितना ही अच्छा काम करो, यह फिज़ूल है  
हमको बनाओ सदर तो सब कुछ कबूल है  
वो फौजे हिन्द जिसकी बफ़ा का नहीं ज़वाब  
जिसने किया है मुल्क को हर वक़्त कामयाब  
चमकी है ज़िगसे देश की किस्मत बजाबोताब  
कहने थे उसको लाये वो तरीबी इंकलाब  
अच्छा किया था काम कभी बह भी मिट गया  
दानिशवर्गों की अक़ल का दिवाला पिट गया  
बदनाम कैसे करने है मजहब का नेक नाम  
रखें छुरी बग़ल में तो लब पर है राम राम  
ग़ारत गरी की छूट नहीं कल्ल भी हराम  
कितने शरीफ लोग हैं देखो तो इनके काम  
कैसा हमी फरेब था, धोखा था, जाल था  
फामा उसी को जो बड़ा साहेब कामाब था

मिलता नहीं जहाँ में उनका कोई जवाब  
इनसान की खोपड़ी में पीयें ऐश की शराब  
चारों तरफ है जिनके मुरा मुन्दरी शबाब  
हर शर है उनका खैर हर इक ऐब है सबाब  
साधू कि सन्त पोर कि ऐसा इमाम है  
उसकी नमस्ते दूर से अपना सलाम है  
फिरकापरस्त फितने उठाने चले थे जो  
अमनो अमां को शम्मा बुझाने चले थे जो  
जम्हूरियत का नाम मिटाने चले थे जो  
दस्तूर के परखेंच उड़ाने चले थे जो  
ईक शेर-दिल ने उनको ठिकाने लगा दिया  
फ़ितनागरी को उनकी जगह पर बिठा दिया।  
आगे बढ़ेगा मुल्क नई आन बान से  
रखेंगे हम अज़ीज इसे अपनी जान से  
कांटे जुदा करेंगे नभी मुलिस्तान से  
नहरायेंगा निरगा यूँ ही अजबो जान से  
उस मुल्क को जहाँ में बकाये दवाम है  
जम्हूरियत पे, अमन पे जिसका निज़ाम है।]

SHRI K. S. MALLE GOWDA (Karnataku): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, not for Indians only but for humanity itself this session of Indian Parliament is fateful and historic. This session of Parliament has a great bearing, a great impact on the human freedoms, human dignity and human living.

Historians, great writers and thinkers arc-waiting in the wings of the stage of the world where the drama of the world is being enacted to write the history of Indian democracy since the rebirth of the nation in 1947, write the history of the fifth Parliament of India—a creature of the Indian people themselves—the fascinaing history of the fantastic ascendancy to power and to near absolute power of a fragile, inno- cent looking gentle lady from our midst. ! and the history and course and tale of the I largest free democracy in the world.

Sir, a good many of us today have pass-| ed the Central Hall of Parliament, that august Hall which proclaimed and ushered in freedom to our country barely 28 years i ago, that august Hall where sat some of ; the great freedom fighters of the world. i where today the portraits of Gandhiji,

[Shri K. S. Malle Gowda.]

Nfchruji, Vallabhabhai Patel and other great leaders of this country who loved the people of India, who fought for the emancipation of Indian people and who dreamt to make this docile nation the greatest free democracies of the world, are watching the Members of Parliament of today who sit in that same great hall where they too had sat and thought of the Indian people and thought of their economic emancipation. What were their sublime thoughts for the Indian people, and what are the slavish and selfish thoughts of some of us !

History will record whether we have been worthy descendents of those great democrats who would defend democracy to death, and whether we at least honestly *try to* defend democracy.

I appeal to my brethren here to think of what human rights, human freedoms and human dignity they gave to the people of India and unto themselves, think of all the abridgements of human rights which we have subscribed to so far in this House in its existence of 28 years. Have we then fallen from the lofty pedestal of human beings and lost our conscience, human dignity and become slaves to our own selfish ends to become human tools to curtail human freedom and human rights to our children and grandchildren ?

Sir, barely 28 years ago, we won our sweet independence. Our constitution embodying human freedom human rights, and giving freedom of press, freedom of speech, freedom of worship to the Indian people, was written. Today, the thinking people of India including many stout democrats in the ruling party itself cannot say that we are a free democracy after the declaration of emergency in peace-time followed by the killing curbs on press freedom. The opposition leaders have been whimsically put behind the bars. They have been prevented from participating in the vital discussions here and voting on vital issues concerning the nation. No reason is given to them for their detention. They are denied the right to seek justice from

the courts of the land. The people of India in the modern world do not know what is happening in the country. Only the songs of Government are sung and only all the glittering Government news which is not gold, is given. Parliament has met in darkness, discusses in darkness. The poor, silly voters are denied news about the discussions in Parliament on vital matters relating to their basic freedoms. Under these conditions, can it be said wrong or mad to say that democracy is kept in cold storage as it is ? Sir, it may not be wrong to say that if the Britishers had only been as subtle as this Government, as sharp witted as this Government and its bad advisers and given no news about the arrests and detention of Mahatmaji. Nehruji and other great leaders and dealt with the people of India as cruelly and ruthlessly and as calculatedly as is being done now, they could have continued their rule at least for half a century more.

Sir, democracy has been demolished in Bangladesh which was part of this ancient nation only 28 years ago. Democracy is not functioning in Pakistan which was part of India till recently.

At least we Indians should vow not to go the way of Bangladesh and Pakistan but preserve, protect and strengthen democracy in this part of the world and every Indian should be able to boast of nurturing a shining illumining, guiding the largest free democracy in the world for humanity to marvel at as in the case of the British American and Japanese democracies. It is an irony of fate that today Mrs. Indira Gandhi, daughter of Pandit Nehru, one of the greatest democrats of this world has been instrumental in clamping the emergency in peacetime and in the taking away of the freedom of speech and the freedom of the press in the country. Many Indians today are stunned and dazed. A great many Indians cannot believe that the Prime Minister who has herself made a great contribution to our freedom struggle, Mrs. Indira Gandhi who was loved so dearly by Gandhiji—Father of this nation—will

ever be instrumental in extinguishing democracy or even abridging human rights and human freedoms in the country whose people have given with faith such immense power to her. I appeal to her on behalf of the people of India, on behalf of the democrats of the world to announce in this session of Parliament complete restoration of press freedom. Only by this measure she can give the lost image to India and give a great measure of happiness to the Indian people. Such joy and happiness, not 20 but even 2000 more of her economic measures cannot give.

Sir, it is very strange that people are being told that emergency is disciplining the life of the nation and that with the emergency good of the nation can be achieved. Sir, it is the normal duty of a civilized Government, the fundamental duty of an institution called Government to ensure discipline in the nation, to keep law and order in factories and fields in the streets and in the entire nation and ensure uninterrupted production and distribution, to put down corruption, smuggling, anti-social and anti-national activities, to collect taxes, to ensure proper attendance in the offices. Do we require emergency to solve the river rows and border disputes? Then the Government proclaims its inability to function normally if it requires clamping of emergency to enforce these normal functions in the country. Sir, I want to bring to the attention of the Prime Minister that a few senior Congress M.Ps have told me that in many States even Congress opponents are being harassed by the Congress Governments, let alone the harassment perpetrated on the shopkeepers and others by the police. It looks as if the emergency is being misused as in a police State. All this will lead ultimately to make the people begin to hate the ruling Congress itself and bring about a sudden explosion, convulsion and revolution in the country. I appeal to the Prime Minister to lift the emergency within the next one month ...

SHRI OMPRAKASH TYAGI : Just now; why one month ?

SHRI K. S. MALLE GOWDA: . . . without yielding to the relentless pressures tactics of sycophants and opportunists who have nothing to loose but everything to gain at (he expense of her tall stature which she has built for herself in her own right and on her own merits.

May it please God to keep this the greatest free democracy for all time. Thank you, Sir.

