

[श्री राजनारायण]

क्रास सोसाइटी के द्वारा रुपया भेजा जायगा, मगर अब प्रधान मंत्री ने पाकिस्तान के कहने से रेडक्रास सोसाइटी द्वारा कोई भी सहायता देने से इन्कार कर दिया है। पाकिस्तान ने कहा है कि रेडक्रास सोसाइटी पूर्व पाकिस्तान के लोगों को कोई सहायता नहीं दे सकती। और भारत की सरकार उस पर चुप साधे हुये है, इसका निकम्मापन है।

**श्री उपसभापति :** अच्छा, ठीक है, अब आप बैठ जाइये।

**श्री राजनारायण :** श्रीमन्, मैं चाहता हूँ कि जब प्रधान मंत्री महोदया यहां पर बोलें तो आपसे हाथ जोड़कर विनती कर रहा हूँ कि वह इन सवालों का भी जवाब दें।

**श्री उपसभापति :** ठीक है, आपकी बात आ गई।

**श्री राजनारायण :** श्रीमन्, श्री जयप्रकाश नारायण के नेतृत्व में हम लोग एक अखिल भारतीय कोई कमेटी बनायें ताकि हम लोग भी अधिक से अधिक सहायता कर सकें, लेकिन यह सरकार हर मामले में आड़े आ रही है।

**श्री उपसभापति :** अब आप बैठ जाइये।

**श्री राजनारायण :** और दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ।

**श्री उपसभापति :** आप बैठिये, एक मिनट जरा मुझे कह लेने दीजिये।

अभी अभी सरकार का ध्यान दो महत्वपूर्ण बातों की ओर आकर्षित किया गया है, एक तो बांध के बारे में और दूसरा पाकिस्तान के बारे में, मैं समझता हूँ कि मिस्टर ओम् मेहता सदस्यों की जो भावनाएं हैं इसकी जानकारी प्रधान मंत्री और सरकार को करा देंगे और आज शाम को पांच बजे या सवा

पांच बजे के दरमियान प्राइम मिनिस्टर जो प्रेसिडेंशियल एड्रेस के सिलसिले में जवाब दे रही हैं उस वक़्त शायद जो कुछ कहना होगा वह कह देंगी। और जब पांच बजे मैं प्राइम मिनिस्टर को बुलाना चाहता हूँ तो मैं समझता हूँ कि हमें आज इस पर बहस पांच बजे से पहले ख़त्म करनी होगी और इसीलिये हम ज्यादा समय लंच के लिये नहीं जा सकते, हम सिर्फ़ दो बजे तक के लिये जा सकते हैं इसलिये मैं हाउस को दो बजे तक के लिये एडजर्न करता हूँ। The House is adjourned till 2.00 P. M.

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

The House reassembled after lunch at two of the clock. THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) in the Chair.

#### MOTION OF THANKS ON THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS—contd.

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI H. R. GOKHALE): Sir, in the course of the debate on the Presidential Address and also by way of amendments to the Presidential Address, several questions have been raised pertaining to the conduct of elections. I am referring to the mid-term poll. I thought it was desirable that at this stage I might refer to some of these points which I have called out from the various amendments and speeches and which are found to be common and which need an explanation to the House.

As the House is aware, the conduct of elections in this country is in the hands of the Election Commission which is a body set up under the Constitution. As Members are very familiar, it is an independent body and, for purposes of the conduct of elections, it is beyond the control of the Government. In fact, the Members of the Commission have adequate safeguards to give them independence for purposes of the conduct of fair elections, for maintaining the purity of elections. Many of the complaints which have been raised are of such

a nature that they could really form part of petitions, if taken to proper court of law. In the absence of particulars, which really cannot be dealt with here because no evidence can be taken here, it is very difficult to deal with them except by way of a general reply. One can merely say that if there is a bald allegation, it can deserve only a bald and general reply.

When an allegation is made, at this stage what I would like to say is, let these allegations be proved in the court of law so that they can be dealt with, and after proof there is ample power in lower courts to set aside an election if anything wrong has happened. But apart from these general observations there are a few points which in particular, I think, deserve to be mentioned.

A lot has been said with regard to the change in the procedure in the last election. It has been said that this change of procedure was not done after consulting the political parties, and there was no opportunity to discuss these changes in this House and in the other House, so on and so forth. But if hon'ble Members will consider the nature of the alterations which are made in the rules, they will realise that these amendments were made to bring the law in this country in tune with the laws prevailing in most other democratic countries. I am particularly referring to Great Britain. In fact, on this point we were lagging behind and after this amendment it has been brought up to date.

The change in the procedure is this that prior to this change counting of votes took place boothwise, and as the number of votes was restricted to few votes in a booth, it was comparatively easier to ascertain which locality or which part of an Assembly constituency voted in favour of which candidate or in favour of which political party. Experience in the past had shown that whole populations in a particular locality were subjected to threats before the election, and the result was that whole localities sometimes did not turn up to exercise their right of voting at all. The second part was that even after the elections...

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI (Rajasthan) : Does it mean that for this purpose consultations were not necessary ?

SHRI H. R. GOKHALE : No, no. I am going to deal with this. I have not yet finished this subject. It is not the whole answer. I have only indicated what were the objections raised, and I am dealing with them one by one.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : We have taken objection only to consultations.

SHRI H. R. GOKHALE : You might have taken objection only to that. But there were other objections by other Members with regard to other aspects also. And as hon. Members will appreciate, I cannot in this intervention deal with only one aspect of the matter ; I will have to deal with all the aspects of the matter. As far as possible, I will deal with all that has been brought to my notice in the course of this debate and by way of amendments which I have read. Therefore, the question whether specifically the political parties were consulted or not is a matter which is in my mind and I will certainly refer to it in the course of this intervention. I was generally dealing with what the change in the procedure is and the object with which this new procedure was sought to be introduced in the last elections. As I was mentioning, first of all it brought our rules in tune with the rules prevailing in most democratic countries. And I made particular reference to Great Britain because most of us consider that the election machinery in that country, in the manner in which it has been in existence for over a century, has fared much better than the election machinery in most other countries. So we brought in tune with that. But it is not something which rests there. If we look at it from the fundamental point of view also, forgetting anything that happened anywhere else in the world, and see what is good for us so far as this country is concerned, I should think that the change is very desirable. Then I was mentioning that experience in the last few elections had shown that even before the elections, whole localities and bunches of voters residing in a locality were subjected to different kinds of pressures to vote one way or the other. And they were threatened that if they did not vote in a particular way, they would be subjected to harassment after the elections. Now this did matter, because experience was that in many localities, a substantially large

[Shri H. R. Gokhale]

number of voters did not turn up at all to cast their votes. Experience has also been that apart from the fact that these threats worked in the sense that large numbers of people did not turn up to vote, they had a very undesirable effect after the elections also, because when these threats were given and people did not vote in accordance with the desire of the people who gave these threats, after the elections, a number of voters in these localities were subjected to harassment. That is the experience particularly in larger cities, and I think even in smaller towns and villages, the same thing, to a greater or lesser degree, has happened. This has been all the more so in the case of the weaker sections of the community, e. g. the Harijans where they were more susceptible, on account of the unfortunate backwardness in which they are to-day, to these pressures before and after the elections. In order to avoid this possibility, in order to ensure a fairer and purer election, this change was brought about. Here it is not a question of one party gaining by it or another party losing by it. It is a question of generally seeing that those who wanted to vote, voted without pressure before or harassment after the elections. That was the sole object of making this change.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI (Uttar Pradesh) : Sir, one point for clarification.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Let him finish first.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : Just one clarification. The question is this according to the old procedure, a candidate had the privilege to file an election petition if he felt that there were bogus votes in the ballot boxes, that there were votes of persons who were dead, or that votes had been introduced into the ballot boxes when the voters had not come. Now, if there are some such allegations, one cannot appeal because all the ballot boxes are mixed together and it is not possible for one to point out in which village how many voters came, whether they are dead, and so on. So this facility which was there previously is now gone.

SHRI A. D. MANI (Madhya Pradesh) : Sir, I want to make the same point.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Why do you want to repeat it? He is dealing with all the points. If he does not reply to that point, I will give you a chance to ask for clarification. Now, please sit down.

SHRI H. R. GOKHALE : I would request Members to wait. If I have really forgotten to deal with anything, I will deal with it later on. And I can assure the honourable Member that this was one of the points with which I was going to deal. I was also going to deal with the other point which was mentioned. In spite of that, if anything remains unanswered, I would request you to point out later on so that I can deal with it.

So I was saying that this is the basis on which the election was brought about. Now, it was stated that there ought to have been prior consultation. Such prior consultation need not necessarily take the form of a formal consultation because, in fact, leaders of most of the major political parties had already addressed the Commission on this issue....

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : Which once?

SHRI H. R. GOKHALE : I will tell you.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : We must be clear about it. This question was never mentioned to any political party. I also happen to belong to one of the all-India parties.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Let him finish it.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI : He cannot go on in a sweeping way. That is why I would like to know which the parties are to which he has referred to?

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Uttar Pradesh) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, is this a Question Hour that Members can go on interrupting any time they like? There should be some decorum and decency in it. I do not understand what he is talking about. That way we can also interrupt every speaker. This is not fair.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): I would not like any Member to interrupt the Minister. If the Minister has not answered any point, after he has finished, I will allow you to ask questions. Mr. Minister, you continue your speech.

श्री मानसिंह वर्मा (उत्तर प्रदेश): अगर गलत बात कहेंगे तो खूदा ही जायगा।

SHRI H. R. GOKHALE: I might tell the honourable Member that I was going to deal with that point also. I have only requested him to have a little more patience. I have not yet finished this point. I shall deal with all the points one by one. I shall deal with the various aspects which have been referred to.

SHRI MAN SINGH VARMA: There should not be any misrepresentation of facts.

SHRI H. R. GOKHALE: There is no misrepresentation of facts. I can assure honourable Members that so far as consultation was concerned, already representations had been received by the Election Commission from the leaders of the Congress (O), of the SSP, of the Jan Sangh, and I do not have all the details now, but I can produce them. I can assure you that the leaders of these parties had written to the Election Commission. This was a sort of consultation where they had indicated their views. That consultation had to be done. But it does not mean that all the objections which were raised must be accepted by the Election Commission. After all, various points of view, diametrically opposed to each other sometimes, were put forward and they were considered by the body in charge of the conduct of the elections. But the paramount consideration before the Election Commission is obviously to see that the election is fair and pure...

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I seek your protection. I would like to know, through you, whether the objection referred to on behalf of the Jan Sangh was received after the procedure had been decided upon by the Election Commission? That is what I want to know.

SHRI H. R. GOKHALE: The Election Commission might have taken a decision, but the rule was not amended. The effective part

of it had not come into being. All these suggestions had come before the rule was amended. Nothing concrete had happened. Therefore, the sum and substance of the matter is this, we were not dealing with the technicalities, particularly when we were dealing with a question which is so vital as the election where the paramount consideration irrespective of any political parties, is to see that the election is fair without any threat of harassment. Therefore, the Election Commission took into consideration the views of all concerned. When those views were there, it took into consideration all those views, all the views which were brought before the Election Commission. And it formed a judgment on the basis of which it came to the conclusion that this is the fairest way of dealing with the election in this country. This is nothing new to us. Even if this is new to us, this is not new to the world, not new to the election system. In fact, we have been following what has been in existence in England for a pretty long time. Here was a situation where, unlike in the past when a booth was restricted for 900 or 1000 voters, it was easier to find out which person had impersonated or who had given a false vote or who was not a real voter, for the purpose of filing an election petition. That was a procedure which was more advantageous from the limited point of view of filing an election petition. That was easier when we were concerned with a small number of voters. Here we have two situations. One situation was the paramount duty to see that on the whole the election is fair and pure. On the other hand, there is a minor event, or comparatively so—I am not saying it is unimportant—where for the purpose of election petitions you maintain a procedure which puts whole localities or bodies of voters in a locality in constant threat of harassment. Somewhere a body charged with this has to make a choice and it has chosen a lesser evil. Do we ensure fair election in this country? Or for the purposes of a few elections petitions saying that three or four names are found out and for going to the court saying that X is not the real voter, but Y is the real voter, should we choose a bigger evil? Even that is taken care of in the existing election procedure. Hon. Members know that where a person goes to vote, it is always open to the election agent or whoever is there to say that he is not the real voter and he has im-

[Shri H. R. Gokhale]

personated. There is provision for what are called tender votes. Ample other provisions are there in the law. The Election Commission has to take into account the sum total of all circumstances and then consider which is the best, the paramount consideration being fair election. Assuming that some kind of disadvantage occurs, is it necessary to choose a bigger evil or lesser evil. The Election Commission has chosen a lesser evil. If it has chosen largely in favour of fair election, I suppose it should be accepted. I am surprised when objection was taken to this.

The other matter was with regard to the so-called delay in the declaration of results. As I have understood it, the complaint is that the elections were held on different dates, but the result was declared only on the 10th and there was thus a gap of so many days. In some places the elections were held on the 3rd, in other places on the 5th, but why the result was delayed till the 10th? It is a matter of common knowledge that in a particular election the result might suit somebody. But that is not the consideration. What is the overall picture is the major consideration. In the past it has been found that in a part of the country or even in sections of a particular State, people have voted in a particular way. It might suit the party in power. But it has its inevitable impact on the voting pattern in other parts of the country or in other parts of a particular State. Is it fair that this should be allowed to happen? I am sure the complaint should have been otherwise. At the Looking victory this time where my party has received such a massive support all over the country, the complaint would have been otherwise, namely, why the results were declared earlier and why they were not declared later and why they were simultaneous? All these arguments are double-edged weapons. The best is what is in the overall interest of all concerned. Is it not in the interest of all concerned that all result should be declared simultaneously so that no one can reasonably complain that the result of the election, say in Gujarat affected the result of the election in Maharashtra? I wonder what objection could be taken to this. What was the delay? If I remember the last day, probably it was the 6th or the 7th except in Bengal where it was after that. Even there counting was in

progress and polling had taken place and I do not suppose that one can reasonably say that there was any delay in the declaration of results...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) :

The announcement was made after the polling in West Bengal...

SHRI H. R. GOKHALE: The hon. Member is missing the point. What is really important is that while some people in some sections of the country or States voted, they did not know how a large section of the people in other parts of the country have voted. Though counting may have gone on, the results were not declared anywhere. That is the crucial point. Therefore, the objections that there was delay, with all respect to those who have raised them, have no substance at all. On the contrary, it has led to a better situation where nobody influenced anybody.

The other aspect of the matter was about coercion, intimidation, propaganda on communal lines, and so on. I am a bit surprised, looking at the parties and persons from whom this complaint has come. Really people who stood on communal platforms and were doing communal propaganda are now complaining that there was communal propaganda. Leave it aside. Here you know that there are elaborate provisions in the Representation of the People's Act. For example, if you make use of something which has any appeal to the religious sentiments of the people and so on and so forth, it is a specific ground on which an election petition can be filed in a court of law and only as a result of that being done, in some constituencies in the last election, election had been set aside irrespective of the party to which that particular candidate belonged.

You have seen the change in the procedure also after the last election. It is not the tribunal now. No less than a High Court itself tries the petition and then the appeal provided to the Supreme Court is not confined to only questions of law, as is usual in some cases. My friends know that in a number of cases the Supreme Court has set aside the elections, the High Courts have set aside the elections, irrespective of who the petitioner was or whose

election was challenged in that particular election petition. Therefore, if there is any communal propaganda and if you have really any reasonable ground for saying that this propaganda has affected the results of the election, why not go to the court? If you have to go to the court, you cannot just make an allegation. You have to give instance one, instance two and instance three and so on and so forth and you have got to prove in the court of law and satisfy the court. Therefore, instead of following the procedure which has been provided for in the law, you make general allegations that this has been done. I am not saying that nothing happened. In a country where from 250 millions the number of voters has risen to 275 millions in this Election, in a country where the Assembly constituencies are over 3,300 roughly and in a country where the staff employed was no less than thirteen lakhs for this Election, something might have happened here and there and some irregularities may have happened. But is it reasonable to say that the whole election has been unfair? Does it lie in the mouth of those people who adopted slogans in the elections which were on communal lines, or sectarian lines? But the whole thing is that all these complaints have come when the results are known and I am sorry to say this. There is ample provision in the law under which you can go to a court and complain. Surely you may not have faith in the people here but you have faith in the machinery that has been set up under the Election Law.

One more thing has been mentioned and that is for an inquiry. Before I go to that, I would like to refer to the irregularities in the electoral rolls. It has been said that in a number of cases many names were not found. Now it is possible that here and there some voters were not there in the electoral rolls, but should have been there in the electoral rolls. It is not possible to say, when crores of people voted in this country, that the machinery was fool-proof, that everyone was included and none was omitted. But the real thing is this: Look at the precautions taken in this connection. 1st January 1970 (?) was the date which was regarded as the qualifying date and for the period 15.11.69 to 15.1.70 (?) all the changes were to be made and it was under the process of continuous change. It did not end

on 15.1.70, because after that the final roll was published. Before that an opportunity was given to the people to come and make their applications in all respects, get their names included which were not there or object to them which were wrongly included. Now, wherever these objections or applications came after following the procedure which was laid down in the law, names were included or deleted. But when notices were issued, they did not show themselves up before the authorities under the law. Thousands of enumerators were sent around in all constituencies to enroll voters again in respect of the roll which was there for the previous election. Now the parties were not vigilant. I wish they were more vigilant when the time for going to the authorities came. But, unfortunately, that was not so. Even on the last occasion, after the dissolution, one more opportunity was given by extending the date so that more names could be added and objections could be taken. Even then, such objections which came were considered and investigations made, names were included or omitted as the case may be. Nobody likes that people should be left out. There may have been irregularities. It was a matter for complaint that the wife's name was there, but the husband's name was there and *vice versa*. Things might have happened. But I am not here to say that in a country, in a large country, where a large number of people come and vote, no irregularity of any kind could be there and everyone of them was in the electoral roll. That would be a very tall claim. What I am saying is this: Was the Election Commission vigilant or not, vigilant enough or not, to follow the procedure laid down in the law, to give adequate opportunity to all concerned, individuals as well as organisations and political parties, to come before the Election Commission and to rectify the defects? Now, wherever they were vigilant, it was done. Not one instance was cited in the course of the debate here or in the other House that applications were made, they appeared, everything was done and even then names were left out. It is important because, if one instance had been shown where they went to the Election Commission and names were not included, one could have understood that that was a matter for inquiry. But no such complaint was made here nor was it made anywhere else. The other matter is with

[Shri H. R. Gokhale]

regard to the method of printing the numbers, serial numbers, on the ballot papers on the back. I told the House the other day in connection with some questions and the Calling Attention Motion—because I did not have the facts at that time—that I would put them before the House when the opportunity came. I think the original statement which I made, I found on verification, was correct. It was pointed out by the hon. Members that the numbering was done serially—one, two, three, one after another—so that in that process as soon as the total number of ballot papers required in that constituency is reached, you have to stop. Then how is it that a large number of ballot papers were found? Now, that complaint arose because the understanding as to the manner in which this printing of serial numbers took place was incorrect. Now I have ascertained that not only with regard to the printing of the ballot papers—the main part of these ballot papers—with regard to the printing of serial numbers also, the method which was employed, particularly in Chandigarh, which was the issue at that time, was that there were two methods of numbering the ballot papers, namely, by means of typehigh numbering machines or by means of hand numbering machines. The complaints which was made on the misunderstanding that the method of hand numbering machine was used. Now, in the present case, the numbering of the ballot papers of all the constituencies in Punjab, Haryana and Chandigarh was done by means of type-high numbering machines. Typehigh numbering machines are fitted into the Press, one for each ballot paper in form. Thus if 24 ballot papers are included in one form, 24 typehigh numbering machines will be fitted in the Press for the serial numbering of the ballot papers. All the printed sheets of the ballot papers are fed into the Press for serial numbers. Consequently, the excess numbers of ballot papers produced for a constituency will also be serially numbered.

The general impression is that if the hand numbering machines had been utilized, they should have stopped at the point where the total required is reached. But here the process was mechanical like the printing of the ballot papers themselves. When the whole form is taken you cannot waste the paper; you have

to expedite the printing and in order that the whole process is completed within a specified time. A number of constituencies are grouped together for the purpose of printing. So in one constituency there may be a lakh of ballot papers required, in another three or four lakhs. So in the constituency where you require only one lakh, the printing of three lakhs would be an excess. But it is inevitable, and therefore adequate precaution has to be taken to see, according to Rules, that the excess ballot papers are destroyed. . . . (*Interruption*).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Let him finish.

SHRI H. R. GOKHALE: I made a promise to this House, because this information was not with me then. I was taking this opportunity to clarify this position. The answer is so complete. Just as there is no answer with regard to the printing of the ballot papers, there is no answer with regard to the printing of the numbers, because both processes are mechanical. In both the cases the whole form has to be used. In both the constituencies—there are sometimes more than one, and sometimes when you take four constituencies—the number of ballot papers required in each constituency cannot obviously be the same.

The same applies to the typehigh numbering machine, which is applied for the purpose of printing serial numbers. Therefore, the general answer which I gave on that day, holds good today.

Another thing mentioned was this. In the House a number of ballot papers were produced and it was asked how it is possible to find ballot papers with numbers in-between in the papers which are sent for the purpose of distribution. Now, apparently, the objection would be correct. But the answer is equally correct and, I think, without any flaw. This particular reference was made to numbers 1,35,999 and 1,35,901. These were in-between. Therefore, the objection, on the face of it, might appear to be correct. But here again the ballot papers are serially numbered by means of a typehigh machine. It sometimes happens that in the process of printing the typehigh machine gets stuck. When they get

stuck the same number is printed several times. When it is noticed, all that you do is to retain one of the ballot papers because that is required and the excess which is so repeated by the repetition of the printing is discarded. Therefore, that which is discarded as excess will be the same numbers and is what probably must have been found in the papers which were stacked for the purposes of destruction. That, I think, is the only answer which can be given because this is the possibility which is reasonable and which must inevitably happen when you print so many ballot papers.

Then one more thing which has been mentioned is that it is necessary that such suspicion may be dispelled with regard to what is described as irregularities which have taken place in the elections. I am sure my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, remembers the complaint which he made about Calcutta. But, as I said that day, these details could not be answered because information was still to be gathered. When it is available, surely Mr. Bhupesh Gupta can come and see me and I will place all the papers before him. With regard to these particular complaints, investigation also has to be done in Calcutta and within the course of a few days, probably, an answer can be given in regard to that.

The complaint is that some sort of a body should be appointed to see as to why these irregularities occurred. I said earlier that the irregularities were indeed marginal. Every Member, with respect to him, when he thinks of an election naturally has his own constituency or, at the most, his own province, in mind. When you are thinking of an election machinery, you are thinking of the whole sub-continent where, as I said, 275 million voters were concerned so far as this election was concerned with an increase of about 26 million voters compared to the last General Election, where you employed a staff of over 13 lakhs and where you have Assembly Constituencies of more than 3,300. And, in a situation like this, what are the irregularities? They are indeed very marginal and most of them are capable of correction by appropriate proceedings in a court of law. There is no need for any such inquiry because the Election Commission which is a high-powered body and is independent

has gone into all the details of the matters referred to it and has taken adequate precautions.

The last question that was raised is with regard to the age of voting. I said that it is a matter which requires very serious consideration and an off-hand answer whether you should reduce it to 18 or keep it at 21 cannot be given. While hon. Members know that there are conflicting views, some have taken the view that it should be reduced to 18. On the other hand, a large body of public opinion says that boys and girls of 18 years should not be involved at the adolescent stage in which they are in active politics. Well, you have your laws today like the Indian Succession Act or the Majority Act or the Guardian of Wards Act and so on where it is recognised that the proper age where you can say that a person attains maturity is the age of 21. So, all these various factors have to be taken into consideration and after taking them into consideration a decision can be taken at the appropriate time.

These are the main points, Sir, which were raised in the course of the debate and to which I wanted to clarify.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Mr. Ganga Sharan Sinha...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I did not get a reply about the case where two empty ballot boxes...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): He says that he is inquiring into it.

SHRI H. R. GOKHALE: I have said that it is a matter for inquiry.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Anything that he has not answered, Mr. Mani?

SHRI A. D. MANI: One or two points were not covered by him. I want some clarifications.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): No clarifications; it is not a statement. Anything new, Dr. Bhai Mahavir?

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR (Delhi) : On these three things which he has clarified, one or two points are not clear enough.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : That is not the way, you see. When a Minister replies if you go on cross-examining him that would not be right.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : Then I fail to understand why Your Honour has asked me ; if you are not permitting me to ask any clarification on something which is not clear, then what am I supposed to do ?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : You were not here when certain things were asked. He said that he would reply to all those points which have been raised and if he has not replied to any point I said that certainly I would give a chance to ask the point that he has not replied. But to ask a new point ...

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : That is what I am asking. For example, he said about the ballot papers that the numbering on them shows that they are not excess.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : You do not accept the explanation.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : On a point of order. I want to know what we are discussing here. I think we are not discussing the policy of the Election Commission. We are discussing the President's Address. The Minister has intervened in the debate. We are not going to question the particular Minister on any particular point. It is a general debate, on the President's Address and if the Minister chooses to intervene and you go on allowing questions on that, then this process will be unending and it is for the first time in this House I am seeing that if a Minister comes to intervene, he is allowed to be cross-examined by the Chair. It is a peculiar method to be adopted in the House because it is not a question related to the Law Ministry. It is a general debate on the President's Address. If you so like, we can also ask hundreds of questions.

SHRI MAN SINGH VARMA : The Minister has come out with certain clarifications.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : If that is the view, then I should not have been asked if there was anything which was not clear. When the Chair asked me, I considered it to be within my right to take advantage of the opportunity offered by the Chair. If the opportunity was not to be given, I should not have been asked. What new factors have emerged to deny me the opportunity ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : There is no biblical pronouncement on this. It is a matter of convention. If any Member wants to seek clarifications on behalf of the Government you may or may not allow it.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : This is what I again and again say that he is not replying to the debate. He is just intervening. The person who replies to the debate will be the Prime Minister and certain clarifications can be asked only from the Prime Minister. Any intervening Minister cannot be put to cross-examination. If you want to give a ruling that every Minister who intervenes can be cross-examined, I have nothing to say.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Neither the Minister nor the Prime Minister can be cross-examined. That is my ruling.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : My friend, Shri Chandra Shekhar naturally on many points, is correct. Sometimes he is also wrong and this is one such occasion.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Is it a point of order ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I made no reflection on the Election Commission.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Are you on a point of order ?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Take it as a point of order. Which way you would like ? Take it as a matter of commonsense. Take it as a matter of idiocy. Your point is that I should not make any point of order. All that I want to say is this. I do not share their views but I am here concerned with this. The only point of order is, the new Minister, the Law Minister, was replying on behalf of the

Government. It was intervention on behalf of the Government, otherwise he cannot speak in this House as he is a Member of the other House. On behalf of the Government, in a debate on the President's Address, in many respects it is open to the Government to field a whole number of Ministers to deal with a subject within his portfolio. There is nothing wrong. If that is so, if the Prime Minister can be asked questions because she finally replies to it, why not another Minister who is saying something on behalf of the Government?

**SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR :** The other Members will be denied the opportunity to speak.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** If my friend takes that pragmatic view that the other Members would be denied, I have nothing to say.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) :** Now the Prime Minister is replying at five. There are many speakers. I would appeal to the House to proceed with the debate and I would appeal to the Members speaking to be very brief in their observations.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) :** Mr. Janga Saran Sinha.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** Have not I helped you?

**DR. BHAI MAHAVIR :** You always help them.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** I help you in good humour.

