

DR. B. N. ANTANI : All right, Mr. Chairman, in my next birth I will be born a Bhupesh Gupta.

(Interruptions)

THE CONSTITUTION (TWENTY-FOURTH AMENDMENT) BILL, 1970

MR. CHAIRMAN : Dr. Antani, please sit down now. It is enough. I am calling the next item, that is, the Constitution (Twenty-fourth Amendment) Bill, 1970. The reply will be given by the Prime Minister tomorrow. All the other speeches will be made today.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI (Uttar Pradesh) : Sir, I have given notice of a question of privilege of this House...

MR. CHAIRMAN : I have got the notice. I will consider it whether leave should be granted or not. So please sit down. I will consider it.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA (Orissa) : It is an important matter. Somebody says it is malicious..

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now please sit down. I have called the next item. Now Shrimati Indira Gandhi.

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर (राजस्थान) : श्रीमन्, मेरी आपत्ति है कि यह विधेयक श्रीमती गांधी सदन में नहीं रख सकती। इसलिए नहीं रख सकती कि लोक सभा ने इस विधेयक को पारित नहीं किया है और पारित इसलिए नहीं किया है कि लोक सभा में इसको दो तिहाई मतों से पारित होना चाहिए (Interruption) नहीं हुआ है। आप बात सुनिये। वहां पर जो मत गणना हुई है, लोक सभा के अध्यक्ष ने उसके बारे में पहले तो 336 मतों की सूचना दी थी। कल उन्होंने कहा है कि 331 मत आये हैं। फिर उन्होंने यह कहा है कि आगे मैं इसकी जांच करूंगा कि मत कितने आये हैं। वहां पर जांच चल रही है। तो जब तक कोई फइनल सूचना नहीं आती कि वास्तव में कितने मत पड़े, तब तक यह विधेयक वहां पारित नहीं समझा जा सकता और

उसे यहां पेश नहीं किया जा सकता। उनको लोक सभा से जानकारी करनी चाहिए और चूंकि यह विधेयक वहां पारित नहीं हुआ है, इसलिए यह यहां पेश नहीं किया जा सकता।

MR. CHAIRMAN : I am not accepting this point. I overrule this point of order. I have received a Message from the Lok Sabha that the Bill has been passed by the Lok Sabha. That is enough for me.

SHRI C. D. PANDE (Uttar Pradesh) : But an inquiry is going on.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please sit down.

(Interruptions)

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI) : Mr. Chairman, I rise to move :

"That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

Sir, my task has been considerably lightened by a Resolution passed by the House...

(Interruptions)

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Sir, what about his point of order ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : I overruled that point of order.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Sir, when you are seized of the matter, can the Prime Minister hurriedly get up and move the Bill ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : I have called her.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : You are seized of the matter. And how can the Prime Minister hurriedly get up and without any indication try to hustle something ?

(Interruptions)

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY

AFFAIRS (SHRI OM MEHTA) : There is no question of hustling.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : For that you must reprimand the Prime Minister.

श्री सुंदर सिंह भन्डारी (राजस्थान) : श्रीमन्, लोक सभा से एक मैसेज आया और उसकी सूचना हमें कल सुबह मिली, जिसका आपने उल्लेख किया है, लेकिन उसके बाद लोक सभा में स्वयं कुछ घटनायें घटीं। यह बात सच है कि उसकी कोई बात अधिकृत सूचना आपको नहीं मिली, लेकिन मैं यह मानने के लिए तैयार नहीं कि आप इस बात से अनभिज्ञता प्रकट करें कि कल वोटिंग के प्रश्न पर कि कितने वोट मिले उसके पास होने पर इस सवाल पर विवाद उठा है और उस प्रश्न को अभी तक स्पीकर लोक सभा ने ठीक प्रकार से निश्चित नहीं किया। यह घटना आपके पास मैसेज आने के बाद की है और इस कारण आप सेक्रेटरी से यह पूछ लीजिये कि कल लोक सभा में इस प्रकार की चर्चा हुई या नहीं हुई और अगर हुई है और इस सवाल की अभी भी जांच हो रही है कि उसके समर्थन में कितने वोट मिले, तो इस सवाल पर आपको उस संदर्भ में विचार करना चाहिये। मेरा आपसे यही निवेदन है।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) : Sir, my point of order is this : We are here concerned with the message which has come from the Lok Sabha... (Interruptions) My request to you is to hear calmly the divergent points of view and then give your ruling. All that we in the Parliament are concerned with the message from the Lok Sabha. You have to satisfy yourself whether the message is a valid message. Even the bulletin which has been circulated says that the Bill was passed in accordance with the provisions of article 368 of the Constitution and hence it is in compliance with the requirements of the Constitution. The Speaker has sent this message to you and you have also told us that it has been passed in the other House.

It is a well known parliamentary practice—and it is mentioned in May's Parlia-

mentary Practice—that we are not even in our speeches to take note of what happened in the other House... (Interruptions) We do not mention about the other House in our speeches. It is a well-known parliamentary practice that we cannot even quote the speeches in the other House. Now we are called upon to go into the conduct of the Speaker as to how... (Interruptions) Strange are the ways of democracy! I submit that this is perfectly in order and the point of order is frivolous and of course obstructive... (Interruptions) According to the newspapers, even those people who have contested the counting have said that it would not have made any difference to the outcome of the voting. Even according to them, the votes cast wrongly from the opposition benches would not have made any difference and even then the Bill would have been passed. That being the position, let us not waste our time.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh) : Sir, I have to go on record that whatever may be the rule, after the message came from the Lok Sabha Speaker to our House, a protest was launched by the members of the other House... (Interruptions) As Shri Bhupesh Gupta said, it is not a question of rules. It is a question of misuse of the rules with the whips exercising their influence... (Interruptions) ...exercising their influence on invisible and visible persons... (Interruptions) Let the country know... (Interruptions) The votes were duplicated and a missing person had voted... (Interruptions) What is happening? Let the world and the country know.

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI S. N. MISHRA) : May I submit that this honourable House should not take a technical view of the matter? Now, it is not a technical view of the matter, but, you see, a legal, constitutional and at the same time, in substance, a matter which affects the very fate of parliamentary democracy. Now, what has happened in the other House is the most shocking and reprehensible thing in the history... (Interruptions)... Please wait. Please wait.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh) : It cannot be...

(Interruptions)

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Please wait...

(Interruptions)

SHRI CHITTA BASU : (West Bengal):
Mr. Chairman, Sir...

(Interruptions)

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Why don't you
listen ?... (Interruptions) Let me say.

SHRI CHITTA BASU : Sir, on a point
of order...

(Interruptions)

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : The point is
that malpractices...

(Interruptions)

SHRI CHITTA BASU : Sir, the hon.
Member is discussing something calling
into question the proceedings of the other
House.

(Interruptions)

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव (बिहार) :
चेयरमैन साहब, आप भूपेश गुप्त को इतनी
देर तक बोलने देते हैं। जब श्री एस० एन०
मिश्र जी बोल रहे हैं, तो उनको शांतिपूर्वक
बोलने नहीं देते।

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please...

(Interruptions)

SHRI CHITTA BASU : My point is
that we should not question the proceed-
ings of the other House.

(Interruptions)

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : हम लोग
मिश्र जी को सुनना चाहते हैं।

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Let us hear each
other...

(Interruptions)

SHRI S. D. MISRA (Uttar Pradesh) :
Mr. Basu, we will not listen to you.

(Interruptions)

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : May I appeal,
Sir, through you, to all the hon. Members
that we are prepared to listen patiently
to every argument that might be advanc-
ed in this case. Now, Sir, my submission
is... (Interruptions) It has not only been
alleged, but established in the voting in the
other House. That has been admitted by
the hon. Speaker of the Lok Sabha. Now,
the hon. Speaker of the Lok Sabha has
admitted that there had been inflation to
the extent of five or six votes in the first
counting. I ask you, Mr. Chairman. ...

(Interruptions)

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN : He had also
said that the decision stands. He had also
said that the decision stands.

(Interruptions)

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : If they don't ...
(Interruptions) ... the hon. Speaker is on
record.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : There
should be some decorum when the Leader
of the Opposition speaks. Sir, there should
be some decorum when the Leader of the
Opposition speaks.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Sir, ...

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Sir, he
should be heard.

SHRI ANANT PRASAD SHARMA
(Bihar) : Sir, on a point of order.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN : What is your point
of order ?

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA (Gujarat) : Sir,
he is speaking there. How can you allow
him ?...

(Interruptions)

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Sir, Shri Mishra
is speaking ... (Interruptions). What is
this ?

SHRI ANANT PRASAD SHARMA : Sir, my point of order is that whatever has happened in the other House should not be discussed. Moreover, I am coming to the point that the Leader of the Opposition is challenging the decision of the hon. Speaker. The hon. Speaker has not only finally disposed of and decided ...

(Interruptions)

SOME HON. MEMBERS : No.

SHRI ANANT PRASAD SHARMA : But he has said ...

(Interruptions)

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI (Delhi) : Sir, on a point of order ...

(Interruptions)

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Sir, on a point of order.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Sir, may I again say at this stage, because the hon. Prime Minister will speak a little later, that I appeal to the hon. Members of the House that we should listen to every Member's speech with attention and respect?

SOME HON. MEMBERS : Yes.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Now, the point is that the hon. Speaker of the Lok Sabha is on record that inflation of votes to the extent of five or six had taken place in the counting. Now, Sir, I put it to you, with all humility and respect, that if the inflation had gone to the extent of ten and still the matter is pending the consideration of the hon. Speaker ...

(Interruptions)

SOME HON. MEMBERS : No.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Since the matter is pending consideration of the hon. Speaker of the Lok Sabha, one does not know what the position is going to be finally in this respect and so, if it falls short of the required constitutional majority, then what would be the fate of our rejection or adoption of this measure? ...

(Interruptions)

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI : Sir.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : So, Sir, in order to make it clear for your ruling, I would repeat that the inflation had been admitted and the point of inflation is still under consideration of the hon. Speaker of the Lok Sabha. And, then, Sir, thirdly, one hon. Member, and leader of the C.P.I., Shri Bhupesh Gupta, for whom we have the greatest respect, had made a charge about some kind of corruption taking place in voting. I do not want to bring it in conjunction with what had taken place in that House. That House is again seized of this matter whether corruption in voting had taken place or not and probably, the communication to you, Mr. Chairman, is in transit from the hon. Speaker to the Lok Sabha. You will kindly bear all these points in mind before you give a ruling.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Every Party has a leader. Call every Party, hear them and then give your ruling.

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : I would like to say that in the other House the Constitution (Amendment) Bill was passed and the message has been communicated to us. After the message was communicated to us, some objections were raised and even they do not substantially make a difference as far as the passing of the Bill is concerned. Therefore there is no point in our taking cognisance of all that goes on in the other House. I submit that if there has been some corruption, if some body has voted wrongly in that House, it is the business of that House and the Speaker will take a decision. It is the lookout of the Speaker to set right any irregularities if there have been any and even those who raised the objection in the other House have not challenged the passing of the Bill, for your information. They have only said that five votes were cast twice or something like that, and one absentee vote has been cast. Therefore, the question about the passage of the Bill had not come at any stage and therefore, we need not waste our time on this.

SHRI N. G. GORAY (Maharashtra) : I entirely agree and support what has been said by Shri Gupta and Shri Murahari. The basis on which we can work is the

message that we have received from the Lok Sabha. What comes in the press or what is going on there after the Bill has been passed is none of our concern.

Secondly I would appeal to my friends in the Opposition that whatever is the verdict here or in the Lok Sabha, let them not resort to this obstructionist tactics. That is not going to help them at all. Let them have the courage to face the decision of the House and let them not obstruct it.

SHRI C. D. PANDE: For the first time the Speaker has given a qualified decision. Though he thinks that the Bill has been passed there is an enquiry about the manner of voting and five votes have been cast wrongly. You have received the message but the message is not complete. He is making enquiries into the affair and till the report is completed we cannot proceed. Then there was one case of voting that has taken place where a Member was not there. One Mr. Mandal was not in Delhi and his vote has taken place. I say that even if there is a single case where the man was not here and the vote had been cast, who had cast it? The Government should be responsible. (*Interruptions*) It should be exposed before the country. (*Interruptions*) You are responsible and those who are not here, when their votes are cast like this, they should be ashamed of it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is wrong. What do you want to say, Mr. Advani? If it is the same thing said already, you need not repeat it.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Sir, I am inclined to agree with what the SSP Leader and the PSP Leader have said, that, so far as this House is concerned, we are seized with the message that we have received from the Lok Sabha. And the Message that was read out to us yesterday told us very plainly that as required by the Constitution, the Lok Sabha had passed with the requisite majority the Constitution (Amendment) Bill. But, Sir, the circumstances under which we are considering this Bill today are quite different, and those circumstances should be taken into account by this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are repeating the same thing which others have said.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: I am not inclined to. I do not propose to discuss anything now as to what happened in the other House, and so far as the Speaker's ruling there is concerned, it is final for us, for everyone.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are repeating the same old thing. Now please sit down.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: I have not completed my say. The situation since yesterday has changed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This has been said by everybody.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Here is a report saying that the Lok Sabha passed this Bill by a majority of one-third of a vote, and the fact that an inquiry is still pending in respect of one absentee whether he was present at the time of voting, or not, makes the whole situation entirely fluid.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It has been said earlier many times.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: My submission is that the inquiry is still pending, and I would request you to request the Speaker to let you know what is the position there now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, please sit down.

SHRI THILLAI VILLALAN (Tamil Nadu): Sir, this is purely a question of procedural position and Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, Mr. Murahari and Mr. Goray have explained the procedural position very correctly, Sir. We are concerned only with the Message sent by the hon. Speaker of Lok Sabha.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

SHRI THILLAI VILLALAN: We are not concerned with the subsequent events which are taking place in Lok Sabha unless and until it is sent to us. We are not guided by the proceedings of the other House. We are guided by our own proceedings, the proceedings of this House. Now our position is clear. We have got

[Shri Thillai Villalan]
a Message from the Lok Sabha that the present Bill has been passed according to the rules.

SOME HON. MEMBERS : No, no.

SHRI THILLAI VILLALAN : So the position is very clear and we have to proceed without any halting of the passage of this Bill here, Sir. So I want to make this request, Sir, that without making any delay or wasting the time of this House the proceedings may proceed further.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (West Bengal) : The Lok Sabha has sent the Message officially and constitutionally. If there had been any other discussion in the Lok Sabha, if the Speaker of the Lok Sabha had thought of sending any other message—the Speaker of the Lok Sabha knows yesterday that our House was going to discuss this matter tomorrow, that is, today—whatever might be the discussion in the other House, if the Speaker had thought that the Message had not been constitutionally and officially sent, then he would have sent another Message. But he has not done so. That being the position, it is perfectly valid for this House to proceed with the discussion, and there should not be any delay in considering this measure and passing it.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now I will give my ruling. I have already said that I overrule this point. I have got the Message of the Speaker and I understand that the Speaker has said that the result would not be affected by it. Now I have got the Message and that is enough. Now the Prime Minister.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Sir, I have moved the motion . . .

SOME HON. MEMBERS : No, no.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : If you will permit me, I would like to say a few words, because I have already moved the Bill for consideration . . .

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : We have not heard you.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I am sorry, if you have not heard, it is on the record.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Let her move it . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please sit down now.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : I cannot move it twice.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : I rose on a point of order and when you were seized of another matter the Prime Minister had no business to get up.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : No, I was called by the Chair. Any way, I have no objection to moving it again if the hon. Member wants it.

I rise to move :

"That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration"

SOME HON. MEMBERS : No, no.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Sir, I can understand the sound and fury on the other side and I see that my hon. friend opposite has come doubly reinforced today with *Puja* and *Tika*.

(Interruptions)

SHRI S. D. MISRA : What about her ? What about Mr. Haveli Ram's advice ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please sit down.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : My task today is considerably lightened because of the Resolution passed unanimously by this august House, not the other House, but by this august House on the 19th . . .

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Not unanimously.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : All right, by an overwhelming majority, if you like. It is good enough.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Only one dissenting and that is Mr. Lokanath Misra.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : It was passed on the 19th December, 1969 asking the Government to take all legal and

other steps for the abolition of the privy purses and privileges of the ex-Rulers. I was also helped by a speech by another Member of Shri Mishra's party on that occasion or on another occasion in this House urging us to hurry up and bring forward this Bill. I think the word used was 'forthwith'. The Bill gives concrete shape to those sentiments. It seeks to omit articles 291, 362 and clause (22) of article 366. The intention of the Government is to discontinue the privy purses, abolish or restrict the privileges and abolish the concept of rulership. This Bill provides an opportunity to hon. Members to redeem their own Resolution. In the context of that Resolution, anything one says would be redundant and would be like preaching to the converted. I shall, therefore, desist from this superfluous exercise. The House knows the feelings of our people and their urge for greater equality. The compulsions of social change and the democratisation of our society were admirably expressed by many hon. Members of this House on the previous occasion and the Bill before you today echoes the feelings which were then expressed. We are convinced that the indefinite continuance of hereditary titles and customary rights, special privileges and privy purses, without any relatable functions and responsibilities, are incompatible with the spirit of the modern age, the demands of the changed circumstances and the political and social evolution of the life of the nation along democratic lines. In the conduct of human affairs, there are always two broad points of view. There is the point of view which fixes on the past and on the desire to conserve all that is old and familiar. The other point of view recognizes what is good in the past heritage and tradition of a nation but refuses to be imprisoned or shackled down by them. It seeks to synthesise the best of the old with all that is worthwhile and enduring in the new. It recognizes that history is irreversible and change inevitable. Ours is the second point of view and judging by the wide measure of support which the Bill has received in the other House, this view is happily shared by a majority of political parties and the overwhelming majority of the people of our great country. It has been our way to try to do things in a manner which is the least abrasive. Hence I tried to talk

with the Princes to find a solution which without in any way compromising our stand or our commitment to our party and our people would help to smoothen the path of change. Unfortunately the sincere effort on our part was misinterpreted and nothing came of it.

It is not our intention to cause hardship to the ex-rulers or to injure their self-respect. In keeping with this point of view the rulers were told and the President said in his opening Address to Parliament that Government would make transitional arrangements. Although these have not yet been worked out in detail, our broad approach is that the payment of these allowances to each ruler should be based on a multiple which would be higher for those receiving lower purse and lower for those receiving higher purses. The total payment would be such as to enable the rulers to adjust to the changed circumstances.

This Bill is the culmination of an important aspect of our freedom struggle. This House showed a sense of history in its resolution of the 19th December, 1969. I now invite it to the occasion and to pass the Bill with a tremendous majority, if not unanimity.

The question was proposed.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Mr. Chairman. I am glad that the Prime Minister ...

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE (Bihar) : Sir, on a point of order Is he opposing or supporting it?

MR. CHAIRMAN : What is the point of order ?

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE : All Members of this House have passed a resolution urging upon the Government to abolish the privy purses and privileges. Nobody opposed it.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I overrule it.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE : If any body opposes it, it will be a contempt of the House. The whole House has passed the resolution. Nobody opposed it.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please sit down. I overrule that. I have called Mr. Mishra.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : He should be taught what a point of order is.

श्री एस० डी० मिश्र : मिनिस्टर नहीं होने वाले हैं अभी से याजी जी ।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : कल से यह टीका हट जायगा ।

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Mr. Chairman, I am glad that the hon. Prime Minister has started the debate in good humour and I hope she will maintain it. I am also very glad that the Prime Minister is a very minute observer of the faces of men.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : It is actually a suggestion about himself.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Let me hope that she is also a good reader of the hearts of men and she will respond to some of the calls of the hearts of men also.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS (Uttar Pradesh) : The difficulty is that Mr. Mishra never proposes but always opposes. So, how can he expect response ?

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : But may I say while I am on the point of this *teeka* on my forehead that this *teeka* has absolutely nothing to do with this occasion ? But I am reliably informed that whenever such important occasions present themselves in this House or the other House, the Prime Minister is always under a strict prescription of the astrologer to wear a particular kind of saree and also some *rudraksha*. But may I say...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Is he the same astrologer of Mr. Morarji Desai ?

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : But I would say that I do not find any fault with the taste or the choice of the astrologer because my taste and choice also agree with the taste and choice of the astrologer. So, it is also good to find her in her costume and such garlands of the *rudraksha* which it is her pleasure to wear.

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI : You are also a minute observe.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Mr. Chairman, I would like to say at the very beginning that we as a party, and for that matter as a united party, had passed a 10-point programme in the AICC in June, 1967 which included the abolition of the privileges and the purses of the princes. But Mr. Chairman, one does not know where that ten-point programme is. The vital target of fulfilling the basic necessities of life of the people by 1975-76 which, in fact, is the cardinal item of the 10-point programme, is already knocked out under the chairmanship of the Planning Commission of the hon. Prime Minister. And so is the fate of the nationalisation of general insurance. I do not want to go into the merits or otherwise of the nationalisation of general insurance. But I am only noting it as a fact so far as the 10-point programme is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, the fate of the other items of the 10-point programme is no better. So, ultimately, what we are confronted with from the side of the Government is a one-point programme; the 10-point programme is already gone. It has already disappeared. We have got a one-point programme of the hon. the Prime Minister and her Government and this programme is to continue in power by hook or crook.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA (Maharashtra) : Your programme is only to oppose the Prime Minister. That is the only point.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : And this is what the common people of India call 'Chairism', not socialism. We are against this 'Chairism', that is, the one-point programme of hers, and that is what we are fighting against. But, Mr. Chairman, as far as we are concerned, ours is not only one-point programme to get the Prime Minister out of office, that is not the one-point programme of ours. If at all there can be said to be a one-point programme of ours, our programme is to fight the ruinous forces that the Prime Minister has released in this country.

Our programme is to fight against the consortium over which she presides, the consortium of the Communists and the communalists. That is our one-point programme. She might be, Mr. Chairman, riding very high at the present moment

in the palki carried by these honourable gentlemen, but she should be quite sure in her mind that she would be thrown into the ditch at their convenience at the earliest opportunity.

Now, Sir, I was saying, Mr. Chairman, that we, as the united Congress, had adopted a programme in 1967 which included the abolition of the privileges and the purses of the Princes. I was one of the active supporters. And here is my friend, Mr. Dharia, who had taken an active and leading part on that occasion. So I was one of the active supporters, and if I may say so with humility, probably the programme at the fag end of the Session could not have been passed without the active support of ours.

The hon. Prime Minister spoke of the historic moment that has arrived in Indian history. But may I tell you, Mr. Chairman, that the Prime Minister did not happen to be present at that historic moment in the history of the Indian National Congress when this Resolution was passed? And may I also say, without revealing any secret, that the Prime Minister had expressed her grave concern when this Resolution was passed by the A.I.C.C.?

SOME HON MEMBERS: No, no.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: I am speaking nothing less than the truth in this matter. And if you want any proof of it, Mr. Chairman, although I happened to be the Deputy Leader of the united party, I do not want to say anything on what transpired in the Executive Committee meeting. But I am quoting only the newspapers. Here is a report from the Hindustan Times, which is very favourable to the hon. Prime Minister on the discussion of the abolition of privy purse discussed at the Congress Party meeting held on 5-7-67.

"Mrs. Gandhi stated that legal, Constitutional and International difficulties in the way of implementing the A.I.C.C. Resolution required examination which would be completed as quickly as possible. The Government would go into the matter thoroughly and decide whether the Resolution could be implemented."

(Interruptions by some hon. Members)

Please wait. I am prepared to stand all the nonsense that can be spoken from your side. Here you say that it is a solemn occasion. But you are the first culprit to disturb the solemnity of the occasion.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY (My-sore): Observe some decorum. Have some patience ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Kindly do not interrupt.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA: Do not worry. I will take care of myself.

श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) : हम सीधे जेल से चले आ रहे हैं और कार्यवाही समाप्त होने के बाद फिर जेल जाएंगे। आज पहली मर्तबा सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने सेन्स से काम लिया है। उन्होंने पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बरों का यह हक कबूल कर लिया कि वे जेल में रहते हुए भी कार्यवाही में भाग लेने के लिए जेल से जा सकते हैं और कार्यवाही में भाग ले कर सीधे जेल आ सकते हैं। उन्होंने दो दिन के लिए हमें कहा। हमने कहा था 1946 में जब कांस्टीट्यूट असेम्बली बनी थी, तब से हमारी मांग थी कि प्रिवी पर्स और विशेषाधिकार न दिए जायें। सन 52, 57, 62 और 67 में हमने यह मांग की थी ...

(Interruptions) हम बोल नहीं रहे हैं, हम आपके द्वारा सदन को सूचना दे रहे हैं कि सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों को अपने मौलिक अधिकार की अनुभूति होनी चाहिए। सुप्रीम कोर्ट से फार दि फर्स्ट टाइम हमने यह बात कबूल करवा ली कि पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर को यह हक है कि जेल में रहे, जाकर पार्लियामेंट अटेंड करे और फिर सीधे जेल में चला आए।

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी : अब आप आ गए हैं, अब बैठ जाइए, मिश्र जी बोल रहे हैं।

श्री राजनारायण : मिश्र जी को भी मैं बताना चाहता हूँ। गवर्नमेंट प्लीडर ने कहा राजनारायण जी से बांड ले लीजिए, इन्फिदरा जी समझ लें कि कैसी उनकी सरकार है, हमने कहा कि हमारी बात में वकत है तो ठीक है, हम बांड से नहीं बंध सकते, हमारा माइंड हमको बांध सकता है, यह सरकार कितनी खराब है, उसको माननीय रादम्य समझ लें और बाकी जो बातें हैं, प्रिवी पर्स पर जब बोलूंगा तब कहूंगा।

श्री पीताम्बर दास : अगर यह व्यवस्था अपने स्वीकार करवा ली है, तो हम लोगों के लिए बंगलों के एलाटमेंट की जरूरत जाती रहेगी। No allotment of bungalows will be needed.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : I was, Mr. Chairman, referring to a press report in the *Hindustan Times* and the line at which my speech was interrupted was, "The Government would have to go into the matter thoroughly and decide whether the resolution could be implemented and, if so, in what manner whether it could be implemented and, if so, in what manner? —the manner is also important—this is what the hon. Prime Minister was pleased to say at a particular meeting of the Executive Committee.