THE PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY, MINISTER OF ELECTRONICS AND MINISTER OF SPACE, MINISTER OF PLANNING AND MINISTER OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI): Sir, I am sorry that I have not been able to listen to the speeches in this House as I was in the other House, but I have no doubt that from our side all relevant points have been made and the situation as it exists today has been explained. Hon. Members will appreciate that the decision to declare an Emergency was not one that could be taken lightly or easily, but there comes a time in the life of a nation when hard decisions have to be taken. When there is an atmosphere of violence and indiscipline and one can visibly see the nation going down, then it is time to stop this process. Some people say that our measures were too drastic. They point to persons and ask which one was endangering the future of the country. The question is not one of personalities. Nor do I think that by themselves these leaders could have done anything that one could pick up and say: "Well, this has created violence." But if you study what has been happening in the last four years, you will find there has been a steady increase of violence, of indiscipline and of crime. It does not mean that the leaders or the others were wanting crime, but somehow the shelter they gave to all kinds of groups and individuals and the call to *n-volt* led to this permissiveness. Perhaps each one of these things by itself was not so serious, although the call to the Army, the police and the industrial workers to revolt was serious enough. Even then I would say that each thing by itself perhaps would

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi.] not have landed us in trouble, but it was gradually weakening the very fibre of national life.

Some Members of the Opposition have rightly blamed us saying we should have taken some action earlier. I do admit that had I taken action earlier, it would have been less drastic action. But somehow I thought: "Here are responsible people. People who have been our colleagues. Whatever they may say today, they will stop when they feel that the limit has been reached beyond which no party and no individual should go in any system, especially in a democracy. The other systems, of course, do not permit such action." Suddenly we found that there was no such limit, that people who wanted very radical measures were willing to join with those who were extremely conservative and whose views on foreign policy and other matters were entirely different. In that process every section of the population seemed to be losing its moorings.

You have only to look at the newspapers. An atmosphere of falsehood, an atmosphere of calumny was being spread, and it was having its effect amongst the people. I do not think that anyone could sit seriously and say that in the situation as it was developing, anything positive could be done.

Some people ask why we did not implement the economic programme before. Who stopped us? I shall not say that any person or any group stopped us. But the atmosphere did stop us. Amongst industrial workers there was a tendency to go on strike, to make demands. The employers on their side also felt that they could take advantage of the situation and they did take advantage. Whether it was the traders, the farmers, or any other section of the people, they felt that this was the time when they could get something for themselves regardless of the effect on the nation. The administration also became lax as it was bound to, when people are trying to get files out of offices, trying to

get all information, true or false. So it was this deterioration in all spheres of national life which was a threat not only to our democracy, although that is great enough, but a threat to our very survival as a nation. It did threaten our unity. Shelter was given to parties which did not interpret unity or integrity in the manner that we had done all these years, as the founders of this democracy had envisaged. This was a big danger. The question was whether one should allow this deterioration to go on or put a stop to it. It is very difficult to measure how drastic a step is or should be.

Perhaps we also were led astray by the newspapers\* because they raised such a hue and cry. Now everybody says that the agitation was small. But at that time the Opposition did not say that it was small. They said that the entire nation was up in arms, that the entire nation was behind these agitations. This was the picture that was painted by the newspapers, a picture of distortion, of misrepresentation, not all the papers but a section of them. That was the picture of India that was built up or was being shown in many newspapers abroad.

Sir, there is poverty in almost every country of Asia and Africa and even in some countries which are not on these continents. Yet only India's name was always bracketed with "Starving". Anything that India did was wrong. Whether it was in the field of science, whether we won a war or whatever we did, if India did it it was wrong and if another country did it, it was right. If we have a peaceful experiment the whole world comes down on us. When other countries explode bomb for military purposes nobody says a word. This was the atmosphere within the country. Whatever the Government did was wrong and anybody who opposed the Government was right. If the Opposition Members said that the battle would be taken on to the streets there was no comment on it. Had any one of us said this, what a tremendous hue and cry would have been

*Emergency*

raised! If anybody from our side had said that we should not co-operate with the Government in Tamil Nadu or in Goa or some other place what a noise there would have been. But, when the Opposition said something openly and again and again, nobody seemed to take any notice of it.

AN HON'BLE MEMBER : No, no.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Now I am told that some newspapers claim that they did protest. It may be, in passing they might have said something. But there was no noticeable disapproval that this sort of call to disruption should have evoked.

The Marxists were called the greatest democrats in India. The R.S.S. was called a truly nationalist organisation. Now, Sir, these are contradictions in terms. To say that the Marxists believe in democracy . . .

DR. K. MATHEW KURIAN : We do.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : It is your version of democracy. But it is not my version.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, now.

DR. K. MATHEW KURIAN : We do not believe in dictatorship.

*{Interruptions}*

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I do not think that these remarks needed any notice. Everybody knows the sort of Governments that Marxists have had. It is known all over the world. If you think that there is a greater freedom under a Marxist Government, well, I would ask other hon. Members : Is that the type of freedom they want?

DR. K. MATHEW KURIAN : Yes, the CPT. They will tell you.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Is this the freedom you want? *{Interruptions}*. So this is not the question, their remarks can be treated as a joke and nothing else.

Similarly, the RSS. We have known its history. This organisation came into being when all of us—I think there may be a few young Members who were not here, but the rest of us—were very much here. We saw how it grew. We saw how it spread hatred. We saw how that atmosphere of hatred resulted in the assassination of the greatest Indian. Can we believe that that organisation has suddenly changed? Right up to two years ago, we have only to see what they wrote, what they spoke, about Mahatma Gandhi, what they spoke even about democracy. They do not believe in democracy, whatever they may say about it today. These were the groups that were taken in this wide sweep that was going to eradicate corruption, that was going to clean up society, that was going to bring "total revolution".

There have been many kinds of revolutionary party because now there is only one party away the rights of the people as well as revolutions that give rights to the people. It has been our endeavour to give rights to the people. And in that process, it has been necessary sometimes to curtail some other rights. For instance, the right to property. In any civilised life, some people have to give up something so as not to encroach upon the rights of others. And that is the only right that we were taking away. I am not talking now about the Emergency. I am talking of what we were trying to do before. Before every election rumours would be afloat that the Congress was not going to have the election. From 1969 onwards, they started saying, "Oh, she will never have the election. The Congress will never allow the election." Well, we did have the election in 1971. but when we had it one year earlier, we were blamed—"Why did you have it one year earlier?" The same people were urging on the floor of the House that we were a minority Government and must have elections. Then came the time for the U.P. elections in 1974. Again it was said that we would not have elections. That we would not have the courage to have elections in U.P. Well, we did have elections in U.P. Now we have had elections in Gujarat. It is true that we wanted to *put them off* by a

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

couple of months because we thought it would make a difference to our drought relief programmes. But still when a certain situation arose and somebody felt very strongly, we said, "All right, let us have the elections". We did not think it was a matter of principle. What did we experience during the election? Was it the Congress which disrupted people's meetings, threw stones and wounded people? And before that in the Gujarat agitation—was that democratic functioning? I should like to know in which country of the world would anybody say that forcing, intimidating, threatening duly elected members to resign is considered part of the democratic system. But that is what happened. Not only that, I do not remember now whether a mother who was concerned or the father, but one MLA was told "Your four-year old son will be kidnapped if you do not sign the resignation letter". Is that any part of democracy? Is that the kind of democracy that these people want to bring in this country? One of our senior members had suffered a heart attack and was in hospital. People went there and beat him up in the hospital. Was that democracy? Was that freedom of action and freedom of expression? And did we start all that and much more?

Today people have the temerity to say that I cannot stand criticism. What have I not tolerated these four years? What has not been said about me? What falsehood has not been uttered? What character assassination has not been done? Did I say a word about it? Did I abuse anybody? I do believe that there is plenty to say about other people. If we did not say it, it is not because there is nothing to say. In every single State we have enough to say about those people who have supported the anti-corruption movement. What are their reputations, I would like to know. Why is it that they had to go out of politics and sit in the dark? Let us not forget things so easily. But we did not speak about these matters because we did not want to lower the standard of public life or standard of democracy that our

country wants. Because the propaganda concerned me personally, I bore it in silence. But when it came to the State, when the country was threatened, I had to do something.