**श्री गंगाशरण सिंह (नाम निर्देशित) :** जनाब वाइस चैयरमैन साहब, इस बार का राष्ट्रपति का भाषण जिन परिस्थितियों में हुआ वे परिस्थितियाँ पहले से भिन्न थीं, जिन परिस्थितियों में पहले चुनाव हुआ करते थे। उनसे इस बार स्थिति में परिवर्तन हुआ था और देश की अवस्था में भी परिवर्तन हुआ था। सबसे बड़ा परिवर्तन यह था कि लोक सभा का चुनाव उसके समय के पहले हुआ और असेम्बलियों के चुनाव से अलग हुआ। चुनाव का

परिणाम निकलने के बाद हमारे राष्ट्रपति का यहां भाषण हुआ। इसलिए राष्ट्रपति के अभि-भाषण पर चर्चा करते समय उसके पहले जो सबसे बड़ी घटना घटी उसकी तरफ सदन और सदन के सदस्यों का ध्यान जाना आवश्यक है।

इस चुनाव में जो परिणाम निकले हैं उन परिणामों से देश में एक नई आकांक्षा, एक नई प्रवृत्ति का जन्म हुआ, किसी किसी क्षेत्र में नई आशाओं का भी जन्म हुआ। जो आकांक्षाएं उत्पन्न हुई हैं उन आकांक्षाओं की कहां तक पूर्ति होगी यह तो समय बताएगा और जो आशाएं प्रगट हुई हैं वे किस हद तक सही हैं वह भी समय बताएगा, आज उसका निर्णय करने का समय नहीं है।

कई बातें इस चुनाव में ऐसी हुईं जिनसे मैं थोड़ा परेशान हुआ। उस परेशानी का जिक्र मैं यहां करना चाहता हूं। इससे पहले लोक-सभा के जितने चुनाव हुए वे असेम्बली के चुनावों के साथ हुआ करते थे और इसलिए जो लोक सभा के सदस्य होते थे उन पर काम का बोझ, खर्च का बोझ उस तरह का नहीं पड़ता था जिस तरह का इस बार पड़ा। मैं भिन्न-भिन्न प्रान्तों में गया—मेरा चुनाव से सीधा कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं था—और वहां जो एक खतरनाक चीज मैंने देखी वह यह थी कि चुनाव में जिस प्रकार खर्चा इस बार हुआ वह पहले कभी नहीं हुआ। उसमें किसी एक पार्टी को दोष नहीं दिया जा सकता। एक व्यक्ति को दोष नहीं दिया जा सकता। जिन लोगों ने कम खर्च किया वह इसलिए नहीं किया कि सिद्धान्त के चलते वे कम खर्च करना चाहते थे, कम खर्च इसलिए किया कि या तो उनके पास पैसे नहीं थे या उनको उसकी जरूरत नहीं पड़ी, लेकिन इस बार लोक सभा के सदस्यों को चुनाव में जिस प्रकार खर्च करना पड़ा, जिस प्रकार का खर्चा अधिकांश जगहों में हुआ, भिन्न-भिन्न व्यक्तियों ने, भिन्न-भिन्न पार्टियों के लोगों ने किया उससे खतरा मुझे यह लगता है कि साधारण आदमी के लिए, एक साधारण कार्यकर्ता के

[ श्री गंगा शरण सिंह ]

लिए एक साधारण पार्टी के लिए जिसके पास पैसे का ऐसा इन्तजाम न हो इस तरह का चुनाव लड़ना बहुत मुश्किल काम हो गया है। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह काम सिर्फ सरकार का नहीं है, सभी पार्टियों को इसके बारे में सोचना चाहिए। चुनाव जितना खर्चीला बनता जा रहा है और उसका जो नंगा रूप हमारे सामने आया है उससे ऐसा लगता है कि किसी पार्टी के लिये जिसके पास ऐसा धन न हो जिसका हिसाब न हो या किसी व्यक्ति के लिए जिसके पास ऐसा धन न हो जिसका हिसाब न हो या जो किसी बाहर के देश का समर्थक न हो पूरा वक्त देकर काम करने वाले उस साधारण कार्यकर्ता के लिए सहो माने में सही तरह से चुनाव लड़ना बहुत ही मुश्किल हो गया है। मैंने यह पाया कि पैसे की दृष्टि से एक नई प्रवृत्ति उठी है पार्टियों के कार्यकर्ताओं में। 1937 का चुनाव मैंने देखा था। अपने सूबे के कांग्रेसी पार्लिया-मेंटरी बोर्ड का मैं सेक्रेटरी था। उस समय मैंने देखा कि कार्यकर्ताओं को कहने की जरूरत नहीं थी, वे खुद सारा इन्तजाम करते थे। इस बार मैंने देखा कि लोगों को किस तरह कार्य-कर्ताओं की खुशामद करनी पड़ी, किस तरह कार्यकर्ताओं को रिश्कत देनी पड़ी, किस तरह पैसे खर्च करने पड़े। मैं समझता हूँ कि आज जो सबसे बड़ा खतरा जनतंत्र को है वह यह है कि इस तरह का खर्चीला चुनाव हमारे देश के गरीब लोग नहीं लड़ सकते हैं। यह प्रश्न ऐसा है जिस पर सरकार को जितनी पार्टियाँ है उनसे मिल कर विचार करे, अगर जरूरत पड़े तो संविधान में संशोधन कर, चुनाव के नियमों में संशोधन कर ऐसे उपाय करने चाहिए जिससे हमारे चुनाव इतने खर्चीले न हों। मुझे खतरा इस बात का है कि अगर चुनाव इतने खर्चीले होने लगे तो जो साधारण जनता की आवाज इन चुनावों के जरिए ऊपर तक पहुंच सकती थी वह नहीं पहुंच पाएगी और जनतंत्र सही माने में प्रस्फुटित नहीं हो सकेगा। पहला चीज तो यह है।

दूसरी चीज यह है कि प्रायः चुनाव में इस बार गड़बड़ियाँ हुईं, जिसमें किसी एक पार्टी का हाथ नहीं रहा, भिन्न-भिन्न पार्टियों के लोगों ने तरह-तरह की गड़बड़ियाँ कीं। मैं देखता आया हूँ इस तरह की गड़बड़ियाँ शुरू के चुनाव से होती आई हैं लेकिन एक नई बात जो मैंने देखी और उसमें भी एक पार्टी के नहीं भिन्न-भिन्न पार्टियों के लोग जिम्मेदार हैं, वह यह थी कई जगहों पर लोगों ने पोलिंग बूथ पर ही कब्जा कर लिया और दूसरे लोगों को वोट देने नहीं जाने दिया गया। कहा जाता है कि आप कोर्ट में जा सकते हैं, चुनाव पिटीशन लड़ सकते हैं, लेकिन कोर्ट में इलेक्शन पिटीशन देकर यह सब प्रमाणित कर पाना और जीत सकना मुश्किल ही नहीं असम्भव है बहुत सी जगहें ऐसी हैं जहां वोट देने के लिए लोग जा ही नहीं पाए, उनके जाने के पहले ही वोट डाल दिए गए, जब लोग गए तो उन्हें पता चला कि उनका वोट दिया जा चुका, इस तरह बहुत जगह लोग वोट ही नहीं कर पाए। यह एक ऐसा खतरा है जो बोगस टाइप का जनतंत्र हमारे यहां पैदा कर सकता है। आज तो ऐसा नहीं है, लेकिन आगे चल कर ऐसा हो सकता है, इसके बारे में हम को सोचना चाहिये। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह भी एक ऐसा काम है जो सारा देश और सभी पार्टियाँ मिलकर कर सकती हैं और केवल गवर्नमेंट के आधार पर यह नहीं हो सकता है।

एक चीज यह भी है कि चुनाव का जो सिलसिला चला और एलेक्शन कमीशन ने शुरू से अब तक इसमें परिश्रम किया, मैं समझता हूँ कि 1952 के एलेक्शन में जो परम्परा उन्होंने चलाई उस परम्परा का निर्वाह आगे भी करना चाहिये। मुझे स्मरण है कि 1952 में जो पहला चुनाव था हमारे देश का, उस जमाने में जितनी समस्याएं आती थीं उन समस्याओं के बारे में एलेक्शन कमिशनर इतनी

मुस्तैदी से काम करते थे कि 12 बजे रात तक, 1 बजे रात तक खबर कर के, लोगों से सलाह कर के कोई निर्णय करते थे क्योंकि हमारे यहां नई पद्धति थी, नया कार्यक्रम था, नई चीजें थीं, नया तरीका चलाना था और उसका निर्वाह किया गया था। मैं चाहता हूं कि आगे भी जो चुनावों के नियमों में परिवर्तन किया जाय तो जितनी पार्टियां हैं, जितने दल हैं उनकी राय ली जाय और तब चुनावों के नियमों में कोई परिवर्तन क्या जाना चाहिये। अखिर में अगर कोई परिवर्तन किये जाते हैं, वे सही परिवर्तन भी हों, कानून की दृष्टि से सही भी हों, उचित भी हों, लेकिन विभिन्न पार्टियों की राय न लेने से जो उनको कहने का एक मौका मिलता है वह मौका नहीं मिल पाता। जैसी कि एक पुरानी कह बात है वैसा होना भी चाहिये कि न्याय सिर्फ किया नहीं जाना चाहिये, लोगों को मादूम भी होना चाहिये कि न्याय हुआ है। इस दृष्टि से मेरा एक यह सुझाव है कि हमारे जैसे बड़े देश में चुनाव कमीशन को शायद बिल्कुल जुडिशियरी की तरह या और चीजों की तरह अलग नहीं कर सकते हैं। जहां 12, 13 लाख कार्यकर्ताओं की जरूरत पड़ती हो चुनावों में वहां इतने लोगों की कोई पर्मानेंट बाडी बना कर हम नहीं रख सकते हैं। लेकिन एक काम किया जा सकता है। केन्द्र में चुनाव आयुक्त अलग है लेकिन उसके लोग भी आते हैं गवर्नमेंट के किसी डिपार्टमेंट से। क्या उन्हें सीधे बहाल नहीं किया जा सकता। क्या इसी तरह हम यह नहीं कर सकते हैं कि प्रत्येक प्रांत में जो हमारे स्थायी कार्यकर्ता चुनाव कमीशन में होते हैं, उनका एक अलग कैडर बना दिया जाय। कुछ कार्यकर्ता ऐसे होते ही हैं जिन को बराबर काम करना पड़ता है। प्रान्तों में अभी पद्धति यह है कि प्रांतीय जो सरकारें हैं और उनके जो अधिकारी हैं उनमें से कोई चीफ एलेक्टोरल अफसर बना दिया जाता है और वही चुनाव का काम करता है। मेरा सुझाव यह है कि जैसे यहां स्वतंत्र रूप से

एलेक्शन कमिशनर नियुक्ति होता है उसी तरह से एक ऐसा कैडर तैयार किया जाय कि जिन लोगों को पर्मानेंटरी चुनाव का काम करना हो उनकी अलग से बहाली हो, स्वतंत्र रूप से बहाली हो और एक प्रांत से दूसरे प्रांत में आवश्यकता पड़ने पर उनका तबादला किया जा सके। स्थायी काम करने वालों में चाहे प्रांतीय सरकार के मुलाजिम हों, चाहे केन्द्रीय सरकार के मुलाजिम हों, सरकारों का कम से कम हाथ रहे या बिल्कुल न रहे तो ज्यादा अच्छा होगा। पुराने जमाने की बात दूसरी थी जब केन्द्र में और प्रांतों में एक ही पार्टी की सरकार होती थी। अब भिन्न भिन्न पार्टियों की सरकारें प्रांतों में और केन्द्र में बन रही हैं। मुझे खतरा इस बात का लगता है कि अब संघर्ष होने की गुंजाइश है। इसके लिये मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि एलेक्शन कमीशन का जो स्थायी इन्तजाम करने वाले लोग हैं, जो स्थायी रूप से मुलाजिम हैं, उनके लिये अलग कैडर बनना चाहिये और जैसे जुडिशियरी स्वतंत्र होती है उसी तरह से एलेक्शन कमीशन भी स्वतंत्र होना चाहिए। जो तात्कालिक काम करने वाले लोग हों वे सरकारी नौकरी में से या भिन्न भिन्न संस्थाओं में से लिये जा सकते हैं।

तीसरी चीज यह भी है कि इस चुनाव में जहां एक ओर सिर्फ गड़बड़ी की चर्चा करके हमको अपने को धोखा देने की कोशिश नहीं करना चाहिए वहां दूसरी ओर जो लोग अधिक तादाद में आये हैं उनको भी अपनी सफलता में भूलकर जो वास्तविकता है, जो भविष्य है उसको नजर अन्दाज नहीं करना चाहिये। यह दोनों खतरे हम लोगों के सामने हैं। मैं यह मानता हूं कि गड़बड़ी जहां कहीं कुछ हुई है, मैं यह मानता हूं कि प्रांतों में या केन्द्र में परिणाम के अनुपात में कुछ फर्क हो, लेकिन मेरी यह मान्यता है और मेरी यह धारणा है कि आम तौर से चुनाव के जो परिणाम रहे हैं वह देश में एक हवा के द्योतक हैं। कुछ

[ श्री गंगा शरण सिंह ]

आदमी जो आज जीत कर आये हैं वह शायद न जीतते, कुछ जो हार गये हैं वह शायद जीत कर आये होते, लेकिन इस सच्चाई से इन्कार नहीं करना चाहिये कि जितना मैंने देखा है बाहर रह कर उसके आधार पर कह सकता हूँ कि यह चुनाव एक प्रकार की हवा का द्योतक है, उसका प्रतीक है और सबको इसके बारे में सोचना चाहिये। यह खुशी की बात भी है और सोचने की बात भी है। आज कौनसा पैटर्न, कौन सा नमूना देश के सामने आ रहा है उसका कुछ कुछ अंदाजा केन्द्र में, बंगाल में और केरल में हम को मिल रहा है। बंगाल क्या में हुआ है। कांग्रेस एक बड़ी पार्टी आयी और दूसरी बड़ी पार्टी आयी मार्क्सिस्ट। केरल में जहाँ सब पार्टियों ने चुनाव लड़ा, उनमें जिनकी गवर्नमेंट है उनकी तो पार्टी आयी ही, लेकिन उसके अलावा दूसरी पार्टी मार्क्सिस्ट है और हालांकि उनकी संख्या बहुत कम है, लेकिन केन्द्र में भी खतरा है, रूलिंग पार्टी के बाद दूसरी बड़ी पार्टी मार्क्सिस्ट आयी है। दूसरी पार्टियाँ ऐसी हैं कि जिनके कुछ लोग आये हैं लेकिन अपने बूते पर, अपनी शक्ति पर नहीं आये हैं। उसके अनेक कारण हैं और इस समय उनमें मैं जाना नहीं चाहता, लेकिन आज यह हवा किस तरफ बह रही है इसको हमें देखना चाहिये और इस पर विचार करना चाहिये और इस दृष्टि से मैं समझता हूँ कि भिन्न-पार्टियों को अपने कार्यक्रमों को बनाना चाहिये। मुझे अभी थोड़ा मौका मिला उन इलाकों में जाने का . . .

सरदार नरेन्द्र सिंह ब्राह्म (पंजाब) : उस समय गवर्नर रूल था वहाँ।

श्री गंगाशरण सिंह : बंगाल की बात मैं नहीं कह रहा हूँ। अभी मुझे कुछ उन इलाकों में जाने का मौका मिला जिनको नक्सलाइट के नाम से कहा जाता है। वहाँ की जो परिस्थिति

है, मुझे दुख के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि हम जितने भी राजनीतिक कार्यकर्ता हैं भिन्न भिन्न पार्टियों के, हमने उस मामले की तह में जाने की चेष्टा अभी तक नहीं की। कुछ लोग समझते हैं कि यह सिर्फ ला एंड आर्डर का सवाल है, कुछ लोग समझते हैं कि सिर्फ यह सोशल और इकानामिक प्राबलम है। मैंने जो कुछ देखा और सुना और जो मैंने बात की और जो कुछ मैं घूमा उसके आधार पर मैं यह मानता हूँ कि यह ठीक है कि यह जो आन्दोलन शुरू हुआ है उसके फैलने में, उसके विकसित होने में सामाजिक और आर्थिक कारण हैं, लेकिन उसके साथ दोनों चीजें मिली हुई हैं, सामाजिक और आर्थिक कारण भी हैं, और ला एंड आर्डर का भी सवाल है। बहुत से इलाकों में मैंने देखा। कुछ लोगों को मैं जानता हूँ कि जो बहुत तेज, ब्रिलियेंट नौजवान थे, जिनके सामने जीवन की सब सुविधायें जो संभव हो सकती हैं वह उनको प्राप्त थीं लेकिन वे सब को छोड़कर नक्सलवादी कैम्प में चले गये और दूसरी तरफ उनमें किमिनल्स भी थे जो उस मूवमेंट के साथ हैं। तो आज यह पोलिटिकल पार्टीज हैं जो जनतंत्र को जाग्रत, जीवित और सजीव रखना चाहती हैं और साथ ही साथ देश में शान्ति के साथ शासन चलाना चाहती हैं, उनके आपसी मतभेद जो भी हों, लेकिन उन सब को आज मिल कर और सरकार को भी मिल कर सामाजिक और आर्थिक दृष्टि से, ला एंड आर्डर की दृष्टि से इस प्रश्न को सुलझाना चाहिये, सुलझाने की चेष्टा करनी चाहिये। नहीं तो वह प्रश्न ऐसा नहीं है कि जिसकी हम उपेक्षा कर सकते हैं। वह आग इस तरह से इधर उधर फैल रही है और बाहर से धुंवा भले ही न मालूम पड़ता हो, लेकिन मेरा ख्याल है कि बहुत से इलाकों में अनजवेयर ही शायद यह चीज हमारे माथे पर आ जायगी। मुझे उनसे मिलने का भी मौका मिला

और उस सबका जिक्र करने का यह अवसर नहीं है, और ऐसा करके मैं आपका अधिक समय नहीं लेना चाहता, लेकिन मैं उससे अभिभूत हुआ हूँ और तभी से मेरे दिमाग में प्रश्न उठ रहा है। मैं दो बार उधर गया और मुझे नक्सलाइट्स से भी मिलने का मौका मिला और मैं समझता हूँ कि इस प्रश्न को सुलझाने का प्रयत्न सरकार को शीघ्र ही करना चाहिए।

वाइस चेयरमैन महोदय, मैं एक बहुत पुरानी बात जो कभी भी चुका हूँ, आज फिर कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे वाइस प्रेसीडेंट की पोस्ट और राज्य सभा के चेयरमैन के पद को अलग रखना चाहिये। हमने अपना कांस्टीट्यूशन अधिकांश में ब्रिटिश मॉडल पर रखा, लेकिन वाइस प्रेसीडेंट या का चेयरमैन हो इसमें अमरीका का पैटर्न लिया। मैं समझता हूँ कि राज्य सभा के चेयरमैन को इतना काम होता है कि उसके लिये एक होल-टाइम चेयरमैन की जरूरत है। मैंने कुछ मित्रों से इसका जिक्र किया तो उन्होंने कहा कि राज्य सभा के लिये अगर होल टाइम चेयरमैन होगा तो वाइस प्रेसीडेंट क्या करेगा। मैं आपका ज्यादा समय नहीं लेना चाहता, लेकिन यह बता देना चाहता हूँ कि वाइस प्रेसीडेंट के लिये बहुत से काम फिर भी बाकी रहते हैं। राज्य सभा के चेयरमैनशिप के अलावा भी और अगर आप समझते हैं कि वाइस प्रेसीडेंट के लिये कोई काम ही नहीं है, उसको केवल राज्य सभा की चेयरमैनी ही ही करना है तो आप वाइस प्रेसीडेंट की पोस्ट को खत्म कर दीजिये। प्रेसीडेंट के न रहने से कैसे जगह भरी जाएगी इसका आपने तात्कालिक प्रबंध कर लिया है। लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि वाइस प्रेसीडेंट की पोस्ट की जरूरत है और उसको और काम भी दिया जा सकता है। दूसरी चीज यह है कि इसमें एक एनामली भी है, एक विचित्रता भी है। हमारे यहां आम तौर पर संविधान और शासन का जो पैटर्न चलता है वह ब्रिटिश पैटर्न है लेकिन यह जो अमेरिकन पैटर्न हमने बीच में मिला दिया है,

इसको सोचिये, इसको देखिये। वाइस प्रेसिडेंट एक तरह से गवर्नमेंट का स्पोक्समैन भी होता है मुल्क में और मुल्क के बाहर गवर्नमेंट जो तय करती है हमारे प्रेसिडेंट, हमारे वाइस-प्रेसिडेंट उसके स्पोक्समैन भी हैं। अब सोचिये कि जो गवर्नमेंट का स्पोक्समैन है उसी आदमी को हाउस में प्रेसाइड करना होता है और तय करना होता है और गवर्नमेंट के अलावा एक स्वतंत्र और निष्पक्ष राय या विचार व्यक्त करना होता है, तो उसके लिये कितना धर्म संकट इम्बरेसिंग, परेशानी, की बात है। इस-लिये मैंने पहले भी कहा था और फिर दुहराता हूँ कि वाइस-प्रेसिडेंट और चेयरमैन की पोस्टों को अलग कर देना चाहिये।

इन कुछ शब्दों के साथ मैं आपको धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि आखिरी वक्त में आपने मुझे कुछ कहने का मौका दिया।

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : Sir, I will not take much time. But there is one thing which occurred to me. I must bring it on record. Firstly, I must congratulate the party in power for having achieved a marvellous success in the elections. There is no doubt about it that the people's sympathy is with the party in power today. Let us concede this fact. I do not believe in creating any type of bitterness between the party in power and the Opposition. An election is like a sports match where after the match is over, both the captains come and shake hands and wish well to each other.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Both the captains?

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : Captains of both the parties.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Who are the captains?

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : Captains of the parties.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : What captains?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : No cross-talk.

**SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI :** It is not the function of the Opposition always to try to pull the legs of the people in power, always to decry them. This is rather cheap. I think our duty is otherwise. Let us know the relationship between the two. The party in power represents those who govern, and the Opposition represents the people who are governed. So, we have to see to it that the Government runs in a just manner and does justice to the people. And we in the Opposition are not to decry the Government. Our foremost duty is to put forward the claims of the people before the Government, and it is expected from the Government with such a big majority that they be more generous and see to it that whatever the Opposition represents is heeded to, that is, the people's grievances are redressed. They must therefore look at the problems with a sense of sympathy.

Sir, I also congratulate the President for the most beautiful Address that he has delivered in the history of India, for the first time since we got independence. Probably, it is due to the fact that good promises were made by the party in power during the elections and with a view to just repeating those promises or just to commit themselves officially, they have to speak on those issues. It is a very good thing. Therefore, though I belong to the Opposition I must speak out my heart as I feel. But the promises are rather hollow—that is my difficulty.

**श्री नागेद्वर प्रसाद शाही (उत्तर प्रदेश) :**  
यह साफ नहीं होता है कि सरकार इधर बैठती है या उधर बैठती है।

**उपसमाध्यक्ष (श्री अकबर अली खान) :**  
आप बैठ जाइये।

**श्री कल्याण चन्द (उत्तर प्रदेश) :** सच्चाई जो कहते हैं तो सरकार बताने लगते हैं।

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** I suggest that Mr. Tyagi be taken as the citizen of the world.

**SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI :** आप कुछ कहिये।

There are very good slogans, attractive slogans. We stand by those slogans. I will say to this House and particularly the hon. Prime Minister that in fulfilling this assurance, everyone of the Opposition parties will cooperate with them. After all, they are in the interests of the nation. And so it is not for us to put obstacles in the way. We are to help. But are you prepared to welcome our cooperation? If this is their spirit, it will go very well. I must say that removal of poverty is a good slogan. But that has to be spelled out. In the President's Address I find that no detail is given, just only the headline is there. I want to say that removal of poverty from amongst the people of India is unthinkable without developing agriculture to a stage where it becomes capable of meeting the rising demand of food-grains on the one side, and of raw materials for industries on the other. Unless that is

3 P. M.

done poverty cannot be removed. For purposes of achieving this end the following steps in my opinion have to be taken on a very large scales :

1. A village-wise survey has to be effected to collect data for development ;
2. intensive development of industries that serve agriculture which include the manufacture of machineries like tractors, harvesters, pumping sets and mineral fertilisers, herbicides and pesticides etc.

(Time bell rings.)

They are the foremost things that should be taken care of. Then, again ;

3. Provision of flow and lift irrigation facilities wherever possible or feasible ;
4. liberal supply of pumping sets and electric power to farmers ;
5. encouragement to cottage and small-scale industries in the rural areas as well as in urban areas ;

6. providing communication facilities to the rural and backward areas by building trunk roads, link roads and feeder roads all over the country. For this purpose a survey of the whole country has to be undertaken. Unless facility of transport is not provided villages can never develop. (Time bell rings)  
Very good, Sir.

7. A large scale house building programme in urban and rural areas ;

8. Medical facilities by opening dispensaries ;

9. Opening of schools and colleges.

All these requirements have to be assessed and for that purpose a survey has to be effected. I appeal to the Government because I have stated that they are the governors and we are the governed. So we represent the people. On behalf of the people I appeal that they might take the people also into confidence in improving their condition.

✓ SHRI KRISHAN KANT (Haryana) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the Motion of Thanks to the President on his Address to both Houses of Parliament. This Address has a special significance because the hon. President addressed the Houses after a big social and political change took place in the country. He has very rightly, in his Address, referred to many of the problems that the country faces and many of the steps that the Government proposes to take.

There are basic questions of social change—removal of poverty, removal of disparities and other things for which he has mentioned a number of steps that the Government will take immediately. The Address enumerates clearance and improvement of slums and rehabilitation of slum dwellers. It mentions the setting up of an important agency for the augmentation of housing facilities in metropolitan centres and urban areas. It aims at allotting building sites to landless workers on a larger scale.

Besides this, the President refers to the abolition of privy purse and privileges to the Princes. He also refers to putting a ceiling on urban property. But one big question is how to implement all these programmes. That question he has not answered in his Address. That question basically refers to the Constitution. The Supreme Court has been the biggest question mark. How does the Supreme Court function? Supposing we want to abolish the privy purse and the privileges, how are we to do that? The Supreme Court has struck down the Constitution Amendment Bill. Even if it is passed again, I am afraid, the Supreme Court will again strike it down. We might recollect

the Bela Banerjee case of 1954. The slums were vacated and houses were to be built for slum dwellers and the amount of compensation granted was much more than the market rate. If the interpretation of the Constitution as at present done by the Supreme Court continues, I am afraid all the programmes that we want to undertake in this President's Address cannot be undertaken. This is the basic question before the country. Hon. Members both in this House and in the other House have said that we should adopt Mr. Nath Pal's Bill and restore to Parliament the right to amend the fundamental rights. But even if that is done, I am afraid that in view of the majority judgment in the Golak Nath case, it might be struck down. This is what Mr. Hidayatullah has clearly stated. In the majority judgment, Mr. Hidayatullah says : "I am apprehensive that erosion of the right to property may be practised against fundamental rights. If a halt is to be called, we must declare the right of Parliament to abridge or take away fundamental rights....." Then he says, "I am of the opinion that an attempt to abridge or take away fundamental rights even through an amendment of the Constitution can be declared void. The Court has the power and jurisdiction to make this declaration." So, the judgment of the Supreme Court shows that even if you pass a constitutional amendment, the Supreme Court will not allow it. This is the situation in which we find ourselves today. The President's Address does not say anything about it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Let us amend it.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : Mr. Vice-Chairman, the question is, what are we doing today? Just after the elections, this question was posed to the Prime Minister in a press conference. And we know, the Prime Minister would not like to say anything openly about what the Government wants to do. When the Prime Minister was asked as to what they proposed to do, Mrs. Gandhi ventured a brief comment that the Supreme Court would naturally take note of the election results. To quote her exact words, she hoped "the Supreme Court itself will see things." "By implication" the *Times of India* report says—"she rejected the suggestion made by a correspondent that the composition of the Supreme Court bench

[Shri Krishan Kant]

might be altered by a string of new appointments." This is what the Prime Minister said. Now, after a few days, in a seminar in Chandigarh, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Mr. Sikri—he was furious about even such small things—said "The meaning of the Constitution does not change with every change in the Government." But may I ask, "Should it change with the changes in the composition of the Supreme Court?" (*Interruptions*) What I am saying is, in the previous case in *Shankari Prasad v. Union Government*, the five judges unanimously held that Parliament had the right to amend even the fundamental rights.

They felt that in Article 13, the word "law" would not include "constitutional law".

**SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI :** Do you think that Parliament is efficient enough to scrap the Constitution also ?

**SHRI KRISHAN KANT :** I am coming to it, Tyagiji. Mr. Vice-Chairman, the difficulty is that my hon. friend, Mr. Tyagi, agrees with the majority judgment.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** When, before or after the elections ?

**SHRI KRISHAN KANT :** In the majority judgment they had said...

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** Now he does not.

**THP VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) :** No interruptions please. Mr. Krishan Kant, you have only two minutes more.

**SHRI KRISHAN KANT :** No, no, I must get ten minutes more at least. I do not know why you are becoming a miser with me.

I was saying that Mr. Tyagi is one of those people who agreed with those judges who gave the majority judgment. They said, "There is nothing to choose between destruction of the Constitution by amendment or by revolution." Whether it is by revolution or by an amendment by Parliament, it is the same. That is what Mr. Tyagi feels. But we feel that the Constitution should be a live organ which can

be amended with the change in times to suit the changing needs and urges of the people. We know how the decision in *Golaknath* case was arrived at. Mr. Setalvad, former Attorney-General, in his autobiography, has written that it was a political judgment. Not only that. When he had a talk with Chief Justice Subba Rao at an evening party, he said, "On a vital issue like this you have given a judgment by a slender majority of 6 : 5." What did the Chief Justice say ? He said, "We tried our best to have a bigger majority, but we failed." That shows how there was a fundamental philosophy of manipulation and how the weight of private property was working. They tried to manipulate the judgment. If we calculate the three judgments, one was by five judges unanimously, another by a majority of 3 : 2 and the third by another by a majority of 6 : 5, we see that thirteen of the judges of the Supreme Court say that Parliament has got the right and only six say that it does not have the right. Even when the majority of the judges say so, still we do not have it. The Constitution is such, the situation is such. We have reached a stage when Roosevelt said when a similar situation arose in America,—

"When judges read words and implications in the Constitution which are not there and refuse to give effect to the words and implications which are there, the remedy is an appeal from the courts to the Constitution and from the Constitution to the people to save the judges from themselves."

And we went to the people after all that happened in the Privy Purse case. But now after getting the people's verdict what are we going to do ? Even after getting the people's verdict, you see what the attitude is of Chief Justice Sikri in Chandigarh. If this is his attitude, what type of a situation will arise ? Is not the situation like that of Bangla Desh where the people with an overwhelming majority say, "We want a Government of constitutional and democratic type ?" When President Yahya Khan stands in their way, they say, "We will not tolerate this."

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** In Bangla Desh when the judges were asked to administer oath to the newly appointed Martial Law Administrator, they refused to do so.

**SHRI KRISHAN KANT :** That is what I am saying. Here is a situation in India where the people by their verdict have given a two-thirds majority in the Lok Sabha, where the people of India have changed their preferences, and here Chief Justice Sikri says, "Constitution should not change with Government. Interpretation should not change with Government." What are we to do? President Yahya Khan is trying to wreck Bangla Desh... (*Interruption*), Chief Justice Sikri is acting in the same way in India...

**SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI :** He had taken oath of loyalty to the Constitution.

**SHRI KRISHAN KANT :** Under Article 368 the Constitution itself has provided for its amendment...

**SARDAR NARINDAR SINGH BRAR :** On a point of order, Sir. Is it desirable to compare Chief Justice Sikri with General Yahya Khan?

**SHRI CHANDI A SHEKHAR :** Why? It is not unparliamentary.

**SARDAR NARINDAR SINGH BRAR :** It is not unparliamentary. But is it desirable to compare like that?

(*Interruptions*)

**SHRI KRISHAN KANT :** Here the Supreme Court is not prepared to hear the verdict of the people and is trying to behave as General Yahya Khan is doing in Bangla Desh. What is this? What is to be done when a stalemate has been created? We cannot run our army and people to the Supreme Court to change it. What is the way out? The way out is the same as what Roosevelt did after he came to power a second time. Having won the people, it began to seem to Roosevelt that the Supreme Court which invalidated many of the laws of his first term stood in the way of the realisation of his programme. He, therefore, tried to reorganise the Federal judiciary by a constitutional amendment and tried to put people... (*Interruption*)... I am coming to that point. Is it not time that we said what Roosevelt said—he said, "I will not allow the country to be governed by a third Chamber like the Supreme Court." Is it not time that Parliament and

Government told the Supreme Court to behave? A time was when we read in the newspapers when they said, "If you do not permit Justice Sikri to become the Chief Justice of India on the basis of seniority, we will resign." I think that was the time when we should have accepted his resignation and said woe to the supreme Court and reconstituted it. Mr. Vice-Chairman.

[ **MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN** in the Chair ]

Mr. Deputy Chairman—I am telling both of you—in the Law Commission's report—Justice Sikri was a member—they have recommended that the post of Chief Justice should not be given merely by seniority. I would like to say that this should have been done and then we could have had a new Supreme Court now.