Let me come back to the point that we have always been for the abolition of the privy purses and privileges of the Princes. We had reiterated our resolve in this connection at the Gandhinagar session of the All India Congress Committee in Ahmedabad. In Parliament also, our Members had always joined with other hon. Members—and even on their own, on many occasions, they had expressed their views in this regard—in demanding the abolition of the privileges and privy purses of the Princes. So whatever may be the dust that is sought to be so assiduously raised by interested persons about our stand, our object remains unalterably the same. Let there be absolutely no doubt about it. (Interruptions) Mr. Chairman, for all these interruptions, I will require time.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please go on.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : But Mr. Chairman, while seeking to do it, there was no malice, no bitterness, no illwill, no disrespect against the Princes in our hearts. Indeed, we are not very happy that we are thinking of wielding the axe against them. Whatever the omissions and commissions of their past rule, the Princes had completely wiped them out by the supreme sacrifice that they had made at the crucial moment in the history of India. And it is highly unbecoming of us to go into that past. Let us delve into our own past; many of us would be found to be much worse offenders than the Princes have been in the past. Mr. Chairman, you know the kind of sacrifices they have made. In some cases they were actually thrown on the streets. When we are thinking of the Princes, we are thinking of only a few of them. But the vast lot of them, and probably the majority of them, were actually thrown on the streets. A grateful nation will, therefore, always remember it and record it over and over again. That is what our party would do. Sometimes we talk of the distance that separates the misery of the many and the luxury of the few, and indeed there are very humiliating, degrading and vulgar distances existing between the few rich and the vast numbers of the poor. Some Princes, not all, do enjoy and they should be—in fact, they should have been—progressively eliminated. In fact, that was our policy also from the very beginning. But if we consider what separates the honourable Members of this House from the vast masses of India, it is very painful for me to find that in the space of the five bungalows that we are occupying on Dr. Rajendra Prasad Road, 300 quarters of Class IV employees existed. This space that is occupied by bungalows gives accommodation to 300 employees of Class IV. And yet we are always raving and ranting, not in this House, outside, against many of the distances that separate the poor from the rich. It is remarkable that the Princes have again fallen in line with the national objective. They only wanted it to be done in a proper and honourable way. I have gone through all the correspondence that has passed between the honourable the Prime Minister and the Princes and nowhere have I found that they do not want to fall in line with the

national objective. Politics changes after each generation. So many things done in the past will have to undergo mutations and modifications. Some of them may even have to disappear completely though we are conscious of the good old wise saying that the more things change, the more they remain the same. It was indeed right of the leadership which brought about these agreements and covenants, to stick to them. Indeed I would have no respect for that leadership if it backed out on them. If Sardar Patel, the great Sardar, was rising every moment higher in the political firmament, it was because the instability of the country was increasing. The more we move away from the path chalked out for us by Sardar Patel, the more will there be the instability in the country. If the great Sardar had gone back upon his word, I would have less respect for him. So also for our late Prime Minister Pt. Nehru (*Interruption*) In the forums of the AICC on many occasions he always expressed his resolve to stick to them. The same would be true if our great Maulana Azad had gone back on his word. Therefore, it was, if I may say so now that the honourable the Finance Minister happens to be just in front of me at the moment, in fact the height of fantasy, if not of impudence, for him to have said that if Sardar Patel had been alive today, he would have gone back upon his word. Probably he was looking upon the great Sardar . . .

(*Interruption*)

श्री नेकी राम (हरियाणा) : अंग्रेजी बोलीये तो बात ठीक नहीं हम को सुनाई नहीं देता।

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Mr. Chairman, would you please ask him not to interrupt me?

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN) : Just a word. Let us forget about Sardar Patel. You are going back upon your own words.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : No, you are going back upon your word. It was the height of impudence on your part . . . (*Interruptions*). Let me come to that. Do not smart under . . . (*Interruption*). You

are a good parliamentarian, you will take it . . .

SHRI N. G. GORAY : I just wanted to know what Mr. Mishra exactly said. Was it "the height of impotence" that he said?

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Impotence? All right, if the honourable Member wants to add that word, I would accept his amendment.

1 P.M.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Mishra, I am addressing you. If your speech is likely to be finished within the next few minutes, we will continue to sit till then and adjourn the House. In that case, you can continue your speech.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : No, Sir, I am likely to take a little more time.

MR. CHAIRMAN : If that is the case, I would let you continue after two. Now we will adjourn the House. But before doing that, I have got to say one more thing.

I have got a very long list of speakers from both the sides. After Shri Mishra has completed his speech after we re-assemble at 2 o'clock, I will request the hon. Members on both the sides to bear in mind that the list I have got is very long and therefore the speeches will have to be very short and brief. Also we should bear in mind how long we are going to sit today.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Sir, as far as I am concerned, you might give me time according to the total time available to my party.

MR. CHAIRMAN : That is right.

श्री राजनारायण : एक दिन और बढ़ा दीजिये, श्रीमन्।

MR. CHAIRMAN : We will continue the discussion after lunch. The House stands adjourned till 2 P.M.

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

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

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : So, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I was referring to a remark of the hon. Finance Minister about Sardar Patel and, to repeat, I would say, that it was highly improper on his part to have suggested, even remotely, that Sardar Patel would have gone back on his words. May I, for the information of this House, quote what Sardar Patel said in the Constituent Assembly of India? Now, in quoting this, may I also emphasise that I, of another generation, would not go by the same kind of criterion, although in my lifetime, if it happens, I will certainly stick to the guarantee or assurance that I give to others. This is what the great Sardar said :—

“Have you read that history? Or, you do not care for the recent history after you began to make history. If you do that, then I tell you we have a dark future. Learn to stand upon your pledged word... Can you go behind these things? Have morals no place in the new Parliament? Is that how we are going to begin our new freedom? ...”

“Do not take a *lathi* and say, ‘who is to give you guarantee? We are a Supreme Parliament.’ You have supremacy for this kind of thing? To go behind your word? That supremacy will go down in a few days if you do that.”

This is what the great Sardar said on that occasion and, even so, the hon. Finance Minister chose to interpret him in his own way and therefore, I was saying, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that the hon. Finance Minister was looking upon the Sardar in his own image. But, at the same time, I would like to stress that the degree of obligation on us, of the next generation, is bound to diminish and, yet, we cannot be completely oblivious of the commitments of our predecessors. The art of statemanship, Mr. Deputy Chairman, lies in bringing about a marriage between the two, the past and the present, and that is the art of democratic change.

There has been a certain ethos of the Indian development and the spectacle of the present troubles that you face in this country is because this ethos has been mercilessly destroyed by the present

Government. Our revolution, as somebody had remarked at one time, was like oil stain spreading noiselessly. That was the spirit of our evolution. So, when we accepted, Mr. Deputy Chairman, this objective which, as I said earlier, remains unalterably the same, of doing away with the privileges and the purses of the Princes, we simultaneously accepted, however general in form it might be, the need for adopting the means and a strategy in consonance with the Congress tradition that there is nothing like having a kind of platonic love for your ideal without spelling out your objective in concrete terms. What the Congress Party, of which I happened to be the Leader in this House, demands is that you must place before us the complete picture, not only the ideal with which you seem to be having some kind of a honeymoon—that honeymoon must end soon now because we are going to get into the brass tacks. So What is the complete picture? Unless we know the means, the strategy you want to adopt, and since we find that it remains even now more or less as a rhetorical concept, we have no doubt that we will have to differ from this approach of the Government. We have been brought up in the tradition and the atmosphere generated by Mahatma Gandhi where we cherished means no less than the ends. Still it is part of the great heritage which has been handed down to us. Therefore it is very unfair to this House to be asked to judge a thing which is not complete. What exactly are we expected to judge? This is something school-boyish or if I may say so, school-girlish approach to the whole problem. Where is the picture that we are expected to judge? The Parties in this House are committed to certain ideals which *prima facie* would appear to be broadly the same and yet we are poles apart because our means are so different, our strategies or methodologies are so different. Therefore it is not right for us to be asked to agree on this. The agreement is on the level of the objective but the agreement must be no less important on the means and strategies to be adopted and what prevented this Government to come before us with the complete picture, beats me completely. Where was the need for hurrying? We had given you sufficient time. A reference was made to the speech of Shri Gurupadaswamy, the

Deputy Leader of our Party. We all have been smarting under the delay but that should have inspired you to come out with all details. Were two years not sufficient to come out with details? Is the Parliament of India to be treated in this manner? That is our main grievance. Why exactly are we not furnished with the details? The Prime Minister said in the other House: "We are working out the details, we shall make certain transitional arrangements" and she broadly indicated that the transitional arrangements would include the payment of lump sums and also the compensation in a differential way, probably on a progressive basis. That was broadly the indication she gave but if at all the measure with regard to this is to come before the Parliament, why cannot it come simultaneously with this Bill? If the Members of the Opposition also join the Government on this issue, they are being unfair to the House. What after all is the reason for this delay? So I submit that we do not agree with this manner of approach to this problem and the manner is no less important as I emphasised a little earlier. For us the means are in fact more important and the manners are more important. Our apprehensions are indeed very great so far as this approach is concerned. Can anybody theoretically argue with me that it could not lead to the complete negation of the objective? If everything is behind the *purdah*, this might lead to the negation of the objective. In fact, one Member belonging to the Congress Party (N), a senior Member at that, Shri Arora, had come out with a statement a few months back that this might undergo a change for the better in the interests of the Princes. He had come out with a long statement. I do not have it now before me. So it might well be a complete negation of the objective we have in our minds. It might be just the opposite of what we desire and later on if the Prime Minister comes with another measure and asks us to pass it, it would not be doing justice either to the cause all of us want to espouse or to the manner to which we have been committed earlier.

Now, Mr. Deputy Chairman, with this kind of blanket measure, does this Government expect that we would trust them with all the powers and the manoeuvrings that they would have under this Bill although

it is extremely doubtful that they are going to exercise much of the powers even under this Bill? That is my legal and constitutional analysis of the whole thing to which I would come a little later. Even if I concede that it does equip them with certain powers, even then does this Government expect us to trust them with those powers? Have we not got the experience, unhappy experience at that, so far as the abolition of company donations is concerned? We all had hoped that the abolition of the company donations would diminish the predominance of the capitalists in the political life of the country, and it was precisely with that objective that we had supported that measure. But what do we find? Now at the present moment, is it not very clear to the hon. Members of the opposition that the Members of the Government seem to be collecting buckets of money under the counter without any let or hindrance? And all are silent spectators of this, and we are deluding ourselves, under the label of progressivism we are deluding ourselves that we have done a remarkable job after having passed that measure. Now this is what is happening. (*Interruptions*) Then, Mr. Deputy Chairman, Government has been helping in fact the capitalists to augment their black money...

SHRI C. D. PANDE : Blackmail.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : ...and then claim their share out of it. What is happening, you see under this Abolition of Company Donations. Similarly, so far as the bank nationalisation is concerned, which as a united party, we had supported, what is the story you hear now-a-days? There is hardly a big loan which can be granted to any person without some kind of a *pagri* to important individuals.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE : Question.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Therefore, we have always pleaded for democratic controls and safeguards. Sir, so far as this bank nationalisation was concerned, we did not want this measure to be thrown into the lap of the bureaucracy.

And then you know about the licensing procedures also, and it is the verdict of some of the expert bodies that they have led to the concentration of economic power whereas the licensing was meant for, reducing concentration of economic power,

[Shri S. N. Mishra.]

it has in fact led to, more concentration of economic power.

Under these circumstances—I have given you, only by way of illustration, a few cases; they are not at all exhaustive—it would be difficult for us to trust this Government with any powers if at all this measure is going to give them the powers. (Interruptions) The main thing is that they have got the big capitalists under their clutches, because of the coercive powers that they have and the corruptive powers that they have. They want now to have the princes in their clutches, and this big combine of the capitalists and the princes they want to utilise for the aggrandisement of their own party interests. That of course we cannot ignore.

Now, after having said this, Mr. Deputy Chairman, I would like to submit that it is also the duty of this hon. Parliament to see that the measure that we pass is legally and constitutionally sustainable. And if any hon. Member of the House lays stress on the legal and the constitutional aspects, some Members generally tend to think that to take such a position is not progressive. May I say that if Parliament have to pass any measure then it does not redound to our credit to find that our measures are struck down by the hon. Supreme Court? We faced some trouble so far as bank nationalisation was concerned and it was to our great humiliation that this measure was struck down by the Supreme Court. It does not reflect very well on the intelligence and legal acumen of the Parliament of India that our measures are struck down. May I say, therefore, in this connection that it appears to me that the legal and constitutional aspects of this measure, which we would like to succeed coming in another form, have not been properly and adequately looked into? If we wanted to make this measure a cast-iron case in order to be sustainable in a court of law, then we should not have indulged in the mere heroics and the verbal progressivism that the Government and particularly the Prime Minister seem to be parading in this House. We must take care of the legal and constitutional aspects and from that point of view I would like to say that it is not satisfactory. (Interruption).

That is the legal aspect. Now, it appears to me that this measure is an exercise in irrelevance. I would go further to say that this measure might well prove to be an exercise in futility. Now, what are the basic documents from which the rights and privileges of the Princes originate, from which they flow? They are the agreements and the covenants. The relevant clauses of the Constitution do not indicate anything more than the fact that the Constitution-making body of India was a registering body. It was simply registering the agreements and the covenants that had been entered into by the Princes on the one side and the Government of India on the other. Now, if the basic documents remain the same, I really do not know what exactly we are going to achieve by this. The first thing, therefore, to which the Government should have addressed itself was to alter or to abolish altogether these basic documents, the basic agreements. For that the Government of India do not require any special authority from Parliament. Had they come forward with certain arrangements with regard to these basic documents, and the covenants, then, of course, the clauses which they are seeking to delete would have become completely redundant or infructuous. The deletion of these articles from the Constitution, I submit, does not mean the abrogation of the treaties and agreements and the covenants. Therefore, the mother-document remaining the same, the Constitution, which is simply a registering document, cannot and is not going to help us in the direction in which we want to go. So, I am the person, who is in favour of the abolition of the privy purses and privileges, not Mr. Bhupesh Gupta who would like to suspend his legal mind so far as this is concerned.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : My friend is an interesting idea of mother-hood.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : All right, but you have no idea at least of a wife.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : For that I believe I have to go to the Princes Chamber.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : You will get plenty of them in Russia.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Now, Sir, I would say that the Government is not trying to translate the objective into reality.

Had they tried to do that, they should have addressed themselves first to this task. Now, article 291 merely indicates the mode of payment. Even this article 291 is inherently infructuous in the sense that article 363 prevents the Princes from going to court. Even if the article remains in the Constitution and if we prevent payment from accruing to the Princes, what would have happened? Nothing! You can prevent payment even right now, without deleting the provisions under article 363. The poor fellows are prevented from going to the court. This is an exercise in irrelevance. It is not as a rhetorical flourish that I wanted to say this but I would like the hon. Members to consider this aspect seriously. If the Government do not want to abolish privy purses altogether and they want only to reduce the payment, do it here and now; what prevents you from doing that? But no. They thought that since the agreements and covenants were there they could not do that. Now it is true that according to that article, if you read literally article 363, that prevents the princes from going to the court. But may I submit that that would not hold ultimately would not be sustainable in the eye of the court? Whatever we may like to satisfy ourselves with in the House, the court is not going to be satisfied with that kind of interpretation of article 363.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You have taken 45 minutes.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : No, Sir, 22 minutes earlier included 5 minutes of interruptions. That would only mean 17 minutes earlier.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : One hour five minutes are allotted to your party. I am only telling him the time allotted to his party and the time taken by him, so that afterwards no other Member of his party could complain about that. You continue.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : I shall take half a minute only to refer to the remarks you have made. I took about 22 minutes. Four or five minutes were interruptions. That leaves 17 minutes. Whatever interruptions take place, I am not going to include that in my share.

SHRI SRIMAN PRAFULLA GOSWAMI (Assam) : Let him give an assurance that he will not interrupt when I am speaking.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Since we have given Rs. 100 crores to the princes, now a spokesman is speaking for the princes...

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : He is a spokesman of a foreign power.

SHRI LOKANATH MISHRA : When we talk about princes, they prevent us. Princes are citizens of this country.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, order.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Even the predecessor Government had taken the view that the treaties, covenants and the agreements could not be referred to arbitration in the case of a dispute. They consistently took that position and they always maintained that the Crown Representative, subject to the Secretary of State, was the final interpreter of the treaties with the Indian States. And yet what happened is extremely important. Shri B. N. Rau has made a certain reference to three cases though in a different context altogether, before the Privy Council. The interpretation of the treaties was referred to the Privy Council. That was in the case of *Forester v. the Secretary of State*, number one. Secondly *Muhammad-Yusuf-ud-din v. Queen Empress* and others. He has also referred to another case, which was a recent English case: that was *Stark vs. Public Trustee*. All these cases showed that the court maintained that they could get into the matter of interpretation, and in the first case, it was decided that Begum Summroi was not a sovereign, she was only a tenure-holder. My apprehension is that the court would not find itself shut out from interpreting the treaties and covenants; and in fact they might say that since it also falls within the category of property—property meaning interests in corporeal things; corporeal things again meaning something tangible and material—the court would not entertain the argument that they can be prevented from going into them.

[Shri S. N. Mishra.]

Therefore you have to see to it that this measure, becomes as cast-iron as possible. But I have not found any argument being advanced from the other side that it would be so. Therefore, the best arrangement that could have been arrived at was through negotiations and agreements. Now, negotiations did proceed for some time, and what I find from all the papers that have passed between the Prime Minister and the Princes is that the Princes had made certain suggestions. Not only that, they have responded to the invitation of the Prime Minister to cooperate with her. In one of the letters they have mentioned—probably it was the Maharajah of Baroda—that they were prepared to abnegate themselves in the interests of the country. It was perhaps the last letter of August 28. But here is the failure of statesmanship. What Sardar Patel could do at the snap of his finger and without raising his eyebrows now these people have not been able to do during the course of the last two years after we passed the important resolution in June, 1967.

SHRI ANANT PRASAD SHARMA : You are opposing ?

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : What am I opposing ? You are opposing yourself.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI : Have a sense of humour.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : The Government is opposed to itself. That is what I am saying.

So, Mr. Deputy Chairman, the Prime Minister tried to make out that this was a historic occasion. This is historic, indeed in the sense that it shows the failure of statesmanship, this shows the failure of leadership, to bring about the abolition of privy purses in a manner in which it could be acceptable to all and it could be particularly sustainable in a court of law. If we come to grief later, it would be we who would be responsible for falling in line with a Government which has no concern for the judicial scrutiny. This is going to be exposed to all kinds of judicial uncertainties. Therefore they are not solicitous about achieving the objective which we had set before ourselves. This is my humble submission.

And finally, I would say, Mr. Deputy Chairman, that my party would have been only too glad to support this measure. On this measure...

SOME HON MEMBERS : Ah ! ah !

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Yes, yes. You expect me to toe your line. (*Interruptions*) My party would have been only too glad, because as I have stated here categorically and emphatically, our objective remains unalterably the same. Our party would have been only too glad to support the measure had it been brought in a manner in which it should have been... (*Interruptions*) Had the picture been complete...

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, order. Please.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : ... had it been brought in the proper manner and had the picture been complete. Keeping many things up her sleeves, the Prime Minister cannot persuade us to support her. We like everything to be placed, all the cards to be placed before us, not to use some cards for political exploitation. And article 363 which remains in the Constitution should have been suitably amended to give them the right to go to the court. I do maintain even now that they have got the right which they would exercise in any case. But you are losing grace by not suitably amending it so that they were brought on levels of equality with other citizens and they were able to hold their heads as high and proudly or as humbly as other citizens. This is one of the grave injustices that is being done.

With these words, I close.

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH (Uttar Pradesh) : Sir, I rise to support the motion moved by the honourable Prime Minister.

श्री राजनारायण : अरे । आप हिन्दी में बोलिये ।

श्री त्रिलोक सिंह : उपसभापति जी, मैं हिन्दी में अपनी अर्ज करने के लिये तैयार हूँ अगर दक्षिण भारत के माननीय सदस्यों की यह इच्छा हो, और उनको कोई ऐतराज न हो ।

एक माननीय सदस्य : अंग्रेजी में बोलिये ।

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH : Sir, as I have said, I rise to support the motion moved by the honourable Prime Minister. I have carefully heard the honourable Leader of the Opposition and I was surprised to know that what the Leader of the Opposition has opposed is not the abolition of privy purses or the personal privileges of the ex-Rulers of Indian States but the manner in which it is proposed to be done. He has not indicated the manner in which it should have been done, which should have been proper, although he took a pretty long time to expound his thesis. He has also drawn in the names of Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel and Jawaharlal Nehru. As everybody knows not only in this august House but outside also, Sardar Patel was a man of history even as Jawaharlal Nehru was a man of destiny, and they do not need any support as their position in history is not in any manner affected by the opinion, most humbly I would like to submit, either of this august House or of the people outside in this country, or of the whole world. Then, Sir, he has brought in the name of the great Mahatma and tried to build his argument upon the means, the purity of means. As I said earlier, he has not been able to give out the means which he would have liked the Government to adopt. He is afraid of the mighty power of the Supreme Court and the High Courts of India, the Judiciary. Let him know, Sir, I would like to communicate to him through you, that the very basis of our Constitution is not the due process of law but the procedure established by law; Parliament is supreme, the Legislatures of India are supreme, and not the Supreme Court or the High Courts. (Interruptions) If he says that we are only going to rewrite the whole Constitution of India, I wonder how his argument can hold good even for a minute.

As the title of the Bill goes to show, this is the 24th amendment. Twenty-three amendments have been passed, and there are reasons to believe why there is so much hue and cry over this 24th amendment and there was not so much for so many other amendments to the Constitution which were passed by Parliament and assented to by the President of India.

(Interruptions)

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : There was a much bigger hue and cry during the 17th Amendment. Mr. Triloki Singh unfortunately was not a Member of Parliament then. He might have been a Member of the Assembly.

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH : I might say I am none the wiser by the information submitted by the honourable Member of the Swatantra Party. What I want to submit is this : These 23 amendments to the Constitution involved the interests of not a few hundreds of people but millions of people, and when the interests of millions of people were involved the honourable Member opposite, particularly the party of the honourable Leader of the Opposition, were not so much exercised or concerned. I would like the honourable Members to stand a little nonsense even if I utter it, because I believe in the principles of parliamentary democracy, even as I stand the nonsense of so many others. Let them say if they have anything to say. I would actually not only listen to them but also try to appreciate their point of view. Sir, when the interest of millions were involved from all parts of the country, there was not so much hue and cry, there was not so much grievance. But when the interest of only a few handful, a few hundreds are involved, then it is not possible for a man like me, who has all along his life strived not only for the attainment of freedom of India but a just social order, a socialist society, to keep silent if the Leader of the Opposition says that the Leader of the party to which I have the honour to belong aims at power. Our aim has been not only to aim at power, but achieve it and to retain it for as long as possible.

Even when the Britishers were there, even when there were so many others in this House and outside who doubted not only the means that we adopted to throw the Britishers out of this country, but who questioned our objectives in 1920, in 1930, in 1931, in 1940, in 1942 and in 1947 also to achieve complete independence for our country, not only the parts which were under the British rule, but also the parts which were supposed to be under the Indian States, complete independence for the whole of the country. That was our objective. Complete independence was the

[Shri Triloki Singh.]

objective and, as its natural corollary, we wanted to come into power. And we did so. When the Britishers went away lock, stock and barrel, it is not that the power was handed over to A, B or C or anybody picked up by the Britisher in India. The power was handed over by the Britishers to those who strove for power. We are holding it now and there is nothing objectionable to it in parliamentary history.

Sir, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition says that the means are not pure. Did not the great Mahatma say that these Princes were an anachronism? Did not Vallabhbhai Patel say the same thing? This is what he said on the 15th August 1948 in the Constituent Assembly which was also the Parliament of India in those days :

"In such circumstances, after careful and anxious thought, I came to the conclusion that for smaller States of this type based on circumstances which are described above, there was no alternative to integration and democratisation."

Sir, much stress has been laid upon history. I do not wish to go into the history of the existence of the States, how these States came into existence. Everybody knows. It is all a matter of history that the Britishers created most of them. The ancestors of some of them were famous for the *thugi* two hundred years back. Then there were also those who revolted against the Moghul Empire and instead of being the Viceroy of Deccan became the Nizams of Hyderabad. Who does not know all this? I need not go into details.

Then, Sir, in my State, the State to which I have the honour and privilege to belong, an Indian State was created in the year of grace 1911 because of their loyalty to the King Emperor and the Queen Empress and so on and so forth. So, Sir, what are these States? And how did they integrate? Is it not a fact that Hyderabad was most reluctant to integrate? Is it not a fact that Junagadh did not integrate at all? I wonder what the hon. the Leader of the Opposition would like to be done in the case of Hyderabad. Who does not know that the integration of Kashmir was also done under certain compelling circumstances? And is it not Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel and his Secretary who have put it in

black and white that the Jodhpur Maharaja pointed his pistol at the Secretary of States Ministry of the India Government if he talked about integration and accession to the Indian Union? As you know, Sir, if the whole of India became free, if the entire Banaras district became free, how could Chandauni and Gianpur tehsils remain independent? And then, Sir, the paramount power is gone, but the vassals have remained. Surprisingly, there are still in this year of Grace 1970 so many persons holding brief for the retention of these Princely privileges.

AN HON. MEMBER : Shame.

It is not a question of shame. It is a question of wonder that those who believe in democracy, those who believe in equal opportunities, those who believe in fundamental rights, also wish to retain the Princely order, not their political privileges but their personal privileges. I can very well understand if one were to argue, work for, agitate and even carry on a movement for the retention of those privileges which are not personal. To talk of something personal in 1970 is something incomprehensible for a man like myself, a humble soldier of Swaraj who for his whole life worked for the attainment of independence. Let the other side think over it.