I do believe that the country was threatened. I can take this House into confidence and say that this is not merely my feeling. A number of heads of State and Government also felt that way. They asked: "What are you going to do to your country and to stop this rot?" They spoke when I visited countries or when they visited us. The whole world thought that we were letting this country go down. But did our opponents care what was happening? Were they bothered when the students cheated? Was it any concern of theirs when buses were burnt? No, that is all part of democracy, they said. But if any Congress member said anything, even to protect himself, then they complained loudly. In this House, we have seen how a small number of people, hardly six or seven, have shouted down the Chairman and not allowed the larger number to exert themselves. And that was democracy. But, if one of our Members stood up, then the entire Opposition would stand up and shout and protest: "Simply because they have a brute majority, they are not allowing us to speak." All these things we have seen and watched, not for one month or a few months, but for four whole years. A time comes when patience is exhausted. That time is here" now. I want to make it clear that it had nothing whatsoever to do with my case, so far as I am concerned. But it did have something to do with the case, not because of me, but because the Opposition thought that this was the moment that they could press hard, that this was the moment to wipe us away, whether it meant chaos to the country or disunity to the country or whether it opened out the country to foreign attack or threat or pressure. They were not bothered about that. Indira Gandhi wants to stick to the chair, you say. If you do not want the chair, why are you doing all these, may I ask?

*Emergency*

The words democracy and truth have been twisted and misrepresented and given a different meaning. Democracy is a much-abused word. Marxists are democrats though they wish to eliminate a whole class; R.S.S. men are democrats, even though according to them Christians and Muslims do not have equal rights. Perhaps that is one form of democracy. Our democracy is different. Our democracy means giving mere rights to the people. But by 'people' we do not mean a section of the people. We mean all the people. Some people think that certain classes who are rich are not people, but others are people. Some people think that people of one religion are people and of other religions are not people. All kinds of distinctions are made. For us, however, every citizen of India is a person and every person individually goes to make the people. But there are some groups who have been set upon through the ages. We think we cannot have real unity, we cannot have peace or harmony in society, unless those who have been oppressed are helped to rise up. I can say without any hesitation that in these last years we have given them more opportunities than they have had before. I do not say that we have given them all that they need. We are very far from that. We have not been able to give them all the food they need or shelter or education and many other things. But we have given them a new self-confidence and I think that is a very big thing. We have given them the courage to speak out and that is a very big thing.

Take the minorities. I remember, not so many years ago, when I was the Congress President there was a State where the people thought that a particular person could be the Chief Minister. But, when I took his name, everybody said, "You cannot have a Muslim Chief Minister in a Hindu-majority State". Would anybody make such a remark today? When I proposed Dr. Zakir Husain's name for President, I was told, "Well, it is a good name; but he cannot be elected. How can we have a Muslim President?". But we did make him the President. Can anybody doubt it?

22 RSS/75—4

Does anybody doubt today that any Muslim can become President or have any position? This does not mean that they are all getting a fair deal. By no means<sup>1</sup>. But we have opened out the doors that were closed and locked. I had personally been told that this door could never be opened. We said that we would open it and we did.

We know that the Harijans have a lot of difficulties and they are subjected to atrocities. We know that they have not the full opportunities which they should have. But we know also that they have greater chances now than they had before. Today, if you see the composition of the Assemblies, you will see that there are far more people belonging to the so-called backward classes than at any previous time. How has it happened? By themselves or because we made efforts to see that they got there?

It is very easy to pull down something that has been built with hard labour. Somebody remarked that the Congress acted in panic and fear. I cannot speak for everybody. But I can speak for myself. I have many faults. But panic and fear do not belong to my character. Whatever I do, I do after giving it serious thought, and very calmly and coolly. There are moments to be excited. But the time of decision is not a time of excitement. It has to be a cool-headed decision and this decision was taken keeping everything in view and yet, I say, it was not an easy decision to take. It is because by nature I am a person who does not believe in restricting people, children or grown-ups. But when you see the people destroying themselves, you have to act. The Opposition was not destroying us, the Opposition was destroying India, of which they are also a part and I think they would have got wiped out much sooner than we, because of our sheer numbers, if not anything else. But it was they who got so over-excited and as some newspapers said, they were practically hysterical. That was why this measure had to be taken. It was, as I have said, a painful necessity.

*Emergency*

t Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

It has been said that if we go further, there will be confrontation. Has there not been confrontation all these four years? And it was not of our making. We could have arrested anybody; we could have done many things. But why didn't we do so? Because we were avoiding confrontation. But the confrontation came to us. It could not push us from our place. We stood by our programmes and we stood by whatever we had said. But our opponents confronted us with hatred. If it comes, you have to meet it. We do not commit aggression. But if aggression is committed, that aggression has to be met. That was why this action was taken.

There is a French saying to the effect: "This animal is wicked. It defends itself when you attack it". This was what was happening to us. We were being hit and we were being maligned. But if we defended ourselves, we were called the wicked ones. Things can be tolerated for so long, and no further. And that point had been reached. Now, you can say that it was a wrong step. You can say that it was too drastic a step. But the step is there. If you want to weep over spilt milk, by all means you can do so, as you have been doing all these years. Instead of looking forward, instead of seeing what kind of India has to be built and what is the role of the Opposition in it, you have always been looking back. And that is why you have not succeeded.

No Country in the world keeps on electing the same party. Why does it happen here in India? This is because the Opposition never has anything positive to say. It functions only on the negative side, only on the maligning side. Why should anybody trust it? You may get elected in one election. But the public will never elect a government which is negative in its point of view. And this has been the position, in India. Each party, if it stood by its principles, has a good chance of growing

well, perhaps not all parties, but most of them. The actions of some parties!), whatever their desires, can only be called anti-

national. Those who do not want to give full rights to the minorities are not acting in the national interest.

Perhaps we have not been firm enough in curbing monopoly. Maybe we have not acted strongly enough because of some constraint or the other. But at least we know what has to be done. And we are moving in that direction, however slowly. There is a section who think that our direction is wrong. They believe that everything should be left to market forces, and if in the process weak people are crushed, so much the worse for them. I do not think they are acting in the national interest, specially in a country with such great diversity and such a vast and poor population.

What is the first thing to do in a country like India? It is to ensure its unity. If unity does not remain, where will democracy be? Who will be a democrat? What will happen to democracy if the country is not there?

I said that we have lost these four years. But don't think that we have not done any work in these years. Please look at the story of what we had to face. Before Bangladesh, there was in 1966 one of the worst periods of drought and famine this country has known. We barely recovered from it, when we had a political crisis. Then we had Bangladesh. We had the refugees. We had the war. We had nearly one lakh prisoners of war to look after. And then again we had a series of droughts. But in spite of that, agricultural production grew. We made notable achievements in science, in technology, and even in education. In every sphere we went ahead. I doubt whether any country facing all these difficulties has been able to take such steps. It was not the Prime Minister who has done this. It is the Indian people who have done this—Indian scientists, engineers of India and other bright young people of India.

When I say 'student trouble', I do not mean that all students are creating trouble. It is a very small number, a handful of



them. But they manage to disrupt the life of the large majority. I do not know how many of you travel by trains. I have heard that on a short distance train journey, the chain was pulled 30 times. Trains were late by three hours or four hours. In one case, the engine driver got so irritated that he disconnected the chain. But at the next junction, students beat him and threw down all the fire, and the train was late by another six hours or so. But no member of the Opposition would say that this was a wrong thing done by the students who are supposed to be leading the nation.