One basic feature in this election is that two types of people have been defeated. One of them represented big business like Tatas, Birlas, and others and the other category was the ex-Army, people like General Cariappa, General Harbakt Singh...

**THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI) :** General Harbakt Singh was not there.

**SHRI KRISHAN KANT :** Major Ranjit Singh of the Jan Singh. All of them were defeated. This country does not want to be ruled either by big business or by military people. The election has shown that the people of this country have shown maturity of judgment and have voted in favour of democracy.

Now the last point. My friend Shri Rajnarain is not here. I wish he was here. While speaking, he said :

अपना जीवन उत्सर्ग कर के भी इन्दिरा जी के प्रधानमंत्रित्व को आज समाप्त करना पड़ेगा तो मैं उसके लिये आज तैयार हूँ, अभी तैयार हूँ।

He said that he is prepared to sacrifice his life, if the Prime Minister can somehow be removed. But I am sorry to say that he has not succeeded, nor the Prime Minister is going

[Shri Krishan Kant]

to oblige him. I wish he does not sacrifice his life. This democratic Government is not going to take action against him. The only way how he can sacrifice is by self-immolation. But I feel that his presence is very much necessary in the political life of the country...

श्री बी० एन० मंडल (बिहार) : राज-नारायण ईमानदार है। वह समझता है कि जो आज शासन चल रहा है वह खराब चल रहा है। इसलिये उसको हटाने के लिये वह अपनी लाइफ भी सेक्रीफाई करने के लिये तैयार है।

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : I do not want him to sacrifice his life or commit self-immolation. Without him, the political life in this country will become very un-interesting because we will not then have antics like him in this country.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : The hon. Member is speaking on humanitarian grounds that somebody should not sacrifice.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : I know that Shri Rajnarain is a very loyal follower of Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia. His leader also felt that he would not get salvation unless defeated at the hands of the then Prime Minister, Shri Jawaharlal Nehru. Now Shri Rajnarain is following on the foot-steps of Dr. Lohia. But the difficulty is that Shri Rajnarain has not gone ahead after Dr. Lohia's death. When he died, anti-Congressism was at its height. After that, Shri Rajnarain has not changed. Like Cassabianca he is standing at the burning deck of the ship. He is still standing at the last post where Dr. Lohia had left him. He will now drown himself with all the reactionaries, syndicates and others in the four party alliance. By doing that, I hope he will show that he has some political maturity.

I would ask him at least to hear the voice of other leaders in his own party. Shri Gaude Murahari made a statement which appeared in the press in which he agreed that this election has given proof that there has been polarisation of voters between haves and have-nots. The

have-nots have voted with the Congress Party and the haves and others have voted with them and their partners. The people know where socialism lies. He said about fraud socialism and real socialism. I do not know if a real socialist will join the four party alliance. Sir, he wants to achieve socialism (*Times bell rings*) the socialism of the Swatantra Party, the secularism of the Jana Sangh and the fulfilment of promises to the people through the Congress (O) who are only known for the non-fulfilment of promises that they make in their resolutions in the thirty years of life. I hope this will be a lesson to all of our friends in the changing times and we in this House and the other House would fulfil the aspirations of the people which they expect.

\*SHRI THILLAI VILLALAN (Tamil Nadu) : During the discussion on Motion of Thanks on the President's Address some Hon'ble Members have expressed their views. Along with them, I would also like to express my views.

Sir, I am happy and thankful for the opportunity given to me to speak on this occasion. Now for the first time I am speaking in Tamil in this House. Previously all my speeches were in English. But this time the inspiration to speak in Tamil came to me because during the joint session, at the time of the President's Address, two Members, carried away by language fanaticism, indulged in undignified behaviour and it is very regrettable and as I have already put a motion separately on the subject, I do not want to dwell on this subject now.

Sir, in the Address it has been stated about the present elections. The people of India have completely reposed their confidence in the democratic front. *Vox populi Vo Dei* is the Political maxim. People-Dei have completely supported Mrs. Indira Gandhi's Government and the DMK party guided by Arignar Anna and led by Mr. Krunanidhi now. They have shown complete confidence to them. Now, the reactionaries have been smashed to pieces. There have been false allegations that the government machinery has been misused and

\*Original speech in Tamil.

that the official machinery has been misused to a large extent. In spite of the allegations of snap election, unfairness, cheating by chemicals misuse of AIR and all those things, I feel, this is a sort of frustration on their part and these are the bogus allegations by the opposition parties. They want to forget their defeat by making these allegations. But let them be happy if they derive that happiness from these allegations.

In a land of 52 crores of people, it is not possible to have elections without blemishes. There are certain mistakes and the Election Commission should take immediate steps to rectify them.

We have already completed four general elections. But we find that man has not stood in the elections, only symbols like elephant, cow, camel, stars, rising sun, etc. have stood in the election. But men have not stood in the election, only the symbols and it is a very sorry state of affairs and I think this should be changed. The people of India are hearing these symbols, but not men. We can ask for votes for the symbols and not for the educated people. Whatever may be the faults in the election machinery and whatever may be the defects but we must change the educational standard of the people. If there are one lakh votes, invalid votes are twelve to twenty thousand and what I think is that it is not enough to change the election machinery only. We should educate the people in this respect. We should see to it that this process should be changed. This is a national issue and not a party issue. The main thing is the unflinching loyalty of the people of India and the people of India have given the responsibility to this Government. The time has now come to fulfil all those promises like 'Garibi hatao' and the main and the important thing is the amendment of the Constitution. Food problem, clothing problem and the problem of shelter are there. All these have to be solved.

I have come from Tamil Nadu where Bharathiar sang

"THANI ORUVANUKKU UNAILAINIL  
JAGATHINAI ALITHUIDUVOM"

which means if any individual is left without food we will destroy the whole world.

We here the song of Bharathidasam

"UNAVILAI INILAI ENUM NILAI"

which means that the stage where nobody is without food must come

"IRANTHUM UYIRVALTHAL VENDINA  
PARANDHU KEDUGA ULAGITTRIYAN"  
valluor has stated that if any body is left to eke out his life by begging, the God must be destroyed

Therefore, Sir, the party should be eradicated.

Another problem is the problem of beggary. This problem should also be solved immediately, and it should be abolished.

The problem of poverty has been existing for a long time. We are very backward in this respect and now time has come to redeem these pledges. Now, take Delhi or any other city. There are palatial bungalows, and we see hovels. How are we going to obliterate this disparity? This is the main question now. These questions are already disturbing the minds of the people. When we are going to remove these disparities, only then it will be called Socialism. We should abolish poverty. But that is not enough. We should see that production is increased.

Even after 25 years of Independence and implementation of Five Year Plans, we have not been able to solve the problem of unemployment—educated unemployment as well as uneducated unemployment. This unemployment problem is going on for a long time, and we are not able to solve this problem. This is the main problem. Whatever plans we are making, we are not able to solve this problem of unemployment. If you cannot solve the problem of educated unemployment, then all our financial plans are, of no use.

The Great Valluor Said

"ULUTHUNDU VALVARAY VALVAR  
MATRALLAM THOLUTHUNDU  
PINSELBAVAR"

which means the agriculturists lead others. Therefore our country is mainly an agricultural

[Shri Thillai Villalan]

country. So far as agriculture is concerned, we should see to it that we make some improvements in agriculture and revolutionize it. I want that one land army should be established. This should be composed of young people with mission spirit. They must work like prosperity Brigade working in Tamil Nadu. And we can see Great Revolution in agriculture after the establishment of the land army. It has already been stated in the Directive Principles of the State Policy, and it is not written words on paper only. It is a thing to be implemented by the Government. Necessary steps should be taken immediately for the implementation of the Directive Principles of State Policy. The Constitution should not stand in the way of progress. It is entirely for this purpose that the people have given *en masse* support to the Government. If it is necessary, the Constitution should also be amended.

We find that in East Pakistan the freedom movement led by Sheikh Mujibur Rehman is in progress and we have already extended our support to that movement. Our Centre and the States should work in harmony and solve all these problems, and for this purpose it is absolutely necessary that the Constitution should be amended. It is also necessary that there should be harmonious relations between the Centre and the States.

Two days before, the Hon'ble Chief Minister, Mr. Karunanidhi, stated in the State Assembly that the centre would have consulted the Chief Ministers of all States before passing unanimous resolution regarding East Pakistan even though we approve of the foreign policy. This sort of problems may be used as opportunity to have closer contact with the states.

Regarding the pay rise of employees and labour problems, with which the States are concerned, the Centre should also work in harmony with the States, and we can easily solve these problems also. The Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu has regretted that in these matters people in the States are getting information only from newspapers.

In the President's Address, we are seeing only the promises but not the ways and means of implementation. The people who brought

about the silent revolution through ballot box will be satisfied that the confidence they reposed is not belied only when the promise given has been materialised. This Government should endeavour to fulfil all those promises. Vanakkam.

With these words I conclude my speech.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Raju, please.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, one section of the House should not be allowed to represent. There are many people left on this side also. The Syndicate Congress is there.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: They will get a chance.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Shrimati Yashoda Reddy is there. After her defeat in the election for Lok Sabha, she should at least be given a chance to speak here.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): I hope, the Chair will give me the time.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: At least in sympathy with Mr. Bhupesh Gupta....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are very hard of time. Please do not interrupt.

SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHAYAY: While I very much welcome the speech of the leader of the D.M.K. Party and I very much thank you and your Secretariat for kindly arranging the translation of this, may I appeal to you to make arrangements for translation of my mother tongue also, so that we can participate in our mother language from the next Session.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is the same thing which I wanted to say. I also want to speak.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please do not interrupt. She has already made this point. Mr. Raju will please speak now.

SHRI V. B. RAJU (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, the election to the 5th Lok Sabha recently

held, unlike the election to the 4th Lok Sabha, is a massive mandate for two significant things. One is the political stability and the other is the socialist economy. Sir, it is also significant in a way that this election has cut many political parties to size and in some respect individuals too and any effort to belittle this mandate will really betray or reveal that major issues are being side tracked and petty matters are being tried to be high-lighted. It also shows that there is a lack of appreciation of the mood of the nation. Sir, there are shortcomings in every election and we have been receiving complaints in every election. But there is a remedy for it and the forum is not this. It is elsewhere.

About the repair to the election mechanism, what exactly has been stated—here I have been hearing and in the other House the reports I have been reading—that the election mechanism has not functioned effectively. Some ballot papers have been found in some godowns or some Officers have been transferred or broadcasting time was not allotted properly. Sir, are these the issues that we are discussing about today? I would like to point out to this House that the exception is only in respect of three areas. The exception has been there in three small parts of such a big country. One is the part of Bengal, which is for one reason. The other is a part of Madhya Pradesh, that is for another reason and the third is a part of Andhra Pradesh, that is for another reason.

AN HON. MEMBER : That is Telengana.

SHRI V. B. RAJ J : Sir, I am not so small minded to import the Telengana issue here. My point is, it is a very big sweep. It is for the first time that those who have been born in free India also had an opportunity to vote. This is a very significant factor. It has opened a new era. Let us not belittle it. On this occasion, let us not talk about things. Some people have predicted, some important journalists, in 1967 that that was the last election in India. The other day the same important journalist has said that he had read India incorrectly. Some people staying in Delhi, or sitting in the Central Hall try to interpret the Indian situation as if they knew everything. India is too big for these people. Let us not misunderstand this country, that it is capable of being advised by mere newspaper

criticism. In fact almost all the papers in this country which are managed by big business have taken a particular stand and they have been exposed. I remember those words of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru when he said that in the UK the newspaper industry is a big industry whereas in India the newspaper industry is a big man's industry. Big capital has captured the newspaper industry here. It is a rich man's industry whereas in the UK it is a big industry by itself. That is the distinction.

In the two decades of our constitutional history, the country had a very short period of threat to the stability at the Centre. Those dark days have gone. There is the sun on the horizon. Let us encash this great enthusiasm and this great awakening in the people for actually securing a very rapid pace towards a socialist economy. If we miss the bus, the future will not spare us. The time is short before us. I did not expect that the Lok Sabha will be adjourned at this particular moment when this part of the globe is passing through a very critical situation. It seems to me that there is lack of urgency, a sense of urgency, now. In fact we do not meet formally. We meet for business. Particularly when great things are happening in Asia, particularly for the first time in South Asia, this House should have been kept alert. The nation should have been kept alert. I would come to that later in half a minute, but let me say that the new enthusiasm has got to be canalised and if we fail to encash this as the leaders of the nation, we will be condemned in history. We have been given a new lease of life. After the Fourth General Elections, as everybody knows, the political organisations got disintegrated in this country. The three evils that actually were there in this country were, multiplicity by political parties, instability in Governments in the States and money corruption in the election. These three have become so significant that outside the country they earned us bad name but fortunately a new image is actually created now. Shall we miss this chance? Let us not. Let us talk about big things. For a poor country like ours, we cannot afford the luxury of political instability, particularly in the State. The States have actually been passing through such difficult times that the people are fed up with the State Governments. If I am correct,

[Shri V. B. Raju]

there are 75 political parties in the country and in Bihar; after 1967, it has passed through 7 Governments. It is a game that we are playing here? Are these instruments to serve the people—the Aya Rams and Gaya Rams? Is this luxury going to perpetuate itself? I suggest, let these parties put their heads together and particularly with regard to the States, let them reconsider about the suggestion of having elected Governors. I am not putting it in a lighter vein or irresponsibly or out of disgust but to gain a certain measure of stability and to reduce the number of political parties and reduce money corruption also and let them see whether such a system would be actually useful. It is not an ideal system but any how it is worth experimenting.

About the federal structure, the relations between the Centre and the States have got to be perfected. A democratic system will survive only by the demonstration of its responsiveness to the urges of the regions otherwise they become so unmanageable and what we have seen in East Bengal actually may be repeated in other parts of the globe as well. Therefore, Sir, the federal system will be successful when its democratic mechanism responds to the assertive urges in the regions and we should see that they are met before they become unmanageable. To resolve the inter-state problems and also the Centre-State problems, I would put a question to the Government, why are they not actually taking recourse to the provisions in article 263? What is the harm in actually constituting an inter-State Council under article 263? Why should the executive part of the Government take all the blame on itself? Why can't it have an open-door policy and constitute an inter-State Council and if that Council's advice is taken into consideration it will solve many of the problems. Therefore a new method should be employed for resolving the tensions between the Centre and the States.

Sir, I will say a word about the economy. From 1960 till 1968 the per capita income in the country has not shown any improvement. The per capita national product has not shown any improvement. In 1960 it was Rs. 306 whereas in 1968-69 it was only Rs. 321; it is only Rs. 15/- more or 5 per cent more over

that in 1960. Why is the economic not growing? I would like to make the suggestion again which I made the other day in my speech on the Budget. I said then that the volume of money available in the market was at the bottom of the mischief. The question is whether by increased production we are going to bring down the prices or by drawing away the money from the market we are going to do it. Increased production will no doubt bring down the prices but my suggestion here is that the Prime Minister should consider the question of drawing a lot of money from the market, especially that money which is not being applied to productive purposes. If you want to increase production, if you want to increase investment in the productive sector, then you must draw away much of the unaccounted money from the market and the only way is by demonetisation, demonetisation of half the value of the notes and the remaining half you convert into bonds. By compulsory borrowing you can draw away a lot of money from the market. I made this suggestion the other day to the Finance Minister.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You need not make it again now.

SHRI V. B. RAJU: But he actually threw it out as a fantastic idea. I would therefore request the Prime Minister to consider this question of drawing away the money from the market.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: Sir, very few people will be having the same advantage that fortunately I have. To-day is the 5th of April and exactly on 5th March the country had decided what the country wanted. Very few people would be fortunate like me, having been defeated at the polls to get an opportunity to speak on the President's Address.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh): You are unique.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: Thank you. As a person who has had the practical impact of the elections, I would like to say a few words to the House. First I congratulate the Congress Party led by Mrs. Indira

Gandhi for the absolutely massive and great victory.

DR. K. MATHÉW KURIAN (Kerala): Belated wisdom.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: Sir, it is better to get wisdom at any time than not getting at all.

Sir, unfortunately after I came back to Delhi I heard from a variety of people, at a variety of places, a lot of talk about the elections. Sir, may I place before you and this House that all these doubts about the elections being rigged, about the elections being manipulated, about the elections being tampered with, are nothing but fantastic nonsense? Nobody can speak with greater authority than myself because I was a candidate myself and was there at the polling booths, at least at 20 polling booths. After the polling I went and told a friend in Madras that if I saved my deposit it would be a great thing. Why did I say that? Not that I felt inferior to the candidate who was pitted against me. I went to the polls with the greatest confidence and I thought that the Congress (R) candidate was not even a patch before me—I am sorry but people should not mistake me—but when I saw the image of the Congress Party led by Mrs. Indira Gandhi I must gracefully and openly accept that if there was one leader in India who was able to do this it was she. And I congratulate her. I was with my father and mother at the time of results. For half an hour, at first I felt sorry that I was defeated, but immediately a thought occurred to me. As an Indian I am thankful to her because she has provided a stable Government at the centre. As a woman I felt proud and as a politician may I, Sir, through you, congratulate Mrs. Indira Gandhi? As pointed out by Mr. Mahavir Tyagi very correctly, the President has made a very good Address, one of the best we have come across, but I do not agree with Mr. Tyagi in one thing. This is not the time for the President to spell out the programme. The time comes when the Government brings forward its Budget in the next Session, when the Government will formulate its policies, when they will interpret their general policy. At the outset, the President, who has just seen what has happened and what commitments

the ruling party has made, has referred to the duty of the party and to the general programme which it should fulfil. I think he has done it very well and I congratulate him for that. Very rightly he has put great emphasis on economic issues. Based on these issues the ruling party went to the polls and naturally he has devoted more time to economic policies.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI: It is a headache to them.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: Certainly. The massive mandate, as the President was pleased to comment, has been equally for democratic stability, which the Government must note. I hope it will pave the way for stability in the States also and it is a mandate for law and order. I am grateful to the President when he said that the politics of murder would be eliminated. A grateful nation is anxiously waiting to see what will happen in West Bengal and elsewhere. I want to remind the Government that the most important thing which they must immediately tackle even before abolishing poverty, which is a long process and cannot be done in a day, is the maintenance of law and order. Peace must be maintained in this country so that the people can have faith in the Government.

The third is the abolition of poverty, to which I have referred. I do not have much time, but I just want to utter a note of warning to the Government. The President has mentioned a variety of things—about poverty, about unemployment, about housing, about land reforms. These are not new programmes. These are more or less the programmes set by every party. Now, a unique responsibility rests on the Government. It is in absolute power today and it shall be judged by its deed and not the other parties. So, I appeal to the Government, just because you have got a very big majority in Lok Sabha do not gloat over your victory. I may tell the Government that their work is not over with the winning of the election. Their work has just started now for the first time and the Government of India is facing a challenge. May I tell Mrs. Gandhi that people have voted for her and her party and it is a vote of hope and faith and expectation? They are expecting a lot of things from her and her party. I know

[Shrimati Yashoda Reddy]

that no one party or one person can do it in five years. I am aware of it, but certainly a very great attempt must be made and some immediate problems at least must be solved. Otherwise, the people will not excuse the party of Parliament or the Government. This one fact about the commitment and duty, the President has very categorically and clearly stated in his Address. I am also glad to say that the President has said that the present Government has no more any excuses, nor can they have any alibis. They cannot put the blame on anybody else. Today the Government of India is in such a position either to make or mar itself, and it will be entirely and squarely responsible for it. It cannot shove that responsibility at all, and this recognition the President has made known, and I think because the President has said it in his Address the Government is aware of it.

About administrative efficiency, the President has given a note. Not that we did not know it, but for the President to have formally said it in his Address is very timely because it is the administrative redtapism, administrative delays and administrative inefficiency which are the headache and bottleneck in planning and implementation. I also think that the pep talk which the Prime Minister gave to the Secretaries and reconstituting the Planning Commission and even on the formation of the Cabinet is a step she has taken with that thought in her mind. After all the result cannot be judged today, but one certainly gets a feeling that the lady knows what she wants and that she is trying to do things.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : Ladies also know how to betray.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY : But it is because of the men. It is the men who make the women betray. The women are not to be blamed.

I do not want to say much, Sir, but one more word and I will finish. As I have said, many of these problems which they want to tackle, for instance land reforms, this problem is not entirely a problem of the Centre but also of the States. May be the Government of India will have to tackle many of the State Govern-

ments and it is the State Government which are more of a bottleneck than the Parliament or the Central Government.

Then Centre-State relations. But one word I want to say about Mr. Krishan Kant. When he made his speech, he was referring to the Supreme Court. With many of the things I disagree with him, and I am not one of those Members of Parliament who believe in criticising the Supreme Court or the Supreme Court Judges. But I must say there are some constitutional, judicial restraints for the working of the Government. Then what should we do? It is for the Government and for Parliament to remove them. I was one of those for the late Mr. Nath Pai's Bill. Unfortunately Mr. Nath Pai is not here to move it. I think the Government will bring in a Bill. I was one of the people who said that Parliament have always the right to amend the Constitution including the fundamental rights. If we want to have any obstacles to be removed, it is for Parliament to remove, whether they are constitutional obstacles or administrative difficulties. So, do that first. My appeal to the Members of Parliament would be : do not try to criticise the Judges so much but give them a Constitution which they should interpret. That is my only humble appeal.

Last, I only want to ask one question of the Government. After the elections there has been a lot of speculation in Andhra about Telengana. Sir, rumours have been going on that the Government of India had promised them a separate State if they got 50 per cent seats. I am an integrationist and one of those people who do not want my State to be divided. But may I know from the Government whether the Government believes in dividing a State on an emotional vote? Because if you want an emotional vote, I can get it by saying to my district "I want a separate State for my district". I am sure 90 per cent of the people would vote for it. After all it was in their wisdom they said that they would be part of Andhra. Separate States cannot be built on emotional vote. There must be political, administrative or other reasons. If so, it is not one State that should be dealt with; the whole country must be dealt with. If you think about a separate Telengana today, I am not averse to anything,

whatever Parliament may decide, but things should not be done piecemeal. With great humility I am saying that if they want any more divisions, India as a whole should be taken and not one State. The moment you try to make this sort of arrangement with one State the trouble starts. Once and for all you must decide whether you should have big or small States. If so, what should it be? It should be done in a national way. And today the Government of India—and Mrs. Gandhi especially—is in such a strong position, and she should, consulting her Cabinet and her colleagues, come to a decision so that she may give us the right lead and so that all the speculation is set at rest.

As I have said earlier, the Government is faced with a very great challenge. At least at this time, I hope that everybody, irrespective of party and political shades, shall wish the Government great success because it is a challenging task that they are faced with. Later if they do not come up to that expectation we can criticise. But today the Government needs all the encouragement that we can offer, and so we wish all the best of luck for the programmes which it has undertaken. And I personally wish Mrs. Gandhi good luck.

✓ **SHRI BIPINPAL DAS (Assam)**: Mr. Deputy Chairman, before I begin, I would request you to be a little more lenient to me about time. It is for the first time that I have taken my stand in this session.

I rise to support the motion moved by Shrimati Purabi Mukhopadhyay, and while supporting the motion, I would like to make a few observations.

The President was pleased to say that in the last mid-term poll for the Lok Sabha, the electorate asserted its sovereignty through the ballot box, that it gave a massive mandate for a peaceful and democratic change. There is no doubt that this was a very correct assessment. But in my opinion, the recent election has shown something more, something of much deeper and wider significance. The vast majority of our electorate may be poor, illiterate and lacking in Political consciousness in the conventional sense. But they are gifted with a strong and shrewd common sense, a mature wisdom

which enable them to make a clear choice and to firmly exercise their will to set to order a situation full of doubts and confusions. Indeed, the Indian electorate defied and fooled all learned pollsters, all expert observers and commentators and threw overboard their speculations, analysis and assessments. They asserted their right to be heard and refused to be dictated from ivory towers.

Sir, this clear mandate for a peaceful and democratic change has a far-reaching significance for this country. The electorate has, broadly speaking, not only rejected the parochial, regional and other fissiparous tendencies, not only cut across caste and communal ties, but has stood firmly against the extremes at both ends, against right reaction on one hand and left adventurism on the other. They have not only reaffirmed their faith in the democratic system, but have also given a clear indication that they can no longer be taken for granted by anybody, however big, powerful or otherwise influential he may be. This is a lesson not for the vanquished alone, but for the victors too.

Instead of learning these lessons, some people have raised all kinds of allegations, questioning the fairness of the elections held, alleging malpractices and irregularities. I shall not go into them because the hon. Law Minister has just now dealt with them and has given effective replies.

But I will only say that none can deny that malpractices did take place in the past, they might have taken place this time also and they may take place again in future in stray and isolated cases involving any political party. And that is precisely why the law has made a specific provision for adequate remedies. But to advance it as an explanation for the success of a single party as a whole is nothing but an insult to the electorate. Such mischievous and malicious propaganda may be indulged in by some people to justify their defeats or may provide a cloak to cover up their battered and mutilated features, but it can never mislead the people who know what they have done and why.

Sir, the programmes mentioned in the President's Address which the Government pro-

[ Shri Bipinpal Das ]

pose to take up in the current year are no doubt realistic, constructive and useful. They will certainly, if implemented sincerely and seriously, help in easing the problems of the people and in setting the pace for further socio-economic reforms. I am particularly happy because more attention has been paid to our villages and the rural sector. India exists in the villages and will continue to do so for a long time to come. India's real progress therefore depends largely on the progress and improvement in the village life and on the extent to which the huge gap between the village and the town can be bridged or narrowed down. Correct social and economic development of this country must have as one of its principal objectives a co-ordinated and balanced development of the urban and the rural sector, of industry and agriculture, of the social role of the peasant and the industrial worker.

4 P. M.

But I am not wholly satisfied with the Presidential Address. The Congress manifesto itself was very modest and pragmatic. I was happy that unlike others the Congress did not indulge in tall talks in its manifesto. They said what they believed they could do. But in his Address the President did not cover some of the important items of the manifesto itself. For example, linking wages with productivity was a very good idea incorporated in the manifesto. But it has not found place in the Address of the President. Similarly, the manifesto boldly said, and rightly so, that no realistic wage and price policy can work unless it is integrated with a rational wealth and income policy. The Address gives us no idea as to how this policy is proposed to be given a concrete shape.

Sir, while speaking on the Fourth Plan in the Monsoon Session of last year I put particular stress on reforming our educational system so as to make it over-whelmingly utilitarian in character, and the Prime Minister in her reply was kind enough to say that she entirely agreed with me. The Congress manifesto also set the same objective before itself as the party's basic policy on education. But the Presidential Address is wholly silent about it. I know education is essentially a State subject.

But the Centre has to play a leading role in this matter. Educational reforms are bound to be a long-term programme and, therefore, formulation of concrete programmes can brook no further delay.

Sir, the people of India have voted Congress back to power with great expectations, and it is our duty and responsibility now to measure up to those expectations. For that we have to solve or at least ease some of their immediate and burning problems. I would like to repeat what I said in my speech on the Fourth Plan that the immediate burning problems of the people are land, prices, disparity, unemployment and regional imbalance. These are the basic problems which agitate the minds of our people most and they will judge our Government primarily on the basis of what the Government can do in these matters. Sir, I have no time at my disposal to go into the details of these questions. I shall, therefore, be very brief in my observations.

I am glad that the Government have proposed to take up the question of land reforms in all earnestness. I would only say that if any State Government, particularly belonging to our party, fails to act in accordance with the party policy and bring about land reforms speedily they should be pulled up and Central financial assistance for other schemes due to such States may even be held up.

The Government propose to control the prices by increasing the supply of goods either through increased production or through import. This is, of course, elementary economics. But I do not think that it is a realistic proposition. Production has increased a good deal during the last 23 years, but prices have never been arrested thereby. A number of other factors come into play. Sir, in my humble opinion the problem of prices should be attacked not only from the end of production but also from that of distribution. The latter is possible only if income and expenditure are brought under strict limits. A ceiling on expenditure is perhaps more important in our situation of today than that on income and such ceilings on income and expenditure will not only have salutary effect on the prices but will also help in raising national savings and

in narrowing the gap of disparity. In addition to this, extensive introduction of State and co-operative trading in all essential commodities, particularly in wholesale trade or side by side with private retail trade, may help to a large extent in stabilising the prices. The Government may perhaps also consider seriously the question of demonetisation as an instrument of price policy.

Sir, I welcome the measures proposed to meet the problem of unemployment. But these are not enough even for the first and immediate task of arresting further growth of unemployment. A real and lasting solution of this problem cannot be found except through rapid expansion of industrial programmes. But here I must sound a note of warning and repeat what I said on earlier occasions, that industrialisation need not and must not mean blind imitation of the Western pattern. We do not have the advantages that were enjoyed by the West, Capitalist or Communist. We have extremely limited resources, a huge population to employ and feed, and have to operate through all the checks and brakes of a democratic system. A highly capitalised technology, therefore, as built up by the West, cannot form the basis of our vast industrial programmes. Small and medium-scale industries on an extensive scale based on low capitalisation and high employment potential is the only answer to our problem. This is the way by which Japan has become the third richest country in the world to-day. This is a challenge to our scientists and research workers and I hope the proposed National Plan for the application of Science and Technology will be geared to meet this challenge. The same principle should apply to agriculture too. While science must come to the aid of agriculture in various forms, introduction of large-scale mechanisation in this field will make the unemployment problem much worse and more acute.

Sir, several Members have spoken about regional imbalances and I need hardly add anything to it. How explosive this problem can become is therefore everybody's eyes to see. If national unity and national integrity are to be preserved and strengthened further, regional imbalances must go. Different regions of the country must develop and progress more or less uniformly and at the same pace. And

for this, the advanced regions must be prepared to make sacrifices for the development of the backward regions. Otherwise, nationalism itself will be in danger and socialism, a distant cry. I hope the Government will come forward with a clear and concrete policy in this regard.

One word more about my State. Sir, I come from a State which is rich in natural resources, but has hardly made even a beginning in the matter of industrial development. The people of my State had a long standing grievance against the Centre. They felt that they were neglected and given a step-motherly treatment by the Union Government. So, they were very happy when the Prime Minister announced a package programme for Assam on December 5, 1969, on the floor of the Lok Sabha. The people were further enthused when a few more industrial projects were decided upon subsequently. But all these projects are still confined to files and no work has actually been started. People have begun to doubt, to be despaired and to feel frustrated. Let me hope the Prime Minister, in whom the people of Assam have reposed so much trust and confidence, will not allow such frustration to grow in them, will take a personal interest in the matter and direct all the Ministries concerned to proceed with the execution of the projects without further delay. Thank you.