Now, what is the subject matter? These Princes entered into certain agreements and covenants with the Dominion of India. As is so well known in international law and otherwise, a treaty can only be between two sovereign and equal powers. Now, as soon as they entered into this treaty, they became overnight citizens of India and lost their sovereign character. The Indian Union has managed to retain its sovereign character. The ex-Rulers of Hyderabad, Gwalior, Jodhpur or Jaipur no longer retain their sovereignty. They have become citizens of India. Now the treaty is between two partners, one of whom has ceased to be sovereign. May I know if it is suggested that these treaties will hold good in perpetuity, till eternity? Even Mr. Morarji Desai, if the press report is to be believed, said that these Princes cannot be allowed to retain their privileges in perpetuity. I think he was right. He was not only technically correct but also politically correct, because a treaty between a sovereign power and a power which is no longer sovereign.

can no longer hold good. Therefore, when this House about nine months ago...

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Having disarmed them, is it not perfidy, cheating ?

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH : I would like to draw the particular attention of the hon. Leader of the Swatantra Party who is very attentive to what I am saying and for which I am thankful to him, that it was only in December 1969, i.e. say about nine months ago, that this august House adopted a resolution that ways and means should be found for the abolition of the privy purses and the personal privileges of the ex-Rulers.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEÉ : They are shameless characters.

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH : My friend is depending too much upon their shamelessness. There is nothing like shame in politics.

श्री जगदीश प्रसाद माथुर : जैसे आपने पार्टियां बदलीं...

(*Interruption*)

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH : Let me repeat it that there is nothing like shame in politics.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, please.

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH : There is nothing like shame in politics. And consistency, I would like to remind the hon. Leader of the Opposition, is the virtue of a fool.

श्री उपसभापति : राजनारायण जी, आप बैठिये, मुँ लीजिए।

श्री राजनारायण : मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि मिश्र जी को परेशान नहीं होना चाहिए बाबू त्रिलोकी सिंह जी यह कह रहे हैं कि एस० एन० मिश्र जी, घबराइये मत, मैं आप की तरफ भी आ सकता हूँ।

श्री त्रिलोकी सिंह : माननीय सदस्य संयुक्त सोशलिस्ट पार्टी को यह पूरा अधिकार है कि वह मेरी बात को मायने खुद पहनायें, लेकिन मैं उन के जरिये से लीडर आफ दि अपोजीशन को याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि

he has said it was the joint Congress. I should have thought that if it was the decision of the joint Congress to which he was also a party, it naturally follows that there is joint responsibility insofar as that policy is concerned; he should stand by it. (*Interruption*) May I remind the honourable the Leader of the Opposition and his party Members that after the split in the so-called joint Congress what they were afraid of was the tampering or the watering down of the ten-point programme adopted at the Bangalore session of the AICC? And their leader in the other House, if I may name him with your permission, Dr. Ram Subhag Singh in the meeting of the All-India session of the Indian National Congress at Gandhinagar, remarked that we will continue to press the Government to implement the AICC directive to abolish the privy purses forthwith...

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : What have they done all the time ?

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH : These words were uttered on the 6th December, 1969 at Gandhinagar, a place somewhere near Ahmedabad...

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI : That was not what my leader had said. What he wanted was that there was no true picture, no full picture, and that the Government should come out with the full picture and we will accept it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I have no doubt that Dr. Ram Subhag Singh was pressing it all the time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I would appeal to honourable Members, let there be no interruptions please.

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH : Now, look at the word "forthwith". With this direction and with this test, with this fear that if there is anything...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please finish now. You have taken twenty minutes already.

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH : First of all let me know how long you are going to give me.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : It depends upon your party.

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH : I will finish soon. But I was told that I could easily take twenty minutes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : You have taken already nineteen or twenty minutes.

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH : Mr. Deputy Chairman, I never thought that a person like me also needs a reminder from the Chair that his time is going to be up.

Therefore, what I wanted to say is this that when they wanted it to be done forthwith, now if what was passed by this august House in December last is taking shape, is likely to come forth within a few months, why are they bothered about it? There must be something which is not a consideration of love and affection. I would go further. There must be something which is not political. There must be something which is other than these two. What it is I have yet to find out. That I will leave to the judgment of the honourable Members. Therefore, what this Bill seeks to do is to delete or omit Articles 291 and 362 of the Constitution. Article 291 is a mere recital of fact that such and such agreements have been entered into and the manner in which—over this the honourable Leader of the Opposition laid great stress—the money was to be paid. It says that the money to be paid will be paid from out of the Consolidated Fund of India. And it would be free of tax. This free-of-tax provision is in the treaties as well. Article 362 of the Constitution merely lays down a directive to the State legislatures and the Parliament that they shall, in making the law, see to it that due regard shall be had to the guarantees or assurances given under any such covenant or agreement as is referred to in Article 291. It lays down a direction. Supposing this regard is not given, what will happen?

The honourable Leader of the Opposition said that if we do anything which is later on set aside by the Supreme Court or the High Court, this House will expose itself to ridicule and the passage of this Bill and adoption of this law will be an exercise in mere futility. This is what he said. May I know if he is not aware of the fact that during the last twenty years after the Constitution came into force or even a little more than that, there have been so many cases where the laws passed either by the Parliament and assented to by the President or by the State legislatures were struck down by the Supreme Court or the High Court on one ground or the other...

AN HON. MEMBER : For what reasons?

SHRI TRILOKI SINGH : The reasons are for the hon. Member to find out. With his bulky body, he is expected to know better than a thin and lean man like myself.

But that does not mean that the Parliament in its supreme wisdom should not exercise its right of amending the Constitution in pursuance of its policy of achieving certain social and political objectives, economic equality, and so on and so forth. Even if the Supreme Court strikes down a law passed by the Parliament, where is the harm? An hon. Member opposite said that we would have to be ashamed of ourselves. There were at least 50 occasions when we would have felt ashamed. What is the harm if we get one more occasion to feel ashamed, if the Supreme Court or the High Court strikes down this Constitutional amendment? I would like to say that there is one more article—article 366(22). That gives only the definition of 'ruler'.

श्रीमान्, माननीय राजनारायण जी बहुत खुश होंगे, लखनऊ में जब अंग्रेजी हुकूमत कायम हुई तो एक नहीं सैकड़ों ऐसे थे जिनको लोग मुखातिब किया करते थे, जनाब वाला, नवाब के नाम से, मुल्क नहीं है लेकिन नवाब हैं और यह जो इंडियन स्टेट्स के साथ इंटिग्रेशन की बात हुई, ट्रीटी और सनअद हुई उसमें भी रहा महाराजा निजाम हैदराबाद और ज़मीन एक इंच नहीं, महाराजा ग्वालियर...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : His Exalted Highness.

श्री तिलोकी सिंह : ... और जमीन एक इंच नहीं है। ये नवाब वेमुल्क, एक नई कौम पैदा की गई थी स्वराज्य होने के बाद, और मैं तो मुबारकवाद दूंगा श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी को, भारत की प्रधान मंत्री को, कि उन्होंने हिम्मत की और जुर्रत की। यह एक मोम्मा था, एक कौम है जिसका कोई वजूद और वकार नहीं था...

श्री निरंजन वर्मा (मध्य प्रदेश) : और आप 22 वर्ष तक खामोश रहे, आप कहाँ थे।

श्री तिलोकी सिंह : ... और जिसका वकार महज कागज में था, उसको कागज से हटा कर इस धोकाघड़ी को खत्म किया।

जनसंघ के माननीय सदस्य फर्मति है कि मैं कहाँ था। मैं जहाँ था वहीं हूँ। मैं जहाँ था वहीं हूँ और अगर इधर के बैठने वाले चन्द हजरात और उधर के हजरात ने आज एक राय बदली है कि इंडियन प्रिसेज के इन तमाम दस्तूर तो, इनको जो मरात है, इनकी जो हैसियत है उसको कम किया जाय तो मैं तो उस राय का था और आज भी, हुजूर, उस राय का हूँ कि बिना मुआविजा इनको खत्म किया जाय। इस बात को कभी छिपाया नहीं। आज मैं कुछ दबा हुआ जरूर हूँ लेकिन अगर इस दबी हुई हालत में मेरे दोस्तों को इतना एतराज है तो मैं अगर अपनी असली शक्ल, अपना असली रूप धारण करूँ तो खुदा जाने वह कहाँ जायें। मैं तो दबी हुई बात अर्ज कर रहा हूँ। कम से कम यह काम हमने किया, यह कदम हमने उठाया। मीस थी बात थी गई। क्या चाहते हैं। क्या लाठी डंडे से फैसला किया जाय। जो कुछ भी इस मुल्क में किया जायेगा, किया गया है, आगे होगा और वह कानून के जरिये से होगा और कानून में हमें इस बात का अधिकार दिया है कि हम जब चाहे तब अपने आईने,

को, संविधान को, भी बदल दे। उसके लिये एक पाबन्दी रखी गई है। वह पाबन्दी अगर पूरी हो जाती है तो मालूम नहीं माननीय सदस्य क्यो, जो मीन्स के बहुत कायल हैं और जो गांधी जी की दुहाई देते हैं, वह आदर से इस हाऊस के या पूरे पार्लियामेन्ट के बहुमत में, नियम के अनुसार दो तिहाई बहुमत के, फैसले के आगे सर नहीं झुकते हैं और यह कहते हैं यह काम सही नहीं किया है। नान्य-वर, मैं आपके द्वारा माननीय सदस्यों से यह अर्ज करना चाहूंगा कि वह मत भूलें कि यह फैसला या यह वान जो आज यहां पेश है, इसका वास्ता महज इस सदन के 240 माननीय सदस्यों से है, या दूसरे सदन के 500 या सवा 500 सदस्यों से है। इसका फैसला लाखों और करोड़ों आदमियों से है। इसके जरिये से हमको वताना होगा कि हम क्या चाहते हैं। हम भेदभाव को मिटाना चाहते हैं कि नहीं मिटाना चाहते हैं, हम ऊंच नीच के डम फर्क को, कि एक साहब ऐसे हैं कि अगर वह कोई अपराध करें तो उन पर मुकदमा नहीं चल सका और हम अगर अपराध करें तो हम पर मुकदमा चल सकता है उनकी आज भी न जमीन है न कुछ है, फिर भी नौ जरब तोप या पन्द्रह जरब तोप सलामी दी जाती है। सलामी किस की हो? क्या व्यक्ति की हो? गौर कीजिए हुजूर, डिमोक्रेसी में प्रजातंत्र में, समाजवाद में, जिमसे आज स्वतंत्र पार्टी के भी सदस्य हमी बहुत हद तक हैं, और जन संघ ने तो करीब करीब उसका जामा पहिन लिया है वह भी यह कहते हैं कि बराबरी होनी चाहिये। तो बराबरी में एक साहब को नौ या पन्द्रह जरब तोप सलामी जाये।

यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है प्रजातंत्र के बुनियादी उमूलों में एक यह है कि विरासत में कोई हैसियत नहीं मिलनी चाहिये और उन मुल्कों में जहाँ कि समाजवाद नहीं है वहाँ भी मौत के कर लगाये जाते हैं कि विरासत में वह हैसियत न हासिल हो आदमी को जो उसके बापदादा की थी वह बेटे को न हासिल हो।

[श्री त्रिलोकी सिंह]

मोज्जिज दोस्त, यह चाहते हैं कि नहीं, वही पुरानी ख्यात कायम रह जाये। मैं उसका हामी नहीं हूँ और आपको शुक्रिया अदा करने के साथ साथ और माननीय सदस्यों को भी शुक्रिया अदा करने के साथ साथ, कि उन्होंने मुकाबलतन मेरी बात दो सकून के साथ सुना, मैं उम्मीद करता हूँ कि वह इस मामले पर गौर फरमायेंगे और कल जब इस पर राय ली जायेगी, तो अपनी राय को बदला हुआ पायेंगे और इस तरमीनी विल के हक में वोट देंगे।

इतना कह कर मैं अपनी बात को समाप्त करता हूँ।

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : Respected Mr. Deputy Chairman. Sir, I rise to oppose the motion moved by the hon. Prime Minister for the consideration of a Bill, which she has been pleased to call a historic Bill. I do not want to deny her the credit of creating history.

We have had many historic occasions even in the past, events unheard of in the history of the world. Twentythree years ago we partitioned this country. Nowhere in the history of the world have we heard of a country being partitioned with the willingness of its leaders. Countries have been partitioned, many countries, but not with the consent of their leaders. Here is a country which was partitioned by the willing consent of its leaders—a partition which had opened the floodgates for disruptive tendencies and an historic event of which no country can ever feel proud, nor do we. It is not surprising that the successors of those leaders, who are also their descendants, are now out for creating history which will open the floodgates of uncertainties and mutual distrust.

3 P.M.

Nowhere in the history of the world we have heard of agreements between sovereign States on one side and States with paramountcy on the other being torn off and thrown to the winds the way we are doing. This Bill which is proudly claimed to be a historic Bill is nothing short of a betrayal which the country can never feel proud of. Another historic event in this country took place almost the same time about 23 years ago. Over

550 States in all voluntarily merged themselves with the Indian Union. History records events where there had been bloodshed and there had been prolonged wars for the retention of Crowns. But here were 550 Princely Rulers who voluntarily took off their Crowns from their heads and willingly placed them on the heads of our leaders. This also is a creation of history, a history of which the country will always feel proud. We have heard it said that Sardar Patel had cleverly hired the services of these people. According to the trade union principles and the principles of capitalism, a person who is hired can be fired. I take the 'hired' part of it first and will take up the 'fired' part later. This remark can come from the mouth of only those who have a trade union way of thinking and who have rendered themselves incapable of appreciating the finer values in life. Assuming this to be correct that these people allowed themselves to be hired for the purposes of national integration by Sardar Patel, they can always feel proud of it and can legitimately claim to be thousand times better than those who allow themselves to be hired for the purposes of national disintegration and by ideologies foreign to this land and by powers who are openly hostile to this country. The shining jewel in the crown of the Indira Cabinet is proud of the fact that he belongs to a family which was responsible for adding thousands of square miles to the territory of India, when Mr. Jinnah was ready to offer an almost autonomous status for Kashmir, and that he would just voluntarily relinquish his Privy Purse. I have very high regard and respect for his knowledge and his doctorate, particularly because the Degree is not honorary. He has worked hard for it and earned it. I have great admiration for his personality, grace and dignity. I have sincere affection for the age of that young Maharaja. I cannot even for a moment think of hurting his pride but I will be failing in my duty if I do not point out that almost all the Princely States had merged themselves in the Indian Union by 15th August, 1947. Only three States remained; out of them one was Jammu and Kashmir.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : It was Indian Dominion then; the Indian Union had not come into existence.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : I stand corrected, thank you

Out of those three, Kashmir was one—and look at the company in which that particular State was—the other two being Hyderabad and Junagarh. And, Sir, it was only when he armies of that Benevolent Qaid-e-Azam, who was ready to offer an almost autonomous status for Kashmir, had, after committing shameful acts of violence, arson, loot, rape and murder, occupied a sizable portion of Kashmir and were knocking at the very gates of Srinagar, that the late Maharaja decided to accede. It was not so much out of voluntariness as out of compulsion of circumstances, and, without being uncharitable to the hon. Minister for Tourism and Civil Aviation it can be said that his offer of voluntarily relinquishing the privy purse has not been so much voluntarily as under compulsion of his surroundings.

Sir, the Prime Minister has referred to a Resolution regarding the abolition of Privy Purses passed by this House. I was in this House when that Resolution was passed, and I think that the implementation of that Resolution largely depended on the skill and capacity of the ex-Home Minister who is the present Finance Minister. Sir, even best of the schemes, if executed in a clumsy and silly way, lose all their charm and grace. Sir, Shri Chavan then occupied the Chair that was once occupied by that indomitable Sardar, who never allowed himself to be overshadowed by even the then internationally advised and advertised Prime Minister. I wish he could step into his shoes and acquire a comparatively similar stature. If that had happened, I am sure that the princes, who felt proud of being hired by that iron man of India, could certainly have felt honoured of being 'fired' by this Modern *Chhatrapati* of Maharashtra.

SHRI C. D. PANDE : And that *Modern Chhatrapati* was himself then fired on.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : Sir, I never had any fascination for the princely order, nor do I feel any attachment for them even today.

SHRI K. CHANDRASEKHARAN (Kerala) : Even now ?

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : Even today, I said. Yes, even now. I am not eager to retain their purses but I am extremely anxious to preserve the honour and dignity of this country. Governments will come, Government will go; so will the leaders and their parties. But the traditions will always remain.

दुनिया के मुसाफिरखाने में मेहमान बदलते रहते हैं,

दस्तूर नहीं बदला करते, फरमान बदलते रहते हैं ।

Sir, this Bill strikes at the very roots of our dignity and trustworthiness. Hence I feel compelled to oppose it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Dharia.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Was it not the understanding that there would be two Members from the Opposition for one from those Benches ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : After this.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Mr. Dharia sponsored this programme in the AICC.

DR. B. N. ANTANI (Gujarat) : Will there be any provision for the abolition of these privileges ?

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I am here to support the Bill moved by our Prime Minister. To me it is a Bill of historic significance. It is a further step in our endeavours to achieve socialism through democracy and I am proud to be here today to participate, as one of the partners, in this peaceful revolution. In this country of ours it is true that we have accepted the Constitution and it is further proof that articles 291, 362 that we have accepted the Constitution and tees and some privileges and privy purses to the ex-Rulers, but unfortunately we have forgotten the other articles of the Constitution. Is it not a fact that the very Preamble, if it is properly read, will show that these privileges and privy purses are

[Shri M. M. Dharia.]

inconsistent with and contradictory to the Preamble itself? The Preamble says:

"WE, THE PEOPLE OF INDIA, having solemnly resolved to constitute India into a SOVEREIGN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC and to secure to all its citizens:

JUSTICE, social, economic and political;

LIBERTY of thought, expression, belief, faith and worship;

EQUALITY of status and of opportunity..."

We have proclaimed to this country and through this Constitution to the whole world that we stand here to secure equality of status and opportunity. Having regard to these privileges and privy purses, can we say that there is opportunity and equality to all the citizens of the same type? Is it not this very Preamble which is a guiding factor to us? Yes, in days to come we shall secure equality of status and opportunity. In this background this Bill was long overdue. It was in the year 1967, in the month of June, the amendment, of which I am, of course, the father and I am proud of it, was carried by the AICC and I expected that this Bill would come not in the monsoon session of 1970 but of 1967. Had my party showed courage, perhaps the history of this country would have been certainly otherwise. There would have been a tremendous amount of progressive forces created by my party in this country and the present atmosphere perhaps would not have existed. Whatever has happened has happened. I am here to congratulate the hon. Prime Minister on bringing forward this Bill before this House, knowing fully well that there are all possible dangers and that all possible manoeuvres will be played by the other side. Even then she has shown her daring and it is out of a commitment to these programmes that she has come forward before the other House and this House.

I was really surprised at the speech of the hon. Leader of the Opposition, who happens to be a friend of ours, who was an ardent supporter of the motion in 1967. When Shyam Nandanji said that the Bill and the endeavours of the Prime Minister are

an exercise in futility, I felt, having regard to his speech, that it was also an exercise in futility. But then afterwards I felt that it was not an exercise in futility because no leader has exposed himself so well. Can you expect of him, such a speech as Shyam Nandanji made today? It is for us to realise that those who claimed at Ahmedabad that they did stand by the ten-point economic programme, have lost their ten-point programme. It is not the Prime Minister who has come to the one-point programme. The one-point programme of having power to secure the social objectives is certainly an important programme. How can it be forgotten in a political democracy? There is nothing wrong in it. But I am sorry to say that if at all any one-point programme has been accepted by anybody, it is by Shyam Nandanji and his party who have no other programme but to defeat the Prime Minister by creating grand alliances, because she is endeavouring to do something progressive in this country. How can there be progress without any commitment? If there is any one-point programme, on our side. Let us not forget it.

Now, I am surprised at the speech made by Shri Pitamber Das. I have not yet forgotten it. It was in the year 1942 that Guru Golwalkar had said in this country that these Rulers were the protectors of the Hindu religion and that he would like to protect these Hindu Rulers even after the British Raj went out from this country. Now those who have grown in that tradition, in case they try to oppose this Bill, of course I am not here that way to be surprised because of that speech. But I am certainly surprised at and shocked by the speech made by Shri Mishra, particularly when I could see...

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR (Delhi): I would request you not to quote persons without the correct quotations.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I am prepared to give all quotations to Dr. Mahavir. Unfortunately I was under the impression that he is a well-read person. He knows the philosophy of his Guruji. If not, I am prepared to give him all possible assistance.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : Is that an answer to my question? Your philosophy must come from your side.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : If there is any conscience left in the other side, then most of the hands must be raised in favour of this Bill and not against this Bill. Privileges and purses for whom? For these ex-rulers? Are you not aware what these ex-rulers stand for? I am not here to make any claim that all of them are patriotic people. I will not say that. There was a very small State of Janjira of three tehsils in Colaba district of Maharashtra. It was on the 30th January, 1948, when the Father of the Nation was assassinated, that we had captured two tehsils, and the very Nawab who was not prepared to sign the Instrument of Accession then went to Bombay, contacted the Chief Minister, Shri Morarji Desai, and he got the Instrument of Accession signed. It was because of the brave farmers and some workers like me who fought that battle at that time that this came about. It was not because of the Nawabs and Princes who are getting privy purses and privileges today. I am not opposed to any transitional allowance on humanitarian grounds. But to what extent? May I recall in this House today that when we raised the issue that Mrs. Mascarenhas was ailing, that her husband was ailing in a Portuguese jail, that some honorarium should be given, we were assured that everything possible would be done to help her. As the House is aware, even till today we have not done anything about it. There are hundreds of freedom fighters in this country, some of whom are leading today a dog's life. If anything should be given, if any honorarium should be given, it should be given to these freedom fighters who were prepared to sacrifice their life for the freedom of this country.

Some reference was made to Jammu and Kashmir. Is it not a fact that when Pakistani soldiers committed that aggression over Jammu and Kashmir, till that time the then ruler was not prepared to sign the Instrument of Accession? After that aggression he contacted the British Government for help, but when it was refused to him, then he contacted the Indian Government, and because of that help the ruler signed that Instrument of Accession. Was it not opportunism? Where is patri-

tism in it? Such huge, fabulous sums are involved in privileges and privy purses. Let us not forget history. There are many who are employed by these rulers. If these families are to be rehabilitated, if some scheme comes from the Government, I say it is absolutely necessary, because in the transitional phase let us not forget the humanitarian approach. But here again I fail to understand the arguments advanced by Mr. Mishra. He just stood by the whole of the Bill. He said, "I stand for the abolition of the privy purses" But his opposition was because of the ways and means adopted. What are the ways and means? To be frank, in spite of their opposition, the hon. Prime Minister has made it very clear that transitional allowance will be paid and it will be in some multiple. Sir, when it has been made very clear by the Prime Minister and when that Bill again will have to come forward before the House. I do not know why we have lost all their confidence. Why are you losing your confidence? It will be coming before Parliament. Sir, let me make it very clear that these were the people who wanted to divide the Government by any means, and this is just a lame excuse that they are putting before the country. No country will believe this excuse.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY : It is those Members sitting there who want to defeat the Government. What about your own people who are inside your own party to defeat Mrs. Gandhi?

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, order, please.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : This loud voice of Shrimati Yashoda Reddy...

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY : I know quite a lot of people who are against Madame Gandhi.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Sir, this loud voice coming from the fair sex, Shrimati Yashoda Reddy, may perhaps amuse this House but it cannot convince the country. That should be understood.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY : You will see it. I challenge.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI (Maharashtra) : May I know whether all loud voices will convince the country ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, order, please.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maharashtra) : Our deeds will convince the country, not voices.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Mrs Yashoda Reddy's voice does not amuse the House, but charms it, which is dangerous.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Sir, Mr. Chinai has flung a challenge. I am prepared to come to Bombay with him. Let him convene a meeting of the citizens at Bombay and let me convene a meeting. Let us see what the audience is. I am prepared to accept his challenge. Let Mr. Chinai take up the challenge.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI : I accept Mr. Dharia's challenge. He has not got the guts to attend even any meeting in Bombay. And he is challenging me. Where was he and his party when they voted me to this House ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, order, please. Let Mr. Dharia continue his speech.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI : Mr. Chinai's contention is that the Taj Mahal Hotel is a place where he will not be allowed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Dharia, your time is up.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : What can I do ?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Yes, continue with your speech.

(Interruptions)

Order, order, please.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI : Mr. Kulkarni was perspiring when the counting was going on about the election to the Rajya Sabha. And he was elected on the fourth count.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Mr. Dharia, five minutes more for you.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : I do not want to challenge the capacity of Mr. Chinai in hiring people and in also having hired some black-legs in order to break up strikes.

This is indeed a very progressive measure. But at the same time, having regard to the strength of both the Houses and the voting strength, may I urge upon the Government on this occasion that we are going ahead with a view to implementing our socialist objectives and to achieve the socialist objectives, this much amendment is not enough. In this country, right to property which is the fundamental right is the greatest possible impediment in the way of achieving this progress, and from that point of view, may I request the Prime Minister and the Government to come before the country and before Parliament with a measure whereby—I do not want the abolition of the property rights, I am prepared to concede that—let Parliament decide the ceiling both in urban and rural areas and up to those ceilings, let us give that guarantee. Let us make it clear that the right to property above the ceiling shall not be a fundamental right. Without having at measure of that sort, it will not be possible for this country to implement any specialist programme; whether it is ceiling on urban properties, whether it is capital levy or otherwise, I am not going into those details. When so many things are being said by the Rajahs and Maharajahs and others, may I bring to the notice of the House, for whom do we stand ? Privileges and privy purses are bound to go in the course of the history; they cannot be retained. But for whom are we meant ? Is it not a fact that Chapter IV of our Constitution, which deals with so many directive principles, is the heart of our Constitution, and it is for the achievement of these directive principles that we have to go ahead. And in this context, whether to go in a democratic manner, in a democratic process, let not people lose their faith in parliamentary democracy. If that faith is not to be lost, we shall have to prove to the people that their dignity, their honour will be properly maintained through this parliamentary democracy.

DR. B. N. ANTANI : Shri Bhupesh Gupta will help you.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Therefore, I would like to appeal to all the friends, let

us not forget that ultimately it is not only we who are to decide the fate of this country, there are the teeming masses of this country who are also to decide the fate of this country. Today they may not, perhaps, be within the purview of our party membership. But millions of youngsters who are now out for the fulfilment of their aspirations, if they have to be satisfied, such measures shall have to be passed in this House, and we all shall have to express our willingness in this regard (*Time bell rings*) Only two minutes more. Otherwise these efforts may be appreciated but they may perhaps prove to be haphazard.