This was the total revolution that India was to have. This was the democracy that was wanted in India. I have no hesitation in saying that we do not believe in that kind of democracy. I may tell you what kind of democracy I do believe in. It is that the ruling party has a responsibility towards the opposition and the ruling party allows the opposition freedom of expression and freedom of organisation, but it also expects that the opposition parties and those who are not in any party will not prevent the Government from functioning and will not come in the way of national programmes. When we took over the wholesale trade of wheat, some opposition parties went to the farmers and told them not to take their wheat to the market. Was that a nationalist thing or a democratic thing to do? I am just giving a few examples. There are thousands of such examples. What has happened in different parts of India during the last couple of years or more. Responsibility has to be on all sides. There are areas where you might say: "we cannot co-operate. With you and we do not agree with this policy and we will fight it". That is understandable. But to say that we will not allow the grain to move at a time of scarcity of food is not democracy.

So, believing a little bit of the newspapers, we also thought that it was as a kind of deluge and would all be swept off by it and I thought that we had to take a risk and face the deluge. We took the step. What do we find? It was not a bang

but a whimper. Once there were no newspaper, there was no agitation. The agitation was in the pages of the newspapers. If you ask why there is censorship of the press, this is the reason why. If nothing else has proved it, this has proved it. I have no doubt that had the newspapers come out and started inciting people, as they did before and as unfortunately they have done in times of communal trouble, there would have been a terrible situation. Our task was to avoid such a situation and we avoided it.

We have now to see about the future. Fortunately, the mere declaration of Emergency has brought about a feeling of discipline amongst the people. It has given them a feeling that a new opportunity has come to them. It is for us to take hold of that opportunity. By us, I do not mean the Congress alone. I mean all the people of India. This is the question which is before us. If we can inculcate this spirit of discipline and this spirit of co-operation in some areas at least, then we can go ahead faster. Nobody wants this type of situation to continue for ever. Nobody, and especially not a responsible government, can sit back and say: "well, we shall allow you to do what you like whether you want murder or anything else."

So, I should like the hon. members to think deeply over these issues. We have had many days of debate on various subjects. But somehow I get the feeling that they are debates for the sake of debate. Nothing comes out of them. What are we going to do afterwards? This is the time when we should all think what will come out of this. Abusing the Government is not going to help. If it helps you to let off steam, do it by all means. But it is not going to help to get democracy back on the rails when it had been derailed and this is what we want to do.

We want to have greater decentralisation. We want to give greater involvement and participation to people in all areas, whether it is industrial workers, whether it is farmers, or whether it is women. But it can only happen if the Centre is strong

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

enough to hold the country together. if you just have decentralisation without anything that holds the different parts together, then the country goes to pieces. But there are some people who want the country to go to pieces. This is the issue before us today. The Opposition is angry and it has been so angry for so long that I should have thought by now it would have worked some of that anger out of its system. But if it hasn't, I hope, it will do so quickly so that we can all, as I said in my broadcast, get on with the job. Thank you.

SHRI KRISHNARAO NARAYAN DHULAP (Maharashtra) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir with your permission, I would like to put my say on record regarding the Motion moved by Shri Brahmananda Reddi in connection with the Declaration of Emergency under article 352 of the Constitution. Sir, since yesterday I was hearing with full attention the speeches of the Members on the Treasury Benches. And today, I had an opportunity to hear the Prime Minister also.

[The Vice-Chairman (Shrimati Purabi Mukliopadhyay) in the chair.]

I heard her speech with rapt attention but I do not understand what the circumstances in the country at present warranted the declaration of Emergency. There is the ordinary law of the land and that ordinary law of the land is sufficient to deal with any situation that is prevalent in the country. Madam, much has been said about forcible resignation of elected members of different legislature bodies, particularly in Gujarat and Bihar. This House came with an amendment to the Constitution and in any resignation given by any representative of the people, if the force has been used, then that resignation was not to be treated as a resignation and his membership was not to stand as cancelled. So, there are ways and means to deal with the situation by the use of the ordinary law of the land. When I heard the speech

of hon. Shri Brahmananda Reddi, he misstated the facts of arson, loot and murder. For four years, these incidents were continuing in the country. And for that too, there was the law of the land. If they had used the law of the land, there would not have been any situation for declaring this Emergency. At present, as a matter of fact, there is no agitation. It was some one or two years ago. But the decision of the Allahabad High Court is the main crux of the situation. Opposition, of course, wanted Mrs. Indira Gandhi to tender her resignation as there was a court decision against her. And, therefore, they were requesting the Prime Minister to tender her resignation. And in support of the leadership of the Prime Minister, all over the country, the Congress started a movement, the Congress started a sort of an agitation, bringing people to the capital of this country. And lakhs and lakhs of people were gathered here to show their allegiance to the Prime Minister of India, to show their faith in the leadership of Mrs. Indira Gandhi. So, that was the atmosphere created. And, therefore, naturally, the Opposition wanted to tell the people that it will be the better and the real democratic for the Prime Minister to tender her resignation.

That was the crux of the whole situation and in the wake of that situation this emergency was declared.

Madam, some of the leaders of the opposition parties do not see eye to eye ideologically and otherwise. In spite of that some of the leaders of these opposition parties were arrested before the emergency was declared. So, my hunch is that first the emergency was declared and then a frantic search was made by the hon'ble President of India and the Prime Minister to find out the causes for the declaration of emergency. Madam, we can very well see and notice particularly after hearing the speeches of so many Members from the Treasury Benches that the emergency was proclaimed because of the opposition parties as they are to be blamed. They talked

about the results of the elections in 1971 and 1972 when opposition "lis flooded to the ground by the massive majority of the Congress elected members. So, there is no opposition, no strong opposition as such. When the Prime Minister gave an interview to a newspaperman, a question was put to her, namely : Those who had supported these agitations had claimed popular support. Did they really have such support ? Madam Prime Minister replied : No. The mischief makers are only just a few. This is what she further said : It is obvious that no lawful Government can allow these few misguided elements to endanger the rights of the vast majority of people. As the situation was becoming grave, emergency had to be proclaimed to bring it under control. This is the whole reply given to the question. But the first line itself is very important. She said : No. there is no popular support to these people who are waging agitations against the Prime Minister 01 whatever activities they are indulging in this country. She further said : The mischief-makers are only just a few. Then, was not the law of the land sufficient enough to deal with these mischief makers who are only just a few. Then, where was the necessity of the declaration of emergency in this country.

Still, the Madam Prime Minister has said that the people are with her. Yes, there is no doubt about that. People are with her because there is a massive majority in this House and also in the lower House. People support her. People voted in favour of the Congress Party. Even now, after the declaration of emergency, we read in the papers that large numbers of people are coming out to support her leadership and they are supporting the declaration of emergency. Whether they are doing it by force or not, I am not aware of it. But, force is being used. In certain local bodies, the Congress members are telling other people, other representatives of the people, in local bodies, may be in a panchayat or a municipal council, that if they do not support their resolutions, they are going to be arrested under MISA. What happened in Poona ?

डा० ब्रह्मपति साह जोधरो : बिनकुल गान बोल रहे हैं।  
सही बात है। मैं बता रहा हूँ।

SHRI KRISHNARAO NARAYAN DHULAP : Madam, in Poona Corporation, the opposition party was in power. Two of the members were arrested under MISA. Then, others too were threatened by the Congress people saying that if they did not turn to the Congress Party, if they did not "come over to the Congress Party, they would be arrested under MISA and because of fear some members crossed the floor. This thing happened, Madam, may I tell you, because of the declaration of emergency. Do you know what forces are let loose ? -

The police officers are now moving about telling the people 'your names are there ; please see what you can manage'. They have started collecting money.

AN HON'BI R MEMBER : A cock and bull story.

SHRI KRISHNARAO NARAYAN DHULAP : There are the forces they let loose because of the emergency. It's a fact.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY) : You have two minutes more.

SHRI KRISHNARAO NARAYAN 1)111  
1) AP : The other Members have been given half an hour or even an hour. At least 15 minutes should be given to me.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY) : No. Ten minutes for you.