سردار نریندر سنگھ برار :- ڈپٹی چیرمین صاحب - میں پریذنٹ صاحب کا شکریہ ادا کرتا ہوں کیونکہ انھوں نے دوڑوں ڈائریکٹر کے سامنے اپنا ایڈریس دیا۔ لیکن جہاں تک میرا خیال ہے مجھے یہ ایڈریس کھوکھلا دکھائی دیا۔ کیونکہ اس میں مغربی دور کرنے کے لئے بہت کچھ کہا گیا ہے مگر اس کو صاف طور پر نہیں بتایا گیا ہے کہ مشرقی مغربی اور دیہات کی مغربی کو دور کرنے کے لئے کیا کیا جائے گا۔ اس کے بارے میں ڈیٹیل ہونی چاہئے تھی کہ کس طرح سے اسٹیل کو ڈیزل کے دھوکے میں کیا جائے گا۔ کس طرح سے بے روزگاروں کو روزی دی جائے گی۔ ان باتوں پر کوئی روشنی نہیں ڈالی گئی۔ جہاں تک دیہاتی مزدور اور شہری مزدوروں کا تعلق ہے ان کے رہنے کا طریقہ، کھانے کا طریقہ، کھانے کا طریقہ یہ بالکل ڈیفرینٹ ہے اس کے لئے انھوں نے کچھ بھی طریقہ نہیں بتایا کیوں کہ انھیں ان لوگوں سے دوٹ لے تھے۔ انھیں اس کے بارے میں بتا دینا چاہئے تھا کیوں کہ مغربی لوگوں نے ہی ان کو دوٹ دیا تھا۔

श्री महाबोर त्यागी : यह तो हमारा और आपका फर्ज है ।

سرदार زریندر سنگھ برار :- جہاں تک میں غریبی کی بات سمجھتا ہوں ہمارے پنجاب کے دیہاتوں کے غریبوں کا زیادہ تر تعلق کھیتی باڑی سے ہے۔ کسان کا کام کرتے ہیں۔ اس لئے کسان کی حوصلہ افزائی کرنا ہماری گورنمنٹ کا فرض ہے لیکن اس کے لئے ان کے طریقے بالکل غلط ہیں۔ مثال کے طور پر لیجئے کسان کو کیا کچھ ادھار لینا پڑتا ہے۔ کھاد بیج جن کی پرائس پہلے سے دوگنی ہو گئی ہے۔ اس طرح بجلی، میٹھے، بجلی ملتی نہیں۔ پانی آتا نہیں۔ ٹریکٹر ہیں وہ بلیک میں بیٹے ہیں۔ وہاں میں اگر ملتا ہے تو اس کے ساتھ غلط ایمپلیمنٹ دے دیے جاتے ہیں۔ فلاں قسم کا ڈیزل انجن تو اس طرح وہ لوٹے جاتے ہیں۔ جہاں تک کسان کا تعلق جو اسی پرنٹ ہماری کنٹری میں بیٹے ہیں۔ ان کی پرائس کو اگر ہم مل نہیں کریں گے تو لینڈ لیس مزدور کا پرانہ حل ہوگا اور نہ ہی کچھ اور کر سکیں گے۔

پنجاب نے اتنی گندم پیدا کی ہے کہ وہ سارے ہندوستان کو گندم دے سکتا ہے۔ جتنا روپیہ ہر بیج کے لیے ہے وہ پنجاب کو دے دیا جائے سبھی کے طور پر۔ جو گندم کی پرائس آپ نے کم کی ہے اگر سبھی ڈائریکٹرز وغیرہ دیں تو ہمیں اس پر کوئی اعتراض نہیں ہے۔ پرائم منسٹر صاحب کو انفارمیشن ہے یا نہیں۔ وہیٹ میں پیسٹ لگ گیا ہے جس کی وجہ سے بہت دقتیں ہیں۔ تو میں کہوں گا کہ کسان کو سبھی ڈائریکٹرز دی جائیں۔ اس کے لئے اسٹیشن کو ڈیزل کی پرائس کم کی جائے۔ دوسرے مزدور جن کے پاس زمین نہیں ہے ان کے لئے اجرت کم سے کم تین روپے سے بڑھ کر چار پانچ روپے کر دی جائے جس سے ان کی حالت بہتر ہو سکے۔

مجھے اعتراض ہے ڈیفینشن پر۔ ڈیفینشن ہوتے ہیں۔ جب کانگریس گورنمنٹ کے خلاف ہوتے تو بہت چلائے۔ ڈیفینشن گئی تھی۔ ہم کو ایسا معلوم ہونے لگا کہ کوئی اچھا قانون بن رہا ہے جس کے ذریعے سے یہ غیر سیدہ چیز بند کر دی جائے گی لیکن مجھے افسوس ہے کہ ایسا نہیں ہوا۔ اندراجی بہت شان سے جیتی ہیں پالیسیکل اسٹیبلشمنٹ آئی ہے لیکن اس کے بعد اب کانگریس پارٹی نے صوبوں میں ڈیفینشن شروع کر دیا ہے۔ (انٹرنیشن)۔ شور مچانے سے کچھ نہیں ہوتا۔ اس لئے میں کہوں گا کہ ڈیفینشن کے لئے قانون پر توجہ دینی چاہئے اسے جلد سے جلد بنایا جانا چاہئے جس سے یہ کرپشن نہ بڑھے۔ جب تک پالیسیکل کرپشن کم نہیں ہوگا تب تک دوسرے کرپشن ختم نہیں ہوں گے اور جب تک دوسرے کرپشن ختم نہیں ہوں گے تب تک کسی قسم کی غریبی کم نہیں ہوگی ایسا میرا مکمل بھروسہ ہے۔

جہاں تک بیوی انڈسٹری کا تعلق ہے پنجاب کو انٹور کیا گیا ہے پنجاب کے غریب کو انٹور کیا گیا ہے۔ جب تک بیوی انڈسٹری نہیں ہوں گی مزدور کہاں کمزور ہوں گے۔ ان کو فارم پر کام نہیں ملتا اس لئے ان کو درہلکا پڑتا ہے اور اس لئے ان کو اجرت کم ملتی ہے۔ پنجاب میں بیوی انڈسٹری نہیں ہیں۔ ہمارے یہاں جو چھوٹی انڈسٹریز تھیں وہ بارہ کروڑ روپے کا ایکسپورٹ کرتی ہیں۔ آپ پنجاب کو اسکوٹریکٹری ڈیزل ٹریکٹری دیکھئے۔ بجلی کا بھی خیال رکھنا چاہئے۔ پنجاب جتنا گندم دیتا ہے اس کے حساب سے اس کے لئے بجلی کی طرف توجہ دینی چاہئے۔

اب سوال یہ ہے کہ کیا دنیا کی کوئی گورنمنٹ کسان کے خلاف اس قسم کی ٹیکسز وغیرہ لگایا یا پریشانی میں ڈالتا یا اس کو روز کی مصیبت میں ڈالتا اس طرح کے کام کرتی ہے۔ کبھی میں لینڈ ریفارم کی بات سنتا ہوں۔ میں سمجھ نہیں پایا کہ لینڈ ریفارم کے کیا مطلب ہیں۔ اگر لینڈ سیلنگنگ کہیں تو سمجھ میں آتا ہے کہ کھنڈر زمین کی تعداد اتنی کر دو۔ اگر سیلنگنگ لگائے کے بعد لینڈ ریفارم کی بات کرتے ہیں تو میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ وہ کسان کے دشمن ہیں اور ان کو پست نہیں کہ کسان کے کیا پرائیملس ہیں۔ لینڈ ریفارم سے ان کا مطلب کیا ہے۔ اگر ان کا مطلب کسان کو تباہ کر دینا اس کو برباد کر دینا ہے تو لینڈ ریفارم آنا چاہئے۔ اگر ان کا مطلب کسان کو طاقت دینا کسان کو حوصلہ دینا اس کی پیداوار کو بڑھانا ہمارے جو اناج وغیرہ ایکسپورٹ کرتے ہیں اس کو بند کرنا ہے تو ان کو کسان کی اعزاز کرنی چاہئے۔ بگس سلوگن بند کرنا چاہئے۔ جہاں تک دوسری زمینیں پڑی ہوئی ہیں ان کو ہریجوں کی بھلائی کے لئے دیں اس طرح گورنمنٹ قدم اٹھائے تو مجھے بہت خوشی ہوگی۔ ان کی اجرتیں بڑھائے اس میں بھی مجھے بہت خوشی ہوگی۔ (جاری)۔

ایک سوال آگیا ہے لائینڈ آرڈر کا۔ آج آپ دیکھئے کہ ملک کے اندر بدترین قسم کا لائینڈ آرڈر ہے۔ جنگل میں جو کچھ ہوا اس کے لئے پہلے مارکس دادی پارٹی پر الزام لگایا گیا ہے کہ انھوں نے وہاں کے لائینڈ آرڈر کو خراب کیا اور وہ اس کے لئے ذمہ دار ہیں۔ وہ اس کے لئے گناہ گار ہیں لیکن جب سے وہاں ہریج ڈیٹنٹ رول ہو گیا ہے تب سے بھی روزانہ پھر سے لے کر آٹھ آدمی مرتے ہیں۔ گویا یہ ایک جھگڑے سے لے کر آٹھ آدمیوں کا کوٹا ہو گیا ہے۔

सरदार रघुबीर सिंह पंजाब : पंजाब में ला ऐंड आर्डर कैसा है ?

سردار نریندر سنگھ برار :- پنجاب کے لائینڈ آرڈر کی بات انھوں نے بوجھی سمجھے خیر ہے پنجاب ۔ لے لائینڈ آرڈر پر میں تو بیچ ہزاری جی کا مشکور ہوں اور ان سے کہوں گا کہ اگر آپ کو سبق سیکھنا ہے لائینڈ آرڈر چلانے کا تو آپ پنجاب سے ٹریننگ لیجئے۔ حیدر آباد میں جب گڑ بڑ ہوئی تو اس وقت پنجاب کی پولیس میلکٹ ہوئی تھی ۔ سردار گوردیاں سنگھ حیدر آباد بھیجے گئے تھے ۔ وہاں اور لوگوں کو نہیں بھیجا گیا تھا ۔ آپ پنجاب میں رہتے ہوئے پنجاب میں لائینڈ آرڈر کی بات کہیں تو میں اسے سیاسی اسٹنٹ ہی کہوں گا اور اس سے زیادہ کچھ نہیں کہہ سکتا ۔

اب آپ دیکھئے کہ چند ہی گڑھ پنجاب کے لئے بنا ۔ وہاں پریزیڈنٹ کا رول ہے اور وہ انڈین ٹریڈی ہے لیکن وہاں لائینڈ آرڈر کی حالت بدترین قسم کی ہے ۔ وہاں پالیٹیکل مڈرس ہوتے ۔ ایک کپتان کے لڑکے نے ریگبیس کی تھی کہ اس کو نکلاڑنے دارنگ دی ہے اور اس کو اپنی جان کا خطرہ ہے پھر بھی اس کو ہوسٹل میں قتل کیا گیا ۔ ایسی حالت پنجاب میں نہیں ہے ۔ کسی پنجابی کو جوش آتا ہے تو وہ سی ڈیسی کا گلا کاٹ دیتا ہے ۔ ات سیری سمجھ میں آسکتی ہے ۔ ویسی بات نہیں ہے ۔ اب آگے بھائی سلطان سنگھ سے معافی چاہوں گا ۔ ابوہر اور فاضلکا کا علاقہ جو ہریانہ کو دیا گیا ہے یہ ایک پالیٹیکل مسئلہ ہے یہ پنجاب کا علاقہ ہے ۔ ابوہر اور فاضلکا کے لوگ پنجاب میں رہنا چاہتے ہیں اور اسے پنجاب کو دے دینا چاہئے ۔ ہمارے بھائیوں کو اس کے لئے کپنسیڈ بھی کیا جائے ۔ یہ جو ہم نے ایکشن لڑا اس میں ہم تیرہ میں سے صرف ایک سیٹ جیت پائے ۔ میں سبک باد دیتا ہوں اندراجی کو کیوں کہ ان کے آدمی باقی سیٹوں پر جیتے لیکن ہمارا ایک آدمی جو جیتا وہ کس اشو پر جیتا ؟ وہ ابوہر اور فاضلکا ، اشو تھا اور اس پر ہم جیتے ۔ مجھے اندوس ہے کہ وہاں ایک منسٹر بھی ہار گئے جو میرے رشتہ دار ہوتے ہیں ۔ تو ٹھیک ہے ابوہر اور فاضلکا کی جتنے فیصلہ کیا ہے اور اس کو اندراجی کو ماننا چاہئے یہ وہاں کی جتنا کی آواز ہے ۔ مسٹر ذیل سنگھ جو آپ کی پارٹی کے پردھان ہیں ان کی بھی یہی آواز ہے ۔ (انٹرنیشن) ۔ تو یہ ایسا علاقہ ہے جس کی طرف ضرور دیکھا جانا چاہئے اور وہاں کسی قسم کی زیادتی نہیں ہونی چاہئے ۔

چونکہ ٹائم میرے پاس نہیں ہے اس لئے باقی باتیں چھوڑ کر میں اب ویسٹ بنگال کی طرف آؤں گا ۔ اندراجی نے ایکشن میں ایسیجیں دیں ۔ ہمارے دل میں ان کے لئے بڑی قدر ہے اور اس لئے راجاؤں وغیرہ کے خلاف ان کے ساتھ ہم نے ووٹ دیا اور آئندہ بھی پروگریسو معاملات پر ہم ان کا ساتھ دیں گے ۔ لیکن میں انھیں بزرگوار کی طرح سمجھتا ہوں

محور نہیں سمجھتا ہوں ۔ جہاں تک ویسٹ بنگال کا سوال ہے میں ان سے توقع رکھتا ہوں کہ جہاں تک ویسٹ بنگال کا سوال ہے ویسٹ بنگال کی حکومت کو مان کر وہاں کے لئے ہمیں کوئی انیکٹیو قدم اٹھانا چاہئے ۔ جب کہ پاکستان کسی قسم کی برائی کرنے میں گریز نہیں کرتا ہے تو ہم کو ۔

آپ کی عمر بانی کہ آپ نے میرکٹ کر دیا ۔ ٹھیک ہے ۔ یعنی ایسٹ پاکستان کی گورنمنٹ کو مان کر بنگلہ دیش کو مان کر ان کی امداد کرنی چاہئے ۔ میں تو سمجھتا ہوں کہ اگر کوئی ریٹیلیٹ کرے تو ہم پنجابی تو ایسٹ کا جواب پتھر پھینک کر دینے میں بلو کرتے ہیں تو میں کہوں گا کہ اس چیز کو مان لیا جائے اور جو لوگ وہاں جا کر جان دینا چاہتے ہیں ان کے ساتھ لڑنا چاہئے ہیں ان کو ہماری گورنمنٹ کو الاؤ کرنا چاہئے ۔ جو انھوں نے کشفیر میں کیا ہے اسکا بدلہ لینا ہمارا فرض ہے ۔ اگر آپ ایک بہادر پرائم منسٹر ہیں اور اگر آپ اس موقع کی نزاکت کو سمجھتے ہیں تو آپ کو اس وقت ٹھوس قدم اٹھانا چاہئے اور ایسے قدم کے لئے ہم آپ کے ساتھ ہیں ۔ اور اس میں آپ کو کوئی ہینڈریشن نہیں رہنا چاہئے ۔ ایسے وقتے دو روز نہیں آیا کرتے ۔ میں کہوں گا کہ آپ جتنا سوچیں گی اتنی ہی پکلیکیشنس بڑھیں گی ۔

श्री महावीर त्यागी : यह बातें पार्लियामेंट में नहीं होती। यह कहने की बात नहीं है।

سردار نریندر سنگھ برار :- میں اس لئے نہیں کہہ رہا ہوں کہ وہ میرا حکم نامہ ہیں گی یہ سیری پرسنل فیلینگ ہے اتنا کہہ کر میں ختم کرتا ہوں ۔

† [सरदार नरेन्द्र सिंह ब्रार (पंजाब) : डिप्टी चेयरमैन साहब, मैं प्रेसिडेंट साहब का शुक्रिया अदा करता हूँ क्योंकि उन्होंने दोनों हाउसेज के सामने अपना एड्रेस दिया। लेकिन जहां तक मेरा खयाल है मुझे यह एड्रेस खोखला दिखाई दिया। क्योंकि उसमें गरीबी दूर करने के लिये बहुत कुछ कहा गया है मगर इसको साफ तौर पर नहीं बताया गया है कि शहर की गरीबी और देहात की गरीबी को दूर करने के लिये क्या किया जायेगा। उसके बारे में डिटेल् होनी चाहिये थी कि किस तरह से एसेंशियल कामोडिटीज के दामों को कम किया

[ सरदार नरेन्द्र सिंह ब्रार ]

जायेगा। किस तरह से बेरोजगारों को रोजी दी जायेगी। इन बातों पर कोई रोशनी नहीं डाली गई। जहां तक देहाती मजदूर और शहरी मजदूरों का ताल्लुक है उनके रहने का तरीका, कमाई का तरीका, खाने का तरीका बिल्कुल डिफेंट है उसके लिये उन्होंने कुछ भी तरीका नहीं बताया क्योंकि उन्हें उन लोगों से वोट मिले थे। उन्हें उसके बारे में बता देना चाहिए था क्योंकि गरीब लोगों ने ही उनको वोट दिया था।

**सरदार नरेन्द्र सिंह ब्रार :** जहां तक मैं गरीबी की बात समझता हूं हमारे पंजाब के देहातों के गरीबों का ज्यादा-तर ताल्लुक खेतोबाड़ी से है। किसान का काम करते हैं, इसलिये किसान की हौसला अफजाई करना हमारी गवर्नमेंट का फर्ज है लेकिन उसके लिये उनके तरीके बिल्कुल गलत है, मिसाल के तौर पर लीजिये किसान को क्या कुछ उधार लेना पड़ता है। खाद, बीज, जिनको प्राइस पहले से दुगुनी हो गई है। इसी तरह बिजली लीजिये, बिजली मिलती नहीं। पानी आता नहीं, ट्रेक्टर हैं वे ब्लैक में लेते हैं। ह्वाइट में अगर मिलता है तो उसके साथ गलत इम्प्लीमेंट दे दिये जाते हैं फलां किस्म का डीजल इंजन लो इस तरह वे लूटे जाते हैं। जहां तक किसान का ताल्लुक है जो अस्सी परसेंट हमारी कंट्री में बसते हैं उनकी प्राबलम्स को अगर हम हल नहीं करेंगे तो न लेंडलेस मजदूर का प्राबलम्स हल होगा और न ही कुछ और कर सकेंगे।

पंजाब ने इतनी गंदम पैदा की है कि वह सारे हिन्दुस्तान को गंदम दे सकता है। जितना रुपया बाहर भेज रहे हैं वह पंजाब को दे दिया जाये सबसेडी के तौर पर। जो गंदम की प्राइस आप ने कम की है। अगर सबसेडाइज्ड फर्टिलाइजर वगैरह दें तो हमें उस पर कोई एतराज नहीं है। प्राइम मिनिस्टर साहब को इन्फर्मेशन है या नहीं व्हीट में पेस्ट लग गया है जिसकी वजह से बहुत दिकतें हैं। तो मैं कहूंगा कि किसानों को सबसिडाइज्ड चीजें

दी जायें इसके लिये असैशियल कमाडीटीज की प्राइसिस कम की जायें दूसरे मजदूर जिन के पास जमीन नहीं है उनके लिये उजरत कम से कम तीन रुपये से बढ़ा कर चार पांच रुपये कर दी जाये जिस से उनकी हालत बेहतर हो सके।

मुझे एतराज है डिफेक्शन पर। डिफेक्शन हुए हैं जब कांग्रेस गवर्नमेंट के हुए तो बहुत चिल्लाए। डिफेक्शन कमेटी बनी, हम को ऐसा मालूम होने लगा कि कोई अच्छा कानून बन रहा है जिस के जरिये से यह गैर पसन्दीदा चीज बन्द कर दी जायेगी लेकिन मुझे अफसोस है कि ऐसा नहीं हुआ। इन्दिरा जी बहुत शान से जीती हैं पोलिटिकल एस्टेब्लिटी आई है लेकिन इसके बाद अब कांग्रेस पार्टी ने सूबों में डिफेक्शन शुरू करवा दिये हैं (Interruption) शोर मचाने से कुछ नहीं होता। इसलिये मैं कहूंगा डिफेक्शन के लिये कानून पर तबज्जो देनी चाहिए इसे जल्द से जल्द बनाया जाना चाहिए जिससे यह करप्शन न बढ़े। जब तक पोलिटिकल करप्शन कम नहीं होगा तब तक दूसरे करप्शन खत्म नहीं होंगे और जब तक दूसरे करप्शन खत्म नहीं होंगे तब तक किसी किस्म की गरीबी कम नहीं होगी ऐसा मुझे मुकम्मल भरोसा है।

जहां तक हैवी इण्डस्ट्री का ताल्लुक है पंजाब को इगनोर किया गया है पंजाब के गरीब को इगनोर किया गया है जब तक हैवी इण्डस्ट्रीज नहीं होंगी मजदूर कहां कंज्यूम होंगे। उनको फार्म पर काम नहीं मिलता इसलिये उनको दर दर भटकना पड़ता है और इसी-लिये उनको उजरत कम मिलती है। पंजाब में हैवी इण्डस्ट्रीज नहीं हैं। हमारे यहां जो छोटी इण्डस्ट्रीज लगी हुई हैं वे बारह करोड़ रुपये की एक्सपोर्ट करती हैं। आप पंजाब को स्कूटर फैक्ट्री, डीजल फैक्ट्री दीजिये। बिजली का भी ख्याल रखना चाहिए पंजाब जितना गंदम देता है उसके हिसाब से उसके लिये बिजली की तरफ तबज्जह देनी चाहिए।

अब सवाल यह है कि क्या दुनिया की कोई गवर्नमेंट किसान के खिलाफ इस किस्म की टेक्सेस वगैरह लगाना या परेशानी में डालना या उसको रोज की मुसीबत में डालना इस तरह के काम करती है ? कभी मैं लैंड-रिफार्म की बात सुनता हूँ, मैं समझ नहीं पाया कि लैंड-रिफार्म के क्या मतलब है अगर लैंड सीलिंग कहें तो समझ में आता है कि घटा कर जमीन को तादाद इतनी कर दो। अगर सीलिंग लगाने के बाद लैंड रिफार्म की बात करते हैं तो मैं समझता हूँ कि वे किसान के दुश्मन हैं और उनको पता नहीं कि किसान के क्या प्राबलम्स हैं। लैंड रिफार्म से उनका मतलब क्या है। अगर उनको मतलब किसान को तबाह कर देना, उसको बर्बाद कर देना है तो लैंड रिफार्म आना चाहिए। अगर उनका मतलब किसान को ताकत देना, किसान को हौसला देना उसकी पैदावार को बढ़ाना, बाहर से जो अनाज वगैरह इम्पोर्ट करते हैं उसको बन्द करना है तो उनको किसान की इमदाद करनी चाहिए। बोगस सलोगन बन्द करना चाहिए। जहां तक दूसरी जमीन पड़ी हुई है उनको हरिजननों की भलाई के लिये दें उस तरफ गवर्नमेंट कदम उठाये तो मुझे बहुत खुशी होगी। उनकी उजर्तें बढाये उसमें भी मुझे बहुत खुशी होगी।

एक सवाल आ गया है ला एण्ड आर्डर का। आज आप देखिये कि मुल्क के अन्दर बदतरीन किस्म का ला एण्ड आर्डर है। बंगाल में जो कुछ हुआ उसके लिये पहले मार्क्सवादी पार्टी पर इलजाम लगाया गया कि उन्होंने वहां के ला एण्ड आर्डर को खराब किया और वह इसके लिये जिम्मेदार हैं ये इसके लिये गुनाहगार हैं लेकिन जब से वहां प्रेजिडेंट रूल हो गया है तब से भी छः से लेकर आठ आदमी रोजाना मरते हैं गोया यह एक छ से लेकर आठ आदमियों का कोटा हो गया है।

**सरदार रघुबीर सिंह पंजहजारी :** पंजाब में ला एण्ड आर्डर कैसा है।

**सरदार नरेन्द्र सिंह ब्रार :** पंजाब के ला एण्ड आर्डर की बात उन्होंने जो पूछी, मुझे फखर है पंजाब के ला एण्ड आर्डर पर। मैं तो पंजहजारी जी का मशकूर हूँ और उनसे कहूंगा कि अगर आपको सबक सीखना है ला एण्ड आर्डर चलाने का तो आप पंजाब से ट्रेनिंग लीजिये। हैदराबाद में जब गड़बड़ हुई तो उस वक्त पंजाब की पुलिस सलेक्ट हुई थी। सरदार गुरदयाल सिंह हैदराबाद भेजे गये थे। वहां और लोगों को नहीं भेजा गया था। आप पंजाब में रहते हुये पंजाब में ला एण्ड आर्डर की बात कहें तो मैं इसे स्यासी स्टेट ही कहूंगा और इससे ज्यादा कुछ नहीं कह सकता।

अब आप देखिये कि चंडीगढ़ पंजाब के लिये बना, वहां प्रेजिडेंट का रूल है और वह यूनियन टैरेटरी है। लेकिन वहां ला एण्ड आर्डर की हालत बदतरीन किस्म की है। वहां पोलिटिकल्स मंडर हुए। एक कप्तान के लड़के ने रिक्वेस्ट की थी कि उसको नक्सलाइट्स ने वारनिंग दी है और उसको अपनी जान का खतरा है फिर भी उसको होस्टल में कतल किया गया। ऐसी हालत पंजाब में नहीं है किसी पंजाबी को जोश आता है तो वह किसी न किसी का गला काट देता है यह बात मेरी समझ में आ सकती है (Interruption) वैसी बात नहीं।

अब आगे भाई सुलतान सिंह से माफी चाहूंगा कि अबोहर और फाजिलका का इलाका जो हरियाना को दिया गया है यह एक पोलिटिकल मसला है यह पंजाब का इलाका है। अबोहर और फाजिलका के लोग पंजाब में रहना चाहते हैं और उसे पंजाब को दे देना चाहिए। हमारे भाइयों को इसके लिये कम्पनसेट भी किया जाये यह जो हमने एलेक्शन लड़ा इसमें हम 13 में से सिर्फ एक सीट जीत पाये हैं मुबारकबाद देता हूँ इन्दिरा जी को क्योंकि इनके आदमी बाकी सीटों पर जीते। लेकिन हमारा एक आदमी जो जीता वह किस इशू पर

[ सरदार नरेन्द्र सिंह ब्रार ]

जीता। वह अबोहर और फाजिलका का इशू था और उस पर हम जीते। मुझे अफसोस है कि वहां एक मिनिस्टर भी हार गये जो मेरे रिश्तेदार हैं। तो ठीक अबोहर और फाजिलका की जनता ने फैसला किया है और उसको इन्दिरा जी को मानना चाहिए। यह वहां की जनता की आवाज है। मिस्टर जैत्र सिंह जो आप की पार्टी के प्रधान हैं उनकी भी यही आवाज है (Interruptions) तो यह ऐसा इलाका है जिसकी तरफ जरूर देखा जाना चाहिए और वहां किसी किसम को ज्यादाती नहीं होनी चाहिए।

चूँकि टाइम मेरे पास नहीं है इसलिये बाकी बातें छोड़कर मैं अब वेस्ट बंगाल की तरफ आऊंगा। इन्दिरा जी ने इलेक्शन में स्पीचें दीं। हमारे दिल में उनके लिये बड़ी कदर है और इसीलिये राजाओं वगैरह के खिलाफ उनके साथ हमने वोट दिया और अइन्दा भी प्रोग्रेसिव मामलात पर हम उनको साथ देंगे। लेकिन मैं उन्हें मद की तरह समझता हूँ और त नहीं समझता हूँ जहां तक ईस्ट बंगाल का सवाल है मैं उनसे तबक्को रखता हूँ कि ईस्ट बंगाल को हकूमत को मान कर वहां के लिये हमें कोई इफेक्टिव कदम उठाना चाहिए। जब कि पाकिस्तान किसी किसम को बुराई करने में गरीज नहीं करता है तो हमको (Interruptions) ईस्ट पाकिस्तान की गवर्नमेंट को मान कर बंगला देश को मानकर उनकी इमदाद करनी चाहिए। मैं तो समझता हूँ कि अगर कोई रिटैलिएट करे तो हम पंजाबी तो ईंट का जवाब पत्थर फेर कर देने में बिलीव करते हैं तो मैं कहूंगा कि इस चीज को मान लिया जाये और जो लोग वहां जाकर जान देना चाहते हैं उनके साथ लड़ना चाहते हैं उनको हमारी गवर्नमेंट को एलाओ करना चाहिए। जो उन्होंने काश्मीर में किया है उसका बदला लेना हमारा फर्ज है। अगर आप एक बहादुर प्राइम मिनिस्टर हैं और अगर आप इस मौके की

नजाकत को समझती हैं तो आपको इस वक्त ठोस कदम उठाना चाहिए और ऐसे कदम के लिये हम आप के साथ हैं और इसमें आपको कोई हेजीटेशन नहीं होना चाहिए। ऐसे मौके रोज-रोज नहीं आया करते। मैं कहूंगा कि आप जितना सोंचेंगी उतनी ही कम्प्लीकेशन्स बढ़ेंगी।

**श्री महावीर त्यागी :** यह बातें पार्लिया-मेंट में नहीं होतीं। यह कहने की बात नहीं है।

**सरदार नरेन्द्र सिंह ब्रार :** मैं इसलिये नहीं कह रहा हूँ कि वह मेरा हुकम मानेंगे यह मेरी परसनेल फीलिंग है। इतना कह कर मैं खत्म करता हूँ। ]

**SHRI NAWAL KISHORE** (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I congratulate the President for his very short, but comprehensive and matter-of-fact Address. He has said broadly some important things which are not new because every year most of them have been repeated. But this time the tone is new and firm and shows the determination of the Government to go in right earnest to solve the stupendous problems of poverty and unemployment. But I must say, Sir, that one party or a few individual, howsoever capable he or they may be, will not be able to solve these colossal problems for it the whole of the people and the entire resources available in the country would have to be mobilised and the support and co-operation of every one, irrespective of party affiliations, would have to be sought by the Prime Minister and her party.