For me this measure is of historical significance because it seeks elimination of classes without violence by masses. It is doing away with classes through democratic processes with the object of forming an egalitarian society. For me it is the struggle for the daughters and the sons. While carrying on this struggle we have malice for none. Let us go ahead to have a peaceful solution to our problems. There is no other alternative. If we want the parliamentary democracy to survive, we must accept the challenge and bring about a change. Thank you.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY (Tamil Nadu) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I cannot help confessing to a sense of the high drama with which this debate is charged. Or it might be that the issues involved may constitute a Shakespearean or Sophoclean tragedy where great issues are at stake. The issues in this debate will take a choice between right and wrong, between justice and injustice, between conscience of the individual and the social and material profit.

Sir, this is an important Bill because the three articles which protect the rights and privileges of the Princes are to be deleted and one article which bans the approach of the Princes to courts of law is retained. Let us remind ourselves of the history of the privy purses. According to Mr. V. P. Menon's History of the Integration of the Indian States, it is Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel who brought about this great revolution in the history of India. According to him, this grant of privy purses was a *quid pro quo*, the *quid* being the voluntary associa-

tion of the States with the Union of India and the *pro quo* being the privy purses. The Government retains the "quid", but what is going to happen to the "quo", namely, the privy purses of the Princes? He referred also to the sacrifices some of the Princes made in addition to the voluntary surrender of their sovereignty. The Nizam of Hyderabad, for instance, when he decided to join the Union surrendered his own personal estate, known in Hyderabad as the Zulfiqar Estate, which brought him an annual revenue of Rs. 122 lakhs, and in return, he got Rs. 25 lakhs per year for his life time only. The successor, the present Nizam of Hyderabad, has lost this Rs. 25 lakhs. Also 12,000 miles of railway that belonged to the Princes were absorbed in the Indian Railway system. The internal customs duty levied by the States was incorporated into the excise revenue of this country, which forms a sizable portion of the income of the Government of India. In addition, large cash balances which were in the treasuries to the personal account of the Princes and investments amounting to Rs. 75 crores, were also surrendered to the Union Government, besides a number of buildings and palaces. Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel in recommending the covenant which embodies, among other things, the rights and privileges of the Princes and the grant of privy purses, referred to the difficulties with which the first days of the Union Government were surrounded. He referred to the intransigence of the Nizam of Hyderabad and to the declaration of independence by the Maharaja of Travancore. He referred also to the horrors of partition and he said that in the midst of all these difficulties, the Princes came to our rescue and offered voluntarily, most of them, a vast majority of them, to integrate themselves into the Union. And he said that the privy purses were a very small price paid for the surrender of their sovereignty, their estates and their territories, and he urged the future generations that they should fully implement the agreement, including the grant of the privy purses.

Now, what are the arguments for the Bill as introduced by the Prime Minister? The Prime Minister says that it is a great step in socialism, and it will bring about equality; that is, a sum of Rs. 5 crores distributed among 500 millions of people is

[Shri M. Ruthmaswamy.]

going to bring about social and economic equality. It works out to Rs. 10 per head. Is that the capital investment which you are going to endow the people of India with? It is a cheap and nasty kind of socialism just to overcome the pledged word of the responsible representatives of the Government of India of those days. To the social and economic horrors of socialism are to be added this new terror of the moral difficulties which will be imposed by this kind of socialism upon people who are unwise enough to accept it. Another great advocate of this Bill is Mr. Chavan, former Home Minister, now promoted—I believe it is promotion—as Finance Minister.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY : Doubtful.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY : He asked the Princes to adjust themselves to the circumstances. Haven't they adjusted themselves to the circumstances? Haven't they become ordinary citizens, fighting elections like ordinary people? Haven't they adjusted themselves to the circumstances by subscribing large funds to the Congress Party? Have they not adjusted themselves to the circumstances in all kinds of ways? Adjustments must be voluntary adjustments. Can you ask the people to adjust themselves to the circumstances? You must leave them to adjust themselves to the circumstances and not force adjustments on them by this kind of a legislation. I am just reminded of what an Irishman said. He said, "Voter, I want you to be free or I will force you to be free". Then, Mr. Chavan was taunted by Mr. Dahyabhai Patel on one occasion in this House that he accepted the Kutch Agreement but would not accept the Privy Purses of the Princes, that he was bent upon the abolition of the Privy Purses of the Princes. To that he replied that the Kutch Award ..

DR. B. N. ANTANI : Mr. Dahyabhai Patel never accepted it.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY : ... related to foreigners whereas the Privy Purses of the Princes related to our own people. So there is one law for the foreigners and another for our own people...

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL : Not only law, but morality also.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY : He says this is only a political act as if political acts are free from all morals and moral principles. Agreements must be kept, whether they are international or private. The law of civic purpose forces a man to perform an act which he has agreed to under the contract which he made with another man. Even among thieves it is honoured. A thief or even a dacoit, if he entertains a guest in his house, will not rob that guest. But I suppose there are other tests for politicians and statesmen. When Lenin and the Bolsheviks ended the Czar, there was a huge national debt of Russia. They were condemned on all sides of the world. There was some justification for Lenin and the Bolsheviks because they were starting from nothing; they were engaged in a war with Germany, they were in great difficulties. They did not know about their future. They did not know how to pay taxes. So there was some justification for Lenin. But what justification is there for this Government, this Congress Government—I suppose it is a legitimate successor of the Old Congress Government—which entered into these agreements and covenants?

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY : It is not; that is why the whole trouble.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY : Is that why this Congress Government refuses to abide by the covenants and agreements of the former Congress Government?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : It is not legitimate, it is illegitimate.

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY : Therefore, I appeal to the Government even at this last moment to take back this measure. After all, it is the Government of a great people. It is the leader of a great people, the official leader of a great people. It is the representative of the people of India in the international forum. May I not ask them to cultivate what is called—the beautiful phrase—the chatity of honour? This Bill looks like a stain against the Privy purses. It looks like a great stain which is going to make a deep wound in the public life of our country. Will the workers be encouraged to keep their agreements in regard to wages when they find

the Government of the day repudiating a solemn covenant, a solemn agreement? Will the businessmen, the employers, observe the dictates of justice and righteousness in regard to their employees if they find the Government treating these solemn covenants like a scrap of paper? Will the students in the colleges in their university campuses, observe the conditions on which they were admitted if they find that the Government of the day enters into a covenant and ten years afterwards repudiates that covenant? Have I to remind our rulers of the great tradition of Indian rulers in regard to the covenants, agreements and promises? Must I remind the Prime Minister of Yudhishtira who gambled away his property, kingdom and even his wife because he wanted to keep his promise? He wanted to keep his gambled debts although under the modern law gambled debts will not be sustainable. Must I remind her of Harishchandra whose story I heard at my mother's knees? In order to keep his promise, in order to be loyal to his promise, he lost his property, kingdom and wife and was reduced to the position of a burial yard keeper. Even in Europe there are historical pieces similar to these. More than a century ago, after the revolutionary and Napoleonic wars, the princes of Germany who had all the attributes of sovereignty surrendered their sovereignty, but had the right to keep all their estates, all the lands and their privileges. Some of them were even made Peers. To this day they have got all those privileges. None of the succeeding Governments—the Prussians nor even the powerful government of Kaiser—has deprived these princes of their privileges who voluntarily surrendered their sovereignty.

I would appeal not only to the Government, but also to the uncommitted Members of this House and even to the Congress Members—after all they are private Members who have a conscience of their own...

AN HON. MEMBER : Have they?

SHRI M. RUTHNASWAMY : Must be assumed. They have a conscience of their own. I appeal to them to utilise their private judgment, to utilise their un-influenced judgement and their individual judgement on this occasion. They need not have fear of any consequences. They would not be

expelled from the party, because the ruling Congress party cannot afford to expel any member with their present political strength. Nothing will happen to them. Even their government will not fall because not affect the future of the government of an adverse vote in the Rajya Sabha will this country. I would appeal to all sections and to members of all parties, and especially to the socialist members, to vote against this measure. This is not socialism. This is not a serious socialism. This is not a mature socialism. This is not the socialism they would like to have. Let them wait for better days when a real socialist party comes to power. Then they can enforce their ideas on socialism. I would appeal to all sections of the House to remember that this is a great occasion, a great parliamentary occasion when they have to choose between justice on the one side and a foreign political theory like socialism on the other, between conscience on the one side and material profit on the other, between good on the one side and evil on the other. I make this appeal to you because I want you to save the honour of this country, the honour of the Parliament, and the honour of the people. I appeal to all the Members of the Rajya Sabha to vote against this Bill and see that right is done at the right moment.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमान्, मैं आपका बहुत ही अनुगृहीत हूँ कि आपने मुझे हमारा समय आने के पहले ही बुला लिया क्योंकि जैसा कि सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों को मालूम है कि हमको यहां से लौट कर सीधे जेल जाना होगा और फिर जेल से ही सीधे यहां कल आएंगे और फिर जेल में जाना होगा। इस बात की हमें खुशी है कि सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने आज के दिन एक नज़ीर कायम की...

श्री उपसभापति : राजनारायणजी, आपका समय बहुत कम है। आज के बिल के बारे में बोल लीजिए।

श्री राजनारायण : हमारे मित्र भूपेश गुप्त अपना समय देंगे। सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने एक नज़ीर कायम की कि अब संसद् और विधान मंडल के सदस्य खास खास ओकेजन पर संसद् और विधान मंडल में जाकर मत का प्रकाशन,

[श्री राजनारायण]

वोटिंग कर सकते हैं। आज यह चीज हमने करा दी

श्री महावीर त्यागी (उत्तर प्रदेश) : सबके लिये आसानी हो गई। डी० ए० वगैरह भी लेंगे और खाना भी मुफ्त में खायेंगे।

श्री राजनारायण : अब मैं आपके द्वारा प्रधान मंत्री और नेता विरोधी दल और सदन के सभी पक्षों के सामने अपनी मुसीबत को रखूंगा। यह है हमारा 1952 का चुनाव घोषणापत्र, जिसको हम कहते हैं "समाजवादी निर्माण की ओर"। आज का नहीं है, यह 1951 में रांची में सोशलिस्ट पार्टी की जनरल कौंसिल ने बनाया था।

"भारत के समान गरीब देश में जहां श्रम शक्ति का बाहुल्य हो, उत्पादन केवल जनता की लगन और सहयोग से ही बढ़ सकता है। अन्य स्थानों से भी अधिक यहां श्रम ही धन का साधन है। कांग्रेस की शताब्दियों की सड़न ने भारत में बड़े-बड़े विशेषाधिकारों वाले गुट और वर्ग पैदा कर दिये हैं। बहुजनों की अत्यधिक निर्धनता और अल्पजनों का अत्यधिक ऐश्वर्य किसी पर्यवेक्षक की दृष्टि से अछूता नहीं है। कांग्रेस के शासन में यह ज्वलंत अंतर ज्यों का त्यों कायम है। राजाओं के पैतृक विशेषाधिकार एक हद तक कम कर दिये गये हैं किन्तु बड़े-बड़े सालानियों यानी प्रिवी पर्स, के द्वारा उनकी तथाकथित व्यक्तिगत सम्पत्ति को न छीनने के कारण और राज-प्रमुख और उपराजप्रमुख की नयी व्यवस्था बना कर उनके बहुत से विशेषाधिकार सुरक्षित रखे गये हैं। सोशलिस्ट पार्टी का मत है कि इस प्रकार के पैतृक विशेषाधिकार भारत की स्वतंत्रता और जनता द्वारा चुने गये लोकतांत्रिक जीवन के विरुद्ध हैं। और इस कारण पार्टी राजाओं को केवल माधारण नागरिक की भांति ही रहने देने की अनुमति देगी। उनका सालियाना बंद हो कर राज्य को प्राप्त होगा। और राजप्रमुख और उपराजप्रमुख आदि पद समाप्त कर दिये जायेंगे और उनकी व्यक्तिगत सम्पत्ति पर भी अन्य व्यक्तिगत सम्पत्तियों

के सभी कानून लागू होंगे। हर रूप में जमींदारी का विनाश हो। भूमि के बटवारे से भूमिपतियों की सम्पत्ति कम हो जायेगी और ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों की असमानता का नाश हो जायेगा"।

अब मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि 1951 का जो हमारा घोषणापत्र है, जिस घोषणापत्र की पुनरावृत्ति हमने सन् 1957 में की, जिस घोषणा पत्र को हमने दोहराया सन् 1962 जिस घोषणा पत्र को हमने दोहराया सन् 1967 में, प्रत्येक घोषणापत्रों में हमने कहा कि राजाओं का प्रिवी पर्स बिना मुआवजा समाप्त हो, फिर अगर राजाओं के प्रिवी पर्स को समाप्त करने का विधेयक आए, तो क्या मैं उसका विरोध कर सकता हूं? क्या हम अपने वचन को चबा जाएं, क्या हम अपने क्लेम को चबा जाएं..

श्री अनन्त प्रसाद शर्मा : मिश्र जी से पूछिए।

श्री श्याम नन्दन मिश्र : कम्पेन्सेशन की बात कहिए।

श्री राजनारायण: आ रहा हूं उस पर। इसलिये, हमारा जो कमिटमेन्ट है, इस देश की जनता के साथ कमिटमेन्ट है कि राजाओं को भी सामान्य नागरिकों की तरह अपना जीवन व्यतीत करने की स्थिति पैदा होनी चाहिये, यह बिलकुल सफाई के साथ हमने कहा है। हममें किसी को मुगालते में नहीं रहना चाहिये।

श्रीमन्, जब समाचारपत्रों के द्वारा तिहाड़ जेल में यह समाचार पढ़ने को प्राप्त हुआ कि प्रधान मंत्री साहिबा विधेयक लाना चाहती हैं, राजाओं के प्रिवी पर्स से संबंधित, तो हमने जेल से प्रधान मंत्री साहिबा को चिट्ठी भेजी कि प्रधान मंत्री साहिबा, आप स्पर्श क्रांतिकारी हो, स्पर्श क्रांतिकारी, जो क्रांति को छूता है, वह क्रांति करता नहीं। हमने उनसे निवेदन किया कि आप "टच रिवोल्यूशनरी" न बनो, आप 'रिजल रिवो-

ल्युशनरी' बनिये । अगर प्रधान मंत्री साहिबा स्पर्श क्रांतिकारी की परिधि में रहना चाहती है, तो हमने उत्तम निवेदन किया था और जेल में हमने चिट्ठी भेजी थी कि आप बिना मुआवजे के राजाओं के प्रिवी पर्स को समाप्त करने के लिए विधेयक लायें । मुझे प्रधान मंत्री साहिबा का कोई उत्तर नहीं मिला । मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे ऐसे पत्र जो प्रधान मंत्री के रुची के अनुकूल नहीं होते हैं, उनका उत्तर वे नहीं देती हैं और जो उनके रुचि के अनुकूल होते हैं, उनका उत्तर वे बहुत जल्दी दे दिया करती हैं । तो हम समझ गये कि इस समय प्रधान मंत्री साहिबा राजाओं को लटकाना चाहती हैं और अभी राजाओं से कुछ और सुविधा तथा सुख लेना चाहती हैं । इस तरह से इस बात में सौदेबाजी चलेगी । इस तरह का पत्र हमने लिखा था और हमें अपना वाक्य याद है कि राजाओं के प्रिवी पर्स को तय करते समय एक-एक राजा के साथ बातचीत चलेगी और इसमें जाल बंटा होगा और किन-किन राजाओं से किस-किस ढंग में कितना रुपया लिया गया, उसकी पुनरावृत्ति फिर होने की गुंजायश इस विधेयक में न रहे । नाम तो हो गया कि हमने क्रान्ति को छू दिया है और राजाओं को साधारण नागरिक की तरह लाने की ओर अभिमुख हो कर चल रहे हैं । तो मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इसमें इस तरह की जो व्यवस्था है उसको छोड़ दो, जिसमें राजा महाराजाओं के साथ बैठ कर सौदेबाजी हो कि तुमको कितना मुआवजा मिलेगा, तुमको कितना मुआवजा मिलेगा । हमने सफाई के साथ कह दिया था । समाजवाद वह नहीं है, जो मानवता से ओतप्रोत न हो । समाजवाद और मानवता पर्यायवाची है । हमने यह कहा था कि रिहबिलिटेशन ग्रांट, पुनर्वास अनुदान की गुंजायश की जा सकती है । सफाई के साथ लिखें कि इसमें मुआवजा नहीं मिलेगा । यदि किसी राजा महाराजा को जीवन निर्वाह करने के लिए या खाने कमाने के लिए नहीं रह जायेगा तो, उनको रिहबिलिटेशन अनुदान की व्यवस्था की जा

सकती है । यह बात हमने अपने खत में लिखी है । अब वे कहती हैं कि यह तो ट्रांजीशनल कम्पेंसेशन है ।

श्री महेश्वर नाथ कौल (नाम-निर्देशित): कम्पेंसेशन तो कोई नहीं कह रहा है ।

श्री राजनारायण : अब मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार की ओर से बहुत सफाई और ईमानदारी के साथ क्रान्तिकारिता की दुहाई दी जा रही है, तो इसमें वे यह वाक्य क्यों नहीं लिख देते "विदआउट कम्पेंसेशन" और इस सवध में जो हमारा संशोधन है, उसको सरकार को मान लेना चाहिये । हमने अपने संशोधन में कहा है कि 15 अक्टूबर की जगह 2 अक्टूबर रखा जाना चाहिये, जो गांधी जी राष्ट्रपिता का जन्म दिन है ।

दूसरा जो संशोधन हमने दिया है, उसमें कहा है कि इसके एवज में राजाओं को कोई मुआवजा नहीं दिया जायेगा । तो मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार को सफाई के साथ कहना चाहिये, उसे अन्धकार में नहीं रहना चाहिये, दुविधा में नहीं रहना चाहिये, भ्रम में नहीं रहना चाहिये, बुद्धि विभ्रम जन्य भ्रान्ति में विचरण करने की आदी प्रधान मंत्री इस चीज से अलग हों । यह बात हमने निवेदन की है ।

मैं इस अवसर पर राजाओं से भी निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ और उन लोगों से भी कहना चाहता हूँ, जो लोग गांधी जी का नाम लेते हैं और सरदार पटेल का नाम बहुत ले रहे हैं । मैं गांधी जी की लेखनी से एक दो कोटेशन पढ़ना चाहता हूँ । गांधी जी कलकत्ते के क्लब में ठहरे हुए थे । लार्ड कर्जन का दरबार लगा हुआ था और वही क्लब में राजा महाराजा भी ठहरे हुए थे । एक कमरे में गांधी जी भी ठहरे हुए थे । उन दिनों लार्ड कर्जन के दरबार में जाने के लिए राजा महाराजा क्लब में ही ठहरे हुए थे । गांधी जी लिखते हैं कि मैंने हमेशा इन्हें धोती कुर्ते में देखा, आज इन्हें पतलून, चोगा, खानशामे की षगड़ी

श्री राजनारायण

और चमकीले बूट पहिने देखा और यह देख कर मुझे दुःख हुआ। इस वेशान्तर का कारण मैंने पूछा कि यह वेश क्यों बदला हुआ है। तो राजा महाराजाओं ने कहा कि हमारा दुःख हम ही जानते हैं। हमारी धन, सम्पत्ति और वादियों को कायम रखने के लिए जो जो अपमान सहने पड़ते हैं, उन्हें आप क्या जानें? यह राजा महाराजाओं का जवाब है गांधी जी को। फिर कहते हैं कि हम में और खानसामाओं में आप क्या फर्क समझते हैं? वे हमारे खानसामा हैं तो हम लार्ड कर्जन के खानसामा हैं। यह राजाओं ने कहा गांधी जी, से कि यह होटल के खानसामा हमारे हैं, तो हम लार्ड कर्जन के खानसामा हैं। अगर लार्ड कर्जन के खानसामा और इन्दिरा जी के खानसामा हट जाते हैं, तो इसमें राजाओं को बुरा नहीं मानना चाहिए और दूसरे लोगों को भी बुरा नहीं मानना चाहिए। राजाओं को तो कृतकृत्य होना चाहिए कि इतने दिनों तक जो पाप था उनके पास, उस पाप को उनसे हटाया जा रहा है। श्रीमन्, यह गांधी जी का वाक्य है, इसलिए लोग बुरा नहीं मानेंगे।

अब मैं गांधी जी का दूसरा वाक्य पढ़ रहा हूँ, उनकी आत्म-कथा में इसी तरह की एक और बात हुई थी, जब काशी विश्वविद्यालय का शिलारोपण लार्ड हार्डिंग के हाथों हुआ था। उस समय भी एक दरबार किया गया था और उसमें राजे महाराजे भी आये थे। भारत भ्रमण मालवीय जी ने मझगो खाम तौर पर उपस्थित होने का आग्रह किया था। मैं गया। राजा महाराजाओं के वस्त्राभूषणों को, जो केवल स्त्रियों को ही शोभा दे सकते थे, देख कर मुझे बड़ा दुःख हुआ। किसी ने कहा कि ये राज्याधिकार के चिन्ह नहीं, बल्कि गुलामी के चिन्ह हैं। मैं समझता था कि ऐसे नामर्दों के आभूषण वे स्वेच्छा से पहनते होंगे, परन्तु मुझे मालूम हुआ कि ऐसे समारोहों में अपने तमाम कीमती वस्त्राभूषण पहन कर आना उनके लिए लाजमी था। उसके आगे गांधी

जी ने कहा है कि धन, सत्ता और मान मनुष्य से क्या-क्या पाप और अनर्थ नहीं कराते। मैं चाहूंगा कि प्रधान मंत्री साहिबा गांधी जी का नाम कभी-कभी लेती हैं, गांधी जी के इस वाक्य को वे स्मरण करें और जब बोलने लगे तो इसका जवाब दें।

अब मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे पीताम्बर दास जी बोले। मैं एस० एन० मिश्र जी की बड़ी कद्र करता हूँ। नेता विरोधी दल है। मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि भारत की संस्कृति क्या है? भारत की संस्कृति का स्रोत समता है या भारत की संस्कृति का स्रोत विषमता है?

श्री महावीर त्यागी : समता है।

श्री राजनारायण : त्यागी जी ने कहा, समता है। तो अगर एक छोटे से सेक्शन में भी विषमता को मिटाने की ओर बढ़ा जाय, तो समतावादियों को इससे विरोध क्यों हो? मैं इस तर्क को समझ नहीं पा रहा हूँ कि श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी या श्रीमती फीरोज गांधी या प्रधान मंत्री जी द्वारा कोई विधेयक आये और उस से राजाओं को अब तक मिलने वाला जो विशेषाधिकार है, जो थैली कोष है, उसका खात्मा हो तो बुरा क्या है। मैं बहुत ही अदब के साथ कहना चाहूंगा कि आज हमारे वे मित्र जो प्रीवी पर्सनल के विरोधी हैं, छाती पर हाथ रख कर सोचें। कुछ लोग यह कह सकते हैं कि प्रधान मंत्री के हाथ में ज्यादा ताकत बढ़ जायेगी। प्रधान मंत्री की ताकत नहीं बढ़ी है। इस मुद्दाले में रह कर इस विधेयक का विरोध नहीं होना चाहिए। मैं मानता हूँ कि इस समय सबसे कमजोर प्रधान मंत्री है। क्या समझते हैं इस सदन के सम्मानित सदस्य कि यह क्या प्रधान मंत्री की ताकत का इजहार है कि वे यह विधेयक ला रही हैं। यह प्रधान मंत्री की कमजोरी का इजहार है कि उनको यह विधेयक मजबूर होकर लाना पड़ा। जनमत की अवहेलना कर के प्रधान मंत्री कहां तक चल सकती थीं। संसोपा ने अपने जन आंदो-

लनों द्वारा जैसा वातावरण पैदा किया उसमें उसने प्रधान मंत्री की कमजोरी का फायदा उठाया, क्योंकि प्रधान मंत्री, जब कांग्रेस पार्टी दो दलों में विभक्त हो गयी, तो समझने लगीं कि अगर हमको मत्ता में रहना है, तो जनता के लाभ का कुछ काम करें। जनता के लाभ का काम करने के लिए परिस्थिति ने प्रधान मंत्री को मजबूर किया और इसलिए प्रधान मंत्री को इस विधेयक को लेकर आना पड़ा, वरन्ता प्रधान मंत्री क दिन टिक सकती थीं। रोज वातावरण देखा जा रहा है। हमारे मित्र चन्द्र शेखर नहीं हैं। श्रीमन्, मैं आपकी आज्ञा से यहां पर कहना चाहता हूं कि आखिर आपने प्रधान मंत्री को समझा क्या है? क्या आप समझते हैं? प्रधान मंत्री कोई आइडियल हैं? प्रधान मंत्री कोई आदर्शवादी हैं, प्रधान मंत्री कोई सिद्धांतानुवादी हैं। प्रधान मंत्रियों के बारे में, अब के प्रधान मंत्रियों के बारे में नहीं बल्कि इससे पहले के जो बड़े-बड़े प्रधान मंत्री हैं उनके बारे में, गांधी जी की क्या राय है उसको मैं पढ़े देता हूं।] गांधी जी ने कहा है : एक लीडर उनसे पूछता है :

"Then, you are really attacking the very men whom we consider to be patriotic and honest."

गांधी जी से जो सवाल करता है वह कहता है, अब तक जिनको मैं देश भक्त समझता था और ईमानदार समझता था, गांधी जी आप उन पर ही हमला कर रहे हैं, तो गांधी जी ने कहा :

"Yes, it is true. I can have nothing against Prime Ministers, but what I have been seeing leads to think that they cannot be considered really patriotic or to be considered as honest. Because they do not take what are generally known as bribes, should they be so considered? But they are open to subtle influence in order to gain their ends. They certainly bribe the people with honours."

मिश्रा जी, सुनिये, गांधी जी कह रहे हैं :

"I do not hesitate to say that they have neither real honesty nor a living conscience."