SHRI KRISHNARAO NARAYAN DHULAP : Madam Prime Minister said that when the Government was thinking about taking over of wheat trade, certain Opposition Members sometimes asked the farmers not to bring their grains to the market. May I ask whether Shri Brahma-nanda Reddi who moved this motion that when the Chief Ministers' meeting was called by the Prime Minister when this

[Shri Krishnarao Narayan Dhulap]

thing was in ojlng whether to take over wheat trade, the Chief Ministers of certain States—and if I remember aright even Shri Brahmananda Reddi who was the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh at that time—not opposed that move ? Who are the persons coming in the way ? We are not the persons who are coming in the way of the implementation of the progressive policies adopted by the Government. On the contrary, what programme has been declared during the emergency ? The 20 or 21-point programme which has been declared is not a new programme. All these things were taken into consideration and declared earlier in the year 1969 when there was split in the Congress. At that time, Madam Prime Minister used to say that Morarji Desai, Nijalingappa and others were coming in her way in implementing these progressive policies. Then they started saying that for these progressive policies to be implemented the Congress, there should be a majority of the Congress Party, there should be a stable government in different States. Barring the two States, Tamil Nadu and Goa, in all the States, and at the Centre, Congress got a massive majority. If I am allowed to say, they have a brute majority in spite of having such a massive majority in both the Houses and at the State level also, why these policies have not been implemented ? Now they start telling that the Opposition is coming in their way, and therefore this emergency has been declared.

And some of the Congress Members have published certain things because they have every right to publish ; others are prohibited from publishing their views because of emergency. What do they say ? They say that there were some of the reactionaries 'subversive plans in which the CIA and its stooges were playing an important role. This was known to the Government for the last two years. If these stooges of CIA are known to the Congress Party for the last two years, what action have they taken ; and if not, why they have not taken any action against those stooges ? The CIA and their stooges are there in this country. The

Congress people are knowing that they are there in this country for so many years. Why action has not been taken ?

Last point I want to mention, and that is regarding Sheikh Abdullah.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY) : I am not giving any more time.

SHRI KRISHNARAO NARAYAN DHULAP : There is only one point I have to mention. The emergency was declared on 25th June, 1975, and in Jammu & Kashmir it has been declared on 29th of June, 1975. I want the hon'ble Minister to state why four days' time lag has been there. It is only because they wanted to consult Sheikh Abdullah to declare this emergency.

In emergency also, what right has been given to Sheikh Abdullah ? I am quoting from the newspaper ; how it appeared in the newspapers during emergency. I do not know. This is from Hindustan Times, Monday July 14, 1975 :

"Sheikh Warns 'deserters'

SRINAGAR, July 13 (PTI)—Chief Minister Sheikh Abdullah declared today that element who "deserted me for personal ends" in August 1953 when he was ousted from office would not be allowed to stage a comeback into the newly re vived National Conference." Further he stated . . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY) : I would not allow. Please sit down. You have taken your time. Yes, Shri Brahmananda Reddi now.

SHRI KRISHNARAO NARAYAN DHULAP : I am just finishing. Only the last point. Madam.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY) : No, you have taken 15 minutes and you are not entitled to more than that. You are only an Independent member and not entitled to the time which is allotted to other parties. You

have taken 15 minutes' time and please sit down. I am not giving you any more time, not even a minute.

SHRI N. G. GORAY : He is finishing.

SHRI OMPRAKASH TYAGI : Let him finish.

SHRI KRISHNARAO NARAYAN DHULAP: Only last point, Madam.

Shri Abdullah further stated :

"He told the "Martyrs Day" rally tonight that those who "let loose repression" after his removal from government would have to make an "open confession of their guilt" before they could be allowed to join his ranks.

He was of the view that it was not impossible for "events of 1953" to repeat themselves. "If you allow such events to repeat, then that would be the end of your freedom and beginning of permanent slavery" he said.

Sheikh Abdullah says that if the Congress rule comes over there, then there will be slavery of the Kashmere people. This is what he says. I want to know what action the honourable Home Minister is going to take about it about this threat to Congressmen in Kashmir.

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDY) : Madam, Vice-Chairman, I have been listening to the speeches of hon. Members these two days, and I feel gratified to find that many hon. Members on this side as well as Bhupesh Guptaji on behalf of the C.P.I., the A.D.M.K. and some other friends have echoed practically, the assessment . . .

SHRI N. G. GORAY : "Echoed" is the right word you have used.

SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDY : . . . and the appreciation I made of the situation in this country in the last 4 years. I thank them for their co-operation and their support. At the same time I felt a little pained to see some of the speeches made by the members belonging to the

opposition ranks. Just now, Prime Minister made a very spirited reply. It was a reply not only to the Congress but to the opposition as well.

All of us and our leaders have adopted a Constitution wherein there is responsibility not only on the Government and the majority party, but also on the minority. As I said even in my inaugural speech, the rules of the game of democracy must be played not only by the majority party, but also by the minority party, so long as we accept the system of parliamentary democracy in this country. Now, Madam, I, do not say lectures, but many types of advice have been given by very respected leaders. I have great respect for them and I have regard for them. I have respect for their service and experience, but why do they not say the same thing to some of the opposition parties and their leaders who are doing something which is extra-parliamentary and extra-constitutional ? Certainly, as the Prime Minister said, in all these years, even when many undesirable things have been happening not only against the party and against the Government but also against her very person, they have been tolerated. As she rightly said, they have come to a pitch when, in the interests of the nation, in the interests of democracy and in the interests of discipline and purposeful progress of this country, no longer such a type of situation could be tolerated. As I have said even before, now certainly in a democracy you have a right to approach the people and convince them. Seek their support and seek their co-operation and unseat the Government in power. After all that is allowed. It has been done in this country in several States. In 1967 many opposition parties formed governments, but if they had fallen because of their own contradictions, we could not help it. Therefore, my submission that if democracy is to survive in a disciplined manner, in a manner where benefits can reach the poorest people of the country, in a manner which can take the masses of this country to higher levels not only economically but also morally

[Shri K. Brahmananda Reddy] politically, certainly I think the leaders of the opposition parties, who are respectable people, who are fairly aged and who have grown in this process during the independence movement and afterwards, must be able to understand that in a democracy there are no short-cuts to power. If you just form a party and the next day you want to form a government. It is well-nigh impossible in any democracy and more so in this country. You have to labour hard. You should have an ideology. You should have a programme. You should try to implement it and you have to convince them of your sincerity. You have to tell them : Please give us support and we will do things better. That is the only way. If you think that you can form a BKD party today and a BID party tomorrow and then come to power the next day, it is impossible. Let me honestly tell you. I have also had some experience, though not as much experience as some of you. In 1967 it was a negative vote. I know it and I come from the Andhra area. We had received this rebuff. In the year 1952 as many communists entered the Legislature as Congress people. Previously it was the forte of the Congress. They said : You please stay out for some time. but what did they do afterwards ? Then they came to realise that we were doing things better and naturally in the course of less than one and a half years we saw that in an Assembly of 196 members, there were hardly thirteen communists. About 170 or 180 were Congress people. My submission to the leaders is this. With all respect to them I say this. Suppose you are dissatisfied. what is the way ? Is a no-tax campaign the way ?

Is a Janata sarkar the way ? Is Janata (lahil the way ? Is it sending students to go into the streets and not attend colleges in one year the way ? I just want to know. Supposing you have partially succeeded is that going to last ? Cannot others do the same thing ? Therefore, that is not a system or the tradition in which all of us have grown. Many friends, our learned Vice-Chancellor, have said that our tradi-

tion is different. You follow the tradition. You go the way in which democracy has to function. Certainly, get the approbation of the people and then form governments. Nobody has any objection to it.

Just now the Prime Minister said that no party can remain in power for a long time. Certainly, in democracy parties may change. When Mr. Mariswamy was speaking I thought he was doing a Kathakali dance on a robber ball. He was trying to say he has respect, he has regard, he owes allegiance to the Prime Minister. He was reverence for the Prime Minister but at the same time he condemns all that she says . . .