Sir, so far as we are concerned, we are equally committed to socialism and other progressive programmes and would, therefore, respond and also support and help in all such measures that are brought forward by the Government to remedy the ills and the sufferings of the people.

Sir, this Address mentions some new good steps like task forces to speed up the implementation of the investment programmes. Sir, the

Reserve Bank Survey says that the money that was allotted last year for many of the projects in the public sector could not be utilised to the tune of 25 to 30 %. I think that this task force may go a bit ahead in implementing those programmes. Then, Sir, the Cabinet has decided on the participation of labour in management. This is a step which I would like to welcome because this would give additional responsibility and sense of maturity also to the labour and may go a step further in the efficient working of the public sector which has not been showing very good results so far. The private sector then can also follow suit.

Then, Sir, there is also the mention about some changes in the administrative apparatus. So many committees were formed by Parliament to go into the working of the administrative apparatus and so, now we have got a big volume, the Report of the Administrative Reforms Commission. But I find that the apparatus is not changing. I would be glad if some more attention is paid as the Prime Minister has started by calling meetings of the Secretaries of the various Departments in order to take quicker decisions and also to liquidate the bottlenecks that crop up in between the various Ministries.

Then, Sir, some suggestions have also been made by some friends who have spoken before me, and I do hope that the Government and the Prime Minister would consider them in right earnestness and sincerity.

Sir, much has been said about the nationalization of the 14 banks. That was a good step. But on the same principle why should not the Government and the Prime Minister go ahead with the nationalization of other Indian banks as well as foreign banks, and also general insurance companies? President Nasser overnight nationalized the entire shares of the Suez Canal. I do not understand why the Government of this big country, the biggest democracy of the world, cannot do that. I do hope that it would be done.

Then, Sir, there was a suggestion by the Leader of the Opposition that we should have some employment tax. Another suggestion came about the capital levy on the accumu-

lated wealth. I think these are some suggestions which the Government should consider seriously.

Now, Sir, a word about the rising prices. It is said that also wholesale prices have gone up by 3.4 per cent. But the Address says that the prices of foodgrains have declined by 6.8 per cent. It is not good for the village economy. The prices of foodgrains must keep pace and maintain parity with the prices of other articles because if the peasant has to sell his goods at a lower price and to purchase at high price, his economy will be disturbed.

Sir, the President has spoken very correctly about the unqualified determination of his Government to remove lawlessness. But I would say that in spite of this, conditions in West Bengal even today are not good. Even the Congress MLAs are being murdered, and if the Government cannot ensure the safety of its own members of the Legislative, what sense of security can be inculcated in the general public? I would only say that the Government should deal with the problem with a strong hand, and I would suggest that the CRP and the army should not be withdrawn from West Bengal, unless normalcy is fully restored.

Then, Sir, much has been talked about changes in the Constitution and about the Fundamental Rights. I am one who believes that the Parliament is sovereign and supreme and can effect changes in the Constitution. But, unfortunately, the judgment of the Golaknath case has changed this situation, and I feel that something has to be done to restore to Parliament its inherent right to make changes in the Constitution to suit the socio-economic changes that are happening fast in the country. But, Sir, I would also like to utter a note of caution that we should not unnecessarily denigrate the judiciary. After all, the judiciary is the creation of our own Constitution and it is there to guard the Fundamental Rights of the people. If we show disrespect and disregard to the judiciary, I fear it will ultimately weaken our democratic structure itself.

Now, Sir, just one or two more points. Sir, one word about East Bengal? I am glad that

[Shri Nawal Kishore]

the Prime Minister moved a Resolution that was passed unanimously by both Houses of Parliament. But, Sir, that is not enough. As we see in the papers, I congratulate the President of the U.S.S.R. for sending a message to the President of Pakistan to stop further bloodshed and to stop sufferings and atrocities on the unarmed people of East Pakistan. He has also suggested that the problems between East Pakistan and West Pakistan be solved democratically and politically, and not by force. Sir, I know the delicacies of the Union Government. It is not very easy to rush immediately and to accord recognition. But India is a big country and the next-door neighbour of Pakistan or of Bengal, and I do hope that the Prime Minister... (*Times bell rings*).

Sir, I will just conclude. I do hope that the Prime Minister would consider taking some steps more than the mere passing of the Resolution. I would like to speak a word of condemnation about the US State Department spokesman, Mr. McClosky. I saw in the paper that unnecessarily that man has dragged that American Treaty with Pakistan saying that the arms that have been supplied by the US under the Treaty can be used against the people of East Bengal to subdue them and to suppress them. It is something shameful and awful. Then things have been said about the election and the flaws and deficiencies as well as irregularities. It is nothing new. Since 1952 after every election these things come. Some are genuine and some are routine but I do find that the demand is that these complaints should be looked into by some high-powered commission. I do not understand what is the difficulty with the Government in ordering such a probe. I also feel that changing the rules of the elections just at the moment when nominations were being made—they may be quite innocent and correct but these do create some doubts in the mind of the people as to why these should have been made just at that moment by a man about whom so many things are said. So I would request the Government to kindly go into these complaints and order an immediate probe. We concede and also congratulate the Prime Minister for the magnificent success but I do not know where the people of the DMK and the CPI come into the picture. So I would ask the Prime Minister that now that she has

a massive support of the people, let her go ahead with her socialist programmes and progressive policies and all those who are on this side or that side, who believe in socialism and who believe in democracy would stand by her but let her not fall into the trap of the CPI. They are simply trying to take credit and trying to bask in the glory of the Prime Minister. I know there was a day when the DMK and the CPI could say that the Central Government depended on them but now the table are turned and the DMK and the CPI depend on the mercy of the Prime Minister and her Party for their very survival. So I would request that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta should well know his exact status and also that of his party. In the end I would say that it was time when slogans should be translated into tangible actions.

DR. (SHRIMATI) MANGLADEVI TALWAR (Rajasthan) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would like to bring to the Prime Minister's attention the statement of the President :

"The massive majority given to my Government is only the first step on the long and difficult road ahead."

The massive majority no doubt the people of India have given to the Congress Party and mostly this is due to the excellent image of our leader, Shrimati Indira Gandhi. In this connection I would like to bring to your notice that thousands of voters who have voted for the first time are the young people who are looking forward to the implementation of the promises that we have given to them—to the people of India—and the young people form a part of the people who are going to be future rulers and citizens of this country and therefore it is very important that we have to pay special attention that important section of the population and take great care of them. Sir, their demands are very legitimate. They want education that will equip them for employment in their future life and I think we should gear our education right from the higher secondary standard to the level of college education in order to equip them with some kind of skill that they can make use of so that they may not be a burden to themselves and a burden to the society and to the nation.

The second thing they want is employment and I welcome the statement of our hon. Prime Minister who has said that we should not make them dole-minded and that we should not pay them a salary for being unemployed but we should make them able to stand on their legs and have respect for their own selves. In this respect I would like to say that small-scale industries and cottage industries and also agriculture and dry farming in the rural areas are the things that will provide opportunities for employment. As has been said several times by the Government, in every district we should have a Programme of development in rural areas which will generate enough employment opportunities for our young people who need it. The number of unemployed engineers is very great, at least 100,000, but the doctors also share in this unhappy situation, though not so much they are also becoming unemployed in many States.

Another point I would like to bring to your notice is this. The President has remarked on Page 4 in item (d) that the Government propose to :

"accelerate changes in the structure and functioning of administrative apparatus, expedite decision making, ensure effective delegation of powers and responsibilities, and streamline financial procedures."

Sir, the administrative machinery must be streamlined. The administrative machinery was set up by the British to suit their convenience, to suit the requirements of a police State but now our State is not a police State but it is a welfare State. Therefore the responsibility of the administrative machinery, the administrative officers, has become very great. And I am glad that the hon. Prime Minister has got this in the forefront of her mind. She has already taken steps towards it by calling the senior Secretaries and explaining to them the new ideals of the Government. The entire administrative machinery must be geared to serve the people first and be their masters afterwards. That is the main thing that we have to do.

Another thing I would like to draw your kind attention to is where the President says on Page 8 :

"My Government will steadfastly pursue its policy of non-alignment. It will raise its voice whenever peace is threatened, wherever the independence of sovereign nations is eroded. It stands firmly against colonialism whether in its old shape or in any new guise."

I cannot help mentioning here the situation in our neighbouring country, the Bangla Desh movement. Our hon. Prime Minister has moved a Resolution in both the Houses and I want to say that not only the Members of this House and the other House but the whole nation is solidly behind her. She has said that we have no desire to interfere in the internal affairs of Pakistan and yet we cannot be silent spectators of what is happening in Bangla Desh. Therefore, I submit that we should give the statement concrete shape and form committees, as announced in the AICC session, to channel our help to the war victims of Bangla Desh. The other thing that we can do is to recognise the provisional Government of East Bengal or Bangla Desh. I think these two steps, if we take, will show to Bangla Desh and to the world that we are earnest about it. I am very glad that not only in our country, but the idea of help and a sense of urgency is spreading in the whole world. The credit for that goes to our Government. We have been trying behind the scenes to persuade the other Governments, the Governments of the United States and the USSR, to see that the matter is brought before the United Nations, the Human Rights Commission, the Security Council and other agencies, and to see that the massacre that is being committed in Bangla Desh is stopped forth with. Thank you.

SHRI M. N. KAUL (Nominated) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, a new impulse is today travelling throughout the length and breadth of this country and it so happens that the Prime Minister is the vehicle of that impulse. Let us keep that impulse going. It is not enough to say that the Prime Minister is now endowed with full powers and authority and the backing of Parliament and she can go ahead with her plans for mitigating poverty and improving the condition of the people. Every section of the community has got to share this impulse and participate in it. Without that this impulse will languish. Please remember what are the conditions under which

[Shri M. N. Kaul]

the Prime Minister and this Parliament operate. It is important to remember those conditions. The Prime Minister is not endowed with the powers of an authoritarian government. She cannot issue decrees that this must be done and nothing else should stand in the way. Secondly, we have not reached a stage where the Government is in control of all the commanding heights of the economy. These are two important limitations.

The Prime Minister has got to take the people and every section of the community with her in the great tasks that lie before her. The impulse that is generated, the new spirit that has arisen, that has restored the confidence of the people in themselves, that has given a new life to the Indian political scene has to be kept going. In what manner and in what fashion can it be kept going? So far as the Government is concerned, the one great power that rests with them is to generate waves of confidence, that is to say, in every step that they take, in every action that they propose, they must inspire the confidence of all sections of the community. That is the key thing which is in their power. Once confidence is generated, new impulses are released and new forces are released and people are in a position to do the work better than what they did before. The response from the people has got to be one of co-operation. The Government should generate confidence and the people should respond by co-operating with the Government. Unless these conditions are existing, it will not be possible to reach the goals and have the mandates of the electorate fulfilled.

For implementing its policies the one great vehicle that the Government possesses is the Planning Commission. I am glad that the Government has the power to shape *de novo* the Planning Commission. This is a body whose functions should now be carefully defined. I was associated with one of the financial Committees which some years ago recommended complete reorganisation of the Planning Commission. They said that the role of the Planning Commission must be clearly defined. It is for the Government to so fashion the personnel of the Commission, choose such a Chairman and personnel, that the very names of those persons inspire confidence in

the country at large, persons who will not only work but will be imbued with passion and knowledge to do their duty and their job. One of the planning Commissions in the past have achieved great results, great things have been achieved, and we cannot ignore that. But there has been so far one basic defect and that has arisen from the fact that the "short term" and the "long term" goods have not been clearly distinguished. I feel that the right balance has not been struck. Too much emphasis has been paid to the long term project with the result that we have made investments in steel and other industries of which the full fruits can only be known in, say, a decade. People as a whole cannot be reconciled to that position. Each generation has got to live in its own time, and we cannot adopt the attitude that heavy industries must be built, come what may to the people, let the people sacrifice, but heavy industries must be built. I therefore suggest for the consideration of Government and this Parliament that there should be a clear distinction between short-term goals and long-term goals. Long-term goals are clear. We want to become a developed country; we want to have a powerful industry, a powerful agriculture, productive machines; all that is clear. We have achieved a lot in the field. The short-term goals are also important. It is by attending to the short-term goals that we can really break the backbone of poverty of the land. The short-term goals are clear and simple. There must be residential accommodation, there must be cloth for people to wear, there must be food, there must be drinking water, there must be communications; that is to say, these objectives should be clearly specified and the goals should be clearly set as to the period within which these objectives should be achieved. What are the resources that are to be allocated to it? The Government have first to consider as to what proportion of the total resources will go to short-term planning and what proportion of the total resources will go to long-term planning. I often recall Gandhiji's observation. "I travel around the country and I must see visibly what is the effect of policies". After the tenure of this Parliament is over, we should each one of us, each one in this country, should be visibly able to see the improvement in the condition of the people in all these spheres, and that can

be achieved provided the targets are clearly laid down.

One thing is important. The Government composed of 40 or 50 people cannot by themselves undertake the tasks. They have to issue directions and announce their policies. It is the Civil Service which has to execute the job. It is the managers of public industries, it is the managers of private industries and other people who are co-operating in this entire endeavour, who have to play their part. The workers in the fields, the workers in the factories, all those people have got to play their part, and they will play their part provided they have a feeling that the fruit of their enterprise or part of it comes back to them in some tangible shape or form.

**SHRI K. S. MALLE GOWDA (Mysore) :** Mr. Deputy Chairman, I want to emphasise on this occasion that it is vital for any Government worth its name not to retard the growth of any section of the society, more so, a major section of the society as the rural society.

We have embarked on a planned economy and we have already implemented three Five Year Plans. Yet, we see a glaring inequality between rural society constituting 80 per cent of the population of India and the urban society growing monstrously. Even after the completion of three Five Year Plans, if no integrated or uniform development of the society is taking place in the countryside as well as the cities the plans can only be one-sided, sinister and envious. What is happening in East Pakistan today and why that situation has arisen should open the eyes of the rulers of India to what they can expect from the rural people if they continue to be given step-motherly treatment for, the realities cannot be suppressed for long from the people in this age of enlightenment.

Today, people in a democracy revolt against the imbalance in development as between different regions and different sections of the society. Per capita income in the rural sector is not rising in comparison to that of the urban sector. The growth of the middle class in rural India is tragically coming to a grinding halt. Elimination of the middle class

from the villages of India seems to be deliberately planned.

The Government proposes to provide Rs. 50 crores to provide employment to the rural unemployed as labourers. Mark my words, as labourers. What about providing jobs to the graduates graduating after selling their lands or mortgaging their paternal houses? Will Government state emphatically that it will reserve at least 50 per cent of the jobs in civil and military service and the ever-expanding public sector projects for the 80 per cent of the people of the villages to return faith for faith and confidence for confidence to the village voters who massively supported the Prime Minister?

I also urge upon the Government to create a separate rural cell in the Directorate of Employment to ensure the employment of the rural people within the reserved quota.

I warn the Government that unless the Government and the Planning Commission stop differentiating between the rural and the urban people and develop both as one integrated society with equal opportunities, they are creating a volcanic situation similar to the one created by Pakistan by 23 years of neglect and differential treatment to its people in the eastern wing, the Bangla Desh.

We see lip-sympathy pouring out for the Harijan cause. It has been repeatedly said that they are the exploited and ill-treated section of the Indian society. If it is realised that the Indian society has exploited them for so long it is the responsibility of the Indian people and the Government to atone for the wrongs done to them and properly compensate for it right now by translating into action the entire people's love and sympathy for our Harijan and tribal brethren.

I would suggest to the Social Welfare Department of the Government of India to spend 60 crores annually in the Fourth Plan period to build houses for the Harijans and the Scheduled Tribes and grants them free. With this provision, two lakhs houses costing Rs. 3000 each can be built in 20,000 villages of our country each year. We will be provi-

[Shri K. S. Malle Gowda]

ding thereby, not only one of the three prime basic necessities of life, i. e. a roof to live under but also introducing clean living habits and social reform to the Harijan families. And also important, we will be giving a little property to own, love and care for. Each house will mean an income of Rs. 350 per annum to each family in terms of rent and this is even better than giving one or two acres of dry land and a debt-load to bring it under plough. The Indian people would love to provide these worth while facilities to their underprivileged Harijan and Scheduled Tribes brethren.

श्री शुक्देव प्रसाद (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उप-सभापति महोदय, मैं महामहिम राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण पर धन्यवाद के प्रस्ताव के पक्ष में बोलने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ। महामहिम राष्ट्रपति ने जो अभिभाषण दिया उसके हम सब कृतज्ञ हैं और उसके लिये हम उनके आभारी हैं। जो विचार उन्होंने अपने अभिभाषण में व्यक्त किये उससे हमें जाहिर होता है कि हम धीरे धीरे एक समाजवाद की ओर बढ़ते जा रहे हैं और वह समाजवाद राजनारायण जी के टाइप का समाजवाद नहीं है बल्कि वह शुद्ध इन्दिरा गांधी वादी समाजवाद है और उसकी तरफ ही हम बढ़ रहे हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : अब समाजवाद स्वी-लिंग हो गया।

श्री शुक्देव प्रसाद : उपसभापति महोदय, एक समाजवाद हमने देखा था डाक्टर राम-मनोहर लोहिया का जिसमें उन्होंने पार्लियामेंट के अंदर गैर कांग्रेसवाद का नारा लगाया था और वह उतरते उतरते गैर नेहरूवाद पर आ गया। और वहाँ से हट कर आ गया इन्दिरा वाद पर। डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया का कुल कांट्रीब्यूशन पार्लियामेंट के अंदर तीन बातों में है। एक तो हीरे का हार, दूसरा मिक कोट और तीसरा स्वेतलाना। और इसी पर उन्होंने सैकड़ों घंटे पूरे हाउस का ले लिया। यही उनका समाजवाद रहा।

दूसरा समाजवाद आया हमारे भाई राजनारायण जी का। वह आया गैर कांग्रेस-वाद से और आकर गैर इन्दिरावाद पर टूट गया और फिर देखिये, यह उनका गैर इन्दिरा-वाद कहां तक बढ़ता जाता है। मुझे बड़ा अफसोस होता है कि भाई कृष्णकान्त यहां पर बोल रहे थे तो कह रहे थे कि राजनारायण जी ने यह कहा। राष्ट्रपति महोदय के अभिभाषण में जो बात आयी उसमें राजनारायण जी भी कुछ बोल गये थे। बहुत से लोग बोले उनमें वह भी बोले, लेकिन मुझे बहुत हंसी आयी जबकि इनका नाम लिया। हमने बचपन में प्रेमचंद की एक कहानी पढ़ी थी। भाई राजनारायण जी से मैं क्षमा मांगता हूँ और सदन से भी क्षमा मांगता हूँ। एक जगह पर हमने यह पढ़ा था कि मनुष्य की अकल और जिस्म में एक और दस की निस्वत है। यानी जिसका जितना मोटा जिस्म उतनी ही मोटी अकल। तो क्या बात है। मैं फिर कहूँ कि आखिर इस बात को ले करके क्यों बावला मचता है वह बेचारें कुछ कहते हैं कहने दीजिये क्या पड़ी है आपको।

#### Interruptions

राजनारायण जी से मैंने पहले ही माफ़ी मांग ली है वह इसका बुरा न मानें। मैं आपकी छड़ी से डरता हूँ।

अब हम राष्ट्रपति के अभिभाषण पर उन्हें धन्यवाद देने का जो प्रस्ताव है और जो देने के लिये हम तैयार हैं उस पर आते हैं। राष्ट्रपति महोदय ने जो अभिभाषण दिया उसमें देश का और समाजवाद का एक सही नक्शा उन्होंने पेश किया और उससे हमें यह आशा बंध चली है कि हमारे देशवासियों का, हमारे गरीबों का, धीरे धीरे कल्याण होगा और वह कल्याण होगा श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी के नेतृत्व में और उनकी कांग्रेस से।

अब हम कुछ और बातों की ओर ध्यान दिलाना चाहते हैं। एक शब्द नया आया है

स्वजनों। स्वजन कहते हैं अपने को लेकिन यहां स्वजन से हमें डर हो गया है, पब्लिक ने देखा कि जहां श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी समाजवाद का नारा लगा रही हैं वहां स्वजनों ने भी समाजवाद का नारा लगाना शुरू कर दिया है। स्वजन के माने अपना होता है लेकिन यहां स्व है स्वतंत्र और जन है जनसंघ और उसके साथ है ओ यानी कांग्रेस (आर्गेनाइजेशन), इन स्वजनों से मैं पूछता हूं कि अगर बिल्ली ही चूहे की वकालत करे तो क्या चूहे का कल्याण होगा। अब यही लोग समाजवाद का नारा बुलन्द करने लगे तो फिर गरीबों का भला हो चुका।

श्रीमन्, मैं तो ऐसी कम्युनिटी को बिलांग करता हूं जो कि सबसे गिरी हुई हरिजन कम्युनिटी है और उस कम्युनिटी की बात करता हूं जो कि देहातों के अन्दर रह कर तड़पती है। मैं कहता हूं कि जिसके पैर फटे न विवाई वह क्या जाने पीर पराई, ये राजा महाराजा के गुटों में बैठने वाले समाजवाद की बात क्या जानें। लेकिन फिर भी एक बात मैं आपको बतलाऊं कि इन सब बातों के होते हुये भी उन गरीबों की हालत की ओर हाउस का ध्यान जरूर दिनाऊंगा। हालांकि मैं देख रहा हूं कि जो लोग नारे बुलन्द करते हैं वह कहते हैं कि कुछ नहीं हुआ तो यह कतई गलत है। हमारा बहुत सुधार हुआ है, हम इस लायक हुये कि हम आज समाज के अन्दर बैठ सकते हैं, हम इस लायक हुये कि हमारे बच्चे डिप्टी कलेक्टर, वलेक्टर और थानेदार और अध्यापक हुये हैं, अज हम इस लायक हुये कि हम खुली हवा में सांस लेने लगे हैं लेकिन फिर भी यह समाज का सबसे गिरा हुआ वर्ग है, सबसे दबा हुआ वर्ग है। तो इस वर्ग पर विशेष ध्यान देने का जरूरत है।

जहां तक भूमि सुधारों का सवाल है, यह आपके तथाकथित पूंजीपति और जमींदार आज जमीन के वंशरण के नाम पर सारी जमीन अपने अपने रिश्तेदारों के नाम कर चुके

हैं और वह हरिजनों को मिली नहीं है, वह गरीबों को मिली नहीं है। वह गरीब बेचारा ताकता रह गया है और यह अपने रिश्तेदारों, दूर के रिश्तेदारों, अपने कारिन्दों, सब के नाम से सारी जमीन हड़प कर आज भी बैठे हुये हैं। तो इस पर भी हमें ध्यान देना है। चौथी बात है, उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, कि हम जहां देखते हैं कि कुछ हमारे पास पूंजी है, उस पूंजी पर हम लोन दे सकते हैं लेकिन जिस मां-बाप ने 50,000 रु० लगाकर एक बच्चे के दिमाग को तैयार किया है, लाखों लगाकर एक इन्जीनियर तैयार किया है, उस इन्जीनियर के दिमाग को गिरवी रखकर रुपया नहीं ले सकता।

5 P.M.

पांचवी बात यह है कि इलेक्शन की बात आती है, इलेक्शन में बहुत सारा करप्शन हुआ, क्या हुआ क्या नहीं हुआ, लेकिन एक बात किलयर है कि जनता ने न लौ देखा, न कुछ देखा, उसने अपनी आशाओं को देखा और आशाओं के वशीभूत होकर उसने अपना सारा सपोर्ट इन्दिरा गांधी को उठाकर दे दिया जिसके कारण इन्दिरा गांधी आज विजयी होकर आई हैं। एक बात किलयर हुई है इस इलेक्शन में कि पूरे देश का एक कामन इन्टरेस्ट है और वह इन्टरेस्ट है क्या—गरीबी हटाओ। जब तक यह इन्टरेस्ट है कि गरीबी हटाओ, और हम लोगों की गरीबी हटाते है, तो वह केवल इन्दिरा गांधी के नेतृत्व में हट सकती है।

एक बात और बतलाऊं, अध्यक्ष महोदय, कि मैं एक देहाती आदमी हूं...

श्री राजनारायण : कौन से देहात के ?

श्री उपसभापति : राजनारायणजी, जरा शांति से सुनिए।

श्री शुक्रदेव प्रसाद : एक गांव में अगर दो भाई लड़ते रहे हैं तो दोनों भाइयों के झगड़े को मिटाने के लिये गांव के आसपास के तमाम

[श्री शुकदेव प्रसाद]

लोग दौड़ पड़ते हैं और दौड़ कर दोनों की बांह पकड़ कर अलग कर देते हैं। अगर बड़ा भाई या जुलूम करने वाला कोई बदमाशी करता है तो उसको दो चपत लगाकर दूर कर देते हैं। ठीक वही हालत आज बांगला देश और पश्चिमी पाकिस्तान की है। ये दोनों लड़ रहे हैं, लड़ने के साथ साथ जो भी अत्याचार बांगला देश पर हो रहा है, उसको देखते हुए हमारा पड़ोसी देश के नाते कर्तव्य होता है कि उसके झगड़े में हम इन्टरफेयर करें, और इन्टरफेयर किस रूप में करें, यह पालिसी हमारे प्राइम मिनिस्टर पर निर्भर करती है, वह जिम रूप में चाहें उसको तय करके, उसके बीच में इन्टरफेयर करके बांगला देश के प्रतीड़ित भाइयों की सहायता कर सकें और जहां तक हो सके उनकी मदद करें, जिससे हम अपने देश की और अपने पड़ोसियों का कल्याण कर सकें।

इसके साथ मैं एक बात और निवेदन कर देना चाहता हूं, वह यह है कि देश के अंदर बढ़ती हुई मंहगाई है। इस बढ़ती हुई मंहगाई में एक बात मैं देखना हूं कि जहां तक किसानों का सवाल है, उनको खेती पर ज्यादा लागत लग रही है, बिजली ज्यादा कीमत पर मिल रही है—खाद की कीमत बहुत बढ़ गई, बीज की कीमत बहुत बढ़ गई, और पैदावार जो उनकी होती है उसको मुनासिब दाम पर बेचने के संबंध में अव्यवस्था हो रही है। लेकिन साथ ही और सारी चीजों को देखें, कपड़े को देखें, साबुन को देखें, तेन को देखें, तो इसमें तो पूजोपति बड़ेगा, चाहे वह इन्दिरा गांधी को बदनाम करे, चाहे वह किसी भी कीमत पर उन चीजों के दाम बढ़ाते जा रहे हैं ताकि गरीबों का शोषण कर सकें और गरीबों का शोषण करके अपनी पूंजी को बढ़ा सकें, अपनी थैली को बढ़ा सकें।

इन शब्दों के साथ मेरा एक नम्र निवेदन है, अध्यक्ष महोदय, कि इन कार्यों को करने के रास्ते में चाहे हमारा कांस्टीट्यूशन आये, चाहे

विरोधी दल के लोग आएँ, हम सब में परिवर्तन लाएं और चाहे संविधान में परिवर्तन करने के लिये हमें संयुक्त अधिवेशन क्यों न करना पड़े, लेकिन उस दिशा में जाने के लिये हमें उचित संशोधन करना चाहिये, इसी में हमारे देश का कल्याण है।

SHRI HAMID ALI SCHAMNAD (Kerala): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, let me at the outset thank you for having given me this opportunity to speak. The results of the mid-term election have been unprecedented in the history of our country. When the last Lok Sabha was dissolved, I had many people saying, that Shrimati Indira Gandhi would not get a majority and she would, if at, all, be able to form a Ministry only with the support of the D. M. K. and some other parties. But she got not only a majority, but an absolute majority, two-thirds majority. The toiling masses of our land, the common man of this country, went to the Polls and voted for Ruling Congress and gave them a massive majority. In spite of their starving bellies, in spite of the difficulties they were facing, in spite of the violence that prevailed, they went to the polls and asked Shrimati Indira Gandhi to go ahead with her Government. Why? Not because of any special considerations but because she was able to capture the minds and hearts of millions of this country. And it is for this Government, it is for Shrimati Indira Gandhi and her colleagues, to fulfil the promises that she has given to them. It is for her to face boldly. I know it is not a very easy task for her. Even though she has got an absolute majority, it is a very difficult task for her because for the past twentyfive years the common man of this country, the toiling masses of our land, the starving bellies of our country, the poor people wanted to see that poverty is removed from our country, but that problem could not be solved. So it is not so easy to solve a problem which could not be solved over the past twentyfive years. All the same the Government will have to go ahead with its task of eradicating poverty and ignorance from this land, otherwise people will not pardon them.

One thing I should like to point out about the Presidential Address. With regard to

communal tensions in this country that has been mentioned in the Address very same Address was read last year also. During these twelve months so many communal tensions, communal disturbances, took place in our country. I am very sorry the Government did not formulate any specific policy for tackling this situation in our country. The Muslims of this country, the minority communities, are honourable citizens of this land. But unfortunately an inferiority complex has been created in this country. It is for this Government to eradicate that inferiority complex which has been infused in the minority communities. In the last election right from Punjab down to Cape Comorin Muslims in this country stood behind the Congress (R), not because of anything else but because they thought Shrimati Indira Gandhi's Government could solve the problem which they are facing. They thought that the grievances which the minority communities have could only be redressed by this Government. I am quite sure Shrimati Indira Gandhi's Government will be able to solve this problem. During and after the last election Muslims had to face many difficulties and hard ship. They have been tortured not only in the U. P., in Moradabad, in Aligarh, they have been tortured even in Mysore State. In Mangalore district many communal clashes took place. Many Muslim shops were looted not because they voted for the Muslim League candidate, but because they voted for Shrimati Indira Gandhi's candidate. Some shops were looted in Mangalore district. Unfortunately the authorities in Mangalore which was ruled by Mr. Veerendra Patil's Government in Mysore State, did not take prompt action in that area. I hope and trust that Shrimati Indira Gandhi's Government will see that the grievances of the minority communities in this country are redressed. Don't be under the impression Muslim votes always to go Congress (R) I wish Shrimati Indira Gandhi and her colleagues all success.

Thank you.