यह प्राइम मिनिस्टर के बारे में गांधी जी का कहना है। आप समझते हो कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर आनेस्ट है।

श्री अनन्त प्रसाद शर्मा : पूरी बात पढ़ा करें।

श्री राजनारायण : यह तमाम प्राइम मिनिस्टर्स के बारे में कह रहे हैं, सभी के बारे में कह रहे हैं।

श्री उपसभापति : राजनारायण जी, आप बिल के बारे में बोलिये, आपको जल्दी खत्म करना है।

श्री राजनारायण : जरा सुना जाय। यह जिस प्राइम मिनिस्टर के बारे में वह कह रहे हैं, उनकी इस प्राइम मिनिस्टर से कोई तुलना नहीं है।

अब सुनिये, पार्लियामेंट के बारे में उन्होंने क्या कहा। श्रीमन्, घबड़ाइये मत, जरा सुनिये। उन्होंने कहा :

"Parliament is simply a costly toy of the nation."

यह उन्होंने ब्रिटिश पार्लियामेंट के बारे में कहा है और यहां की पार्लियामेंट तो उससे भी ज्यादा कास्टली है।

श्री एन० जी० गोरे : उन दिन इसे चन्द्र शेखर जी ने पढ़ा था।

श्री राजनारायण : उन दिन चन्द्र शेखर जी ने थोड़ा सा हिस्सा पढ़ा था, चन्द्र शेखर जी हमारे पुराने सहवासी हैं और वह चन्द्र शेखर जी को वाध्य करता है कि कभी-कभी हमारी बातों को भी कहें। तो हमारी पार्लियामेंट जो है वह इस नेशन का, इस राष्ट्र का सचमे बेशकीमती, सबसे ज्यादा, खर्चीला खिलौना है। यह गांधी जी का वाक्य है। जैड० ए० अहमद साहब आप क्या समझते हैं कि गांधी जी कोई बुद्ध थे। उन्होंने यहां तक कहा था :

[श्री राजनारायण]

"Have you considered it—the Mother of Parliament is a sterile woman and a prostitute?"

उन्होंने कहा कि बंध्या औरत है, वेश्या है, पार्लियामेंट के लिये यह कहा । और गांधी जी ने कहा कि पार्लियामेंट कुछ नहीं करती जब तक कि पार्लियामेंट पर आउटसाइड प्रेशर न हो ? तो मिश्रा जी, यह इस पार्लियामेंट के आउटसाइड का प्रेशर है, जो प्रधान मंत्री को मजबूर कर रहा है कि प्रधान मंत्री ऐसा विधेयक लावें । प्रधान मंत्री जब तक प्रभु-ताई में थी, जब तक सचमुच में इनके पास ताकत थी, तब तक यह अपने ताकत के मद में प्रिवी पर्स के समाप्त करने का विधेयक नहीं लाई, मगर जब प्राइम मिनिस्टर कमजोर हो गई, तो उस कमजोरी को कम्पेंसेट करने के लिये इनको ज़रूरी हुआ कि हम कोई ऐसा काम करें जिससे कि जनता को एहसास हो कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर भी कुछ हमारे साथ चलने के लिये तैयार है ...

श्री पंढरीनाथ सीतारामजी पाटिल (महाराष्ट्र) : राजनारायण जी, इतने दिन तक जो गैर-हज़िर थे तो क्या उसका सारा समय आज ही निकालना है ?

श्री राजनारायण : बेकार को पांच मिनट हमारा ले लिया इन्होंने ।

श्री उपसभापति : पांच सैंकड़ भी नहीं लिया ।

श्री राजनारायण : तो मैं आपके द्वारा आदरणीय मिश्रा जी और अपने बुजुर्ग भाई पीताम्बर दास जी और डाह्याभाई जी से निवेदन करूंगा कि अगर प्रधान मंत्री की कूटनीति और इनके छल-कपट का और इनका सामना करना है तो सीधे चलो, सीधे पथ पर चलिये । छल-कपट और कूटनीति से भरी हुई प्रधान मंत्री का सामना कूटनीति और असत्य मार्ग का अवलम्बन करके किया ही नहीं जा सकता । अगर प्रधान मंत्री का सामना करना है, तो सीधे चलिये । क्या आप समझते हैं कि प्रधान मंत्री करें कि हम प्रिवी

पर्स समाप्त करें और अपोजीशन कहे कि हम उसको कायम रखेंगे, तो आप प्रधान मंत्री का सामना करेंगे ? तब प्रधान मंत्री का सामना नहीं कर पायेंगे, यह मैं सफाई के साथ कहना चाहता हूं । प्रधान मंत्री का सामना करना है, तो हमारे मार्ग का अवलम्बन करिये, हमारे साथ आइये ।

मैं राजाओं से एक विनम्रता के साथ निवेदन करना चाहता हूं । हमारे राजागण, इतने दिनों तक जो प्रधान मंत्री आपको लटकाये रहीं और आप लोगों ने अखबारों में बयान दिया कि प्रधान मंत्री ने विश्वासघात किया, ऐसे प्रधान मंत्री पर यकीन कभी मत करना । खाद बनो । डा० लोहिया ने हमें सिखाया है कि समाज में बढ़िया पुष्प पल्लवित करने के लिये आज अपने को खाद बनाओ । मैं राजाओं को कहना चाहता हूं, महाराजाओं को कहना चाहता हूं कि समाज को सुन्दर बनाने के लिये खाद बनने के लिये तैयार हों । कही इस चकल्लस में रहेंगे कि प्रधान मंत्री से बातचीत करेंगे तो कुछ हाथ नहीं आयेगा । अभी तक तो उन्होंने प्रधान मंत्री की पार्टी का साथ दिया, अभी तक तो वे लोग प्रधान मंत्री की रूलिंग कांग्रेस में थे, राजा लोगों ने हमारा तो कभी साथ नहीं दिया, हमको तो कभी मदद नहीं दी, हमको तो कभी एक पैसे से चन्दा नहीं दिया, कभी तक तो प्रधान मंत्री का प्रधान-मन्त्रित्व कायम रखने का महापाप उन्होंने किया । अब प्रधान मंत्री जनता के दबाव में आ गई, तो राजा कहते हैं कि प्रधान मंत्री तो छलनी हैं, प्रधान मंत्री तो वचन-भंगी हैं, इनका हमें विश्वास नहीं । इस तरह के प्रधान मंत्री का विश्वास किया, यही राजा लोगों की सबसे बुनियादी गलती थी ।

इसी के साथ-साथ, मैं इस देश के जो बड़े बड़े उद्योगपति हैं, उनको भी कहना चाहता हूं ...

श्री उपसभापति : समाप्त कीजिये, राजनारायण जी ।

श्री राजनारायण : मैं खत्म कर रहा हूँ, जरा दो-चार मिनट सुन लीजिये। हम यहां बड़े-बड़े उद्योगपतियों से कहना चाहते हैं कि प्रधान मंत्री के चुनाव-चन्दे में लाखों करोड़ों रुपये का चन्दा देकर अगर वे चाहेंगे कि उनका एकाधिकार कायम रहेगा तो असम्भव है, नामुमकिन है, जब तक भूपेश गुप्त प्रधान मंत्री को बचाने के लिये रहेंगे। एक दिन समाजवादी शक्तियां भाई भूपेश गुप्त को मजबूर करेंगी कि प्रधान मंत्री का साथ छोड़ कर राजनारायण के साथ चलो, यही तुम्हारा मार्ग है। भूपेश गुप्त उन लोगों को नहीं बचा पायेंगे, वह आसाम आ रहे हैं। और मैं आज अदब के साथ सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर वे ईमानदार हैं, अगर वे राजाओं के प्रिवी पर्स को सही मानें में समाप्त करना चाहते हैं, तो जो बिना मुआवजा समाप्त करने का हमारा संशोधन है, उस पर वोट करें, हम उस पर डिवीजन करायेंगे। प्रधान मंत्री साहिवा अगर स्पर्श-क्रांतिकारी नहीं हैं, क्रांतिकारिता उनमें लेशमात्र भी है, तो मैं उनसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे संशोधन को मान लें। वे रात को खा-पीकर सोयें, छाती पर हाथ रखे, राजनारायण ने जो बात कही है उसका गंभीरता से अध्ययन करें, विचार करें। हमारे मित्र के० सी० पन्त हंस रहे हैं, उन्हें हंसता देख कर मुझे गोविन्द वल्लभ पन्त जी की बातें याद आ जाया करती हैं, मैं उनका आदर करता था, श्रद्धा रखता था। मैं इस समय सरदार वल्लभ भाई पटेल के बारे में कुछ नहीं कहूंगा तो मैं सदन के साथ न्याय नहीं करूंगा। सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यगण क्या यह समझते हैं कि राजाओं के प्रिवी पर्स का सौदा सरदार ने जिया? अगर उनके दिमाग के कोने में यह बात हो तो उसे निकाल दे। पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू को देश में समझने वाला केवल एक व्यक्ति था, तो डा० लोहिया था। जब गांधी जी की हत्या हुई—गोरे साहब जानते होंगे—हमारी पार्टी के जयप्रकाश नारायण थे, उन्होंने कहा कि बयान निकाल दो कि गृह-

मंत्री की अकुशलता के कारण गांधी जी की हत्या हुई। डा० लोहिया ने कहा कि हरगिज यह बयान नहीं जायगा, बयान जायगा तो प्रधान मंत्री का भी नाम जायगा। प्रधान मंत्री को बचाने के लिये आप गृह-मंत्री को कहना चाहते हैं, प्रधान मंत्री सारी बातों का जिम्मेदार है। और डा० लोहिया ने सार्वजनिक बयान दिया सरदार वल्लभभाई पटेल के मरने के बाद कि साल भर का मैं समय देता हूँ, जो कुछ आरोप सरदार वल्लभभाई पटेल पर लगे थे, जवाहर लाल जो उन हुआ है उसको अनडन कर दें। तो जो सरदार थे जवाहर लाल जी नहीं थे। जवाहर लाल जी इन सब बातों में बड़े चतुर थे। और इंदिरा गांधी जी ने उनके भी कान काट दिये। बड़े मिया तो बड़े मिया छोटे मियां सुबहान अल्लाह। ये और आगे बढ़ी और आगे बढ़ कर, ये चाहे जो समझती है, किसी जगह पर स्थिर नहीं है। और हमारे बुजुर्ग जिनकी मैं इज्जत करता हूँ, बाबू त्रिलोकी सिंह, उन्होंने कह दिया कि कांसिस्टेन्सी तो मूर्खों का गुण है : consistency is the virtue of fools.

SHRI S. D. MISRA : Horse !

श्री राजनारायण : हास नहीं बल। तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ, अगर त्रिलोकी सिंह कहें क्रमबद्ध शालीनता गधों और मूर्खों का स्वभाव और गुण है, तो कृपा कर के आप एक दिन गधा बन जायें। गधा बन जाओगे तो मामला बन जायेगा।

श्री त्रिलोकी सिंह : संग में बन सकता हूँ।

श्री राजनारायण : बन सकने नहीं है, बन गये हैं। वह तो बना दिया है। तो मैं इतना ही निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ, श्रीमन्, आपको पुनः अपनी ओर से धन्यवाद देते हुए कि आपने पहले हमको जो थोड़ा समय दिया कि मैं अपनी बात कह कर चला जाऊंगा, तो मैं थोड़ा सा संविधान के वारें में कह कर . . .

श्री उपसभापति : अब तो समाप्त कीजिये राजनारायण जी।

श्री राजनारायण: दो मिनट और दीजियेगा। मैं यह संविधान के बारे में पूछना चाहता हूँ। देखिये उसके बारे में मैं सफाई चाहूंगा यह आर्टिकल 362 और 291 और 363, यह 363 क्या चीज है।

श्री उपसभापति : वह मव जानते हैं। बतलाने की क्या जरूरत है।

श्री राजनारायण: मैं आपको भी बतलाना चाहता हूँ। राजाओं के साथ जितनी संधि, जितना समझौता, जो कुछ है वह अपनी जगह पर है। प्रिवी पर्स समाप्त होने की बात हल हो गई, मगर राजाओं के साथ जो समझौता हुआ वह अपनी जगह पर है कि नहीं?

श्री श्याम नन्दन मिश्र : अमली बात है।

श्री राजनारायण : तो यह कांटेडिक्शन क्यों है, असंगति क्यों है, इसकी सफाई होनी चाहिये। क्या इसको समाप्त करने के बाद राजाओं के साथ जितने समझौते हैं, वे समाप्त हो जाते हैं या कायम रहते हैं। तो उन्हीं समझौतों की बुनियाद पर प्रधान मंत्री से अलग-अलग सौदा करेंगे। तो हम प्रधान मंत्री की लोक सभा में कही बात स्वीकार करने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं कि हम लोगों से अलग-अलग सौदा नहीं करेंगे, सौदेबाजी नहीं होगी, हम एक नियम बना देंगे, हम राजाओं को कुछ देना चाहते हैं, उनको मारना नहीं चाहते। मारे या नहीं मारें लेकिन समय का प्रवाह है। समय की शिला पर मधुर चित्र किसी ने बनाये क्या? किसी ने नहीं बनाये। यह समय की शिला है, इसमें कितने ही मधुर चेहरे आयेंगे, चले जायेंगे। आज इंदिरा नेहरू आंधी आयीं, वह चली जायेंगी, कल विलोकी सिंह भी चले जायेंगे। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि भारत का जो सबसे बड़ा विश्वास है, अगर विश्वास ही नहीं रहेगा, तो देश कैसे रहेगा...

(Time bell rings)

इसलिये श्रीमन्, आपके द्वारा विनम्र के साथ प्रधान मंत्री साहिबा से निवेदन करूंगा कि वह जरा अपने दिल को टटोलें कि वह विधेयक लाई, जिस ढंग से लाई, वह कहाँ तक ईमानदारी से और सच्चाई से भरा हुआ है। मैं चाहूंगा

प्रधान मंत्री अब तक जिस तरह की प्रधान मंत्री थी उससे आगे बढ़ें। अब तक उनका जो जीवन प्रधान मंत्री का रहा है, वह बिल्कुल खट्टा था। मैं चाहता हूँ उनका प्रधान मंत्रीत्व जीवन कुछ मीठा भी हो। लेकिन जो विधेयक आया है, उससे मिठास नहीं आयेगा, वह खट्टे का खट्टा रहेगा। इसलिये प्रधान मंत्री अगर अपने प्रधान मंत्रीत्व को मीठा बनाना चाहती है, देश की जनता के लिये लाभ कर बनाना चाहती हैं, तो बिना किसी हिचक के, बिला मुआवजा राजाओं के निजी कोष को समाप्त करके, विशेषाधिकार को समाप्त करें और जो हमने अपनी घोषणा पत्र का पहला हिस्सा रखा, 1953 के घोषणा पत्र का, उसका लागू करें। राजाओं के पास बड़ी-बड़ी जमीन शहरों में कितनी है, कितना रुपया बैंक में है, जेवरात और जवाहरात कितने हैं, उनके पास कितने बड़े-बड़े खेत हैं, जिनके बारे में हदबंदी होते हुए भी, सीलिंग का कानून होते हुए भी, उनके पास अतिरिक्त भूमि है और भी, तमाम चीजें हैं, जिनके बारे में वह लागू हो। तब हम मानेंगे ईमानदारी और सच्चाई है, नहीं तो नहीं है।

SHRI JOACHIM ALVA (Nominated): Mr. Deputy Chairman, in warmly supporting the Motion moved in a historical manner by the hon. Prime Minister, I want to speak about the vagabonds, the traitors and also the martyrs of Indian Nationalism. The Leader of the Opposition said that Sardar Patel had drawn a big curtain and you have to forget it all. Then, no question of gratitude in politics is there; gratitude does not last for ever. There is something like changing values all the time. It was Sardar Patel—I had the honour of knowing him personally—who drew a big curtain over the affairs of men.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) in the Chair]

When he drew up the treaty with the Princes, he drew a big curtain over all that they did in the past. And what did they do? We are trying to forget it. We are trying to forget the vagabonds of society amongst whom there were a lot of Princes. The Nizam of Hyderabad and the Maharaja of Travancore raised their big hand

against Indian nationalism and several others. These are facts which we are trying to forget. Nobody has mentioned these facts here. There were Princes who wanted the British Raj to remain here for ever. But for the great sacrifices made by the people of India, the great sacrifices made by the masses of India, by the great number of people, things would have remained as they then were. Young men under 21 went smilingly to the gallows; these are not known even to their families.

Then there was the case of a former Maharaja of Indore who killed a well-known Muslim citizen of Bombay. Bawla, on account of a dancing girl, Mumtaz. The late Messrs. Jinnah and J. M. Sen Gupta defended the murderers set up by the then ex-Ruler of Indore, Tukojirao. Lord Reading, a great Viceroy, ordered Tukojirao to face a trial for murder or quit the gaddi. Tukoji Rao was forced to quit the Gaddi. Bawla's mother told me that she wanted her surviving second son to phone her even in the night at 8-30 p.m., because the first son was murdered by Indore hirelings just at 8-30 p.m.

Then the case of another Prince, I shall not name him. Perhaps most of you or some of you were then too young to have known about it. Another Prince was tied up with 33 lakhs of rupees because a lady was involved in England. The case went even to the Secretary of State, but everything was done to hide the case. Then you know the case of the ex-Maharaja of Baroda and Sia Devi. I am only concerned with the facts of the case.

About the ex-Maharaja Pratap Singh : He fell at the feet of Jawaharlal Nehru later, but what did he do? He carried away the gold and silver of this land to a lady in Paris who left her husband and her Hindu faith. She will not dare to return to India.

Then we had the old Maharaja of Patiala. The way he functioned, the number of women that were there in his palace and all that. It is all in the book on Maharajas published recently.

SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADH-
YAY (West Bengal) : Sir, on a point of order. We are fighting for a principle. I do not think it is wise of this House to

personally attack anybody. We are fighting for a cause.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS :
Yes, yes.

SHRI JOACHIM ALVA : Then we come to Gwalior.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI
AKBAR ALI KHAN) : I would like you to abstain from personal references.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : What is 'personal' about it? Undoubtedly we are free to talk about the Maharajas. Are they gods?

SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHER-
JEE (West Bengal) : They are made heroes.

SHRI JOACHIM ALVA : I will speak relevantly, Sir. Then we come to Gwalior. I have travelled about half a dozen times in the early fifties from Indore to Gwalior on way to and from Delhi. There is not a blade of grass in the land for years. But the horses were running, a number of horses, horses costing from two to twenty lakhs of rupees. From Indore to Gwalior there was then not a blade of grass, across 300 miles of Indian territory. Now we come to the vagabonds, martyrs and traitors of Indian nationalism. You know the story of Hyderabad. While I was on my first journey to Europe, I saw via the Karachi airport in 1948 four aeroplanes by an Australian adventurer named Cotton going from and coming to Hyderabad creating trouble for India. We want to have a soft corner for these people. Before Hyderabad finally acceded to India numberless negotiations were carried on with which the then Viceroy Lord Mountbatten was disgusted and the matter was settled by the seizure of Hyderabad. I must say that the present Ruler of Hyderabad is a talented young man. He is an Oxford graduate. He is different from his grand father. He has read the signs of the times. But here I am talking of the old man. Therefore, there is no question of principle involved. We can never forget these things when we scan through the pages of history.

Then we come to Travancore before its final accession to India under the regime of the late Diwan, late Sir C. P. Ramaswamy Iyer, who gave India hell of a trouble. Sir

[Shri Joachim Alva]

C. P. Ramaswamy Iyer actually sent an envoy to Pakistan and wanted to join up with Pakistan. Once he was a hireling of the British Raj, and as the hireling of the Rani in Travancore there was tremendous repression of the people's liberties. He later became the *de facto* Ruler of Travancore. Somebody cut him with a sword. We cannot forget these things. There is no question of gratitude to people who have done so much wrong.

We talk of gratitude. What is the meaning of gratitude? There cannot be any gratitude to the people who have done so much wrong. Very few, too few Princes amongst the Maharajas were really good. There was the former Ruler of Jodhpur. He wanted to go over to Pakistan. You know all that. They would have gone to Pakistan but for the upsurge of the people and the spirit of the people. They would have gone with their palaces, their hirelings and their money bags to London. Now in the year 1970, when things should be changed for the people of India they have been hanging on to the past.

Sir, there are good people also amongst them. I was mentioning about what the late Sayaji Rao of Baroda did at the Delhi Durbar. He walked in the Durbar as a man should walk and not walk in a humiliating way as the other Princes did before the then King Emperor George and Queen Mary. It was not easy, because most of the Maharajas were the satellites of the King; they were afraid even of the A.D.Cs. of the Viceroy. I should, therefore, pay my tribute to the Maharaja of Baroda, the late Sayaji Rao under whom were the late Arvind Ghosh, late Dr. Ambedkar, Dr. K. M. Munshi and our great friend, Mr. Ruthnaswamy, as teachers in his educational system. Therefore, we cannot forget him. He was the one man who turned his back on the King Emperor George V. and for which he suffered. His Maharani, the late Shrimati Chinnabai, told me herself that as a result to punish him, one of the acts against him was that the British refused to give permission to the mother of Rajmata Gayatri Devi of Jaipur to marry the then Ruler of Gwalior. There are good men also. How can we forget the late Maharaja of Nabha? I still remember how the late Pandit Motilal Nehru was interested against his detention. We recall the late Benjamin

Guy Horniman, one of India's great journalists, handing over papers connected with the Maharaja of Nabha to the late Pandit Motilal Nehru. I watched this incident as a student at a meeting in Bombay. So these are the few lilies in the field. But what kind of gratitude can you give to the other unworthy ones? Some of them were immoral debauches. We as human beings permit a certain amount of rasacity amongst ourselves but not beyond a certain point. We shall not bow beyond a certain point.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Sir, why should you allow all these irrelevant things? Is that relevant at all? How is that relevant to the point?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : What is irrelevant about it? Privy purses, after all, have been allowed for the maintenance of their families, staff and harems. Without privy purse how many Rajas and Nawabs can be thought of? Therefore, it is a relevant subject... (*Interruption by Shri Kalyan Roy*).

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : How are you interested in history...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Order, please. Please wind up.

SHRI JOACHIM ALVA : We are interested in the privy purse because the privy purses come directly from the pockets of the people. That is what I am concerned with. I shall end up by saying that we should be concerned with the privileges and the rights of the people of India. How many people have gone to the gallows? How many people have died in the Sino-Indian war? Do you look after their wives and children? Have you given them any privy purses? Is any money going to them? And to-day you are fighting for a handful of people. It is our duty to take away these privileges. Sir, I must mention that two most important constitutional proposals have come through a woman. It is very interesting. The first is the question of banks which had been dominated by men throughout; the second is the question of Maharajas; most of them are Maharajas, except, of course, the late Begum of Bhopal. So, we are glad that the hon. Prime Minister brought these two proposals which are both good for the country.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I rise to speak on a momentous occasion. Now we are about to pass one of the significant Bills to emerge from this Parliament.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : We are going to defeat it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Let us see. Now, Sir, I say it is momentous not only because we are going to abolish the legacy of the dismal and dead past, the privy purses and privileges of the despots and tyrants and the traitors and oppressors of the people, but also because we are going, to-day and tomorrow, by passing this Bill, to strike a blow to the heart of right reaction. These Princes who were servitors of British imperialism in the days of the British, have become the instruments of reaction and counter-revolution under the present regime. Hence, the significance of this measure extends far beyond the monetary considerations or even a few private families who may be denied the privy purses and the privileges.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, before I speak, naturally I recall to mind the great sacrifices and sufferings and the martyrdom of hundreds of thousands of States people in those days of our freedom fight who stood up to the monstrosity of the Princely regime and made the supreme sacrifice. Today their dreams are not going to be fulfilled, but a step in that direction we are taking, by striking a blow to the privy purses and privileges symbolising the Princely order of tyranny and oppression. Now, much has been said about the greatness of the Indian Princes, their great contribution, their great heritage. Do the Princes think that India has lost commonsense? They should credit the Indian people with a little more sense of patriotism and with commonsense. What they say is really contrary to historical facts. I recall to the House to-day what Lord Canning in a despatch on April 30, 1860, said. After Queen Victoria's proclamation, after having suppressed the Indian rebellion of 1857, this is what Lord Canning said :

"It was long ago said by Sir John Malcolm that if we had made all India into *zilas*, it was in the nature of things that an Empire would last 50 years; but if we could keep up a number of native

States, without political power, but as royal instruments, we should exist in India as long as our naval supremacy was maintained."

So, the Princely States were created by the British and maintained by the British in India in order to perpetuate the colonial slavery. Hence these Princely institutions are associated with the horrid memory of the nightmare of colonial rule, colonial subjection and national humiliation. I would presently invite the attention of the House to the Report of the Indian States' Committee otherwise known as the Butler Committee appointed by the British Government in 1929. The Committee said—about the Princes :—

"Their loyalty at the time of the mutiny, their noble services in the great war, their splendid devotion to the crown and the person of the King Emperor and the royal family are one of the proud things of our annals and the glory of the empire."

So are we to perpetuate the glory of the empire by taxing the Exchequer? This is the question. The same Committee went on :

"The promise of the King Emperor to maintain unimpaired the privileges, rights and dignities of the Princes carries with it a duty to protect the Prince against attempt to eliminate him and substitute another form of Government."

These are the pronouncements from the patrons, from the masters of the Princes, the British imperialists.

Now much has been said from these benches about Mahatma Gandhi. There is another gentleman who goes under the name of Morarji Desai, who has always misunderstood Mahatma Gandhi and who quotes Gandhiji always. He says all kinds of things in respect of the privy purses. What did Mahatma Gandhi say? Mahatma Gandhi wrote in *Hindustan* on October 7, 1939—friends opposite should also hear—.

DR. B. N. ANTANI : At Raighat Mahatma Gandhi must be very happy just now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : All right. You never understand anything. You are a Mahatma yourself.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

Mahatma Gandhi wrote in *Harijan* on October 7, 1939 :

"But every Indian Prince is a Hitler in his own State. He can shoot his people without coming under law, Hitler enjoys no greater powers."

Are we to perpetuate these prototypes of Hitler in this country? This is the question I put before the nation. You answer it. This is Gandhiji's own quotation. They do not know about Gandhiji and they never care to read about him or his life.

Now let me come to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. I quote from his autobiography. Even his daughter has forgotten his autobiography. I may remind the House and the friends here who have not only forgotten it, but who would like to bury it now with the blessings of Mr. Nijalingappa and Mr. Morarji Desai, of what his autobiography says :

"A sense of oppression comes; it is stifling and difficulty to breath, and below the still and slow moving waters there is stagnation and putrefaction."