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY : No allegiance. I am not her party Member.

SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDY : You have respect. You have regard. You have reverence. Everything you have but you condemn all that she says.

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY : I have only admiration.

SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDY : Excuse me. You are a friend of mine. Therefore, I am taking a little liberty with you. You are very solicitous about the image of the Prime Minister. Very rightly as an Indian you ought to be . . .

DR. K. MATHEW KURIAN : He is performing folk dance from Andhra Pradesh.

SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDY : After all, what is the Prime Minister ? A Prime Minister of a country or a President of a country is a person in whom the real authority vests as the symbol of the country. It is through them that a nation gets respect or disrespect. You may attack the policies. You may attack the programmes. You may say that this is bad and that is good. You may criticise the Government, as I said even before harshly, but you are denigrating the very office of the Prime Minister. Whom are you denigrating ? Are you not denigrating our OWD country and thereby lowering the image of this great country . . .

SHRI S. S. MARISWAMY : I have not done that.

SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDI : You have to make a distinction. Now, Madam, my friend was saying yesterday that we have not seen this thing in England. But has such a thing happened in England ? Has any Opposition leader done anything like this in England ? Did he ask the students to go into the streets and throw stones on some others ? Did they ask for a no-tax campaign ? Did they ask for any Janata *adalat* other than the Government *adalat* ? Did they ask the police and the army to revolt ? That is what I want to know.

DR. K. MATHEW KURIAN : Shall I give you an example from England ? The Parliament and democracy there were born in the midst of the biggest gherao called the Magna Carta.

SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDI : All right. But Mr. Kurian, when you spoke I did not disturb. However irrelevant you are I bear with you. Therefore, as the Prime Minister just now rightly remarked it is not a question of abusing any X, Y or Z. It is not a question of being against a particular party. It is a question of a nation's survival. It is a question of how to function since the nation has to progress. The question is under what discipline, with what purpose, with what future in view you have to progress. That is the real test. Parties may come and parties may go but the nation survives. If the nation has to survive, if either you have to rule or we have to rule, there must be a disciplined nation for you to rule.

And that discipline can come only when all these fissiparous tendencies, when all this encouragement to violence, when all this encouragement to all types of rumour-mongering will stop. These, as she said somewhere else, would shake the confidence of the people, would shake the nation's will and the nation's faith in its own progress. How can we survive ? Sir,

22 R.SS/75—5.

there may be deficiencies, there may be lapses there may be many other things which we have to proudly improve upon and make things better. But all the same, if you really do not inspire the necessary confidence, if the people whom you want to involve in every type of activity of yours, in the representative institutions at the Central level, at the State level and at the local levels, are not giving their cooperation if you shake their confidence, if you destroy their will, if you weaken them, how are you going to get their support ? And even if you get that support, are you going to fulfil your obligations ? Therefore, my submission to you would be that this type of thing must stop in the interest of the nation. Now, Mr. Krishan Kant was speaking here. I was listening to him. He asked : Who came in the way of the 20-point programme or some other programme ? It is not a question of somebody coming against it or trying to thwart that programme. But if the nation has no discipline if you have not right type of administration, if you have not an atmosphere of confidence amongst people, of cooperation amongst people, amongst the majority party and the minority party, you cannot go forward. After all, democracy goes by discussion and consent. And even if you oppose each other, it does not matter. Let the people understand that these are the policies and these are the programmes on which the majority party and the minority party differ, and let them choose who is better. Therefore, my submission is that the type of scandals that have been going on must stop. If a Bill is introduced for checking smuggling, that very day you condemn it. You say the Congress Party or the Government party is in league with smugglers. You spread all types of rumours, that they have taken this, they have taken that they are in league with them and so how they can implement it. If Lalit Narayan Mishra was a victim of a dastardly attack on the 2nd of January, before Dikshitji reaches Patna, by the time we wake up in the morning, we see in the papers in cold print that somebody else is responsible for the mur-

[Shri K. Brahamananda Reddy] der. If some accidental deaths happen on the road, if natural deaths occur, you say they are calculated murders. If something happens, immediately, the next moment, you say something. Do you think people believe this? And even if people believe, it will be a short-lived glory for you. It can only be a momentary thing. It will not last. People will know the truth. As Shakespeare said, truth must be out to-day or tomorrow. Therefore if you have only patience to wait or B while, truth will be out. What do people think of these rumour-mongers? What confidence do you create in them? Therefore, this type of loose-talk, this indiscipline, this cynicism must go from the national life. Then alone will India survive whoever is the Prime Minister. If the Opposition parties think that we have many lapses, we have not implemented our programmes, we have failed in the implementation of our programmes, that is a golden opportunity for you to criticise us, to go to the people, explain to them, tell them that we are incapable of implementing our policies. You do not do that. You want to create . . .

DR. RAMKRIPAL SINHA: How can we new?

SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDY : Please. Not now, you had many years to do that. And if you give encouragement like this what will happen? My friend was saying that Jayaprakash Narayan only asked the police to act according to their conscience.

I wish Shri S. S. Mariswamy who says that Tamil Nadu is his Government goes and tells his Chief Minister : "Whenever you issue an order to the Police, you ask them not to obey, but first consult their conscience and if their conscience is not satisfied, ask them to go a *Vakil* and find out what is the legal position and then try to implement it". Respected Tyagi ji also said the same thing about our Defence forces. I do not have much experience with them, but from whatever I know our

Defence Services are a disciplined, loyal and patriotic force.

Therefore, my submission is that we have to understand our tradition. I do not want to say further. Yesterday Shri Prakash Veer Shah said that the Parties can come together. Can Dr. Kurian and my friend Shri Veerendra Patil agree? Impossible. Shri Veerendra Patil will be swallowed in just two minutes. Therefore, when ideology is diametrically opposite there is no question of joining, whatever people may say for outward purposes. You know what Shri Jayaprakash Narayan has said about these parties. You won't believe me. If I read out you will probably be enlightened.

Looking at the picture as it is, it seems impossible that the scattered political fragments of the Opposition with severe controversies, their widely differing and often contradictory ideologies, personal ambitious and interests of its leaders can be bound together in any viable manner.

This is the opinion which Shri Jayaprakash Narayan has given.

SHRI N. G. GORAY : You have put him in jail for this?

SHRI K. BRAHMANAND REDDY : I have not put him in jail for that. I am only saying what Shri Jayaprakash Narayan has said of all parties individually and collectively. I would also like to lead one other passage.

SHRI N. G. GORAY : What is his opinion about your Party?

SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDY : His opinion with regard to our Party is not very relevant because we have the capacity to take care of ourselves. Because you do not have, either individually or collectively, the capacity to take care of yourselves, you have to depend on his services.



श्री ओम प्रकाश श्यामः श्रवणं श्राप, कांश्रम  
श्रीर मस्तिम लीग श्रीर मी०पी० दाई० एक साथ  
चल सकने हैं तो दूसरी पाटियां उस में साथ-  
साथ क्यों नहीं चल सकती ?

SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDY :  
I am not against it. You can combine if you  
want. I am not saying anything against it. Five  
or six or eighteen of them can combine. I have  
no objection. I am only submitting that parties  
with so much divergence either in ideology or  
programme, even if they combine, cannot  
inspire any confidence amongst the electorate  
to get to power in a democratic way.

That is all what I say. I am not saying  
anything else. You can combine with five, six,  
ten or fifteen. Nobody has got any objection  
to that. It is your right and the freedom of  
association is guaranteed. But F would also  
like to say what opinion Jayaprakashji had of  
the RSS.

"The RSS is like an iceberg. A part of it  
is visible and the greater part is invisible. It  
is a secret or a semi-secret organisation and  
certainly not a cultural organisation. I am  
sure that there are less known things  
spreading the same kind of poison. This  
propaganda is like stocking dry powder in  
the community and when the match is  
struck, there is an explosion."