**श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी :** उपसभापति महोदय, बहुत से मित्रों ने अपने विचार हमारे सामने यहां रखे और मैंने बहुत गौर से उनको सुना। सभी ने यह महसूस किया है कि इस

चुनाव से एक नया चित्र हमारे देश में बना है। हमारी जनता ने स्पष्ट रूप से अपनी राय दी। अनेक कठिनाइयां उसके सामने आईं और कहीं कहीं जुल्म भी हुए, लेकिन हिम्मत से उन्होंने अपनी राय दी और यह स्पष्ट दिखलाया कि कौनसा कार्यक्रम वह अपने लिये लाभदायक समझती है।

जैसा हमारे मित्र ने अभी कहा कि कुछ लोग समझते थे कि शायद यह नतीजा चुनाव का न निकले, लेकिन हमें तो जरा देर के लिये भी ऐसा विचार नहीं आया—क्यों ! इसलिये नहीं कि हम चाहते थे कि हम जीतें, इसलिये नहीं कि हम समझते थे जीत जायेंगे, लेकिन इसलिये कि जनता की नब्ज पर हमारा हाथ था और हमको मालूम था कि जनता क्या चाहती है और हम समझते थे कि उस रास्ते पर चलना हमारी शक्ति है और यही चुनाव में साबित हुआ कि यह रास्ता और जो जनता का मन हमने पढ़ा था वह सही निकला। भारत की जनता की आवाज खाली सारे भारत में ही नहीं बल्कि सारी दुनिया में गूंज उठी और बहुत से लोग जिनको हमारी नीतियों पर विश्वास नहीं था, शायद आज भी न हो, दूसरे देश के लोगों ने भी इस आवाज को सुना। लेकिन यह दुर्भाग्य की बात है कि हमारे देश में आज भी ऐसे लोग हैं जिन्होंने उस आवाज को सुना नहीं। सुनना नहीं चाहते, या कान बन्द कर रखे हैं या क्या कारण है, यह मुझे मालूम नहीं, लेकिन यहां के कुछ भाषणों से यह साबित हुआ कि जनता किस तरफ मुड़ी है इसका आज भी उनको कोई ज्ञान नहीं है।

राष्ट्रपति जी ने जनता की आशाओं की तरफ फिर से ध्यान दिलाया और कुछ झलक इसकी दिखाई कि किस दिशा में हम जाना चाहते हैं और कैसे कार्यक्रम हमें अपनाने चाहिये। जाहिर है कि सब कार्यक्रमों के बारे में उन्होंने नहीं बतलाया और न ऐसे मौके पर यह उचित था, न उतना समय था कि इन

[श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी]

चीजों पर विस्तार से वे बोलें, लेकिन उन्होंने कुछ झलक दी और उन्होंने यह इशारा भी किया कि हमारी सरकारी पार्टी का जो घोषणा-पत्र था, जो हमने जनता के सामने कार्यक्रम रखे थे उनको हम पूरा करने के लिए पूरे कदम उठायेंगे। जो बातें उन्होंने नहीं भी कहीं वे इस वाक्य में शामिल हैं।

हमारे माननीय सदस्य आदरणीय गंगा बाबू ने कुछ विचार प्रकट किये कि चुनावों में धन का उपयोग बहुत बढ़ता जा रहा है। मैं उनसे सहमत हूँ कि यह अच्छी बात नहीं है, लेकिन मैं उनको याद दिलाऊंगी कि जिन लोगों ने सबसे ज्यादा धन खर्चा किया हार गए, वे धन के कारण जीत नहीं सके। एक हमारे बिहार के ही सदस्य चुन कर आये हैं। वह एक ऐसा चुनाव क्षेत्र था जिसके बारे में हमारे सब लोगों ने यह कहा कि हम नहीं जीतेंगे, चाहे दूसरी पार्टी को दीजिये, हम तो जीतेंगे नहीं, चाहे जमानत भी जप्त हो जाय, लेकिन हमने कहा किसी को खड़ा तो करेंगे भले ही न जीतें। इन्होंने बताया कि जितना ज्यादा इनके विरोधी उम्मीदवार ने रुपया खर्च किया उतना ही उनका वोट कटता गया, जितनी ही ज्यादा मुझे गालियां दीं उतना ही उनका वोट कटता गया और जो हमारे उम्मीदवार वहां से खड़े हुए थे वे बहुमत से जीत कर आये हैं। इसलिये यह ठीक है कि रुपया खर्च न किया जाय, लेकिन उससे भी अच्छी बात यह है कि जनता ने इस वक्त रुपये को देखकर अपना वोट नहीं दिया, बल्कि . . .

श्री राजनारायण : चेहरे को देखकर दिया है रायबरेली में . . .

(Interruption)

श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी : दिल्ली के शहर में...

... (Interruption)

श्री राजनारायण : मैं आपको न्योता देता हूँ . . .

श्री उपसभापति : आप बैठिए।

श्री राजनारायण : यह सदन है, आदरणीय सदन है।

श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी : मैं बैठ नहीं रही हूँ और न किसी को . . .

(Interruption)

श्री राजनारायण : तमाम रजाई, तमाम धोती . . .

(Interruption)

श्री उपसभापति : आप बैठिये, आप बैठिये मुन लीजिये।

(Interruption)

श्री राजनारायण : देखिये, हल्ला से कोई काम नहीं बनता। सदन में असत्य भाषण नहीं होना चाहिए।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Will you please sit down ? You had your say and now you please hear the Prime Minister patiently.

श्री राजनारायण : तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि ये रुपये के बल पर जीतकर आई हैं, 50-50 हजार रुपया एक एक आदमी को बांटा है, प्रिसाइडिंग आफिसर्स को इन्होंने खरीदा है . . .

श्री उपसभापति : बैठिये आप . . .

(Interruption)

श्री राजनारायण : अरे बेशर्म कही के। 1 लाख 3 हजार वोट इनके उल्टे पड़े हैं इनकी अपनी कांस्टीटुएन्सी में जहां से ये दो बार चुनाव लड़ी हैं।

श्री उपसभापति : आप बैठिये।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी (बिहार) : शर्म नहीं आती है।

श्री राजनारायण : शर्म तुमको आनी चाहिए। अगर कोई शर्मदार जनतंत्री प्राइम मिनिस्टर होता तो इस्तीफा दे देता।

(Interruption)

श्री उपसभापति : बैठिए आप।

श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी : देखिये मुझे बड़ा आश्चर्य है कि यहां के माननीय सदस्य जब उनको बरसों से जानते हैं तब भी उनकी बात

को सुनकर शोर गुल मचाते हैं, क्यों नहीं उनको बकने देते ।

**श्री राजनारायण :** ऐसे गन्दे लोग तुम्हारे पीछे पड़े हुये हैं ।

**श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी :** उपसभापति महोदय, दुनिया में दुर्भाग्य यह है कि जो जैसा स्वयं होता है वह दूसरे को वैसा समझता है । जो गन्दी बातें खुद करते हैं उसी का दूसरों पर इल्जाम लगाते हैं ।

(*Interruption*)

**श्री राजनारायण :** मैं डंके की चोट पर कहता हूं कि इस सदन की कमेटी बना दो ।

**श्री उपसभापति :** आप बैठिए, आपको जो कहना था वह आपने कह दिया ।

**श्री राजनारायण :** आज के अखबार में निकला है कि बैलट पेपर दो बैगन मिले ।

**श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी :** दिल्ली के बारे में मैं कह सकती हूं कि यहां . . .

**श्री राजनारायण :** क्या लड़ाई उन्होंने विद्यार्थियों की लड़ी । बड़े बाप की बेटी . . .

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order please.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Sir, this should be expunged. He has no right to say all those things. It is unparliamentary.

**श्री राजनारायण :** यहां संसदीय प्रथा चलेगी, गुण्डागर्दी नहीं चलेगी ।

(*Interruption*)

**श्री उपसभापति :** इस तरह इंटर्रुप्ट करने से संसदीय प्रथा नहीं चलती है आप को मौका मिला और आपने अपने विचार सदन के सामने रखे । (*Interruption*) अब इसके बाद में कोई किसी किस्म का इंटर्रुप्शन नहीं होना चाहिये ।

**श्री ह्यातुल्ला भन्सारी (उत्तर प्रदेश) :** मैंने उत्तर प्रदेश में काम किया है । मैंने राय-बरेली में काम किया है । मुझे मालूम है कि कितना पैसा खर्च किया है राजनारायण जी ने . . .

(*Interruption*)

**श्री राजनारायण :** आप इस सदन की कमेटी बनाइये । मैं आप को जज बनाता हूं . . .

**श्री उपसभापति :** आर्डर, आर्डर, प्लीज । अब आप रनिंग कमेटी बन्द कीजिये ।

**श्री राजनारायण :** आप उधर रोकिये ।

**श्री उपसभापति :** आप बैठिये ।

**श्री राजनारायण :** हमने तो अपनी जिन्दगी बिताई है और समाजवादी बने ये . . .

**श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी :** यहां जो भी दिल्ली में घूमेगा वह देखेगा कि यहां के गरीब आदमियों ने केवल वोट नहीं दिया बल्कि जो सारा धन उसमें लगा वह उन्होंने खर्चा । उन्होंने कहा कि हम पार्टी से नहीं चाहते हैं, हम जनता से नहीं चाहते हैं, किसी से नहीं चाहते हैं । टैक्सी वालों ने टैक्सी दी और खाली टैक्सी नहीं दी, पेट्रोल का खर्चा स्वयं किया, स्कूटर वालों ने पेट्रोल का खर्चा स्वयं किया . . .

**श्री नागेश्वर प्रसाद शाही : \* \* \***

**श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी :** यह सुनी हुई बात नहीं है । वे हम से कह गये हैं, अलग में कह गये हैं ।

**श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा :** आन ए प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर । यह लफ्ज अनपार्लियामेंट्री है और इस को आप एक्सपंज कर दीजिए ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right. That word will be expunged.

**श्री राजनारायण :** उस की जगह सब्स्टीट्यूट, हो जायगा असत्य ।

**श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी :** इस का फैसला जनता ने कर दिया है । पहले आप लोग बहुत जोरों से बोलते थे । एक दफा जब बहस हो रही थी तो सभी विरोधी दलों ने मिल कर कहा था (*Interruption*) जब मैंने कहा कि इन मसलों पर

[श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी]

जनता अपना निर्णय देगी, शायद आप को याद होगी उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मालूम नहीं आप कुर्सी पर थे या नहीं, हमारे भाई जो उधर बैठे हैं बहुत नाराज हो गये थे और उन्होंने बहुत ज्यादा गुल मचाया था। और उन्होंने यह भी कहा था कि प्रधान मंत्री को माफो मांगनी चाहिए। लेकिन जो बात मैंने उस दिन कही थी आज वह बात देश ने साबित करके दिखा दी। एक चुनाव क्षेत्र नहीं, कितने ही चुनाव क्षेत्रों ने मेरी बातों को साबित किया है। यह सभी को मालूम है, दोहराने की जरूरत नहीं है।

**श्री राजनारायण :** ठीक है।

**श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी :** अब सवाल यह है कि यहां हमारे जनसंघ के सदस्य ने जो भाषण दिया उस से साबित हो गया, जो मैं हमेशा ही कहती आयी हूं, कि ये हमेशा पीछे ही देख सकते हैं, आगे भविष्य को नहीं देख सकते हैं। उन्होंने अपनी पोजीशन बिलकुल साफ कर दी है।

**श्री सीताराम सिंह :** मेरा एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न है। मेरा व्यवस्था का प्रश्न यह है कि माननीय प्रधान मंत्री जी कह रही हैं कि उन्होंने पेट्रोल भी दिया और मोटरें भी दीं, तो इस लिए हम माननीय सदस्यों की एक कमेटी बना दी जाय और इस की जांच हो।

**श्री उपसभापति :** इस की कोई जरूरत नहीं है। आप बैठिये।

**श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी :** यह सच है कि चुनाव के दौरान कुछ दिक्कतें आयी, प्रत्येक चुनाव में कभी कभी दिक्कतें होती हैं, अत्याचार भी होते हैं और इस चुनाव के दौरान भी हुए और जैसा कि एक भाई ने मैसूर के बारे में बताया वह दूसरी जगह भी हुआ और चुनाव के बाद कुछ जगहों में लोगों पर मारपीट हुई है और जुल्म भी हुए हैं और इन चीजों को हम को देखना है कि ये रुकें, और यह तभी

होगा कि जब हम अपने चुनाव से जातिवाद और सांप्रदायिकता को हटायें, इन को अपने राष्ट्रीय जीवन में से हटायें यही हमारी कोशिश है। हमें मालूम है कि इसमें हम पूरे तौर से कामयाब नहीं हुए हैं, लेकिन यह ऐसी चीज नहीं है कि जिस को केवल सरकार या कोई एक व्यक्ति या कोई अफसर कर सके। यह तो एक राष्ट्रीय प्रश्न है जिस में सब दलों के, सब माननीय सदस्यों के और बाहर की जो भी संस्थाएँ या व्यक्ति हों उनके सहयोग की जरूरत है और उन सब को मिल कर इस चीज का सामना करना चाहिए। तभी हम इस में सफलता प्राप्त कर सकते हैं...

**श्री बी० एन० मंडल :** मैं एक बात जानना चाहता हूं।

**श्री उपसभापति :** आप बैठिये।

**श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी :** जब तक मैं खड़ी हुई हूं आप नहीं खड़े हो सकते।

**श्री राजनारायण :** यह बात सही है।

**श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी :** तो इस बार कहीं कहीं जातिवाद का असर पड़ा लेकिन अधिकांश जगह जातिवाद चाहे जिस दल ने चलाने की कोशिश की, लेकिन वह चला नहीं। लोगों ने जाति की ओर ध्यान न देकर अपना वोट डाला। तो इस तरह से यह चुनाव पूरे हुए हैं और हमारे आगे बढ़ने का एक रास्ता खुला है। मैं इस चुनाव को केवल विजय की दृष्टि से नहीं देखती बल्कि इससे एक दरवाजा खुला है और हमारा समाजवाद के रास्ते पर रोशनी पड़ी। रास्ता हमारे सामने है। मैंने किसी भाषण में कोई वायदा नहीं किया। जो वायदे थे वे हमारे मैनीफेस्टो में थे। उस में हम ने कहा था कि हम क्या करेंगे, लेकिन किसी भाषण में मैंने नहीं कहा कि अगर हम को वोट देगा तो उस को यह आराम मिलेगा या उसकी समस्याएँ जल्दी से हल हो जायेंगी। प्रत्येक भाषण में मैंने कहा

कि रास्ता बहुत संम्बल है और कठिनाइयों से भरा हुआ है, खतरे से भरा हुआ है और जो उस कठिनाई का सामना करने को तैयार हों, खतरे का सामना करने को तैयार हों वह ही हमारे लिए वोट दें, वह ही हमारा साथ दें, जिस तरह से आजादी के आंदोलन में हुआ था। तो जनता ने जो हमें वोट दिया उसे हम कोई अपनी जीत नहीं मानते, लेकिन यह जरूर मानते हैं कि जनता हमारी शक्ति है, जनता हमारी ताकत है। उस की उम्मीद लगी है कि इस समाजवाद के रास्ते पर हम एक एक कदम कर के आगे बढ़ें और जितनी जल्दी वह कदम उठ सकें, वह उठें। तो यह चुनौती हमारे सामने आयी है। जिस के हाथ में जिम्मेदारी है वह जिम्मेदारी तो हमेशा उसकी कि उसको काम पूरा करना है, चाहे उसका बहुमत ज्यादा हो या कम। यह जरूर कह सकते हैं कि कुछ काम ऐसे थे विशेषकर संसद में, जिन को हम नहीं पार कर सकते थे, अगर उनको हम आज अपने बहुमत से पार कर सकेंगे और वह कदम हम को जल्दी से जल्दी उठाने हैं।

यह भी मैंने बार बार कहा कि यह काम सरकार नहीं कर सकती है। इस में जनता का सहयोग और साथ चाहिए और जो दूसरे राजनीतिक दल हैं उनको भी हमारा साथ और सहयोग देना चाहिये। माननीय त्यागी जी को तो मालूम है कि हम ने हमेशा ही उनके साथ और सहयोग का स्वागत किया है। हमेशा कोशिश की है कि हर विषय पर विरोधी दलों के नेताओं से हम बात चीत करें और जहां तक मिल कर काम हो सके, उस की चेष्टा करें। आज भी हमारी यही कोशिश है और इधर जो मसले निकले हैं उन के लिए थोड़े ही दिनों में ही, हम तीन दफा विरोधी दल के नेताओं से मिल चुके हैं। और मैं उनकी प्रशंसा करूंगी कि कठिन समस्या में जो कि पूर्वी बंगाल की है उन्होंने बहुत समझदारी दिखाई और अपना पूरा सहयोग हमें दिया।

एक हमारे किसी माननीय सदस्य ने यह

बात कही, शायद श्री कौल थे, कि अभी तक हम दूर के कार्यक्रम देखते रहे और अब समय आया है कि जो अभी हमारे पैरों के सामने है उसको देखें। तो यह बात पूरे तौर से ठीक नहीं है। कुछ दूर के कार्यक्रम अगर नहीं देखेंगे तो बहुत जल्दी वह दूर की बात आज हो जायगी और उस वक्त जो जरूरतें हमारी होंगी वह पूरी नहीं हो सकतीं। आपको जरूर मालूम होगा कि जो बहुत सी कठिनाइयां हमारे उद्योग के सामने हैं या हमारे घर बनाने के कार्यक्रम के सामने हैं या अधिक स्कूल बनाने के सामने हैं या अनाज के गोदाम बनाने के सामने हैं वह स्टील की, लोहे की, कमी के कारण हैं। तो आप कहें कि हम स्टील की तरफ ध्यान न दें तो इससे कुछ राष्ट्र का कल्याण होने वाला नहीं है। ये बड़ी बड़ी चीजें बनानी आवश्यक हैं, इसलिये कि ये देश के आर्थिक ढांचे की बुनियाद हैं और उसमें अगर कुछ कष्ट भी उठाना हो तो वह करना होता है। जैसे कि बालक की शिक्षा के लिये है, अपने बच्चों को पढ़ाने भेजते हैं तो वह कोई तुरन्त कमाने नहीं लगता है लेकिन हमें मालूम है कि वह शिक्षा देनी आवश्यक है चाहे उसमें दस साल लगे, उन्नीस साल लगे, जितना भी लगे। इस तरह से कुछ बुनियादी काम है जो देश छोड़ नहीं सकता है और करना जरूरी है लेकिन इसके संग यह मैं पूरे तौर से समझती हूं कि जो और काम हैं जैसे प्राथमिक शिक्षा का प्रश्न है, बेकारी दूर करने का प्रश्न है, शहर में गन्दी बस्तियां हटाने का प्रश्न है, घर बनाने का प्रश्न है—चाहे शहर में चाहे देहात में—इन सब बातों की तरफ हमें ध्यान देना है और इससे दो काम हो सकते हैं, एक तो जनता की आवश्यकतायें पूरी हो सकती हैं और साथ साथ इससे बेकारी भी दूर हो सकती है, बहुत से लोग काम में लग सकते हैं। यह हमारी कोशिश है। कुछ लोगों ने कहा कि जो 50 करोड़ धनराशि अलग रखी गई है वह इसके लिये काफी नहीं है। यह मैं भी मानती हूं लेकिन यह कोई पूरा कार्यक्रम नहीं है।

[श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी]

बेकारी असल में तो तब हटेगी जब सारे देश की एकानामी है, जो तस्वीर उसकी है उस तस्वीर में देखेंगे, उस तस्वीर में इसको देखना है और यह जो कार्यक्रम है यह उसका एक बहुत छोटा सा भाग है, इसको भी हमको बढ़ाना है लेकिन यह नहीं समझना है कि सारा सुझाव एक इसी में है। हमारी कोशिश है कि इस कार्यक्रम को भी हम और बढ़ायें, और फैलायें, और दूसरे और कार्यक्रम भी सोचें और योजना के ऊपर भी हम चाहते हैं कि फिर से एक निगाह रखें जिससे उसमें भी जो परिवर्तन हो सकते हैं उसको हम लायें।

एक प्रश्न हमारे डी० एम० के० के माननीय सदस्य ने कहा कि चुनाव में हमको यह निशान नहीं रखना चाहिये, तो उनको तो यह मालूम होना चाहिये कि हम भी इसी दिशा में बढ़ रहे हैं। पहले तो केवल निशान ही होता था अब निशान और नाम होने लगा है और हमारी उम्मीद यही है कि जल्दी से जल्दी जैसे सब लोग पढ़ने लगेंगे वैसे निशान की जरूरत नहीं होगी और केवल उम्मीदवारों का नाम ही वहां पर होगा।

एक और प्रश्न वह हर समय उठाते हैं और है भी महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्न, वह है केन्द्र और राज्य सरकारों का संग में काम करने का और सम्बन्ध का। इसके लिये नियम तो हैं, आज के हमारे संविधान में भी नियम हैं, और बहुत नियम शायद बन सकें, लेकिन कितने भी नियम हों यह तो एक सहयोग की बात है, कैसे किस भावना से हम इस प्रश्न का सामना करना चाहते हैं उसका प्रश्न है। अगर मैत्री भावना है तो हमेशा काम ठीक से चलेगा और अगर नहीं है तो कितना भी नियम बने वह ठीक सम्बन्ध बन नहीं सकेगा...

... अक्सर जब नियम बनते हैं, तो हमने देखा है वह बंदिश बन जाते हैं; बजाए इसके कि सहायता करें, रास्ता खोलें; उनमें बंध

जाते हैं क्योंकि नियम बनाते समय किसी को मालूम नहीं कि कौन समस्या 5 साल बाद उठ सकती है। आर्थिक समस्या की पहले से कोई कल्पना नहीं कर सकता है। मैं समझती हूं, अगर हम सब लोग, यह जो हमारे राज्य के प्रश्न हैं, उनको एक राष्ट्रीय समस्या या राष्ट्रीय दृष्टिकोण से देखें तो हमें एक दूसरे के संग काम करने में कोई कठिनाई नहीं होगी। असल में, आज जो कठिनाई है वह कमी की वजह से है। हर चीज का अभाव है—फंड्स का अभाव है, स्टील का अभाव है, दूसरी आवश्यक वस्तुओं का अभाव है। तो इसलिए उनका बंटवारा करने में सभी लोग हमसे असंतुष्ट हो जाते हैं, और हर एक सरकार समझती है, हर एक प्रान्त समझता है कि उसी के साथ अन्याय हो रहा है। जिन प्रान्तों को हम समझते हैं बहुत आगे बढ़ गए, दूसरे प्रान्तों से धनी हैं, वह भी समझते हैं कि हमारे प्रति अन्याय कर रहे हैं। तो अगर सब मिल कर के देश को आगे बढ़ाएं तो सब को काफी मिल सकेगा।

इस वक्त मुख्य प्रश्न हमारे सामने एक तो बेकारी का है और एक बढ़ती हुई कीमतों का। बेकारी के बारे में, कुछ जो मैंने अभी कहा, कि उसके कारण है। बेकारी बढ़ी क्योंकि हमारे उद्योग इत्यादि कुछ कम हो गए पिछले वर्षों में। लेकिन हमारी आशा है कि अब जो कार्यक्रम हो रहे हैं उनसे हम आहिस्ता-आहिस्ता इस समस्या का हल निकाल सकेंगे—एकदम तो यह हो नहीं सकता—और हमारी यह भी आशा है कि जो भी कार्यक्रम हम हाथ में लें उसका दृष्टिकोण यह हो कि उसके संग कितनी नौकरियां हमारी जनता को मिलती हैं, चाहे वह देहात की अनपढ़ जनता हो, चाहे वह हमारे शिक्षित नौजवान हों।

यह जो कुछ कार्यक्रम बने हैं देहात के कामों के लिए उसमें खास तौर से जो छोटे किसान

हैं, जिनकी कम जमीन है और उन किसानों के लिए जो भूमिहीन हैं, 235 करोड़ रु० अलग रखा गया है और इसके अलावा जो कई संस्थाएं हैं, जो कर्ज देती हैं, वह 300 करोड़ रु० ऐसे छोटे प्रोजेक्ट्स के लिए और देहाती मजदूरों के लिए वर्ज देंगी। जो सूखी जमीन पर के किसान हैं उनके लिए 150 करोड़ रु० की धनराशि अलग रखी गई है। ये सब कार्यक्रम तो अभी खाली एक शुरुआत है और हमारी आशा है कि इसके चारों तरफ और बड़े कार्यक्रम बन सकेंगे।

हमारे मित्र श्री गुरुपादस्वामी ने एक 100 करोड़ रुपए की योजना के बारे में बात कही। ऐसी बड़ी बड़ी संख्या देना तो आसान है, लेकिन कहां से यह धनराशि आएगी, इस पर उन्होंने कुछ रोशनी नहीं दी। हर एक चीज की, कि कितना काम करना है, फेहरिस्त तो बना सकते हैं, लेकिन जहां समानता और धन का अभाव है वहां देखना होता है कौन चीज ज्यादा महत्वपूर्ण है, कौन चीज कम महत्वपूर्ण है—प्लानिंग का सारा अर्थ यह है। करना तो बहुत है लेकिन कौन चीज तुरन्त करनी हैं और कौन बाद में करनी हैं, इसमें चुनना पड़ता है।

इसी तरह से वरुण लोगों ने कहा कि बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण हुआ लेकिन उसका कुछ लाभ गरीब जनता को नहीं पहुंचा—बहुत बार यह बात हमने सुनी है लेकिन यह लोग जो ऐसा कहते हैं, उन्हें भी क्या सुविधा है और कितना बैंक दे रहे हैं, उस पर शायद कोई ध्यान नहीं दिया क्योंकि छोटे किसानों को जिनको पहले कुछ नहीं मिलता था, उनको अब काफी मिलने लगा, जितना मिलना चाहिए था उतना नहीं मिला क्योंकि इतने लोगों को मिल ही नहीं सकता जितने चाहते हैं। और अभी जितनी आसानी से देना चाहिए वह भी काम नहीं हुआ, यह भी मैं मानती हूं। लेकिन तब भी एक ठीक दिशा में हम चल रहे हैं और अगर अभी तक उसमें कोई सुस्ती है तो दिशा नहीं बदलनी

है, देखना है कि कैसे तेजी से उस रास्ते पर चलें।

हमारे कई माननीय सदस्यों ने वही बात फिर से उठाई, कि हम विदेशी बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण क्यों नहीं करते हैं, जो बैंक यहां बचे हैं, उनका राष्ट्रीयकरण क्यों नहीं करते हैं। अब इस मसले पर मैं यहां नहीं जाना चाहती हूं क्योंकि दो दफा इस हाऊस में इस पर काफी लम्बी-चौड़ी बहस हो चुकी है और मैंने उसका जवाब दे दिया है।

मुझे बहुत ही अश्चर्य हुआ इस बात से कि कुछ हमारे माननीय सदस्य शायद समझते हैं कि कोई भी बात कह दो तो जनता उस पर विश्वास कर लेती है। हमारे सी० पी० (एम) के एक माननीय सदस्य ने कहा कि नक्सलाइट्स जो हैं उनसे भारत सरकार काम ले रही है। मैं तो समझती हूं न इस सदन में, न बाहर, कोई ऐसी बात पर जरा भी विश्वास करेगा।

श्री अहमद और दूसरे लोग भी भूमि सुधार के कार्यक्रम पर बोले। आप सब को मालूम है कि हम इस चीज को बहुत महत्व देते हैं। मुझे मालूम नहीं कि हमारे भाई का क्या विचार था कि भूमि सुधार में क्या क्या चीज होती है क्योंकि इसमें बहुत सी चीजें आती हैं। इसमें जरा भी सन्देह नहीं है कि हमारे जो छोटे किसान हैं, जो हमारे हरिजन, भूमिहीन हैं, दूसरे देहात के रहने वाले गरीब लोग हैं उनके साथ बहुत अत्याचार होते आये हैं और आज भी हो रहे हैं। मुझे इस बात का दुःख है कि इसमें कोई भी प्रान्त नहीं बचा है। अगर कोई यह समझता है कि उसका प्रान्त बचा है तो ऐसी बात नहीं है हमको देहात में सुधार लाना है तो सबसे पहले भूमि सुधार का काम करना है। इसमें खाली लैंड सीलिंग का प्रश्न नहीं है और बहुत से प्रश्न हैं। वे लोग भूमि के मालिक है या नहीं, ऐसी बहुत सी चीजें हैं, जिन पर हम ध्यान दे रहे हैं। पूर्वी बंगाल में कुछ किया भी है।

**एक माननीय सदस्य :** पश्चिमी बंगाल में।

**श्री अर्जुन अरोड़ा :** पूर्वी बंगाल में भी कुछ करना है।

**श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी :** पश्चिमी बंगाल में कुछ किया भी गया है और यहां सरकारें हैं वहां के मुख्य मंत्रियों पर पूरी पूरी कोशिश कर रहे हैं कि वे भी इस किस्म के नियम बनायें। मुझे आशा है कि जितने भी दूसरे यहां पर दल हैं वे इस चीज में रुचि लेंगे कि उनके प्रान्तों में यह काम जल्दी उठाया जाय।

अक्सर हमारा मुकाबला जापान से और ऐसे ही दूसरे देशों से किया जाता है। अब जापान एक बहुत छोटा देश है। दो साल हुए उन्होंने शताब्दी मनाई? जो उनके यहां 100 फीसदी लिट्रेसी हो चुकी है, उसकी शताब्दी मनाई? उनसे मुकाबला करना कि हमने 20 सालों में कितनी प्रगति की और जापान कहां पहुंचा, तो यह कोई बराबर का मुकाबला नहीं है। वहां की स्थिति दूसरी है और जनता का रहन सहन तथा आदर्श भी बिल्कुल दूसरी हैं। लेकिन वहां भी जो प्रगति हुई है उसकी एक बुनियाद लैंड रिफार्म है क्योंकि वहां अमेरिकन फौजें अब अक्यूपेशन में थीं तो उन्होंने पहला काम किया वह थोड़ा बहुत लैंड जबर्दस्ती ला दिया। ईरान जहां पर ममाजवादी सरकार नहीं है उन्होंने भी लैंड रिफार्म के सम्बन्ध में काफी जोरदार काम किया। आज तक दुनिया में ग्रामीण जनता को लाभ पहुंचा नहीं सका है जबतक कि भूमि सुधार का काम साथ साथ न चले।

बढ़ती हुई कीमतों पर स्वाभाविक है कि सब को परेशानी हो, भारत सरकार को भी इसके बारे में बहुत चिन्ता है और उसकी यह पूरी कोशिश है कि किस तरह से काबू में आये। थोड़ी बहुत कीमतें जैसे कि हमारी डेबलपिंग इकनोमी है, उसमें कीमतें थोड़ी बहुत तो बढ़ेंगी। अगर हम इस सम्बन्ध में और देशों को