"How much of the wealth of the State flows into the palaces for personal needs and luxuries of the prince, how little goes back to the people in the form of any service?"

Now, how much was going to the Princes has also been stated in his book, "Indian Feudal States and National Liberation Struggle" by Mr. A. R. Desai. He said :

"The King of England receives roughly one in 1,600 of the national revenue, the King of Belgium one in 1,000, the King of Italy one in 500, the King of Denmark one in 300, the Emperor of Japan one in 400. No king receives one in 17 like the Maharani of Travancore (which is the most progressive State in India), one in 13 as the Nizam of Hyderabad or the Maharaja of Baroda, ..."

Maharaja of Baroda is the Convenor-General of the Concord. Do you know—his father was called "His Highness"? Farzand Khas Daulat-i-Inglshia. What does it mean? His Highness the special son of the English State, special son, not of the Indian people, but special son of the English State. And we have to

pay money for this special son of Daulat-i-Inglshia. And now our friends talk about patriotism. He also wrote :

"The world would be scandalised to know that not a few Princes appropriate one in 3 and one in 2 of the revenues of the State."

This is what they say. Now, before I go to the other point, I should also like to remind you of what Karl Marx stated, Karl Marx, the founder of Marxism-Leninism, the founder of communism, writing in "New York Daily Tribune" dated July 25, 1853—nearly a century and a quarter ago :

"The native princes are the stronghold of the present abominable. English system and the greatest obstacle to Indian progress."

Therefore, as far as the Communists are concerned, the definition of the princes was there, not today not even when Bhupesh Gupta was born, but this definition was there a century and a quarter ago and the princes were defined by the founder of the scientific communism, Karl Marx. This is the background as far as this point is concerned.

Now let me come to some other points relating to covenants and agreements. My friend has gone away. Where has he gone away? Shri S. M. Mishra with a tilak on his forehead—where is he? Tilak is sometimes used for covering up sins.

SHRI N. SRI RAMA REDDY : Please do not indulge in outright criticism. This is very unfair. Some people consider tilak as a sacred thing.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Tilak is a sacred thing. But it is not on a sacred forehead, in this case ideologically.

Regarding agreements and covenants, I would like to say that when the Constituent Assembly was considering the Constitution, the original draft Constitution did not have any provision which the government is deleting now. The original draft Constitution presented to the Constituent Assembly by the Congress leaders of the time and the Constitution sub-committee of the Constituent Assembly did not think in

terms of making any provision whatsoever, for the privy purses or for special privileges of the princes. In fact a Constitutional amendment was brought in the course of the discussion and this was brought in by Sardar Patel. It was produced on the floor of the Constituent Assembly by Sardar Patel, Shri V. P. Menon and Shri C. C. Desai. The three had come to the conclusion that privy purses should be included in the Constitution of the country and hence article 291 emerged. It was a different article. When they passed the Constitution amendment, it was re-numbered. Those who talk about the Constitution should know very well that the Constituent Assembly was faced with a surprise all on a sudden when an amendment was brought in and hurriedly got passed. You must recall this. The proceedings of the Constituent Assembly are there. Let us, therefore, talk on the basis of facts. In the Constituent Assembly these agreements were settled and the covenants were discussed. Sardar Patel himself gave the reason while explaining his position on 12th October, 1949. He said :

"The capacity for mischief and trouble on the part of the rulers, if a settlement with them is not reached on a negotiated basis was far greater than we could imagine..."

Therefore, it was plain that we had to agree to pay them money because these princes, these tyrants, these traitors took advantage of the difficult situation in the country soon after independence and black-mailed the Government, brought pressure and bullied the Government with the assistance of some I.C.S. officials in the Secretariat. A *coup d'état* against the nation was thus staged on the Constituent Assembly which had to agree to sanction the privy purses and this article was included in the Constitution to defile the Constitution of India.

What are these privy purses? Up till now, according to the Finance Ministry, taking the budget estimates up to 1971, we have already paid Rs. 107,51,31,185. Hundred and seven crores of rupees we have paid. You can say, Rs. 107½ crores, which we have already paid according to the Budget figures given recently by the Finance Ministry including, of course, the current

year's Budget Estimate. Now, out of this Rs. 100 crores paid up to 1969-70, twenty top Rulers grabbed Rs. 55.11 crores and this is how they have cornered the money, the privy purses. Do you know how it was settled? Sardar Patel revealed it and it is stated in the White Book on "The Indian States". It was settled like this: Sardar Patel deputed a Secretary of his Department to meet the Princes and the local officials and then settle the privy purse to be paid to the Indian Princes, on the basis of the documents supplied and claims made by the Princes themselves. There was not even proper scrutiny into the papers and the documents and the claims put forward by the Princes which is why the Maharaja of Baroda ran away with 26 lakhs of rupees, the Maharaja of Mysore with 26 lakhs of rupees and the Nizam was given 50 lakhs of rupees and so on. This is how it was done. As you know... (*Time belt rings*) ...Sir, you have given half an hour for Shri Raj Narain.

Sir, this is what I say. Therefore, let us not talk about the obligations in respect of privy purses. Now, it is not the money that matters, the money, hundred crores of rupees in about twenty years.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Sir, you must not be so generous. If you are so generous in allowing time to people who are speaking in favour of the Bill, of abolition of the privy purse, you will have to give me time. I want to speak for half an hour. You must be generous to this side also. You cannot do it this way.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : I will be equally generous.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Now, I must tell you that Rs. 100 crores is the net income, the net money given to the Princes free of tax. Do you know how much income you require to have a net earning of Rs. 100 crores? You require a gross income, subject to tax, of the order of Rs. 1,000 crores. Therefore, the privileges and advantages given to the Princes are not to be measured in terms of the net money they get, but in terms of the gross income that would be required to yield that kind of net income, if they were subject to taxes. Therefore, you see, you have

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.]

a category of people who enjoy the privileges and position which are far greater than what even the Birlas and the Tatas are enjoying in spite of their earnings and so on. This is very important and you should bear this in mind.

And, yet, I was surprised that the Maharaja of Baroda, who calls himself the Convenor-General of the Concord—I do not know why the Prime Minister is talking to him needlessly when she has no time. If she has plenty of time to talk to the Princes, she can spend the time in good music and some cultural show instead of wasting the time in talking to these useless Princes who have insulted us—has said this. Do you know what the Maharaja of Baroda said in a public statement... (Interruptions) He has said this :

“It is an act of betrayal and perfidy by the State and the Government”

This is what you have got. You have negotiated for five, six or seven months; you have negotiated a number of times and held six meetings with them, only to be told that you have committed an act of treachery and perfidy to the Princes. And, yet, we find the Prime Minister saying that she is ready to discuss with them and pay compensation to the Princes. What compensation?

We are not taking any property from them under the Constitution. We have not given any property. These provisions of the Constitution only guarantee certain payment in a particular way, as far as Article 291 is concerned, in certain agreement signed elsewhere. Why then the question of compensation comes? The Articles of the Constitution relevant to the acquisition of property do not apply. We are only taking away some privileges that we offered to them. That is about all. We are not extinguishing any right. We have been over-generous. We are withdrawing the generosity from the Princes. I do not know why people should pay compensation for withdrawing the generosity over a period of 23 years or heavy payment at the cost of the exchequer in the midst of the starving millions of our country. Therefore I would ask the Prime Minister not to talk about the transitional arrangements. Transition from what? Transition from a monumental folly to a kind of bargain with the Princes again? This would be contrary to the spirit in which we

are passing this measure. Therefore, I say, give up this idea of tampering and compensating the Princes. They are not destitutes from East Pakistan. They are not beggars in the streets. They have not come from West Pakistan driven by some other people. They are rich people. In fact some years ago on the floor of this House it was revealed that some of the Princes had foreign accounts of the order of Rs. 30 crores in the British and other banks. They have palaces, they have jewellery, they have so many other things and what is the use of again paying compensation to them? Therefore this idea should not also be entertained.

Before I sit down I say that the question of compensation does not arise. The question of betrayal or violation of any commitment does not arise. We had made no commitment to them that for generation after generation we shall bear the stigma and disgrace of payment to the oppressors of the people. There is no commitment. If they talk about the pledges, what about the pledges to the 500 million people of our country, starving, unemployed, lining up before the Employment Exchanges without jobs, suffering without drinking water in many places? What about the pledges to them? The pledges to them had not been only voiced in the resolutions passed from the platforms of the Congress or from the State Peoples Congress. The pledges to the masses are given in the Preamble to the Constitution which opens with the pledge to the people. The pledges to our masses are given in the Directive Principles of our Constitutions. The pledges to the people are given in the Five Year Plans of our country. The pledge to the people we gave in our election manifesto on the basis of which we get elected thereby getting a mandate of the people. What about the violation of these? Who are going to redeem these pledges? When the unemployed shall have employment? When the hungry will have food? When the landless will have land? Therefore I submit that the Princely Order is a shameful Order. The Princely Order is something which is abominable, abhorrent to the conscience of the nation. It is not a question of individual Rajas or Ranis. I do not know them and I do not wish to know them but they are symbols of shame, dishonour, treachery, tyranny, violation of all that is decent and good in our public life. They are the ex-

crecence of our society. Therefore I have great pleasure in supporting this and I do not see my friend Mr. Dharra here. He took the initiative in moving the amendment to get it passed at the AICC which moved the Ruling Party for the passage of the Bill, which symbolises the unity of the progressive forces sitting in these Benches and those who are sitting in the other Benches like my friends, Shri Krishan Kant, Shri Chandra Shekhar, Shri Dharra and many others. Here is an occasion when we are uniting in concrete terms for the sake of the nation, not in any partisan spirit but recapturing the spirit of the nation, recapturing the highest tradition of our national struggle. Here is a symbol of unity for us and the symbol of tyrann is being fought unitedly by all of us sitting on both sides. Tomorrow we shall given even a more crushing defeat to the side of reaction and the Princes' Lobby in this House than in the other House. I agree with the Prime Minister when she appealed to us that the Rajya Sabha should give effect to its own resolution. In this House only last year we passed a resolution telling the nation that the Rajya Sabha is for abolition of the Privy Purses and except my friend Shri Lokanath Misra, not one Member voted against that resolution. Is it not our duty today to tell the nation that the Rajya Sabha Members, collectively and individually, mean what they say, that they do not mean it as a mere talking shop, that they are not double-talkers, that they do fulfil the pledge they took on the floor of this House? Therefore, Sir, not only for the sake of the national honour but for the honour of the House also, we must pass this Bill with a thumping majority and tell the nation that we are falling in step with them

Thank you.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : At what time the voting would take place?

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Tomorrow.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : Tomorrow at what time of the clock?

SHRI M. N. KAUL : After the Prime Minister's reply

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : Will it be in the forenoon?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : Probably in the forenoon, I am told definitely in the forenoon...

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI : It means that the debate will practically close today and the Prime Minister will reply tomorrow, say, between 11 and 12, and after that the voting will take place.

SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, if personal equations were to be squared, perhaps I would have been the first man to support this Bill today. If there is anybody, who has been much wronged by the Princes, it is myself. But that is not the criterion to be taken into consideration when a very high principle is involved. I want to bring to your kind notice, Mr. Vice-Chairman, this Bill, which is being put before us, I intend to oppose it tooth and nail. It is not for the first time that I am opposing this Bill, this proposition. I have on all occasions, whenever discussions have taken place in my party on such a proposition, whether it was in the Jabalpur Congress or in the Delhi Congress or, after the split in the Congress, in the Gandhinagar Congress, I have always opposed it, and I intend to do so today.

The Constitution (Twenty-fourth Amendment) Bill, which is before our august House, seeks to end the concept of rulership and abolish the privy purses and special privileges of ex-rulers. This Bill has been described as historic by the Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi. I agree with her, though for different reasons. Certainly, history will decide how we legislators have exercised our private conscience and conformed to public morality.

The Lok Sabha has passed the Bill by a small margin. It is up to us in the Rajya Sabha to view the whole issue independently and pragmatically. We derive our authority from the Constitution and the Constitution clearly shows that the Rajya Sabha is equal in status and in no way inferior to Lok Sabha, and the two Houses together that constitute the Parliament of India have to agree for any amendment of the Constitution. Under the procedure laid down, an amendment of the Constitution may be initiated by introducing a Bill in either House of Parliament. If only this Bill had been introduced earlier in the Rajya Sabha rather than in the Lok Sabha, I venture to say that the outcome would have been different.

[Shri Babubhai M. Chinai]

I am not for a moment suggesting that the hon. Members of the Lok Sabha are careless of their obligations or lack in objectivity. My short point is that we from the Rajya Sabha must believe the popular but erroneous dictum that, if a Second Chamber dissents from the first, it is mischievous; if it agrees with the first, it is superfluous. As I have already said, ours is not a Second Chamber, nor an Upper House. Our Constitution has clearly specified our high role in the legislative work of Parliament.

Only if we vote against the Bill we will be true to ourselves and to the great patriots who are no more with us, but who in their wisdom thought it necessary and right to give protection to former Rulers—a protection in terms of specific articles in the Constitution of India.

Speaking in the Lok Sabha, the Union Finance Minister, Chavan Sahib, said that history has ordained that privy purses and other princely privileges should be abolished now. He went on to say that this was a compulsion of history. These are fine words. But the fact of the matter is that history is not an inert force nor is it pre-determined. History is neither natural nor supernatural. It is made or un-made by people, who take decisions. Today, we have been called upon to take a decision. We are here to exercise our free will, free will both in the democratic as well as philosophical senses. There is nothing fatalistic about this Bill. We can by our own conscious freeplay of wills, individually and collectively, not allow a betrayal to take place.

We will be betraying the ex-Rulers as well as our great leaders who are no more with us. I appeal to the Prime Minister to abide by the Indian tradition, and that tradition is to discharge the obligations that have been committed by their fathers in their lifetime. Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, the architect of India's independence, committed himself to the princes. Will the daughter, who is in a position of power disown what her father had committed? Is she going to betray her father?

A reference has been made to the undivided Congress which by an AICC Resolution accepted in 1967 to abolish in

principle the privy purses and princely privileges. Even then, I spoke against this Resolution. And I cannot help saying that the two wings of the Congress seem to have this one undesirable objective in common even while there is enough of common ground for them to get together in more worthwhile causes.

This Bill represents in the extreme a distorted sense of proportion in relation to the march of the nation towards the direction of modernisation and democratisation of Indian society. The Prime Minister has herself admitted that the abolition of privy purses and princely privileges will not solve poverty, unemployment or any other problem facing the millions. Thus the Bill represents a complete escapism from the real problems of public welfare. The source of confusion in the minds of so-called socialists stems from the fact that true ends are being forgotten. These socialists have become doctrinaire and are deifying the means into ends in themselves. Socialism cannot be measured by a reference to abolition of privy purses or more public enterprises or more planning irrespective of the results. Socialism cannot be tied in this way to rigid patterns, devoid of meaning and relevance and without substance to the masses or to the coming generation.

While there are weighty problems of the day like rising prices, falling production, growing unemployment, rural unrest, communal tension, Naxalite violence, inter-State disputes, Centre-State relations, international affairs and many more, we are wasting the nation's money and time by discussing the fringe question as this Bill represents. At no time, since Independence, have our political life and time of Parliament been reduced to such an utter farce.

Let us look at the provisions of the Bill. There are only three amendments and therefore it is a short Bill. That does not make it less objectionable, just as a new-born child, delivered on the wrong side of the bed, because it is small, cannot mitigate the offence of the parents. Of these three Articles which are sought to be omitted, two are important and they are Articles 291 and 362. Clause 22 of Article 366 is only consequential. Article 291 guarantees the assurances given by the Government as regards privy purses. Article 362 solemnly asks Parliament to give due regard to the

assurances given in article 291, with respect to personal rights, privileges and dignities of the former rulers of erstwhile Indian States. In this connection, article 363, which is untouched, is of crucial significance. This article bars interference by courts and tribunals arising of such treaties, agreements, etc. It was originally introduced to fortify the guarantees given to the former rulers of Indian States. By retaining this article, what is sought to be done now is to deprive them of their right as ordinary citizens to seek the protection of courts.

Either the agreement, covenants, engagements and sanads should be looked upon as a moral obligation insofar as they are embodied in the Constitution or they should be treated as commercial contracts. If former, nothing should be done to violate the Constitution through any amendment. On the other hand, if they are contractual obligations, it is only meet and proper that any aggrieved party to the contract is enabled to approach the courts so that the respective obligations are tested by courts. 'Heads I win tails you lose' policy is illogical, irrational, unjustified and predatory.

Let us remember that the original understanding itself on this subject was framed on bilateral arrangements. Sardar Patel whom we called the Bismark of India brought about a revolutionary change from separate States to integration and from separate constitutions to one for the whole country by persuasion and through negotiations and did not force a change through legislative compulsion. Why cannot a change be effected now in the same bilateral manner? Is it because unlike stalwarts like Sardar Patel and Jawaharlal Nehru, those who are in power today lack diplomacy or they are too giddy with power? Let not in the name of any new ideology, let not in the name of the people any lapse be covered or a wrong done. As guardians of justice and framers of legislation we have to be watchful. Whether an individual or a party or a nation, that which does not stand by the pledged word has no future in this world or the next. I beg that this House should oppose the Bill so that the impression may go abroad that we stand by our word. If, on the other hand, this Bill is passed, it will be a false and disastrous step. We will be condemned by the world and history as violators of commitments. We are all mortals, and we must give place to

the younger generation. The younger generation will not forgive us because their word will not be believed by anyone either at home or abroad, for no other reason than the fact that they happen to be our progeny. The sins of the father will verily descend on the son.

The price of the Bill is not Rs. 4½ crores or so. It is the price of pledges, honour and ethics.

श्री अनन्त प्रसाद शर्मा : वाइम चेयरमैन सर, अभी जब आखिरी वक्त श्री बाबू भाई चिनाई इस बिल के खिलाफ बोल रहे थे, तब मैंने बीच में उनसे कहा भी कि उनकी तबीयत खराब है, वह अपनी स्पीच टेबल पर रख सकते हैं, क्योंकि बात इसमें यह है कि जो कुछ भी बात ये लोग सीख कर आते हैं उन्हीं बातों को यहां पर कहते हैं। अपनी कोई सोचने की शक्ति, विचार करने की शक्ति, ऐसी कोई चीज नजर में आती नहीं है। . . .

श्री बाबू भाई एम० चिनाई : वह सब आप में है।

श्री अनन्त प्रसाद शर्मा : मेरी होती तो मैं दूसरे तरह का होता।

मैं इस मौके पर कहना चाहता हूं कि इस सदन में जितने भी माननीय सदस्यों ने इस बिल पर अभी तक भाषण किये हैं, चाहे वह विरोधी पक्ष के नेता थे या हमारी तरफ के लोग थे, सभी लोगों ने इस बिल को ऐतिहासिक बिल माना है, इसको एक बहुत बड़ा महत्वपूर्ण बिल माना है। हां, यह बात ठीक है, उन लोगों के कारण जो थे वे अलग अलग थे। जैसा राजनारायणजी ने अपने भाषण में सिर्फ बिल का समर्थन किया लेकिन जो कांग्रेस पार्टी के प्रति उनको गुस्सा है, या कांग्रेस जो काम करती है चाहे जितना भी अच्छा करे उससे सहमत नहीं होते, तो उन्होंने अपना प्रचार किया। लेकिन मुझे आश्चर्य हुआ इस बात से, जैसा कि इधर से हमारे पहले के वक्ताओं ने भी कहा, कि विरोधी दल के नेता जब कि अपने आपको एक बहुत बड़ा मोशलिस्ट कहते आ रहे हैं, वह अभी यहां हैं या नहीं हैं

[श्री अनन्त प्रसाद शर्मा]

मुझे मालूम नहीं, वह सोशलिस्ट फोरम के नेता थे, जिजर ग्रुप के नेता थे लेकिन आज विरोधी दल के नेता हैं। लेकिन जो उन्होंने अपने भाषण में इस विधेयक के विरोध करने के कारण बतलाये वे सिर्फ दो बतलाये। उन्होंने यह नहीं कहा कि यह बिल पास नहीं होना चाहिये। उन्होंने यह नहीं कहा कि प्रिवी पर्स और प्रिन्सेज के प्रिविलेज खत्म नहीं होने चाहिए, उन्होंने सिर्फ मेनर की बात कही और उन्होंने यह बतलाया कि जिस तरह से यह बिल पेश किया गया है और उसके लिए जो मीन्स एडाप्ट किये गये हैं वे गलत हैं। लेकिन इसके साथ ही साथ वाइम चैयरमैन महोदय, उन्होंने यह नहीं बतलाया कि कौन से साधन वे ठीक समझते थे, कौन से मीन्स वे ठीक समझते थे। इसके साथ ही साथ उन्होंने कुछ समय का भी जिक्र किया। उन्होंने कहा कि इतने दिनों के बाद इस बिल को लाया जा रहा है इसमें देर क्यों की गई। अगर देर इसमें हो गई है तो उनकी मुश्किल को हम समझ सकते हैं लेकिन आज वही काम जिस को वे चाहते थे उनकी पार्टी चाहती थी और आल इंडिया कांग्रेस के अहमदाबाद मेशन में उन्होंने इसके संबंध में प्रस्ताव पास किया था, हम कर रहे हैं तो उसके बाद कौनसी ऐसी वजह आ गई है जिसकी वजह से आज उनको इस बिल का विरोध करना पड़ रहा है।

मैं इस सदन के लोगों से और देश की जनता से कहना चाहता हूँ कि वह उनकी तकरीर को जब गौर से देखेंगे तो उससे यह बात साफ मालूम होगी कि उनका विरोध बिल से नहीं है बल्कि विरोध सरकार से है। वे इस सरकार को खत्म करना चाहते हैं और इस लिए उसके हर एक कार्य का वे विरोध करना चाहते हैं। अगर सरकार की ओर से कोई सही कदम भी उठाया जाता है, कोई अच्छा काम भी किया जाता है तो वे उसका विरोध करते हैं।

मैं श्री पीताम्बर दास जी की बहुत इज्जत करता हूँ और उनकी बात ठीक तरह से समझ

में आती है। उन्होंने इस बिल का विरोध किया तो मुझे इसमें कोई आश्चर्य नहीं हुआ। विरोधी दल के नेता इस चीज को तो सिद्धान्त रूप में स्वीकार करते हैं, पहले जब वे कांग्रेस में थे और जब से अलग हो गए हैं तब भी वे इस बात को मानते हैं, लेकिन इसके बाद भी जब वे इस बिल का विरोध करते हैं तो यह एक बड़े आश्चर्य की बात मालूम होती है।

वाइम चैयरमैन महोदय, मैं इस बिल का समर्थन करता हूँ और यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे देश के इतिहास में जिस तरह से 26 जनवरी जो हमारा स्वतंत्रता का दिवस है और जिस तरह से 15 अगस्त का दिन हमारे स्वतंत्रता के इतिहास में एक स्थान रखता है, उसी तरह से जिस दिन राजा महाराजाओं का प्रिवी पर्स खत्म किया जायेगा, वह दिन भी हमारे देश के इतिहास में एक महत्वपूर्ण दिन माना जायेगा और उसका एक महत्वपूर्ण स्थान होगा। जैसा कि अभी हमारे भाई ने बतलाया है कि हमारे संविधान में जो सब से मूल बात लिखी है कि भारत के आजाद होने के बाद इस देश के अन्दर सभी लोगों को बराबरी का हक होगा। लेकिन यह एक बड़े दुःख की बात है कि आज भारत को आजाद हुए इतने वर्ष हो गये हैं फिर भी कुछ लोगों को कुछ इस तरह की सुविधाएं मिली हुई हैं जो हिन्दुस्तान के करोड़ों लोगों को, गरीब लोगों को वे सुविधाएं प्राप्त नहीं हैं। अगर ये लोग कोई गुनाह करते हैं तो उनके ऊपर कोई कार्यवाही नहीं की जा सकती है। अगर लाखों का समान ये विदेशों से लाते हैं तो उन पर कोई टैक्स नहीं लिया जाता है, सिर्फ वे यह कह देते हैं कि व्यक्तिगत इस्तेमाल के लिए लाया जा रहा है।

श्री जगदम्बी प्रसाद यादव : राजाओं को राजप्रमुख बनाने वाले तो आप ही लोग थे।

श्री अनन्त प्रसाद शर्मा : तो मैं यह कह रहा था कि हिन्दुस्तान की गरीब जनता को इस तरह की सुविधा प्राप्त नहीं है। इसलिए मैं मानता हूँ कि हमारे देश के लिए, हमारे

लोगों के लिए, खासकर कांग्रेस पार्टी के लिए यह एक महत्वपूर्ण काम है और इससे बढ़कर और कोई दूसरा काम नहीं हो सकता है। इसलिए मैं इस बिल का समर्थन करता हूँ। मैं इस बिल को एक ऐतिहासिक बिल मानता हूँ और मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जिस दिन राज्य सभा इस बिल को पास कर देगी वह दिन देश के इतिहास में सुनहरे अक्षरों में लिखा जायेगा।

एक बात कहकर मैं अपना भाषण समाप्त कर दूंगा। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह बिल तो यह सदन पहले ही पास कर चुका है। श्री याजी ने एक राइन्ट आफ आर्डर रज किया था जब हमारे विपक्षी नेता बोलने के लिए खड़े हुए थे। उन्होंने पूछा था कि आप इस बिल का समर्थन कर रहे हैं या विरोध कर रहे हैं। मैं सदन को याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री अकबर अली खान): रिजोल्यूशन पास हुआ था।

श्री अनन्त प्रसाद शर्मा : इस बिल का वे विरोध कर रहे थे या समर्थन कर रहे थे यह उन्होंने पूछा था। मैं इस सदन के सम्मानित सदस्यों को याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि जैसे लोकनाथ मिश्र जी ने कहा उन्होंने विरोध किया था तो सिवाय एक लोकनाथ मिश्र को छोड़ कर, जो मोरेलिटी की बात करने वाले हैं.....