Now, as late as 1968—that was in 1948—he  
has said like this :

"Following Gandhiji's murder, the Sangh  
was under the shadow. There were many  
protestations about its being a cultural  
organisation. But, apparently emboldened  
by the timidity of the secular forces, it has  
grown full and has emerged as the real  
power behind and the controller of the  
Bharatiya Jana Sangh. The secular  
protestations of the Jana Sangh will never  
be taken seriously unless it cuts the bonds  
that tie it so firmly to the RSS machine.  
How can the RSS be treated as a cultural  
organisation as long as it remains the  
mentor and an effective manipulator of a  
political party'."

DR. Z. A. AHMAD : Why are you giving  
these quotations which are old ? He has  
given a certificate to the RSS recently. Don't  
give these old quotations.

SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDY : I  
am coming to it . . .

DR. Z. A. AHMAD : Don't go to 1948 or  
1963 or 1964. It is all confusing.

DR. K. MATHEW KURIAN : Dr.  
Ahmad should be there to reply . . .

(*Interriptyany* I

DR. Z. A. AHMAD : You Marxist friends,  
so and join the RSS.

SHRI OM MFHTA : They have already  
done it.

SHRI Eft. BRAHMANANDA REDDI :  
Recently, in a conference in Delhi, he has  
said :

"If you are a fascist, then I am also a  
fascist ..."

DR. /.. A. AHMAD : Don't quote all these  
things. We know it.

SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDY :  
AH right. Thank you. My submission is that  
it is true and I agree with Prakash Veer  
Shastriji when he said about the misuse. If  
there is any chance of misuse of these  
regulations by the various officers, I would  
like to say that the Prime Minister has already  
advised all the Chief Ministers to be very  
careful and to see that it is not misused, that it  
is not used against the law-abiding citizens  
who do their normal activities. Certainly, you  
come within the yrip of the arm of law only  
when you do extra-parliamentary or extra-  
constitutional things under this Emergency.  
Therefore, my submission is . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Mr.  
Brnhmananda Reddi. we have come to know  
of a number of American officials, the CIA  
men. who Were involved in the conspiracy  
during the last month and we-vvanled to  
publish their names. The facts

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

were absolutely terrifying, the facts about their movements. But we were not allowed to do that. Will you make them known to all because these people should be identified. I have got their names, their particulars, details about their movements, their ideas and all these things are with me. But we cannot just say a word about them. Why these people should be shielded, I cannot understand.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY) : Do not start any arguments now. Let the Minister reply. You have already said all those things. Let him answer now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Madam, facts are one thing ; argument another.

SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDY : What Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has said, I will bear in mind.

Madam, there is nothing much for me to say now except that the type of violence that this country saw in the year 1974—I have got the facts and figures now, but I do not want to trouble you with those things now at this late hour—was more if you compare it with the previous years. Hence this Emergency. If you appreciate it properly instead of merely trying to put forth your party's point of view for the sake of putting forth, if you appreciate the democracy that is existing in our country, if both of us follow the rules of the game, if you can think that the nation is on its march as the Prime Minister has said, if you can bring about discipline and if you can see that the administration at the Centre and in the States works more energetically to implement "the 20-point programme or any other programme that may be undertaken, certainly, all of us will be doing a great service to this country.

I am not going into the question of economic programme just now, because my friend tells me that a day or two has been allotted for discussion of the economic programme. I may take part in the proceedings for a while.

श्री श्रीधर प्रकाश त्वाणी : मैं आपसे एक चीज पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आपने, पार्लियामेंट के सदस्यों जो यहाँ बोल रहे हैं उनकी स्पीच और विचारों को प्रेस में प्रकाश होने से क्यों रोका ? इसमें कौन सी डेमोक्रेसी है ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY) : The question is . . .

श्री महावीर त्वाणी : मैं अपनी स्पीच में यह कहा था कि मिनिस्टर साहब हम को यह बताये कि जो डिटेन हैं उनका टोटल नम्बर क्या है ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY) : The question is

That this House approves the Proclamation of Emergency made by the President on the 25th June, 1975, under clause (1) of article 352 of the Constitution as also the Order of the President dated 29th June, 1975, made in exercise of powers conferred by subclause (b) of clause (4) of article 352 of the Constitution, as applied to the State of Jammu and Kashmir, applying the said Proclamation to the State of Jammu and Kashmir.

*The House divided.*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY) : Ayes 136 ; Noes 33.

#### AYES—136

Abdul Samad, Shri A. K. A.

Abid, Shri Kasim Ali

Adivarekar, Shrimati Sushila Shankar

Ahmad, Dr. Z. A.

Alva, Shrimati Margaret

Amla, Shri Tirath Ram

Amjad Ali, Shri Sardar

Anandam, Shri M.

Arif, Shri Mohammed Usman

Avergoankar, Shri R. D. Jagtap  
 Banerjee, Shri Jaharlal  
 Berwa, Shri Jamnalal  
 Berwa, Shri Jamnalal  
 Bhardwaj, Shri Jagan Nath  
 Bhatt, Shri N. K.  
 Bisi, Shri Pramatha Nath  
 Bobdey, Shri S. B.  
 Borooah, Shri D. K.  
 Bose, Shrimati Pratima  
 Buragohain, Shri Nabin Chandra  
 Chakrabarti, Dr. Rajat Kumar  
 Chandrasekhar, Shrimati Maragatham  
 Chaturvedi, Shrimati Vidyawati  
 Chaudhari, Shri N. P.  
 Chaurasia, Shri Shiv Dayal Singh  
 Chettri, Shri Krishna Bahadur  
 Chowdhary, Dr. Chandramanilal  
 Chowdhri, Shri A. S.  
 Das, Shri Balram  
 Das, Shri Bipinpal  
 Deb Burman, Shri Bir Chandra  
 Dhabe, Shri S. W.  
 Dikshit, Shri Umashankar  
 Dutt, Dr. V. P.  
 Dwivedi, Shri D. N.  
 Gadgil, Shri Vithal  
 Goswami, Shri Sriman Prafulla  
 Gujral, Shri Inder Kumar  
 Gupta, Shri Bhupesh  
 Hashmi, Shri Syed Ahmad  
 Himmat Singh, Shri  
 Imam, Shrimati Aziza  
 Jain, Shri Dharamchand  
 Jha, Shri Kamalnath  
 Joshi, Shri Jagdish  
 Joshi, Shrimati Kumudben Manishanker  
 Kalaniya, Shri Ibrahim  
 Kalp Nath, Shri  
 Kalyan Chand, Shri  
 Kamble, Prof. N. M.

22 RSS/75—6.

Kapur, Shri Yashpal  
 Kesri, Shri Sitaram  
 Khan, Shri Khurshed Alam  
 Khan, Shri Maqsood Ali  
 Khan, Prof. Rasheeduddin  
 Kollur, Shri M. L.  
 Kripalani, Shri Krishna  
 Krishna, Shri M. R.  
 Krishnaswamy, Shri K. A.  
 Kulkarni, Shrimati Sumitra G.  
 Kumbhare, Shri N. H.  
 Kureel, Shri Piare Lal *ur* Piare Lal Talib  
 Lokesh Chandra, Dr.  
 Lotha, Shri Khyomo  
 Mahanti, Shri Bhairab Chandra  
 Mahanti, Shri B. K.  
 Mahapatro, Shri Lakshmana  
 Makwana, Shri Yogendra  
 Malaviya, Shri Harsh Deo  
 Mali, Shri Ganesh Lal  
 Mehta, Shri Om  
 Menon, Shrimati Leela Damodara  
 Mishra, Shri Rishi Kumar  
 Mondal, Shri Ahmad Hossain  
 Mukherjee, Shri Kali  
 Mukherjee, Shri Pranab  
 Munda, Shri Bhaiya Ram  
 Murthy, Shri B. P. Nagaraja  
 Musafir, Shri Gurmukh Singh  
 Narasiah, Shri H. S.  
 Nizam-ud-Din, Shri Syed  
 Nurul Hasan, Prof. S.  
 Panda, Shri Brahmananda  
 Parashar, Shri Vinaykumar Ramlal  
 Patil, Shri Deorao  
 Patil, Shri Gulabrao  
 Pradhan, Shrimati Saraswati  
 Prasad, Shri Bhola  
 Prasad, Shri K. L. N.  
 Punnaiah, Shri Kota  
 Puri, Shri D. D.