देखें तो शायद ही कोई ऐसा देश हो जहां पर पिछले तीन वर्षों में कीमतें थोड़ी बहुत न बढ़ी हों। चाहे वे देश इंग्लिस्तान हो, अमरिका हों या योरप का कोई और देश हो। जो गरीब देश हैं वहां भी सब जगह करीब करीब कीमतें बढ़ती आई हैं। इसका बोझ हम पर भी ज्यादा पड़ा है क्योंकि हमारे यहां गरीबी ज्यादा है और लोगों में शक्ति नहीं है इस बोझ को सहन करने की। इसलिए हमको पूरा प्रयत्न करना है और हम इस चीज पर गहराई से विचार कर रहे हैं।

यहां पर औद्योगिक शान्ति रहे, यह बहुत ही आवश्यक है और हमारी भी यह कोशिश है ट्रेड यूनियन्स के नेताओं से, मैनैजमेंट से कि हम बातचीत करें जिसमें कोई न कोई समझौता आये और इस समझौते को हमें पैदावार की बुनियाद पर करना चाहिये। इसके साथ ही साथ हमें यह भी देखना चाहिये कि मजदूरों के साथ न्याय हो और उनका भी यह कठिन कर्त्तव्य है कि देश की सम्पत्ति बढ़ाने में वे भी अपनी पूरी शक्ति लगायें। इस तरह का अगर सहयोग दोनों का रहा तो हम भारत के औद्योगिक चित्र को काफी बदल सकते हैं। हमने कभी नहीं कहा कि गरीबी जल्दी से जायगी या जादू से जायगी, न कोई इसको समझता है, न ही हमने कहा कि हम ही गरीबी दूर कर सकते हैं। हमने बराबर इस सदन में और दूसरी जगहों में कहा कि यह राष्ट्रीय समस्या है आप सब लोग आइए, इसको दूर करने में मदद कीजिए, गरीबी आज की नहीं है, किसी एक दल के कारण नहीं है, यह बहुत पुरानी बीमारी है हमारे देश की और यह कार्यक्रम देश के सामने रखा, सारा देश इसको अपना कार्य में मार्च कर आगे बढ़े तो यह जल्दी दूर हो सकती है। यही आज भी आप से प्रार्थना है कि इस कार्यक्रम को अपनाएं, साथ देंगे तो हम सब लोग मिल कर इस बड़े काम को पूरा कर सकेंगे। विरोधी दल का काम है कि वे विरोध करें और हम उसका स्वागत करते हैं इस सदन में या बाहर कि वे

क्या गलतियाँ हैं, क्या कमियाँ हैं, उनको खोज कर निकालें। वे जितना चाहें जी भर के कहें, लेकिन साथ-साथ जो राष्ट्रीय प्रश्न है उनको मिलकर करें तो इसमें कोई शक नहीं कि वे काम जल्दी से हो सकेंगे और मजबूती से हो सकेंगे।

एक हमारे सामने और सभी के सामने पूर्वी बंगाल का प्रश्न है। मैं उस पर कुछ कहना नहीं चाहती इसलिए नहीं कि कुछ कहने को नहीं है, इसलिए नहीं कि उससे दुख और क्रोध हमको नहीं होता है बल्कि इसलिए कि दोनों सदनों में हम सब ने मिल कर एक प्रस्ताव पास किया और उसमें हमारी सब भावनाएं प्रगट हो गई। इस समय हम कुछ भी कहें या कुछ भी करें तो एक ही दृष्टिकोण से उसको देखना है और वह नहीं कि हम उस पर अपने विचार प्रगट कर रहे हैं और उसी से हम खुश हो रहे हैं या नहीं और वह इस दृष्टिकोण से कि हमारे ऐसा करने से उन पर क्या असर होगा, उनकी मदद होगी या उनकी कठिनाई बढ़ जायगी। इस दृष्टिकोण से इस वक्त इस प्रश्न का देखना है और मैं यह विश्वास दिलाती हूँ कि यह हमारे ध्यान में रहेगा।

श्री मेहता जी ने कहा था कि हमारी जमीन पर पाकिस्तान के जहाज उड़े हैं या नहीं इस पर जहां तक हमने जांच की है इसमें सत्य नहीं है। होता यह है कि सीमा के बहुत पास लोग रहते हैं, सीमा के उस पार भी जहाज आए तो लग सकता है कि इधर आए। दूसरे उन्होंने पूछा कि नागम बम फेंका या नहीं। अखबार में भी निकला था, हमने भी सुना था, यह पक्की खबर नहीं है कि पड़ा या नहीं पड़ा। और कोई बात नहीं है, करीब करीब जितने पाइन्ट्स थे उनका मैंने जवाब दे दिया। मैं आशा करती हूँ कि इन सब बातों का ध्यान रखते हुए जो श्रीमती पुरबी मुखर्जी का प्रस्ताव है, उसका समर्थन अप करेंगे।

श्री राजनारायण : मैं आपके द्वारा एक निवेदन करता करता हूँ कि 27 जनवरी को

जो चुनाव मतगणना पद्धति में इलेक्शन कमीशन की सिफारिश पर केन्द्रीय सरकार ने तबदीली की उसके बारे में प्रधान मंत्री ने कुछ नहीं कहा (व्यवधान) प्राइम मिनिस्टर को उसके बारे में जवाब देना चाहिए।

श्री उपसभापति : राजनारायण जी, रूल्स के बारे में तो बाद में आयेंगे, लेकिन मुझे बतलाया गया है कि आप ने जो प्वाइंट्स रेज किये थे उनके बारे में अपने ला मिनिस्टर, श्री गोखले साहब ने काफी लम्बी तकरीर करके डिबेट में उनका जवाब दे दिया है और आप तो यहां रहते नहीं और बाद में बहस उठाते हैं। जिस समय आप का जवाब दिया गया उस समय आप हाजिर नहीं थे।

श्री राजनारायण : गोखले बेचारा क्या जवाब देगा। वह तो प्राइम मिनिस्टर को देना चाहिए था।

श्री उपसभापति : कल भी इसके बारे में बहस होगी। अब आप शान्त रहें।

Amendments Nos. 1 to 3 of Shri Sen Gupta are before the House Mr. Sen Gupta, do you press them ?

SHRI DWIJENDRALAL SEN GUPTA : I am not pressing them. I beg leave to withdraw my amendments.

\* Amendments Nos. 1 to 3 were, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Amendments Nos. 4 to 18 are in the name of Shri Rajnarain. Now, amendment No. 4 is before the House.

श्री राजनारायण : एक एक और सब पर अलग वोटिंग होगी।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : It is not necessary.

\* For text of amendments *vide* debate dated the 24th March, 1971.

**श्री राजनारायण :** आप अमेंडमेंट पढ़िये । इस सदन में यह प्रथा प्रतिष्ठित हो चुकी है । आप अमेंडमेंट पढ़िये । जो लोग यहां पर समाजवाद का नारा लगा रहे हैं कम से कम उनका चेहरा तो काला होगा । आप उसको पढ़िये ।

**श्री उपसभापति :** आप लोगों के सामने प्रिंटेड अमेंडमेंट्स हैं । क्या नम्बर है, क्या अमेंडमेंट है यह सब लोग जानते हैं ।

**श्री राजनारायण :** यह व्यवस्था का सवाल है । अगर मजाक करना हो तो करिये । आप चाहते हैं कि संख्यासुर के बल पर आप जो चाहे करा लें । जो एक स्वस्थ संसदीय प्रथा है उसका पालन करिये ।

**श्री उपसभापति :** राजनारायण जी इस में कुछ नहीं है । हमेशा सदन में अमेंडमेंट नम्बर दिया जाता है इस और उस पर वोट लिया जाता है ।

**श्री राजनारायण :** आप अलग अलग वोट कराइये । और उसको पढ़िये । मैं ईमानदारी के साथ आप से कहना चाहता हूं कि...

**SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADH-  
YAY :** Sir, there cannot be any discussion during voting.

**श्री राजनारायण :** मैं आप से निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि आप ईमानदारी के साथ सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों से पूछ लीजिए कि किन किन के पास अमेंडमेंट है । किसके पास अमेंडमेंट है ?

**SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY :** Sir, on a point of order. When amendments are circulated, Members are supposed to have read and known what they are. Whether they know about them or not, he cannot question. Technically, when the amendments are given, it is supposed that each Member has known it, has read it, and would vote on it with some knowledge. He is right in asking for separat-

ing voting on each if he wants, but it is not necessary for you to read it, Sir.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** On that point of order. I think that the hon. lady Member generally does not read Mr. Rajnarain's amendments.

**श्री राजनारायण :** श्रीमन्, भूपेश गुप्त जी ने हमारे मत का समर्थन किया ।

**श्री शीलभद्र याजी :** आप बैठिये ।

**श्री राजनारायण :** आप याजी जी को कहिये कि ये सीमा में रहें ।

**श्री उपसभापति :** याजी जी, आप बैठ जाइये ।

**श्री राजनारायण :** आप देखिये कि एक संसदीय परम्परा रही है । इतनी देर में वोट हो जाता ।

**श्री उपसभापति :** मैं सदस्यों की राय देख रहा हूं कि उन्होंने अमेंडमेंट पढ़ लिया है ।

**श्री राजनारायण :** अगर आप यही बात करेंगे तो मैं हर एक पर वोटिंग कराऊंगा । अगर आप डाल डाल चलेंगे तो मैं पात पात चलूंगा । अगर आप ऐसा करायेंगे तो मैं हर एक पर वोटिंग कराऊंगा ।

**श्री उपसभापति :** चार में जो आप सब से ज्यादा महत्व का समझते हों उस को मैं सदन के सामने पढ़ दूँ । सब को पढ़ने की क्या जरूरत है ?

**श्री राजनारायण :** श्रीमन्, श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी आज समाजवाद का प्रतीक बन रही हैं । हम 1934 से समाजवादी बने चले आ रहे हैं और समझते हैं कि समाजवादी सिद्धान्त क्या हैं । आप एक एक अमेंडमेंट को पढ़िये और उस पर वोट कराइये ।

**श्री उपसभापति :** मैं यही कह रहा था कि सदन का समय बचाने के लिये आप कहें कि कौन कौन सा पढ़ूँ । आप कौन कौन सा पढ़ने को कहते हैं ।

श्री राजनारायण : कौन सा क्या, सब पढ़िये ।

श्री उपसभापति : जो महत्वपूर्ण हैं वह पढ़ दूंगा ।

श्री राजनारायण : क्या आप समझते हैं कि हमने कोई महत्वपूर्ण संशोधन नहीं रखा है । आप पढ़ दीजिये या हमको कहिये तो हम पढ़ें । हिन्दी में आप पढ़िये ।

श्री गोडे मुराहरि : इतने में तो आप पढ़ देते ।

श्री राजनारायण : नहीं तो हम एक एक पर डिबीजन करायेंगे ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I am putting amendment No 4 before the House. The question is :

4. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :—

'but regret that the Address throws no light on the reasons for dissolving the Lok Sabha immediately after its last meeting'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

5. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :—

'but regret that the Address makes no mention of the reasons for revising the procedure of counting of ballot papers after the President called upon the voters to elect their representatives'."

*The motion was accepted.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

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

'but regret that for removing the increasing unemployment, poverty, dearness and economic disparity in the country, the Address does not lay stress on the urgent need of forming a tillers' platoon, an irrigation service corp., and a team for the expansion of education, and on limiting the maximum income and expenditure at

fifteen hundred rupees per month, and on fixing the selling price of the essential commodities within the range of one and a half times of their cost price'."

*The House divided.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :

Ayes .. 15

Noes .. 76

AYES—15

Bhandari, Shri Sundar Singh  
Goray, Shri N. G.  
Gupta, Shri Balkrishna  
Gurupadaswamy, Shri M. S.  
Mandal, Shri B. N.  
Mathur, Shri Jagdish Prasad  
Murahari, Shri Godey  
Murthy, Shri B. P. Nagaraja  
Pushpaben Janardanrai Mehta, Shrimati  
Rajnarain, Shri  
Reddy, Shri Mulka Govinda  
Sahai, Shri Ram  
Shahi, Shri Nageshwar Prasad  
Singh, Shri Sitaram  
Yadav, Shri J. P.

NOES—76

Abdul Samad, Shri A. K. A.  
Amla, Shri Tirath Ram  
Ansari, Shri Hayatullah  
Arora, Shri Arjun  
Bhatt, Shri Nand Kishore  
Bobdey, Shri S. B.  
Brar, Sardar Narindar Singh  
Chandra Shekhar, Shri  
Chandrasekharan, Shri K.  
Das, Shri Balram  
Das, Shri Bipinpal  
Dass, Shri Mahabir  
Gautam, Shri Mohan Lal  
Goswami, Shri Sriman Prafulla  
Gujral, Shri I. K.  
Hussain, Shri Syed  
Jain, Shri A. P.  
Jairamdas Daulatram, Shri  
Joshi, Shri Umashanker  
Kalyan Chand, Shri  
Kaul, Shri M. N.  
Khaitan, Shri R. P.  
Khan, Shri Akbar Ali  
Kollur, Shri M. L.  
Krishan Kant, Shri  
Mahida, Shri U. N.

Mangladevi Talwar, Dr. (Mrs.)  
 Mehta, Shri Om  
 Mirdha, Shri Ram Niwas  
 Mishra, Shri L. N.  
 Mitra, Shri P. C.  
 Mohamod Usman, Shri  
 Mohideen, Shri S. A. Khaja  
 Mukherjee, Shri Pranab Kumar  
 Nandini Satpathy, Shrimati  
 Narayan, Shri M. D.  
 Narayani Devi Manaklal Varma, Shrimati  
 Neki Ram, Shri  
 Panda, Shri Brahmananda  
 Panjhazari, Sardar Raghbir Singh  
 Patil, Shri G. R.  
 Patil, Shri P. S.  
 Pratibha Singh, Shrimati  
 Punnaiah, Shri Kota  
 Purabi Mukhopadhyay, Shrimati  
 Purakayastha, Shri Mahitosh  
 Puri, Shri Dev Datt  
 Raju, Shri V. B.  
 Ramaswamy, Shri K. S.  
 Ramiah, Dr. K.  
 Reddy, Shri Gaddam Narayana  
 Reddy, Shri K. V. Raghunatha  
 Reddy, Shri M. Srinivasa  
 Salig Ram, Dr.  
 Sangma, Shri E. M.  
 Satyavati Dang, Shrimati  
 Schamnad, Shri Hamid Ali  
 Shukla, Shri M. P.  
 Shyamkumari Devi, Shrimati  
 Singh, Shri Bhupinder  
 Singh, Shri Jogendra  
 Singh, Shri Sultan  
 Singh, Shri Triloki  
 Sinha, Shri Awadheshwar Prasad  
 Sisodia, Shri Swaisingh  
 Sivaprakasam, Shri S.  
 Sukhdev Prasad, Shri  
 Tiwary, Pt. Bhawaniprasad  
 Untoo, Shri Gulam Nabi  
 Usha Barthakur, Shrimati  
 Venigalla Satyanarayana, Shri  
 Vidyawati Chaturvedi, Shrimati  
 Villalan, Shri Thillai  
 Yajee, Shri Sheel Bhadra  
 Yashoda Reddy, Shrimati

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

7. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address makes no mention of the desirability of reserving at least sixty per cent of the places in all spheres of life for Harijans, poor and depressed Muslims, and Adivasis".

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

8. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not draw the attention of Government towards curbing the misuse of the All India Radio by it".

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

9. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not emphasise the democratic necessity of making the Election Commission a non-Government body".

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

10. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not outline the arrangements made by Government for handing over the authorised Banks to the Nation".

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

11. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely:—

"but regret that the Address does not throw light on the pitiable plight of agricultural and industrial labour and Government employees".

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is :

12. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely :—

'but regret that the Address does not outline a policy for solving the various problems faced by students and the teachers'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is :

13. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely :—

'but regret that the Address does not lay emphasis on the need of the hour to effect radical change in foreign policy, educational policy, industrial policy and agricultural policy'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is :

14. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :—

'but regret that the Address does not draw the attention of Government to the growing danger posed by shrinking national borders'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is :

15. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :—

'but regret that the Address fails to caution Government against the crisis caused by continuously increasing foreign and indigenous loans'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is :

16. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :

'but regret that the Address does not spell out a policy to free the country from the menace of increasing tension between Hindus and Muslims'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is :

17. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :—

'but regret that the Address does not lay stress on striking a just balance between the prices of essential agricultural produce and industrial products in order to bring about an egalitarian society and a four-pillar State'."

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, आपने अनुवाद बिलकुल गलत पढ़ा है। न्यायोचित संतुलन का मतलब होता है "पैरिटी—पैरिटी बिटवीन इन्डस्ट्रियल एन्ड एग्रीकल्चरल प्रोड्यूस यह है। मेरे संशोधन में चाहा गया है कि : किन्तु खेद है कि अभिभाषण में समवादी समाज और चौखम्भा राज्य बनाने की दृष्टि से...

श्री उपसभापति : हां, वही चौखम्भा राज्य आ गया।

श्री राजनारायण : ... कृषि-जन्य तथा कल-कारखाना जन्य अत्यावश्यक पदार्थों की कीमत में न्यायोचित संतुलन स्थापित करने पर बल नहीं दिया गया है।"

श्री उपसभापति : न्यायोचित संतुलन "बैलेन्स" से आ गया।

6 P. M.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: No, no balance.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: "Santulan" means balance.

SHRI RAJNARAIN: No, parity between industrial and agricultural produce. Your translation is totally wrong.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. If you want, I will put the amendment in Hindi.

The question is :

17. "प्रस्ताव के अन्त में निम्नलिखित जोड़ा जाये, अर्थात् :—

'किन्तु खेद है कि अभिभाषण में समवादी समाज और चौखम्भा राज्य बनाने

[ Mr. Deputy Chairman ]

की दृष्टि से कृषि जन्य तथा कल कार-  
खाना जन्य अत्यावश्यक पदार्थों की कीमत  
में न्यायोचित संतुलन स्थापित करने पर  
बल नहीं दिया गया है।”

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The ques-  
tion is :

18. “That at the end of the Motion, the  
following be added, namely :—

‘but regret that the Address fails to draw  
the attention of the nation to the failure of  
Government in evolving a socio-economic  
and political order...’.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, हमारा एक  
प्वाइन्ट आफ आर्डर है। मैं आपसे कहना  
चाहता हूँ कि जो हमारा हिन्दी का अनुवाद किया  
गया है वह गलत किया गया है। आप देख  
लें इकोनोमिक एन्ड पोलिटिकल डि सेन्ट्रलाइ-  
जेशन के सम्बन्ध में आप मोनोपली पढ़ रहे  
हैं। इकोनोमिक एन्ड पोलिटिकल डि सेन्ट्रलाइ-  
जेशन के सम्बन्ध में जो सरकार अपने को  
समाजवादी सरकार कहती है, वह इकोनोमिक  
एन्ड पोलिटिकल डि सेन्ट्रलाइजेशन की विरोधी  
है और ऐसी सरकार को क्या शर्म नहीं  
आती है।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : All right,  
please sit down.

The question is :

18. “That at the end of the Motion, the  
following be added, namely:—

‘but regret that the Address fails to draw  
the attention of the nation to the failure of  
Government in evolving a socio-economic  
and political order in which the innocent  
people of the country may get rid of official  
and non-official corruptions and their hands  
may be strengthened by the decentralisation  
of State power and money power and the  
nation may be freed from the illusion of  
hypocritical socialism so that true socialism  
may be ushered in’.

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The ques-  
tion is :

19. “That at the end of the Motion, the  
following be added, namely :

‘but regret that the Address fails to  
refer to the serious malpractices and irre-  
gularities that have taken place in the  
conduct of the recent mid-term Elections,  
particularly in respect of abuse of Govern-  
mental machinery by the ruling party at the  
centre and extremely defective electoral  
rolls’.

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The ques-  
tion is :

20. “That at the end of the Motion, the  
following be added, namely :

“but regret that the Address fails to refer  
to—

(a) the serious misuse of the Government  
machinery particularly All India Radio and  
Television for the promotion of the electoral  
prospects of the ruling party at the Centre  
and the steps taken by Government to allay  
public misgivings in this regard through a  
high-powered independent probe ;

(b) the fact that the electoral rolls used  
in the recent mid-term elections were ex-  
tremely defective as a result of which mil-  
lions of *bona fide* electors have been cheated  
of their right of franchise ;

(c) the concrete steps to be taken to  
solve the problems of unemployment and  
rising prices ;

(d) the measures Government proposes to  
take to compel Pakistan to make amends for  
the hijacking incident and to hand over the  
hijackers to India ;

(e) an independent foreign policy that  
should now be chalked out ;

(f) the fact that for an independent  
foreign and defence policy, India must  
become a nuclear power ; and

(g) the fact that the Fourth Five Year  
Plan would be overhauled to make Indian  
economy self-reliant, dynamic and employ-  
ment oriented’.

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is :

21. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely :

'but regret that the Address makes no mention about the failures in Plan implementation'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is :

22. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :

'but regret that the Address gives no indication about the specific schemes to solve the crucial problem of unemployment'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is :

23. "That at the end of the Motion, the following to added, namely :

'but regret that the Address gives no indication of any immediate solution to tackle the problem of inflation and rising prices'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is :

24. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :

'but regret that the Address gives no indication about the mobilisation of resources for the fulfilment of the socio-economic objectives mentioned therein'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is :

25. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :

'but regret that the Address makes no reference about the non-fulfilment of the commitments made to the Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and Backward Classes in the Constitution'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Ganeshi Lal Chaudhary did not move his amendment. Amendment Nos. 27 to 29 are in name of Shri A. D. Mani. Is he pressing them?

SHRI A. D. MANI : I am not pressing.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Has he got the permission of the House to withdraw his amendment Nos. 27, 28 and 29?

श्री राजनारायण : नहीं, नहीं। देखिए मैं इसका विरोध करता हूँ वह सदन की प्रापर्टी है। इस पर वोट ले लीजिए।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: As no leave has been granted by the House, Amendment Nos. 27, 28 and 29 are before the House.

श्री राजनारायण : पोइन्ट आफ आर्डर। किस नियम के तहत जो सदन की प्रापर्टी हो गई है, उसके लिए आप कह सकते हैं कि इस प्रस्ताव को वापस ले लें तो ले लें।

श्री उपसभापति : मैंने कहा कहा। सुना तो करो, सुनने के बाद दिमाग से समझा करो।

श्री राजनारायण : आप दिमाग से रूल बता दीजिए। अब इन्हें अधिकार नहीं है कि प्रेस करें या न करें।

श्री उपसभापति : सुनने के बाद बोला करो। मैं यही कह रहा था कि एक सदस्य भी विरुद्ध है तो एमेंडमेंट विदवा नहीं कर सकते। इसलिए बीच में बोलने की जरूरत नहीं होती है। अब आप बैठिए।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is :

27. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :

'but regret that while the Address has made references to the General elections and the verdict of the people, it does not contain any scheme of reform of elections and their procedures which would ensure the adequate reflection of the true will of the people'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

28. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :

'but regret that, while the Address mentions the Government's social objective of ceiling on urban property, it does not mention the need for a preliminary enquiry State by State about the adequacy of ceiling from the point of view of social justice so that distortions and inequalities do not appear in the picture when the social objective is implemented'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

29. "That at the end of the Motion, the following added, namely :

'but regret that while the Address contains references to unemployment it has not announced any measure of immediate financial relief in the form of an allowance to those who have been unemployed for over three years'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Amendment Nos. 30 to 56 are in the name of Shri J. P. Yadav. Do you want to press them ?

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : पढ़ दीजिए । आप हमें नहीं पढ़ने देते, स्वयं भी नहीं पढ़ते ।

श्री उपसभापति : ये बहुत हैं, उतना लम्बा पढ़ने की जरूरत नहीं है ।

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : आप पढ़ दीजिए ।

श्री राजनारायण : अगर आपको समय इतना बचाना था तो प्राइम मिनिस्टर का भाषण न कराते ।

श्री उपसभापति : लास्ट टाइम आप सब लोगों ने कहा था पढ़ना चाहिए, इसलिए...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : In the past I must have also moved some 200 amendments.

Everything was not read out. Shri Rajnarain wanted them to be read out and they were read out. If everything is to be read out, it is a torture.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Then, you have to change the rule accordingly.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I am speaking about the reading out only. Reading out is not necessary.

श्री राजनारायण : श्री भूपेश गुप्त ने जो कन्वेंशन की बात कही तो एक मर्तबा इन्होंने ऐसे ही कहा बिजनेस एडवाइजरी कमेटी के बारे में, उसमें ये हार गये । कन्वेंशन यह है ही नहीं । सदन के सदस्य जो एमेंडमेंट देते हैं, क्या वह अनावश्यक देते हैं ?

SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY : There is no question of reading out everything.

श्री राजनारायण : पुरबी मुखर्जी का संशोधन ऐसे ही रखते, अनावश्यक उसको पढ़ दिया आपने ।

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Sir, I have a suggestion to make. If there is a rule like that, the House is competent to suspend that rule. The time has come when the Leader of the House or the Chief Whip should move that this rule should be suspended because if two or three Members become unreasonable and try to waste the time of the House, the House cannot undergo this torture. (*Interruptions*). When I am speaking, I hope the hon. Member will have some patience. Mr. Deputy Chairman, my only request is...

श्री राजनारायण : सख्या के बल पर जो चाहे करा लीजिए ।

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I shall request my friend, Shri Rajnarain, through you that he should have some patience and some decency to hear others also.

श्री राजनारायण : मैं श्री चन्द्रशेखर जी से कहना चाहता हूँ कि नियम के परिवर्तन के

सम्बन्ध में जो वह सुझाव यहां दे रहे हैं वह उनकी डीसेंसी और मोरेलिटी का ज्वलंत उदाहरण है। वह कहे हैं कि नियम सस्पेंड कर दिया जाय। बारा दीजिए। काहे समय नष्ट हो रहा है ?

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, if it is occasional, it is some what interesting. But if it becomes permanent. . .

(Interruptions)

श्री राजनारायण : चापलूसी और बेहूदगी करते हो और अभी तक पार्लियामेंटरी सेक्रेटरी नहीं हो पाये। अनावश्यक हल्ला मचाते हो।

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : But if it becomes a permanent phenomenon, it becomes annoying and disgraceful to the whole House. Now, Sir, I have made the suggestion. . .

(Interruptions)

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, श्री चन्द्रशेखर इस सदन के लिए अड़जती हैं। उनको सदन में रहना नहीं चाहिए। जो इस समय लास्ट मोमेंट में कहता है नेता सदन से कि रूल सस्पेंड कर दिया जाय और उसके साथ ही जो जनतंत्र का हामी बनता हो, वह कैसे इस तरह का सुझाव दे रहा है। नेता सदन हैं उन से कहिए कि प्रस्ताव रखें और आप अमेंडमेंट करा दीजिए।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, order please.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I know that Mr. Rajnarain has nothing to do with effrontery. For him there is no limit to that. He can indulge in any language and I do not take him seriously at any time. I take only seriously the time of the House. Any speech of Rajnarain and any acrobatics of his do not make any impression upon me or upon the country or on anybody. . .

(Interruptions)

श्री राजनारायण : किसी भी बेवकूफी मे हम साथ नहीं देंगे। (Interruptions) वह चाप-

लूसी कर के कांग्रेस में गये थे और वहां से फिर भाग आये। यह बड़े भारी क्रान्तिकारी बने हैं। सजनी मैं हूं राजकुमारी। (Interruptions) समय क्यों नष्ट करते हैं आप, आप उस प्रस्ताव को ले लीजिए। नेता सदन बैठे हैं, वह प्रस्ताव रखें और आप उसे लीजिए।

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : I have made the suggestion, Sir, . . .

(Interruptions)

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, श्रीमन्, . . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Sir, under Rule 267 of the Rules of procedure, I move that this Rule should be suspended and the Chair should not be called to read out all the amendments before the House.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY : I second this.

SHRI MONORANJAN ROY : Sir, to suspend the rule at the request of one Member, I think, is not... (Interruptions)...It is the right of the Opposition...

(Interruptions)

श्री राजनारायण : हाउस को हम संख्यासुर के बल पर नहीं चलने देंगे।

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : We cannot be cowed down by one Member who is out to demolish all decency and decorum of this House. . .

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, please.

श्री राजनारायण : तो हम लोग भी काउंड डाउन नहीं हो सकते एक आदमी से जो अपनी शक्ति का दुरुपयोग करना चाहता है।

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the majority has been given by the people to you. We cannot allow certain people to demolish the parliamentary system by sheer hooliganism in the House...

(Interruptions)

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमन्, आपने प्रस्ताव लिया है या नहीं ? अगर आपने प्रस्ताव लिया है तो उस पर बहस होगी ।

श्री चन्द्रशेखर : बहस के लिए गुंजाइश नहीं है ।

SHRI RAJNARAIN : Who are you ? ... Who are you ?

श्री उपसभापति : आप बैठिये । आर्डर प्लीज ।

SHRI RAJNARAIN : I have seen so many people...

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, order, please.

SHRI RAJNARAIN : There must be some discussion.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI K. C. PANT) : This debate is not very clear. Are we debating whether there is a rule which makes it obligatory for you to read the amendments ? I do not find any such rule in this.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : You said that there is a rule.

SOME HON. MEMBERS : There is no rule.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Which rule ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I have not given any permission to suspend any rule...

(Interruptions)

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY) : Sir, there are no rules governing this particular situation. But, in the absence of rules, we are guided by the Chair and also we are obliged to maintain the dignity of the House and we are in agreement with that. Sir, in this particular case I suggest that whenever a Member asks the Chair to read out his amendment, I think the Chair may read out the amendment and put it to vote, but in other cases we may not

do that. Therefore, Rajnarain has demanded from the Chair that his amendment may be read out and you have read out the amendment and I think some hon. Member has also asked that his amendments may be read out. If we are persuaded to agree to your suggestions, we will have no objection. But there are no rules governing this particular situation. Therefore, while we agree that the amendments need not unnecessarily be read out because it will consume the time of the House, only in exceptional cases, where the Members are exercised so much about their amendments being read out...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : There are about forty amendments.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY : Quite right. The better course would be this : The hon. Member who moves such amendments may select such amendments which are important from his point of view and they may be allowed to be read. I think that this should be observed.