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : हमने विरोध किया था।

श्री अनन्त प्रसाद शर्मा : एक या दो माननीय सदस्य थे जिन्होंने विरोध किया था। उनके सिवाय जिन माननीय सदस्यों ने रिजोल्यूशन का समर्थन किया था, जो मोरेलिटी की बात करते हैं, उनकी क्या मोरेलिटी है आज इस सदन में इस बिल का विरोध करने की?

आखिर में मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह बिल पास करने से कोई बहुत बड़ा काम नहीं होता है यह मैं मानता हूँ, जैसा हमारे बहुत

से दोस्तों ने कहा, लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान की जनता, जो आज उत्सुक नजर से इस ओर देख रही है, समझती है कि देश में कांग्रेस ने समाजवाद की तरफ जो नेजी से कदम बढ़ाए हैं उनमें यह एक तेज कदम है। जो एक वादा देश को कांग्रेस ने किया था उसकी पूर्ति की तरफ यह कदम बढ़ाया है उस दृष्टि से इस बिल का बहुत बड़ा महत्व है। इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस बिल का समर्थन करता हूँ।

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : शर्मा जी, आपका भाषण भी बड़ा ऐतिहासिक रहा।

श्री लोकनाथ मिश्र : इसको छाप कर बांटिए।

SHRI M. R. VENKATARAMAN (Tamil Nadu) : Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I wish to support this Bill. The colleagues of my party will support this Bill.

Sir, there have been references here to the All-India Congress Working Committee Resolution. Long, long before that, my party had the privilege of demanding the abolition of the purse to the Princes. Not only that, we have even gone on record in Indian history that we also attacked this very Covenant with the Princes, the arrangement that was arrived at because that was the time when close on the heels of the success of the freedom movement were the struggles put forth by the people of these native States that lent strength to the national movement. That was the time when the Princes badly wanted a protecting hand. The logical course of the States' people's struggle would have culminated in the Princes being shown their place as they well deserved to be shown. Who can forget how Pandit Nehru was treated when he went to Kashmir? I have not forgotten, at any rate, when our President, Mr. Giri, accompanying Pandit Nehru, was stopped half way by the Raja of Bobbili, and when huge drums were beaten to drown in its noise the address by Pandit Nehru in Bobbili. How can we forget the behaviour of the Raja of Pudukotta towards that well-known leaders of the Congress Party, Mr. Satya-murthy—Banning his entry? Have we forgotten all these things? Have we forgotten that the uprising of the Telengana peasantry close on the heels of the attainment of

[Shri M. R. Venkataraman]

Swaraj threatened the very existence of the Nizam of Hyderabad ? Have we forgotten the struggle of the Travancore-Cochin people when Sir C.P. Ramaswamy Iyer, with all his capacity and wits could not go and stand against that brilliant, heroic people's struggle highlighted by the sacrifice of hundreds of Kerala people on the fields of Vayalar and Punnupra ? Have we forgotten all that ? Therefore, my party's support to this measure is obvious. This should have come a long time ago. And it has come at last. That is how I look at it. It has not come easily. It has come, I say, definitely because of the pressures particularly of democratic parties, democratic forces and democratic voices in this country. Why should you take three years to negotiate with the Princes ? My esteemed and respected friend, the hon. Finance Minister, said in the Lok Sabha only two days ago that they took three years. Why ? Of course, he was giving the factual narrative. But it shows their whole attitude. Even now, while I say that we support this measure, I want to decry completely all this talk of compensation to the Princes. Whence does it come ? It is repugnant to the whole idea you have put before the House for passing this Bill. It is something like shadow-boxing in one sense that is going on in this House. Some have said that this is a revolutionary measure, and there is this big talk of "historic moment", "we are having a tryst with destiny", and so on. But this is a normal thing which a democratic Government, not to talk of a Government which talks day in and day out of socialism, should have done long ago. Now when this measure comes, you say, there will be compensation. Did you consult the States' people, to seek protection from whom the Princes came to the Government of India, when you entered into covenants with the Princes ? It is a sort of alliance between the rising capitalist class of India, which after all got political power when the British got kicked out, and the old feudals who were the props of the British rule and who wanted a protecting hand. They came together; and the Congress Party has been functioning and it still functions, I am constrained to say, on behalf of these classes. You are all the time talking of the people. All the time you are passing resolutions on socia-

lism. But you are concerned about the protection of this feudal class and you take a halting attitude to touch their interests. That is why this measure is half-hearted. Therefore, I want to go on record right now that if and when this question of compensation comes, my party will oppose it tooth and nail. There should not be any question of compensation. The whole thing is repugnant. Now this compensation is not as simple as it is sought to be made out. It is a sort of sugar-coated thing. You are going to give them by way of transitional allowances and future compensation huge amounts. There is a regular conspiracy or plan behind this to give them huge amounts. So, instead of giving them privy purses, as you are doing to-day, you will give them substantial amounts under a different label. It is something like saying "I refuse to call it a dozen; I will call it only twelve". So what you are taking away with one hand, you are giving back with another hand. So, however much my friend Mr. Bhupesh Gupta or my friend Mr. Dharia or other friends may talk about "historic moment", "a step towards socialism", etc., this halting attitude towards the Princes, the old feudals, is not going to help. (*Interruptions*) Therefore, my whole point is that this question of compensation is not a simple affair at all. Of course, the Prime Minister said in the other House that there would be no hush-hush about it, and she would put it before Parliament. If it is so, what are you going to do ? Why is this attitude of giving compensation ? This is my question. Then you will say, "Friends like Mr. Lokanath Mishra are opposing this measure and they want a huge amount to be paid as compensation. But Communists and Socialists and other friends do not want any compensation to be given. So, we want to give a fair and just compensation." That is the game. This sort of a thing is being prepared even now. This sort of a thing cannot be tolerated. All this talk of socialism and democracy is just hypocrisy. The Government is hypocritical in the extreme saying that we are coming forward with a revolutionary measure while at the same time saying that for higher purses smaller multiples and for lower purses higher multiples. What is all this mysterious formula ? It is something like the *tantras* of the olden days which except the learned pandits nobody could understand. Therefore,

there is a scheme behind this whole thing. After all, the Princes know their game, they know their position, they know their difficulty. They will only be too glad to get some compensation and be rid of any further botheration. Our bourgeoisie wants more money for industries. They go on investing money in the shares of companies. All this is not going to benefit the people. You are doing all this at the cost of the tax-payer. It is the people of India who will have to pay to these exploiting classes, to these people who alone are thriving in this country. This is the background of the socialist talk and propaganda that is going on in this country. It is all the hypocrisy of this Government

There is another thing which I want to say in this connection. We must take a lesson from our experiences and that lesson is in relation to the Constitution. With this Constitution you cannot do anything for the people of India. It is coming in our way more and more. It came in our way for the nationalisation of banks. It is coming in our way now again on this question of Privy purses. When you want to do some good to the people, bring some measure against those who are exploiting the people, there are all sorts of restrictions and hurdles, Lok Sabha discussion, Rajya Sabha discussion, two-thirds majority, then Supreme Court, etc. all sorts of things. And the Supreme Court will go back on its own decisions which I had occasion to point out in this House when we were discussing the bank nationalisation. Now you will find that bit by bit like a carapace which looked very nice outwardly but which had all patches and ultimately was practically torn, this is becoming something like that. Let me not be misunderstood to be saying that there is no need of a Constitution for the country. Of course, we do need a Constitution. But a Constitution is not so sacrosanct that we cannot touch it. Even now you are going on changing the Constitution bit by bit, section by section, 22nd amendment, 23rd amendment, 24th amendment and so on. This way the whole thing is going to be defaced. It is just like a cycle tube. If there is a puncture, you get it repaired. If there is a second puncture, have it repaired. But like this if there is a repair after repair, should you go on only repair-

ing it when the whole thing is full of punctures ? You have got to throw it away and get a new tube. This is my point. This is what any layman will say...

SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY (Tamil Nadu) : You have taken oath under the Constitution. And how can you go against it ?

SHRI M. R. VENKATARAMAN : Don't try to rattle me. We all have taken oath under the Constitution. That is a different thing. But by way of these frequent amendments you are doing it piecemeal. You do not remove it wholly...

SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY : That is the Marxist theory.

SHRI M. R. VENKATARAMAN : Your hands have the same stain as those of mine, if at all, if that comes to that.

Therefore, since the Regulating Act of 1773 and the Board of Control Act of 1784, there have been various Acts. There was the Government of India Act of 1813, then of 1833, and then there was the Indian Councils Act of 1861. There was the Act of 1919, Minto-Morley Reforms, then came the 1919 Act and the Montague-Chelmsford Reforms and then there was the Simon Commission which created the Government of India Act of 1935. For whose purpose were all these enactments made ? They were all made for the benefit of the British people, for safeguarding the British interests. Did this country not have a Constitution ? Yes, it did, but for the benefit of the British in those days. Now after we got independence, we made our own Constitution. The Constitution written by the British did not serve our interests. Therefore, some eminent people, some "wise" people, of ours wrote this Constitution and left it to us. But experience is telling us that everything done at that time is full of defects. Shri Dharia said that there is a gap between the noble sentiments contained in the preamble of the Constitution and what we are witnessing in the country today. Therefore this Constitution must go. The Constitution, after all, goes before the Court and the court applies the law. The Parliament makes the law. But they make the law, with due respect to Shri Parthasarathy, in accordance with the Constitution which was made in 1949 or 1950. Things have changed . . .

SHRI R. T. PARTHASARATHY : That is why we have amended it 23 times.

SHRI M. R. VENKATARAMAN : It will go on changing. Unless it is changed fundamentally and basically, people will go on to throw it out because they regard it as their enemy. The Congress is used to attack the people. I am as seriously as that. How can we tolerate that ? They will say : "Have a fresh Constitution". All of us must see the writings on the wall.

Lastly, much has been talked about the sacrifices of the princes. The princes saw the writing on the wall. They had, therefore, to seek protection and our new class which came to power wanted all the territory and all the resources. So, these agreements were entered into. There is no question of any sacrifice being made by them. Let us take things as they are. Let us not exaggerate things.

I cannot understand my friend, Shri S. N. Mishra's statement. He said : "I am for the abolition of privy purses. Yet I oppose the Bill". I hope he will reconsider his attitude.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : You happen to be a lawyer. Have you not understood what I said ? Why did they not change the agreements which are the mother documents ?

SHRI M. R. VENKATARAMAN : The agreements they have entered into were with the persons who are the accredited enemies of the people. I am not only a lawyer, but also a politician. I am more concerned with your attitude to the privy purses. You say that you are for the abolition and yet you do not support this measure. I am not able to understand these contradictory positions. Is it because of compensation being given ? What exactly is the reason behind it ? I think he is inconsistent. I really hope that he will rethink and reconsider his position. I will not make this appeal to Shri Lokanath Mishra. He was forthright. He does not approve of this Bill at all. Somebody else said the Supreme Court should decide it. I can understand that position too, but not your position. I am seeing this in the context of differences between the Ruling Congress and the Organisation

Congress. What should be the best attitude to help the reestablishment of the Congress with 1972 in mind ? Is it the strong-arm attitude to protect certain interests in the background of giving radicalisation and talks of communism and socialism among the people or is it better to pretend to be socialists and under the mask of socialism do the same things ? I see these two attitudes. Part of the Congress parties as the ruling thing which constitutes the difference.

That apart, the Government has at last come forward with this measure—better late than never.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Are you not Mr. Vice-Chairman speaking on this matter ?

SHRI M. R. VENKATARAMAN : I hope that the Government will seriously think about the issue of compensation. There can be no question of any consideration of compensation on this issue.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : Sir, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta wants you to speak.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Sir, you come from Hyderabad, proximity to the Nizam. You should also speak.

SHRI THILLAI VILLALAN : Sir, I rise to extend my whole-hearted support to this Bill, the Constitution (Twenty-fourth Amendment) Bill, 1970, since our party has already decided in favour of the abolition of privy purses and special privileges to the Princes. This is the most awaited Bill by the whole nation. But, I must say, this is the most controversial one.

Sir, in the morning, our Leader of the Opposition, Shri S. N. Mishra, said that he would support the Bill if it was brought in the manner in which it should be brought. In the afternoon, Mr. Morarji Bhai, who leads the Opposition there, has also stated. "This Bill is a deceitful piece of legislation. I would support the Bill if the Bill is brought in the manner in which it should be brought." To my poor understanding and meagre knowledge, Sir, I can conceive of two manners or two ways in which the Bill is to be brought. Sir, I would deal with the problem involved in this Bill by dis-

secting it into three parts : One is, the constitutional and legal, the second is, the monetary or financial, and the third, the last but not the least, the political, moral and ethical aspects.

[JIAN in the Chair]

Sir, as a student of Constitutional Law, I want to discuss some of the constitutional or legal problems. The first manner or way is this, Sir. The amending Bill introduces three Articles, namely, Article 291, Article 362 and Article 366, sub-clause (22), from our Constitution.

Sir, I shall first take up Article 366(22) which deals with the definition of Ruler. The manner I mentioned is this, Sir. If we go through the provisions of Article 366, sub-clause (22), we can find the definition :

"The Ruler, in relation to an Indian State, means the Prince, chief or other person by whom and such covenant or agreement as is referred to in clause (1) of Article 291 was entered into and who, for the time being, is recognised by the President as the Ruler of the State and includes any person who for the time being, is recognised by the President as the successor of such Ruler."

The first manner or way is this, Sir. The President can withdraw the recognition of a Ruler at any moment. Here, there is one way for the Prime Minister to fulfil the purpose of this Bill by asking or by requesting the President to withdraw the recognition of Rulers or Princes, who are now prevented from getting privy purses. But, she has not chosen that manner or way we can say that this is most deceitful by applying technicalities or what we can call, the back-door method, Sir. But she has chosen the other way. That is the most democratic way, by bringing an amending Bill, a Constitution (Amendment) Bill, to this House, Sir. I will like to ask our Leader of the Opposition in which manner he wants the Bill to be brought before the House—by the deceitful manner of taking shelter under the technicalities of the provisions in the Constitution or the democratic way of bringing a Constitution (Amendment) Bill before the Parliament which is the desirable manner? I appreciate the democratic spirit shown by the Hon. Prime Minister

by the adopting the democratic way of bringing forward this Bill and I applaud the manner in which the Bill is brought.

Then, by removing Article 291, we stopped the payment of the Privy Purse from the Consolidated Fund of India. By this article we have given sanction to the obligation on the part of the Government on any agreement or covenant with the Ruler of any Indian State. But from the very reading we can find that these agreements or covenants are not at all contractual ones. They are only political arrangements of a temporary nature. If they are contractual, there is no necessity of ingrainning of this article. This has been incorporated since these agreements stand on a different footing.

Some say that these agreements are of an international nature, and the Government should answer to the comity of nations. This is also a false notion. These agreements were entered into at the time of the formation of the Union. We have changed the very structure of the Union itself. First we had Part A, B and C States, then we reorganised them on the basis of language and now we are carving out new States, States within States and conferring Statehood for Centrally Administered States. We are in the age of change. We have therefore to amend the Constitution.

We have amended our Constitution 23 times within 21 years. If the Constitution is sacrosanct, then there will be no meaning in having article 368. We are not having a rigid Constitution. It is flexible and the process of amendment of the Constitution is not cumbersome or difficult.

Therefore the argument of commitment will also fall to the ground if we analyse the position of fulfilment by the Government to the nation. This Government has committed to the nation that they will give democratic socialism. Therefore they have to democratise the society as committed to the nation. The commitment to the nation is bigger than any commitment to any other section, if at all it is worth the name of commitment.

There is no infringement of the Fundamental Rights. This is not at all a Fundamental Right or property right. There is no hitch regarding articles 14, 19 or 31(1)(2).

[Shri Thillai Villalan]

The second part is the financial aspect of it. They are Princes, not paupers. They are not much worried about the monetary aspect. Besides, they say they are more worried about the self-respect, breach of trust, loss of honour, derogation of law or rule of law and the injustice to a section of the people. So I do not want to go into the quantum of Privy Purse now being abolished. Sir, I want to stress that there is no question of compensation or solatium or multiple to them. There is no property right at all.

There is no sacrifice either, I say this because there has been mention here of their sacrifice, because when some hon. Members recall the past glories of the princes, they say they have sacrificed, they have shown patriotism. (Time bell) I will finish within one or two minutes. Some hon. Members say that because of their sacrifice and patriotism the integration of India was fulfilled. That was an argument advanced by some of my friends, Sir. I want to know what is the sacrifice, Sir. A coward cannot preach non-violence. An invalid cannot preach non-violence. A beggar cannot be a 'Dharmaprabhu'. First of all, a person must be in possession of certain rights. Then only the question of abandoning them or giving them up arises. And if he does abandon them or give them up voluntarily, then only it will be called a sacrifice. But here in the case of these princes there is no right at all; they were not in possession of any right. It is the right of the people. It is the right of the toiling masses. Simply the princes were exploiting the people. So there is no question of sacrifice at all and, at the same time, there is no question of patriotism also, Sir. We can call it panicianism. We can put it like this that only to save themselves they signed the Covenants of Accession.

There is talk much about breach of trust. There is no trust at all, because now this is the trust reposed by the nation in this Government. It has been an executive arrangement by the Government. Now it has been changed; that is all.

The honour of the nation will be enhanced since it democratised the whole society by abolishing the feudal remnants. It will not in any way lower the honour

of our country. These are days of democracy, not of monarchy.

Justice to be done to the nation, not to the princes. Therefore, Sir, by abolishing the privy purses we are rendering justice to the nation.

Here there has been mention about the conscience also. The conscience of individuals should not be considered. The conscience of the nation has been pricking for more than two decades. At the command of the conscience of the nation the Government is acting in bringing this amending Bill. The behests of Time should be heeded. If not, Time will become the judge of events and give its own verdict in its own way. Only to save one section of the citizens of this country from the fury of Time this Bill has been brought. So the princes must all join and support this Bill. Sir, the Leader of the Opposition stated that they are now thrown out into the streets. Whether they are now thrown out into the streets or not, the people were on the streets. They were struggling for the integration. . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Please conclude now.

SHRI THILLAI VILLALAN : Yes, Sir. The people were struggling against the tyranny of these princes and they now succeeded in that struggle.

Some hon. Members spoke about the glories of some of the princes also, Sir. But we have got enough materials for the vagaries of the princes also. We need not go into the vagaries of these princes; we know many things about these princes.

Before I conclude, Sir, I would like to say this. Here some hon. Members mentioned about Mahatma Gandhi, Vallabhbhai Patel and Pandit Nehru, Sir, and they said that if they were alive today they will not go back on the word given to these princes. I am not a political magician. I have no magic wand in my hand to bring them alive. Therefore, Sir, I am not able to do a political miracle. But Sir, I can assure this House that they are mingled in the blood, sweat, toil and breath of the toiling masses of this country, Sir. They have made their hearts as their seats but they are not here because

so many of us are heartless. In the morning the Leader of the Opposition mentioned about the heart. But the pity is most of us are heartless. Therefore, they are not here. They are only with the masses. They have now the hearts of the masses as their home. (*Time bell*). Through them they are showering their blessings on the Government for bringing this amending Bill. I also join the three hundred million who are applauding this Government for bringing this Bill. I whole-heartedly support the Bill. With these words, I conclude.

SHRI N. G. GORAY : Mr. Deputy Chairman, I have been listening to the debate in the House since the Prime Minister moved the motion. I had tried to follow the debate in the Lok Sabha also. I find that this debate has suffered. On the one hand, some people have praised it sky-high, while others have denounced it. We are living in an atmosphere of hyperbole, ever since we started discussing this Bill. There were hon. Members who described this Bill as historical and somebody said that the day on which we pass it will go down in history as important as the 15th of August or the 26th of January. Others have said that it is a breach of faith, a dishonourable piece of legislation. It seems that nobody is trying to put it in the correct historical perspective.

I was surprised that my friend. Shri Mishra, the Leader of the Opposition, in spite of the fact that he supports the idea of abolition of privy purses, is opposing it. He has said that not only he, but his whole party, will oppose the Bill. It is very strange that he accepts the idea of abolition, but, at the same time, he says that it will not be possible for him to support it. It seems that he is trying to hunt with the hound and run with the hare. So far as the Jan Sangh reaction is concerned, I was not at all surprised. The Jan Sangh seems to be a worshipper of the past. They refuse to be architects of the future. So far as the Swatantra Party is concerned, their solicitude for the feudal class and the capitalist-class is well known. Therefore, a lot of things were said about the sacrifices of the Princes. I do not like to criticise any person, but sometimes it becomes very difficult not to go back

to history, because it is very necessary to understand the role that this Order had played. The Maharaja of Darbhanga had written to me a letter and he had supplied all the arguments that he had mustered in favour of preserving the privy purse, and to that letter I had replied saying that I look at this question from two angles: one is the historical angle and the other is the social angle. I do not want to go back to ancient history, but if you look into the history of the last two centuries, you will find that this particular order has somehow managed to survive, though the Moghul Empire has vanished, the Maratha Confederacy is no more, and the Sikh kingdom was liquidated, and still this order continued. Then the British have gone, and the People's Republic was established in India, and still for 22 years the order has continued. I think it is the greatest miracle in history what these people have achieved, that they have gone through all the vicissitudes intact. So much praise has been heaped on them even by the Prime Minister that what they did at the time of our freedom was something for which we should be always grateful. I would like to point out here: is this the only country in the world where the feudal interests have voluntarily surrendered themselves? Sir, you will remember that in Germany under Prince Bismark the old States were liquidated. In Japan in the mighty period the mighty lords who had parcelled up Japan, surrendered their power to the mighty Emperor. These things have happened. This is being quoted in India as something by way of supreme sacrifice, and my friend, the venerable friend, Shri Pitamber Das, went to the extent of saying that they surrendered their crowns. Were they wearing crowns? If they were wearing crowns, they were made of cardboard. They were not crowns. They were living because the British were there to support them. When the British withdrew their support and when the Princes found themselves confronted by a mass agitation of the people, they resorted to this way out, and Sardar Patel also thinking that it would be better to gain their support followed a particular policy. So it was a simple case of what is described in Sanskrit as :

“सर्वनाशे समुत्पन्ने अर्धं त्यजति पंडिता :”

[Shri N. G. Goray]

It was a simple case of adjusting their relations. New relationships were established and our Princes perpetuated themselves for some time, and peace was bought, time was bought by giving the privy purses to the Princes.

Now, Sir, 22 years have gone and so much is being made of these honourable covenants that were entered into and the word that was plighted and all that. Sir, I would like to ask the legal luminaries who happen to be here: after all is it not a fact that law is a child of the social environment? Or is law something supreme that whatever the social environment, however great the changes that may happen, the law remains where it is? It is not possible. All these covenants, Sir, are nothing but a reflection of the new relationship between the people and the Princes. That also has changed. These 22 years have passed and still they say that the privy purses must be there. I just want to ask the House to think of the 1857 struggle. It was a feudal struggle. I am not saying that it was really a struggle on behalf of the people. It was a feudal struggle. What has happened to those who died at that time fighting the British? The Rani of Jhansi fought the British. There is no question of giving privy purse to her descendants. She has vanished from the scene. Today in this House the name of the Scindias was mentioned. The Scindias became the chieftans. They had a State of their own simply because they refused to help the Rani of Jhansi and the Rani of Jhansi was killed on the battle-field of Gwalior. So, Vijaya Raje Scindia, who happens to be the leader of the Jana Sangh, is claiming the privy purse for the betrayal of the freedom struggle and the Rani of Jhansi who fought them is liquidated, and the only thing is that we raise statues to her memory. The same thing has happened to the Peshwas, the same thing has happened to the descendants of Ranjit Singh. Sir, the last Moghul, from the jail of Mandalay Road, said, "I want only six feet of land in India when I die". But even that six feet of land was not made available to him.

So, we must try to understand that there is a historical compulsion about which Shri Chavan spoke the other day. Here

a lot of people made fun of it, historical compulsion. It is ordained by history. I entirely support him and say that this is ordained by history. This was ordained by history. But perhaps the Congress itself, the united Congress, which was instrumental in defeating the historical forces for such a long time. It is a good thing, therefore, that at last they have realised that this thing cannot go on, it is impossible it is really not in keeping with the spirit of the Constitution. How can you have privileged people and privileged classes? How can you think of giving compensation to them? My friend here brought up this question of compensation. I really want to tell you, Sir, that so far as may party is concerned, we had moved this Resolution on the floor of this House. Really, the whole discussion was not necessary because this House had in all sincerity and in all seriousness passed that Resolution almost unanimously; two or three people might have voted against it. But once the entire House had given its consent to the Resolution and put its seal of approval, where was the necessity of such a long debate? But now we find that such a long debate is taking place and all sorts of things are being said.

Sir, here I have got a small pamphlet written by the Maharajah of Bikaner. I was really amused to read this pamphlet. The case, as the Maharajah has put it, is that while he was receiving Rs. 10 lakhs, he was spending Rs. 15 lakhs and therefore he says, why do you abolish the privy purses? I think it is much better that he should have welcomed this because he was spending Rs. 15 lakhs when he was receiving Rs. 10 lakhs. Now, the question comes, where was he getting Rs. 5 lakhs per year from?

Therefore, this is a very funny argument that has been placed before us. And we are being told that in respect of the Princes we should adopt an attitude which will not deprive them of their privy purses and other rights. Sir, I say, once for all, let us decide whether India is going to be a real Republic or not. If it is going to be a Republic, then you cannot have a few selected people enjoying certain rights and privileges and purses which are being denied to the common people.

Sir, when this question of compensation came up, my friend here was very specific. I would like to be specific myself and I would tell the Prime Minister that if she has got any idea of giving compensation to these people, we will not tolerate it. Let it be very clear, because, Sir, to whom are you giving this compensation? I would like some of these Princes to tell us how much money they have put in the foreign banks, how much property they have here. Are they going to be destitutes if the privy purses are not given to them? Are they going to be on the streets? They are not going to be on the streets. The only thing is that we shall be carrying out some of the Directive Principles of our Constitution. By this measure, we would be helped to bring about some sort of egalitarian society, some beginning, but a very small beginning at that.