Rachaiiah, Shri B.  
 Raha, Shri Sanat Kumar  
 Raju, Shri V. B.  
 Rao, Shrimati Rathnabai Sreenivasa  
 Rao, Shri V. C. Kesava  
 Reddi, Shri K. Brahmananda  
 Reddy, Shri Gaddam Narayana  
 Reddy, Shri Janardhana  
 Reddy, Shri K. V. Raghunatha  
 Reddy, Shri Mulka Govinda  
 Refaye, Shri A. K.  
 Roshan Lal, Shri  
 Savita Behen, Shrimati  
 Seyid Muhammad, Dr. V. A.  
 Sharma, Shri Kishan Lal  
 Shukla, Shri Chakrapani  
 Shukla, Shri M. P.  
 Shyamkumari Devi, Shrimati  
 Singh, Shri Inder  
 Singh, Shri Irengbam Tompok  
 Singh, Shrimati Jahanara Jaipal  
 Singh, Shri Kameshwar  
 Singh, Shri Mahendra Bahadur  
 Singh, Shri Mohan  
 Singh, Shri Nathi  
 Singh, Shri Parbhu  
 Singh, Shrimati Pratibha  
 Singh, Shri Ranbir  
 Singh, Shri Sultan  
 Singh, Shri Triloki  
 Sinha, Shri Awadheshwar Prasad  
 Sukhdev Prasad, Shri  
 Sultan, Shrimati Maimoona  
 Swu, Shri Scato  
 Talib, Shri Niranjana Singh  
 Tanvir, Shri Habib  
 Thakur, Shri Gunanand  
 Tilak, Shri J. S.  
 Tiwary, Pt. Bhawaniprasad  
 Totu, Shri Gian Chand

Tripathi, Shri Kamapati  
 Trivedi, Shri H. M.  
 Varma, Shrimati Narayanidevi Manaklal  
 Vyas, Dr. M. R.  
 Wajd, Shri Sikander Ali  
 Yadav, Shri Shyam Lal

## NOES—35

Abdul Khader, Shri M. S.  
 Alva, Dr. K. Nagappa  
 Anandan, Shri T. V.  
 Deo, Shri Bira Kesari  
 Dhulap, Shri Krishnarao Narayan  
 Ganguli, Shri Safil Kumar  
 Goray, Shri N. G.  
 Gowda, Shri K. S. Malle  
 Gowda, Shri U. K. Lakshmana  
 Joshi, Shri Umashankar  
 Kadershah, Shri M.  
 Kanchi Kalyanasundaram, Shri  
 Krishan Kant, Shri  
 Kunjachen, Shri P. K.  
 Lakshmanan, Shri G.  
 Mariswamy, Shri S. S.  
 Mathew Kurian, Dr. K.  
 Mathur, Shri Jagdish Prasad  
 Menon, Shri Viswanatha  
 Misra, Shri Lokanath  
 Natarajan, Shri C. D.  
 Patel, Shri D. K.  
 Patil, Shri Veerendra  
 Sen Gupta, Shri Dwijendralal  
 Shastri, Shri Prakash Veer  
 Singh, Shri Jagbir  
 Singh, Shri Sitaram  
 Singh, Shri T. N.  
 Sinha, Dr. Ramkripal  
 Sivaprakasam, Shri S.  
 Tyagi, Shri Mahavir  
 Tyagi, Shri Omprakash  
 Varma, Shri Mahadeo Prasad

*The motion was adopted.*

lead. It mentioned only the names of the participants whereas Shri Brahmananda Reddi's speech was reported fairly fully and high-lighted. This morning's newspapers reporting of the proceedings is also on the same lines. We cannot but protest most emphatically against such unfair reporting of the proceedings which tells the country the Government's point of view in regard to the emergency without indicating what the Opposition has to say on the floor of the House on this very vital subject.

It is clear that this has been done in accordance with the instructions issued to the Press and the A.I.R. by the Chief Censor on the 20th July under the heading "Guidance for the covering of Parliamentary proceedings." It is not indicated if these instructions that the speeches of Members of Parliament participating in the debate shall not be published in any manner or form though their names and party affiliations may be mentioned, were issued with or without the approval of the Chairman.

We have, therefore, been compelled to ask ourselves the question whether continued participation in the further business before Parliament on these terms would serve any useful public purpose. The decision to amend the Constitution to make the proclamation of Emergency non-justiciable makes the consideration of this question more urgent and immediate. It is evident that the Government, having already denied the entire people of the country the basic fundamental rights is now determined to ride rough shod over the rights of the Members of Parliament.

Taking all relevant facts into consideration and bearing in mind in particular the fact that leading Members of Parliament have been incarcerated, we are satisfied now that no useful purpose will be served by our taking part in the further proceedings of this session of Parliament, for it is clearly in no position to discharge the functions of a free and democratic Parliament.

,--,,J

*the State of Nagaland*

[Shri N. G. Goray]

Madam, with this, we all of us withdraw from the House.

*(At this stage some hon. Members left the Chamber)*

-----

**STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE. THE  
CONTINUANCE IN FORCE OF  
THE  
PROCLAMATION ISSUED BY THE  
PRESIDENT IN RELATION TO THE  
STATE OF NAGALAND**

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS  
(SHRI K. BRAHMANANDA REDDY) :  
Madam, I beg to move the following Resolution :

"This House approves the continuance in force of the Proclamation issued by the President on the 22nd March, 1975, under article 356 of the Constitution, in relation to the State of Nagaland, for a further period of six months with effect from the 26th September, 1975."

All of you are aware that a situation had arisen in March, 1975, in which the Government of Nagaland could not be carried out in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution thereby necessitating the issue of the Proclamation dated 22nd March, 1975, regarding Presidential Rule in Nagaland. The Assembly was, however, not dissolved but only suspended, since the Governor had said in his report dated 20th March, 1975 that it would not be advisable to dissolve the legislature but the possibility of forming another Ministry should be explored after some time and in a cooler atmosphere. The Governor had also observed, and I quote :

"One cannot reasonably expect that another Ministry if formed out of the present Legislature would be stable, or that unprincipled defections, induced by lure of office, would not continue. This would be an unhappy and disturbing situation in any State, and it is particularly so in a State which has special security problems because of insurgency

with the insurgents maintaining contact with and securing arms from foreign countries . . ." 5 P.M.

It is only a fresh election at which the electors may withhold their support from defectors that holds out the prospect of a fully stable Ministry.

In his subsequent report, dated the 18th May, 1975, the Governor stated "In view of the instances of shifting loyalties during the last five months or so, one could not reasonably expect that a Ministry now formed would be stable. Apart from the scale and frequency of defections, there have been allegations from both sides that Members had been taken away more or less against their will and kept under duress, that in addition to offer of ministerial offices, substantial amounts of money had been offered or paid in certain cases. The reports I have received from independent sources suggest that these allegations are not fully unfounded." The Governor, therefore, recommended that the Nagaland Legislative Assembly might be dissolved. The recommendations of the Governor were accepted and the President dissolved the Nagaland Legislative Assembly under article 174(2) of the Constitution on the 20th May, 1975.

Now, Madam, the situation in Nagaland, after the President took over, has shown considerable improvement and I think regarding the violent incidents that has happening or with regard to kidnappings or recruitments etc, that were being made previously, they have been considerably reduced.

In fact, the security forces have been able to be very vigilant and many hostiles have been arrested and many have surrendered during this year after the President has taken over. Among the most notable arrests has been that of the self-styled commissioner, and Midan Piyu, of Lower Sema area. Important documents of the underground have also been captured. In addition, we have received a report that 9 hostiles, including 2 Commanding Offi-