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : श्रीमन्, मैं पहले व्यवस्था के प्रश्न पर उठना चाहता था इसलिये कि माननीय सदस्य श्री चन्द्रशेखर जी ने अपने आवेग में सदस्यों को अनरीजनेबिल और क्या-क्या कहा और हाउस को भी. . .

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : I have used only parliamentary language.

DR. K. MATHEW KURIAN : You have used the word "hooliganism"...

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : We can not allow anybody to disrupt Parliament. . .

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, order, please.

श्री राजनारायण : यह तो चन्द्रशेखर जी को एप्लाइ करता है । चन्द्रशेखर का हूलीगनिज्म हम लोगों को डरवा नहीं सकता और न किसी का चन्द्रशेखर तो चन्द्रशेखर हैं, प्राइम मिनिस्टर का हूलीगनिज्म नहीं डरा सकता है ।

**श्री उपसभापति :** राजनारायण जी, यह ठीक नहीं।

**श्री जगदम्बो प्रनाद यादव :** श्रीमन्, प्रजा-तंत्र पद्धति के ठेकेदार बनने की अगर कुछ लोगों को आप अनुमति दे देंगे तो मैं नहीं समझता कि उससे सदन की गुरुता ठीक होगी। हम भी चाहते हैं कि आपके साथ सहयोग करें लेकिन इस तरह के शब्द कहे जाते हैं और अगर आप एक को अधिकार देते हैं तो हमें भी दें। श्रीमन्, आज ही की बात नहीं है, हम लोग पीछे बैठते हैं, चाहे ध्यानाकर्षण का मोशन हो, चाहे प्रश्न पूछने की बात हो या चाहे और कोई प्रश्न हो कुछ लोगों को छूट दे देते हैं कि जब चाहे खड़े होकर कह लें या पूछ लें और आपसे बात मनवा लें लेकिन हम लोग रीजनेबिल तरीके से, तर्कसंगत ढंग से चाहते हैं तो कठिनाई होती है। आप स्वयं देखें। हमने देखा कि हमारे संशोधन अधिक संख्या में हैं और हम चाहते थे कि इस पर कुछ सीमा रहे, लेकिन जब आप दूसरे के लिये सीमा नहीं बांधते हैं तो वह सीमा हमारे लिये ही क्यों बांधी जाय। यह सिर्फ आज ही की बात नहीं है। आपने देखा होगा कि आज सबरे लोगों ने कॉलिंग अटेंशन में सवाल पूछ लिया और हमें मौका नहीं मिला। तो क्या लिमिटेशन करें, सीमांकन करें, इसमें हमारी ही बारी आयेगी। अगर आप कहेंगे कि जो इम्पेंट हो वह ही पढ़ें तो मैं मान लूंगा, लेकिन जो अधिकार आप एक सदस्य को देते हैं, उसके नाते जब एक सदस्य की बात मान लेते हैं, तो हमारी बात भी मानें। तो जो इच्छा हो उस हिसाब से मैं अपना संशोधन रख सकता हूँ।

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** My Point is this. Our friend, Mr. Chandra Shekher, moved a motion under Rule 267. . .

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :** He has not moved it.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** He just wanted your permission to move it. You have

not given the permission. Neither should you give the permission. I sympathize with him. But we are suffering from the same afflictions. Is there any Rule in the Rules of Procedure that the amendment should be read out? You cannot make a sub-rule and then ask him to do it. All that we are concerned with is a kind of convention which has been followed. Conventions are not rules. . .

**SHRI RAJNARAIN :** It has no force. . .  
(Interruptions)

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** Mr. Rajnarain is stronger than Rules, Conventions—both.

**SHRI RAJNARAIN :** Yes, because I know more than what you know. Surely I know. . .

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** Surely you know; otherwise how you will be Rajnarain if you do not know more.

Sir, all I say is that no Rule is involved here at all. As far as my friend, Mr. Rajnarain, is concerned, he insisted that his amendments should be read out. I sympathise with him because some Members in this House never read Mr. Rajnarain's amendments but as far as others are concerned, we all read their amendments. Therefore why should they insist on their amendments being read out? You appeal to the Members at least for the shake of sympathy towards you. . .

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :** I can read those amendments all right but it is a question of the time of the House.

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** You are a young man; you can take it, I know. You can read the whole Mahabharat but the point is why should we be tortured here? We have read very carefully the hon. Member's amendments. I have read them carefully and in fact I have read them out to others also.

**SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY :** As it has been stated, every Member is supposed to have read the amendments. Whether they have read them or not is a different matter but they are supposed to have read them and it is purely chair's discretion, if any Member insists that his amendment should be read out

[Shrimati Yashoda Reddy]

to read it out or not. If reading out is for the convenience of the House it may be all right but if somebody makes a nonsense of the whole thing then you should use your discretion and not allow that kind of thing.

**श्री उपसभापति :** ठीक है, इसीलिए मैं कह रहा था—यहां पर बतलाया भी गया—कि ऐसा कोई रूल नहीं है जो यहां पर लागू है। पिछले साल भी जब यह सवाल आया था यहां पर तो बहुत से सदस्यों ने यही कहा था कि अगर कोई सदस्य पढ़ने के लिए कहता है, तो सदन के सामने पढ़ दिया जाय।

**श्री राजनारायण :** यही प्रथा है, दुनिया में हर जगह यही प्रथा है।

**श्री उपसभापति :** नहीं, हमारे यहां की जो प्रथा थी, यह थी कि अमेंडमेंट्स के नम्बर पढ़ दिए जाएं। (Interruptions) नहीं, नहीं आप बैठिये। तो अमेंडमेंट का नम्बर पढ़ा जाए, यह प्रथा थी। लेकिन गए साल राजनारायण जी ने एक, दो अमेंडमेंट्स के बारे में जोर देते हुए कहा कि उनको पढ़ा जाना चाहिए। उस वक्त उनका अमेंडमेंट पढ़ लिया गया और अन्य सदस्यों के भी जो महत्वपूर्ण अमेंडमेंट्स थे वह पढ़ लिए गए। लेकिन यह एक कन्वेंशन था जिसके लिए रूल बना नहीं और पिछली दफा पहली बार यह किया गया है और जैसा कि यादव जी ने कहा है, कोई एक सदस्य के लिए इस तरह की सहूलियत नहीं होनी चाहिए, तो मैं यादव जी की भावनाओं से बिलकुल सहमत हूँ—इस तरह की कोई खास सहूलियतें, विशेष सुविधाएं किसी एक सदस्य के लिए नहीं होनी चाहिए और अगर कोई एक सदस्य इस तरह की सुविधाएं उठाने का प्रयास करेगा तो उसका प्रयास सफल नहीं होना चाहिए। इसमें इस सदन के सारे सदस्यों का अगर समर्थन और सहयोग मिलेगा, तो कोई एक सदस्य इस तरह से नाजायज फायदा सदन के अन्दर उठाएगा नहीं।

**श्री राजनारायण :** प्वाइन्ट आफ आर्डर "नाजायज फायदा" शब्द वापस होना चाहिए। इस सदन में कोई ऐसा सदस्य नहीं है जो नाजायज फायदा लेता है और जो चेयर नाजायज फायदा देता है वह चेयर पर बैठने की योग्यता खो देता है।

**श्री उपसभापति :** आप बैठ जाइए। मैं यादव जी से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि कोई एक सदस्य को विशेष सुविधा नहीं मिलेगी, इस तरह की हम कोशिश करेंगे। मैं आपसे यही अनुरोध करता हूँ कि आपके जो भी एक, दो खास अमेंडमेंट होंगे, उनको पढ़ने की कोशिश करूंगा।

**श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव :** मैं सिर्फ 5 संशोधनों को पढ़ने का आपसे आग्रह करूंगा—नम्बर 30, 31, 32, 33 और 38।

**श्री उपसभापति :** अच्छा, ठीक है।

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA :** Sir, here I suggest, if there is a rule which enjoins on you to read out, it may be so changed as to make Mr. Rajnarain read it out.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :** Order, please.

The question is :

30. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :—

'but regret that the Address does not throw any light on the highhandedness and irregularities perpetrated during the last general Elections, such as misuse of money power, publicity by Radio and Television for the new Congress, delayed counting of ballot papers by the Election Commission, sudden changes made in the procedure of counting of ballot papers, non-availability of correct Electoral Rolls, ignoring of the use of physical force in elections and not making arrangements for casting votes peacefully, freely and fearlessly'."

*The motion was negatived.*

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :** The question is :

31. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely :—

"but regret that there is no directive in the Address for the constitution of an Enquiry Commission to go into the allegations made by prominent persons of the country in regard to the misuse of authority during the recent General Elections and the manipulation of election results."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

32. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely :—

"but regret that the Address does not throw any light on the problems of poverty and unemployment which are the outcome of 23 years of Congress rule and on the means of solving them by enshrining the "Right to Employment" as a Fundamental Right in the Constitution through a Constitutional amendment."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

33. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :—

"but regret that there is no indication in the Address in regard to the granting of the right of franchise to persons in the age group of 18 to 21 years."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

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

"but regret that the Address makes no mention of granting interest-free loan to farmers for a period of five years for procuring implements, seeds and fertilisers so that the country may be self-sufficient in food in a short period of time."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

35. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :—

"but regret that the Address does not indicate that the national income could be increased by 10 per cent by making the Plan a Swadeshi Plan and by not depending on foreign money for its implementation."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

36. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely :—

"but regret that the Address makes no mention of the number of the unemployed and semi-employed educated persons, specialists and others in the country and of the means of providing them employment without taking recourse to slogan-mongering."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

37. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :—

"but regret that the Address does not spell out the measures that should be taken to solve the problem of non-availability of drinking water in lakhs of villages in the country."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

38. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :—

"but regret that the Address does not throw any light on formulating a Master Plan including a programme for flood control, providing irrigation facilities, checking soil erosion, developing fisheries and navigation, and for providing canal system for the river Ganga with her course of 1500 miles influencing the lives of 21 crores of people."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

39. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :

[Mr. Deputy Chairman]

"but regret that the Address does not throw any light on the procedure to be adopted for advancing loans to small farmers, small entrepreneurs and to those persons who want to launch an enterprise of their own and who are not able to furnish security for such loans."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is

40. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :

"but regret that the Address does not indicate the measures to be taken to provide electricity to farmers and villagers at cheap rates."

*The motion was negatived*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is

41. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :

"but regret that the Address makes no mention of the measures to be adopted for the rehabilitation of persons affected by the erosion on the banks of rivers and for providing houses near the place of their work to the jhuggi-jhopri dwellers in the cities."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is :

42. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :

"but regret that the Address makes no mention of the measures to be adopted for providing drinking water, clean and tidy houses, medicines, education, employment and security of life, to usher in 'Ram Rajya' of Mahatma Gandhi's conception."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is :

43. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :—

"but regret that the Address does not indicate measures to be adopted for workers

participation in the management of mills and factories and for making them co-sharers of the same."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is :

44. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :—

"but regret that the Address makes no mention of the measures to be adopted for the use of the national language in the transaction of business in the country and abroad."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is :

45. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely :—

"but regret that the Address does not indicate the measures to be adopted for ensuring a fair price to the agriculturist for his produce vis-a-vis the prices of non-agricultural commodities."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is :

46. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :—

"but regret that the Address does not spell out the steps to be taken by India to recover the thousands of square miles of its territory under Chinese Occupation."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is :

47. That at the end of the Motion; the following be added, namely :—

"but regret that the Address makes no mention of the measures to be taken for the security of the country keeping in view the fact that China is equipped with nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles and has friendly relations with Pakistan."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

48. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :

'but regret that the Address does not indicate the measures to be adopted for checking the intrusion of big Powers in the Indian Ocean."

*The motion was negatived*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

49. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :—

'but regret that the Address does not make mention of the fact that the New Congress had entered into an alliance with the Muslim League in the last General elections, thereby preparing ground for another partition of India."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

50. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely :

'but regret that the Address does not spell out further measures to be adopted with regard to the hijacking and blowing up of the Indian Airlines' plane and Pakistan Government's refusal for repatriation of the hijackers and payment of compensation'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

51. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely :

'but regret that the Address does not mention as to how the attempts to encourage defections being made by the ruling party at the Centre may be checked'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

52. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :

'but regret that the Address does not throw light on how the increasing incidence of

violence in the country and the communal and secessionist tendencies encouraged by Government may be checked'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

53. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :

'but regret that the Address makes no mention as to how the faith of the people and the politicians in democracy and elections could be sustained'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

54. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :

'but regret that the Address does not enumerate the measures as to how and in what manner the mineral resources of India particularly that of Bihar should be exploited and how those places where minerals are located should be linked by rail and road so that the country is made self-sufficient in respect of minerals and the finished goods instead of raw materials are exported thereby increasing the income of the country'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

55. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :

'but regret that the Address does not indicate the steps to be taken for speedily raising the economic, social and educational level of Harijans and tribals and for preventing their proselytization'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

56. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely :

'but regret that the Address does not emphasise the need of enacting legislation for banning cow slaughter and also does not indicate the steps to be taken for the preservation of the cow and its progeny'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Amendments Nos. 57 to 75 are before the House. Mr. Niren Ghosh is not here. I am putting them to the House...

SHRI K. P. SUBRAMANIA MENON (Kerala) : I would like to say...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : They were moved by Mr. Niren Ghosh and not by you. You may have given notice of the amendments, but the amendments were moved by Mr. Niren Ghosh.

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI (Uttar Pradesh) : If five Members have given notice of the amendments, it means the other Members have also a say.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Only one.

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : Then, I object. I have given notice of amendments which are also in the name of Shri Rajnarain. He is moving them. Does it mean that I cannot be a mover of the amendments?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Notice of amendments you may give.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Only one Member can move it.

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : Of course, not. The first Member formally moves it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : It has already been moved by Mr. Niren Ghosh.

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : They are also signatories.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The notice of amendments was given by five Members, Mr. Niren Ghosh was present and he moved the amendments. If Mr. Niren Ghosh had not moved them, you could have moved them. Now, the amendments have been moved by Mr. Niren Ghosh. He alone can withdraw them and he alone can make any other suggestion.

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : It is an extraordinary procedure.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : This is the correct procedure, please sit down.

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : Then, why should five be allowed to move the amendments?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The amendment can be moved at one time only by one Member. It cannot be moved many times.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY : There seems to be some misunderstanding. If there is more than one Member...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : There cannot be two movers of a motion. There can be a hundred Members to give notice of a motion, but there can be only one mover.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY : There are two positions. You are taking up a position by which you say that each amendment can be moved by only one Member and not more than one. That is your position. Now, he has taken up another position. He says that more than one Member can move the same amendment.

Let us have the procedure. Let us understand the position. Now many Members give the same amendment, for instance, and according to Mr. Bhupesh Gupta only the first Member who moves amendment is the mover, the other names are only signatories. I think there is no rule which prevents the others. All these years my understanding of the rules was that along with the first others are also bracketed. They are also to be considered as movers of the same amendment. In case the first Member is absent from the House, then the other Members have the right to move those amendments.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : There is doubt about it. They can move the amendments, but that is not the point.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY : Others should also be deemed to have moved the amendment.

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : अगर एक ही आदमी एक बार अमेन्डमेंट मूव करे, अगर वह आदमी उपस्थित नहीं हो तो हम सब मूव करेंगे, फिर तो तीनों आदमियों को कहना पड़ेगा कि हम भी मूव कर रहे हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : जो नियम आप चला रहे हैं उसके मुताबिक तो प्रस्ताव में जितने नाम रहेंगे वे सब खड़े होकर कहेंगे कि हम भी मूव करते हैं ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Notice of a motion or notice of an amendment is given by as many Members as they like, and after that when the question of moving the amendment in the House comes, the first Member in whose name the motion stands or the amendment stands gets up and moves it.

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : The others are also supposed to move it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please listen. The first Member who has moved it, that motion or amendment is before the House. Then the second, third and fourth Members cannot move the amendment a second time.

( interruption )

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : Please listen to me. You do not know anything. I am sorry to say that. It is a fantastic suggestion. Please listen to me. If I want to move an amendment and if somebody else wants to know the amendment...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : No, no ; he cannot.

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : Please listen to me first. You listen to me. I will explain to you now. I want to move an amendment. The same amendment is to be moved by Mr. Mishra. The same amendment is to be moved by Shri Akbar Ali Khan. Suppose I want to move it and I move it. Their names are also there. Then decide I am not going to press it. Suppose Mr. Mishra wants to press it. Do you mean to say that he has no right just because my name happens to be number one in the list ? Definitely not. I have moved the amendment and it stands in the names of all those whose names are there. If I decide not to press it and if the second Member wants to press it, he has every right to press it, unless they give it to you in writing that they have nothing to do with the amendment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I have understood your point. Mr. Murahari got into the heat of the moment. I am not differentia-

ting between the right to move and the right to withdraw the amendment. He says suppose the mover of the amendment wants to withdraw and another person who has appended his name to the amendment or motion does not want that the amendment should be withdrawn, then what is the position. That is the question he has posed. May I say even if the Member who has appended his name refuses to withdraw or any other Member refuses to give permission to withdraw the amendment, the amendment is the property of the House and it will have to be voted upon ? Please listen. If the Member who has moved the amendment says that he wants to withdraw, he will not be allowed to withdraw the amendment even if he wants that even if one Member desires to oppose it. I am only saying this thing that once the amendment is moved by one member, another Member cannot get up and say he wants to move the same amendment again. He cannot say that. The motion or the amendment can be moved once only in the House. It cannot be moved a second time.

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : You are wrong on this point. When I move, it does not mean that all the other Members are not allowed to do so.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : There are two stages here. You should not confuse one with the other. One is when the amendments are moved and the other is when the amendments are voted. When the amendments are moved—I am not concerned with the stage of voting—if a Member moves an amendment, another Member can say, "I also move it." You cannot prevent it because he has certain rights, status, etc. Now, if for example only one Member has moved it and it comes to the stage of voting, naturally, unless he wants to withdraw it, the Member would state that he wants to press it—only the Member who has actually moved it. It is based on the act of moving as distinct from the fact of notice that you have received. If, for example, he wants to say that "I want to withdraw it", having moved it, it is not only up to anyone of the four notice-givers but also to any Member of the House to prevent the withdrawal of that motion. That right is there. But the Member who has actually moved—I underline the word 'actually'—does not acquire the status of a mover of the amendment. This is all that I say.

SHRI K. P. SUBRAMANIA MENON : Sir, my intention in standing up was not to withdraw the amendment or anything. What I wanted to tell you was that we wanted to press only amendment No. 60.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : For division ?

SHRI K. P. SUBRAMANIA MENON : Yes, division. That was all that I wanted. I do not know why you all have made so much fuss.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Menon not only you but any Member of the House can get up and ask for a division on any amendment. There can be no doubt in it. You say that you want division on amendment No. 60 ?

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : When next time six of us give amendments, all of us will get up and move.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : That will not be allowed under the rule. I can say that. Only one mover can do that.

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : That will have to be, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You please study the rule. The question is :

57. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :—

'but regret that the Address does not mention any intention on the part of the Government to curb the right to compensation by the feudal property owners and big monopoly capitalists.'

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

58. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :—

'but regret that the Address does not mention any measures to abolish foreign private capital.'

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

59. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :—

'but regret that the Address does not refer to the measures to be taken to curb expansion of Indian big business'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

60. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :—

'but regret that the Address does not mention any measure for granting the States the widest measure of autonomy so that they can develop without being dependent on and restricted by the Centre.'

*The House divided.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :

Ayes	..	5
Noes	..	65

AYES—5

Choudhury, Shri Suhrid Mulick  
Menon, Shri K. P. Subramania  
Ganguly, Shri Salil Kumar  
Roy, Shri Monoranjan  
Mathew Kurian, Dr. K.

NOES—65

Abdul Samad, Shri A. K. A.  
Amla, Shri Tirath Ram  
Ansari, Shri Hayatullah  
Arora, Shri Arjun  
Bhatt, Shri Nand Kishore  
Chandra Shekhar, Shri  
Das, Shri Bipinpal  
Gautam, Shri Mohan Lal  
Goswami, Shri Sriman Prafulla  
Gujral, Shri I. K.  
Jain, Shri A. P.  
Jairam Das Daulatram, Shri  
Kalyan Chand, Shri  
Kaul, Shri M. N.  
Khaitan, Shri R. P.  
Khan, Shri Akbar Ali  
Kollur, Shri M. L.  
Krishan Kant, Shri  
Mangladevi Talwar, Dr. (Mrs.)  
Maragatham Chandrasekhar, Shrimati

Mathur, Shri Jagdish Prasad  
 Mehta, Shri Om  
 Mirdha, Shri Ram Niwas  
 Mishra, Shri L. N.  
 Mitra, Shri P. C.  
 Mohamod Usman, Shri  
 Mohideen, Shri S. A. Khaja  
 Mukherjee, Shri Pranab Kumar  
 Narayan, Shri M. T.  
 Narayani Devi Manuklal Varma, Shrimati  
 Neki Ram, Shri  
 Panda, Shri Brahma Chandra  
 Panj hazari, Sardar Raghbir Singh  
 Patil, Shri P. S.  
 Pratibha Singh, Shrimati  
 Punnaiah, Shri Kota  
 Purabi Mukhopadhyay, Shrimati  
 Purakayastha, Shri Mahitosh  
 Puri, Shri Dev Datt  
 Raju, Shri V. B.  
 Ramaswamy, Shri H. S.  
 Ramiah, Dr. K.  
 Reddy, Shri K. V. Raghunatha  
 Reddy, Shri M. Srinivasa  
 Salig Ram, Dr.  
 Sangma, Shri E. M.  
 Satyavati Dang, Shrimati  
 Shyamkumari Devi, Shrimati  
 Singh, Shri Bhupinder  
 Singh, Shri Jogendra  
 Singh, Shri Sultan  
 Singh, Shri Triloki  
 Sinha, Shri Awadheshwar Prasad  
 Sinha, Shri Ganga Charan  
 Sisodia, Shri Swaisingh  
 Sukhdev Prasad, Shri  
 Tiwary, Pt. Bhawaniprasad  
 Untoo, Shri Gulam Nabi  
 Usha Barthakur Shrimati  
 Venigalla Satyanarayana, Shri  
 Vidyawati Chaturvedi, Shrimati  
 Yadav, Shri J. P.  
 Yadav, Shri Shyam Lal  
 Yajee, Shri Sheel Bhadra  
 Yashoda Reddy, Shrimati

*The motion was negatived*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

61. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret to note that the Address has failed to mention the fascist type of repression let loose on the people of West Bengal and the politics of murder and assassination initiated by the Government of India under President's Rule against the democratic forces in that State'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

62. That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret to note that the Address does not mention the Government of India's policy on land reforms in concrete terms and has not declared a moratorium on peasants' indebtedness'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

63. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret to note that the fourteen nationalised banks have not advanced direct loans to the poor and peasants against crops in order to free them from the shackles of money-lenders'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

64. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

'but regret to note that the Address makes no mention of the measures taken by Government to reopen all the closed factories all over India'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

65. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely:—

[Mr. Deputy Chairman]

'but regret to note that while the Government talks of crash programmes etc. for relieving rural unemployment it is at the same time resenting and encouraging rationalisation, automation and mechanisation of agriculture, thus throwing out millions of people from their existing employment both in urban and rural areas'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

66. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely :—

"but regret to note that the Government has not cared to announce any firm and effective steps to curb the rise in prices, black-marketing, hoarding, etc'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

67. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely :—

'but regret to note that the Address does not mention any steps to amend the electoral laws to provide for proportional representation which only can ensure a democratic Parliamentary system'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

68. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :—

'but regret to note that the Address does not make any mention of the question of abolition of the post of Governors in States and measures to stop the imposition of President's Rule'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

69. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :

'but regret to note that the Address does not make any reference to the increasingly frequent use of the Armed Forces for suppression of democratic movement'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

70. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :—

'but regret to note that the Address does not mention the question of abolition of privy purses of former rulers *without compensation*'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

71. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :—

'but regret to note that the Address ignores the question of full diplomatic recognition of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the German Democratic Republic, in subservience to imperialist pressure and blackmail'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

72. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :

'but regret to note that the Address fails to condemn U. S. aggression in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia and the military occupation of South Korea'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

73. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :—

'but regret to note that the Address ignores the question of the Government of India's banning of trade with North Vietnam and to take any steps to promote trade with Democratic People's Republic of Korea and Cuba'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

74. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :—

'but regret to note that the Address does not mention the question of quitting the British Commonwealth even after the Rhodesian issue and the arms aid to South-Africa and racial immigration laws'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

75. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :—

'but regret to note that the Address does not mention the threat to peace and independence of the people around Indian Ocean due to the establishment of British and American bases in that area.' "

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

76. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :

'but regret that Government have not been able to assist the State Governments which have introduced land legislation'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

77. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added namely :

'but regret that in spite of Nationalisation of Banks, the scheduled Banks have not been able to help the small industrialists and industrial co-operatives of the engineers and technicians' "

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

78. "That at the end of the Motion, the following to added namely :

'but regret that the role of the Reserve Bank has been to discourage industrial growth'."

*The motion was negatived*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

79. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :

'but regret that the Address does not mention about the extension of electricity to rural areas which has been made difficult because of steel shortage and wide-spread black marketing in steel products'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

80. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :

'but regret that the Address does not make any reference to the abnormal rise in unaccounted money operating in the country'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The question is :

81. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :

'but regret that the Address makes no reference to the national minimum wages for industrial workers.' "

*The House divided.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN :

Ayes : 16

Noes : 59

AYES—16

Choudhury, Shri Suhrid Mullick,

Ganguly, Shri Salil Kumar.

Gupta, Shri Bhupesh.

Gurupadaswamy, Shri M. S.

Mandal, Shri B. N.

Mathew Kurain, Dr. K.

Mathur, Shri Jagdish Prasad.

Menon, Shri Balachandra.

Menon, Shri K. P. Subramania.

Murahari, Shri Godey.

Murthy, Shri B. P. Nagaraja.

Rajnarain, Shri.

Roy, Shri Monoranjan.

Shahi, Shri Nageshwar Prasad.

Singh, Shri Sitaram.

Yadav, Shri J. P.

NOES—59

Abdul Samad, Shri A. K. A.

Amla, Shri Tirath Ram

Ansari, Shri Hayatullah

Bhatt, Shri Nand Kishore  
 Chandra Shekhar, Shri  
 Das, Shri Bipinpal  
 Goswami, Shri Sriman Prafulla  
 Gujral, Shri I. K.  
 Jain, Shri A. P.  
 Kalyan Chand, Shri  
 Kaul, Shri M. N.  
 Khaitan, Shri R. P.  
 Khan, Shri Akbar Ali  
 Kollur, Shri M. L.  
 Krishan Kant, Shri  
 Mangladevi Talwar, Dr. (Mrs.)  
 Maragatham Chandrasekhar, Shrimati  
 Mehta, Shri Om  
 Mirdha, Shri Ram Niwas  
 Mishra, Shri L. N.  
 Mitra, Shri P. C.  
 Mohamod Usman, Shri  
 Mohideen, Shri S. A. Khaja  
 Mukherjee, Shri Pranab Kumar  
 Narayan, Shri M. D.  
 Narayani Devi Manaklal Varma, Shrimati  
 Neki Ram, Shri  
 Panda, Shri Brahmananda  
 Panj hazari, Sardar Raghbir Singh  
 Patil, Shri P. S.  
 Pratibha Singh, Shrimati  
 Punnaiah, Shri Kota  
 Purabi Mukhopadhyay, Shrimati  
 Purakayastha, Shri Mahitosh  
 Puri, Shri Dev Datt  
 Raju, Shri V. B.  
 Ramaswamy, Shri K. S.  
 Ramiah, Dr. K.  
 Reddy, Shri K. V. Raghunatha  
 Reddy, Shri M. Srinivasa  
 Roy, Shri Biren  
 Salig Ram, Dr.  
 Sangma, Shri E. M.  
 Satyavati Dang, Shrimati  
 Shyamkumari Devi, Shrimati  
 Singh, Shri Bhupinder  
 Singh, Shri Jogendra

Singh, Shri Sultan  
 Singh, Shri Triloki  
 Sinha, Shri Awadheshwar Prasad  
 Sisodia, Shri Swaisingh  
 Sukhdev Prasad, Shri  
 Tiwary, Pt. Bhawaniprasad  
 Untoo, Shri Gulam Nabi  
 Usha Barthakur, Shrimati  
 Venigalla Satyanarayana, Shri  
 Vidyawati Chaturvedi, Shrimati  
 Yajee, Shri Sheel Bhadra  
 Yashoda Reddy, Shrimati

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is :

82. "That at the end of the Motion, the following be added, namely :

'but regret that in deference to the will of the people expressed through the mid-term polls the Address does not mention the specific and time-bound programme for—

(i) putting drastic curbs on the Wealth and economic power and the consequent political leverage of a few families, and speedy measures to reduce visibly the vast disparities of income ;

(ii) creating new job opportunities on a large scale commensurate with the size of the problem of unemployment ;

(iii) reducing the ceiling on land holdings and enforce the new limit and distribute the surplus as well as fallow land to the landless and the poor peasants ;

(iv) putting effective curbs on the rising prices of essential commodities ;

(v) ensuring a decent wage for an honest day's work to all while seeing to it that the ratio between the minimum wage and maximum salary is steadily reduced ;

(vi) ending profiteering and racketeering at the expense of the people in relevant spheres ;

(vii) investigating into the financial structure of the private industry, especially of bigger units, and introduce measures to end the control over it of a few families ;

(viii) expending the public sector to cover step by step all industries and undertakings that directly or indirectly impinge upon the public interests ;

(ix) recasting the licensing policy in the light of the findings of the inquiry bodies ;

(x) recasting the credit policy so as to provide facilities for the small industrialists, the small businessmen, add the small farmers to maximise output and serve the national interest ;

(xi) ensuring the supremacy of the Parliament to carry out the people's collective will, by over-hauling the entire judiciary of the country ;

(xii) placing Centre-State relations on a sounder basis ; and

(xiii) building closer Afro-Asian solidarity to shape their own future without the interference of imperialists operating through

their innumerable agencies'."

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I shall now put the main Motion to vote. The question is :

"That an Address be presented to the President in the following terms :

"That the Members of the Rajya Sabha assembled in this Session are deeply grateful to the President for the Address which he has been pleased to deliver to both Houses of Parliament assembled together on the 23rd March, 1971'."

*The motion was adopted.*

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : The House stands adjourned till 11 A. M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at forty-eight minutes past six of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 6th April, 1971.