So, Sir, I support this Bill. But so far as the compensation issue is concerned, I would like to point out that when you build huge dams, hundreds of villages are submerged and people are thrown out. What compensation do we give them? Those people who have got some land, they get some compensation. But those people who have got no lands, they

6 P.M. do not get any compensation. They have to go to

Bombay, they have to go to other cities, to fend for themselves as best as they can. There is no question of compensation. When you bring in new machinery like tractors, so many people are thrown out of their occupations. It is happening and it will happen and we are not thinking in terms of giving any compensation to these unfortunate people who are not so vocal, who are not influential. On the other hand, we talk of giving compensation to the people who do not need it at all. Therefore, I would like to say that so far as my party is concerned, we are supporting this Bill with reservations. We would have liked this Bill to contain a few clauses about compensation, what idea the Government has. I do not want the Government to have something up their sleeve. We know that this is going to give them tremendous power of patronage and leverage. We know that, but I only think that it will be possible for us to arrest this process and I hope that they are honest when they say that they want equality. With this parti-

cular constitutional arrangement they are honest, I hope, if they really want to go towards an egalitarian society, I hope will not betray what they are promising to do. Let them not play a fraud on the people of India.

SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHERJEE : Sir, I support this Bill wholeheartedly. It has been stated by some Members that it is historic Bill. Others have characterised it as a revolutionary one. But neither of them dealt with it in a revolutionary way. It is the direct outcome of a resolution passed on the floor of this House a few months back and it was pointed out, when the resolution was passed, that Government should bring a Bill abolishing the privy purses within the next Budget Session. The Bill now brought in by the Government is a simple Bill, amending certain provisions of the Constitution and abolishing the privy purses. This House has an obligation to pass the Bill because originally it was mooted on the floor of this House. Secondly, when the popular House has passed the Bill affecting public life in such a vital way, this House should not go against this Bill.

The main question is whether after abolishing the privy purses and amending the constitutional guarantees Government is violating the treaty obligations which the then Government had entered into with the native Princes. In this connection it was pointed out that as soon as the Indian Independence Act was passed by the British Parliament, almost all the native States had got back their sovereignty and the Government of India, by making instruments of accession, had recognized the power of paramountcy and the power of sovereignty of all the native States. This contention is not correct. Even Sardar Patel who dealt with the matter with his own hands and who was well conversant with it did never express that the native States had their own paramountcy. In his speech on the 5th July, 1947 Sardar Patel categorically pointed out that the Indian States had no sovereignty. When the British established their rule in India they evolved the term 'paramountcy' which established the supremacy of the British interests, but the doctrine has remained undefined to this time. Therefore, the question of sovereignty in regard to a

[Shri Pranab Kumar Mukherjee]
treaty obligation as far as international law is concerned, does not exist.

Surely the main issue is this whether the circumstances under which such treaty obligations were made are still prevailing today. We all know that when the treaties are made, when the instruments of accession were signed, the whole country was bleeding from the partition, suffering from the miseries of partition. When in the country all sorts of fissiparous and separatist tendencies were prevailing in every corner, as an astute politician Sardar Patel had no other way but to accede to the demands and claims of the native Princes who utilised the situation in their best way. Therefore, it is not correct to say that the circumstances under which the treaties were made still continue. Even so per international law there is no definite and specific mention of the period during which the treaty obligation should continue. Therefore, the question of treaty obligation, as claimed by the supporters of privy purses, should not be taken into consideration.

It has been pointed out, Sir, that the native Princes ruled their States with efficiency. They were patriots and some of them did their best for the betterment of their subjects. Sir, I am quoting from the Budget provision of one of the most progressive States at that time, that is, Bikaner. In 1929-30, out of a total Budget of Rs. 30,00,000, a sum of Rs. 12,55,000 was spent on Government staff, Rs. 82,000 on the marriage of the Prince, Rs. 6,18,384 over roads and buildings, Rs. 4,26,614 over the expansion of the palace, Rs. 2,24,864 on the Royal family and only Rs. 2,22,979 on education. That was the state of affairs in the native States.

It has been pointed out by quoting Pandit Nehru on various occasions that Pandit Nehru supported the States. But I know what he writes on page 530 of his autobiography. He condemns the British Government for supporting and continuing the most atrocious administration in the world in the native States.

We all know how the native Rulers dealt with the freedom movement. There may be one or two exceptions, or one or two progressive rulers. But to generalise

them and to pose as if they were great heroes and supporters of freedom and great patrons of their subjects, as great patrons of education would be completely unhistoric. This is absolutely without any basis. There is nothing to boast of the native Princes.

I shall now refer to another point about the way the native Rulers rule their States. It has been pointed out by Mr. P. L. Churgarh in his book, "Indian Princes under British Protection" that the "King can confiscate property or any right of any citizen and there is no remedy to it". Without any definite charge any person could be detained for an indefinite period. This book was published in 1942. Therefore, immediately before independence what were the state of affairs in the native States could be easily understood from these observations made by the writer.

Even when Mr. Harekrishna Mahatab formed a committee to investigate whether there was any *begar* system and *Dasas* system in the native States of Orissa, his observation was that as late as 1945 the *begar* system and the *Dasas* system existed in almost all States. It is curious enough that mysteriously evidences collected from the two native States of Keonjhar and Dhanakol were stolen away from the custody of the Enquiry Committee. Therefore, there is nothing to boast of about these native States.

It is made out that it is just a question of Rs. 5 crores per year for 281 native States. Where is the money? And these are not spent for any constructive work. These are not spent for any useful purpose. And what is it that the native Princes contribute to our culture? Some of them are undoubtedly very good golf-players. Some of them are very good dancers. Some of them are very good patrons of the French art or French night clubs. Most of them spend their time in Europe, in some of the luxury cities of the Continent. That being so, I do not see why this system should continue. It has been pointed out that according to the Constitution, their rights are guaranteed. So many rights are guaranteed under the Constitution. There are Directive Principles. It was expected that with the implementation of the Constitution, within a certain number of years, certain provisions of the

Directive Principles would be given effect to. But when we cannot give effect to the Directive Principles, when we cannot give free and compulsory education to all children up to the age of 14 years, when we cannot give jobs for the unemployed youth, when we cannot improve the lot of the downtrodden people should we still go on paying privy purses? To continue to give privy purses to the ex-Rulers is an anachronism in democratic principles and this anachronism should be put an end to as early as possible. With these words, I conclude.

श्री राम लहाय (मध्य प्रदेश) : उपसभा-पति महोदय, मैं इस बिल का विरोध करने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ। सब से पहले मैं यह बात आपको स्पष्ट कर देना चाहता हूँ कि जैसा कि आम तौर पर यह कहा जाता है कि हमारी पार्टी जनसंघ और स्वतंत्र पार्टी की विचार धारा के साथ जा रही है और उनका समर्थन कर रही है यह बात बिल्कुल, कतई, गलत है। इस मामले में मैं आपको यह बता देना चाहता हूँ। सितम्बर, 1967 में, श्रीमान, मैंने जो पत्र श्रीमती इन्दिरा गाँधी को, उनको वहैसियत प्रशान मन्त्री और कांग्रेस प्रेसिडेंट के लिखा था, उनको मैं आप के सामने पढ़ कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ :

"राजाओं की प्रीवी पर्स की समस्या प्रारम्भ से ही विवाद का विषय बनी हुई है आपको भली भाँति जानकारी है। कि मैं एक पुराना कांग्रेसी हूँ। इतना ही नहीं कि मैं कांग्रेस वर्किंग कमेटी का सदस्य आदरणीय सरदार पटेल के जमाने में रहा हूँ और मध्य भारत विधान सभा का अध्यक्ष और कांस्टीट्यूट असेम्बली का सदस्य रहा हूँ वरन् मैंने प्रीवी पर्स दिये जाने की वानचीत अंर राजाओं के अपने अधिकार सरेडर करने में विशेष रूप से ग्वालियर महा-राज को इस कार्य के लिये तैयार करने में भाग लिया है। मेरा विश्वास है कि पूर्व में जो हमारे आदरणीय नेताओं ने अनुबंध किया है और जिम की किसी न किसी प्रकार संविधान

में सुरक्षा की गयी है उसको किसी प्रकार भी भंग करना केवल नैतिकता के ही विपरीत न होगा, वरन् कांग्रेस के उच्च आदर्श के भी प्रतिकूल होगा और लोगों की आस्था को ठेस पहुंचेगी। जिस प्रकार प्रस्ताव के रूप में नहीं केवल एक अमेडमेंट के रूप में और सेशन के अंतिम समय में बहुत थोड़े से बहुमत से यह निर्णय गत ए० आई० सी० सी० अधिवेशन में हुआ है उससे आप भली भाँति परिचित हैं। इसमें भी शका है कि उस समय कोरम भी था अथवा नहीं।

कुछ भी हो मैं यह भी अहसास करता हूँ कि हमारे वरिष्ठ नेताओं ने अगर मौन साधा या विभिन्न मत जाहिर किये तो सम्भव है कि किसी अन्य सेशन में भी यह मसला इसी तरह पास हो जाये।

मेरे पत्र लिखने का कारण केवल इतना ही है कि आप सब वरिष्ठ नेताओं ने इस पर गम्भीरता पूर्वक विचार करना चाहिये और वातावरण पैदा करना चाहिये जिससे अपने वरिष्ठ नेताओं के लिये गये अनुबन्ध में उनके अनुयायियों द्वारा ही कोई भी ऐसा अनुचित कार्य नहीं हो सके और हर एक सदस्य को कांग्रेस में या संसद्, विधान सभा में अपने मत प्रकट करने और मत देने की पूर्ण स्वतंत्रता हो।

मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस मसले पर आप सब वरिष्ठ नेता विचार कर सही, न्यायोचित मार्ग दर्शन करें।

श्रीमान, मैंने यह पत्र लिखा और यह सन् 1867 की बात है। यह पत्र श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी को पहुंच गया और उसकी पहुंच भी उन्होंने स्वीकार की।

तो मैं यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे लोग यह भूल जाते हैं कि जिम वक्त अंग्रेज गये उस वक्त उन्होंने जैसे हमें सावरेन बताया था वैसे ही तमाम राजाओं को उन्होंने सावरेन

[श्री: राम सहाय]

बताया था और उनकी यह सावरैनिटी थी, जिसकी वजह से सरदार पटेल को यह सब कार्य करना पड़ा था।

एक बात मैं और अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे भूपेश गुप्त जी ने ड्राफ्ट कांस्टीट्यूशन की बात कही। मैं समझता हूँ कि शायद उनको पता नहीं है कि कितना ड्राफ्ट कांस्टीट्यूशन तैयार हुआ है।

इतना ही नहीं, माडल कांस्टीट्यूशन फार स्टेट्स एन्ड यूनियन भी एक तैयार हुआ था, जिसको तैयार करने के सिलसिले में मैं स्वयं एक सदस्य था। तो मेरा अर्ज करना यह है कि बिना पूरी भूमिका जाने हुए, बिना पूरी बात जाने हुए, हम अपने अनुबंधों को इस प्रकार खत्म करते जाएं, तो मैं नहीं समझता इस देश में और दूसरे देश में क्या हमारी स्थिति होने वाली है। उन अनुबंधों को पोलिटिकल कहा जाता है। हम कितने पोलिटिकल अनुबंध दूसरे राज्यों से करते हैं। अगर पोलिटिकल अनुबंधों के बारे में हम यह कहें कि हम उनको तोड़ सकते हैं, तो फिर दूसरे देशों के साथ जो हमारे अनुबंध हैं, उनके बारे में हमारी स्थिति क्या होगी। उनमें हमारी क्या साख बाकी रह जायेगी।

हमें तो ऐसा लगता है कि अब आपको अपने संविधान की शपथ को भी बदलना पड़ेगा; क्योंकि धारा 363, जिसको कि हम बदलने जा रहे हैं, उसमें हमने यह कहा है कि हमें उन अनुबंधों को, उन एग्रीमेन्ट्स को, ड्यू रिगार्ड देना पड़ेगा। लेकिन मुझे अफसोस है कि उस धारा को भी खत्म किया जा रहा है, जिसमें इस बात को कहा गया है कि हमको अनुबंधों को मानना चाहिए। खैर, यह तो समय बताएगा कि क्या होगा।

मैं एक बात यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि एक मामूली से मसले के ऊपर, जिसमें किसी प्रकार का भी, किसी अनुबंध का या किसी भी एग्रीमेन्ट का सवाल नहीं था, आत्मा की आवाज पर सदस्यों को मिसगाइड किया गया

हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी द्वारा। लेकिन जिम वक्त अनुबंधों का सवाल था, जहाँ दरअसल लोगों की आत्मा की आवाज का सवाल आता था, वहाँ उनको वह साहस नहीं हुआ कि अपने साथियों को वह कहती कि अपनी इच्छा के मुताबिक, अपनी आत्मा की आवाज के मुताबिक अपनी राय प्रकट कर सकते हो।

Time bell rings

मेरा निवेदन है कि यह इस प्रकार की समस्या है, इस पर कहना तो बहुत था, लेकिन चूँकि आपने घंटी बजा दी है इसलिये खत्म करता हूँ।

SHRI T. N. SINGH (Uttar Pradesh) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, I want to know how long we are sitting.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Up to 8 O'clock.

SHRI T. N. SINGH: How can we sit for such a long time?

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: Do you expect all the Members to sit up to 8 O'clock for voting?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The voting will be done tomorrow. All the speeches will be over today and the reply of the Prime Minister will be tomorrow.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT (Haryana) : It was already announced in the morning by the Chairman.

SHRI T. N. SINGH: It is already past six and I do not think it is fair of you to expect us to sit here for such a long time.

SHRI N. SHRI RAMA REDDY: By sitting for a long time we get tired.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Actually we decided this earlier. Tomorrow we have got some other business.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: No notice was given to us in the morning.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No, the Chairman announced it in the House in the morning. I was also here in the House.

So far as I remember the Chairman told us that we will have to continue the debate and finish the speeches today and we will have the reply tomorrow.

SHRI N. SHRI RAMA REDDY : It is difficult to sit for such a long time.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY : The Chairman did not say that.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH : The Chairman said that the Prime Minister will reply tomorrow.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : The Chairman announced in the House very clearly that the discussion will finish today and the Prime Minister will give her reply tomorrow. If the Members do not want to participate, it is a different thing.

SHRI T. N. SINGH : But that is not the way.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Uttar Pradesh) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, if there are more Members wanting to speak, what is the difficulty in extending the discussion for tomorrow ?

SHRI T. N. SINGH : We can have the discussion even tomorrow. It does not matter. We are also human beings.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA : Sir, kindly consider one thing. If the voting could be taken up 3 O'clock tomorrow . . .

SHRI OM MEHTA : Actually it was only with mutual agreement that we said that the reply will be tomorrow forenoon. If more Members want to speak, it is all right the reply can be in the afternoon tomorrow.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Then, should we adjourn now ?

SHRI OM MEHTA : No, no. We must continue up to 7 O'clock.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY : I think that is very right. We accept it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : All right, up to 7 O'clock. The Government side has come half way to meet the honourable Members. So let us sit up to 7 O'clock. We will get some time tomorrow also.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY : Thank you very much, Mr. Om Mehta.

डा० भाई महावीर : उपसभापति जी, संविधान संशोधन के इस बिल पर जो मत व्यक्त किये गये हैं, उनमें से और जो बात सामने आईं वे तो आईं लेकिन हर पार्टी के सोचने की जो कुंठाएं हैं, जो सोचने की उनकी अभिनिवेश है, वह भी हमारे सामने प्रकट हुई। मुझे यह देख कर बड़ा आनन्द हुआ कि श्री भूपेश गुप्त भी कालोनियलिज्म के विरोध में खड़े हो कर इस सवाल पर बोले और महा-राजाओं का प्रिबी पर्स उनको कालोनियलिज्म की याद दिलाने वाली बात दिखलाई दी, जबकि आज सारे विश्व के अन्दर सबसे बड़ा साम्राज्यवादी देश रूस है और उनकी किसी नीति में उन्हें उपनिवेशवाद दिखाई नहीं देता है। उनको यह नज़र नहीं आता है कि आज सारे पूर्वी यूरोप और उसके अतिरिक्त बाकी देशों के ऊपर रूस किस तरह से अपने प्रभाव को बढ़ाना चाहता है और बढ़ा रहा है।

हंगरी के अन्दर जो कुछ हुआ, जेकोस्लो-वाकिया में जो कुछ हुआ, उनको वे उपनि-वेशवाद नहीं मानते हैं, साम्राज्यवाद नहीं समझते हैं और न ही उनको यह याद रहती है कि जिस वक्त वे यह कह रहे थे कि राजाओं ने हमारे देश के बहुत से लोगो को गोली से उड़ाया।

Mr. Deputy Chairman, may I request you to restore some order and silence in the House? May I have the pleasure of some silence in the House while I speak?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I think there is silence.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : May we also have the pleasure of not having any irrelevant reference to outsiders?

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR : I never thought that Shri Bhupesh Gupta was an outsider.

मैं अपनी जो बात कह रहा था, उसका उल्लेख इसलिए कर रहा था कि आप जिस देश को ससार में आदर्श मानते हैं, जिस देश के साँचें में अपने देश को ढालना चाहते हैं, वहाँ कुछ होता है। मैं इसके अतिरिक्त आपको याद

[Dr. Bhai Mahavir]

दिलाना चाहता हूँ; क्योंकि आपने अभी यहाँ पर राजा महाराजाओं द्वारा लोगों को गोली से उड़ाये जाने का जिक्र किया। लेकिन मैं आपसे यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या आप भूल गये हैं कि राशि के अन्दर कितने लोगो को बिना ट्राइल, बिना किसी कोर्ट के सामने लाये, किस तरह से गोली से उड़ा दिया गया। ट्राटस्की की कहानी मैं सिर्फ नहीं कहता, मैं जिनोविश की कहानी आपको याद कराऊँ, कामे-नेम की कहानी याद कराऊँ, रोडेफ की कहानी याद कराऊँ, बुखाररेन की कहानी याद कराऊँ, मैक्सिम गोर्की की कहानी याद कराऊँ, जिसको जहर देकर मारा गया था और जो बात सिद्ध हो चुकी है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि श्री भूपेश गुप्त इस बात को भी न भूले कि रशिया में एक शब्द इस्तेमाल होता रहा है, जिसे बेजप्रजोनिश कहते हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि श्री भूपेश गुप्त इस सदन के सम्मानित सदन को बतलायें कि यह बेजप्रजोनिश कौन थे, ये वे लोग थे, जिन्होंने एक करोड़ किसानों को स्टालिन की आज्ञा से कमेन्ट्रेशन कैम्पों में या जेलों में फँक दिया था। उनके जो बच्चे थे वे आवारा सड़कों पर घूमते थे।

They do not belong to any-body who belongs to none.

तो ऐसे बच्चों को अनाथ करने का काम जिस देश के अन्दर हुआ, जहाँ पर करोड़ों जीवन बच्चे मारे गये, उनकी मारी गिनती श्री भूपेश गुप्त को मुझ से ज्यादा मालूम होगी।

इसके अतिरिक्त 1937 में जब आर्मी में मर्ज हुआ था तो उसके अन्दर कितने जनरलों को खत्म स्टालिन की आज्ञा से किया गया, यह वान भी श्री भूपेश गुप्त को मुझसे ज्यादा अच्छी तरह से मालूम होगी। वे इस बात को भी मुझ से ज्यादा जानते होंगे कि श्री ख्रुश्चेव ने अपने प्रसिद्ध भाषण में इन सारे तथ्यों को प्रकट किया और यह भी बतलाया कि लैनिन के दिनों में जो सेंट्रल कमेटी कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी की थी, उसके 66 मैम्बर थे, उनको मरवा दिया गया। स्टालिन, मौलोटोव आदि जो

बाकी बचे 70 में से 66, वे सबके सब स्टालिन की आज्ञा से खत्म कर दिये गये।

श्री उपसभापति : आप बिल पर बोलिये।

डा० भाई महावीर : उस देश को आदर्श समझने वाले श्री भूपेश गुप्त जब यहाँ पर गोली से लोगों को उड़ाने की बात बतलाते हैं, यह कहते हैं कि इन राजा महाराजाओं ने यहाँ के लोगो को गोली से उड़वाया, तो मुझे आश्चर्य होता है कि जब वे इस तरह की बात कहते हैं, तो वे रूस के सारे इतिहास को अपनी आंखों के सामने, दिमाग के पर्दे पर रखते हुए कहते हैं या वहाँ की चीजों को भूलादेते हैं।

इसके अतिरिक्त यहाँ सरकार की गोली से पिछले 23 वर्षों में कितने लोगो को मारा गया, कितनी बार गोली वर्षा हुई, इसका हिसाब क्या उन्होंने लगाया या नहीं, अगर वे इस बात का पता लगा कर यह बात कहते तो अच्छा रहता। परन्तु महोदय, इतनी बात नहीं है। यहाँ पर समाजवाद की बात कही गई है और यह कहा गया है कि अब हम समाजवाद में नया जमाना ला रहे हैं और उस नये जमाने में यह इनोवोनिज्म की बातें नहीं रहनी चाहियें। यहाँ पर हमारे गोरे जी ने यह सर्टिफिकेट दिया कि हम सिर्फ पीछे की तरफ देखते हैं, हमारा सिर्फ भूत है, हमें वर्तमान की चिन्ता नहीं है, हमें भविष्य का भी पता नहीं है। मैं नहीं समझता गोरे जी जिस पार्टी के हैं, वह जिस अवस्था में पहुँच चुकी है, वह अपने आपको वर्तमान में समझती है, वह अपने आपको वर्तमान में मानते हैं या हम लोग अपने आपको वर्तमान में रहने वाला मान सकते हैं। मैं उनको विश्वास दिलाता हूँ कि वह जमाना जल्द आ जायगा, जब उनकी पार्टी तो इतिहास के गर्त में समा जायगी। लेकिन जनसंघ जिन आदर्शों को ले कर खड़ा है और जिन तमन्नाओं को लेकर खड़ा है, ये वर्तमान के धरातल के ऊपर हैं, भविष्य का निर्माण करने वाली तमन्नाएं हैं, हम भूतकाल से प्रेरणा लेते हैं वर्तमान की धरती पर खड़े हैं, लेकिन भविष्य का निर्माण करने का इरादा ले कर हम चले हैं, चलते हैं, इस बारे में उन्हें कोई सन्देह नहीं रहना चाहिए।

कौनसा समाजवाद हमारी सरकार लाना चाह रही है ? वर्तमान समाजवाद के जो प्रणेता हैं, प्रवक्ता हैं, उन्हीं के अन्दर मतभेद हैं तो हम क्या करें। पिछली ए० आई० सी० सी० की मीटिंग में इस सवाल पर जो कुर्सी कांग्रेस के प्रमुख नेता हैं, उनके अन्दर जो मतभेद था, वह समाचारपत्रों में आ चुका है। जगजोवन राम का समाजवाद और है, राजा दिनेश सिंह का समाजवाद और है, केशवदेव मालवाय का समाजवाद और है और हमारे मननीय चन्द्रशेखर का समाजवाद और है। कौनसा समाजवाद आ रहा है ? धारिया माहव का समाजवाद इनमें से किसके साथ मेल खाता है, चन्द्रशेखर के साथ या किशोर ओर के साथ, यह तो वे ही छोट कर बता सकेंगे, लेकिन मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जिस समाजवाद की तरफ हमें ले जाने की कोशिश हो रही है, क्या उस समाजवाद की जो बड़ी पार्टी होगी, उसके नेता के ऊपर टैक्स देने की जिम्मेदारी होगी या नहीं होगी ? अगर वह टैक्स नहीं देता तब दस साल तक तो उस पर पेनल्टी होगी या नहीं और अगर उसके लिए पेनल्टी वेव की जायगी तो बाकी जनता के ऊपर पेनल्टी रहेगी या उनके लिए भी वेव की जायगी या उस समाजवाद में पार्टी के नेताओं के लिए और कानून और माधारेण जनता के लिए और कानून रहेंगे ? अगर ऐसा समाजवाद लाया जा रहा है तो देश की जनता को स्पष्ट तौर से बता दिया जाय कि क्या किया जा रहा है।

हमारे यहाँ पर जो भाषण अभी हुए हैं, उन भाषणों में और बहुत बातें कही गईं। लेकिन उन सारी बातों के साथ मैं शायद न्याय नहीं कर सकूंगा, केवल दो-तीन बातों का उल्लेख करूंगा। अल्ता साहब ने कहा फलां महाराजा इतना खराब था, फलां महाराजा इतना खराब था। मैं मारे महाराजाओं की कहानी के अन्दर नहीं जाऊंगा। ग्वालियर के महाराजा की बात उन्होंने कही। ग्वालियर के महाराजा के सामने हर दशहरे के मौके पर

आपके वहाँ के कांग्रेस के मुख्य मंत्री, जो उस समय प्रधान मंत्री कहलाते थे, जाकर 32 तोला सोना लेकर मुजरा करते थे। इनमें लीलाधर जोशी, गोपीकृष्ण विजयवर्गीय और तख्तमल जैन शामिल हैं। ये नाम मैं इसलिए ले रहा हूँ ताकि जो लोग उन महाराजा को गाली देते हैं, वे समझ लें कि उनके सामने चवर डला कर, सलामी बजा कर 32 तोला सोना जिन्होंने प्राप्त किया है, वे उनके राज्य के प्रधान मंत्री या मुख्य मंत्री रहें हैं। उनकी अब प्रतिष्ठा इसके अन्दर कम होती है, तो कम से कम इस दल को, इस दल के नेताओं को, जो आज महाराजाओं के ऊपर कीचड़ उछालने के लिए खड़े हैं, पता होना चाहिए। जोधपुर के महाराजा की बात कही गई। मैं सारे महाराजाओं को देवता नहीं मानता, मैं समझता हूँ कि उनके अन्दर भी मानवीय दुर्बलताएं हैं, रही हैं और जब आप उनके ऊपर कीचड़ उछालते हैं तो आप भी अपने गरेबान के अन्दर मुह डाल कर देखते हैं, यह मैं उनसे पूछना चाहता हूँ। जोधपुर के महाराज के बारे में कहा गया। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि जयनारायण व्यास जो राजस्थान के मुख्य मंत्री थे, उनके बारे में सरदार पटेल ने जो कुछ लिखा है वह सारा आपने पढ़ा है और अगर नहीं पढ़ा है, तो मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप एक बार पढ़ लें, उसके बाद बतायें। हमारे यहाँ पर ऐसे मंत्री हैं, जो रजाकार रहे हैं, ऐसे मंत्री हैं जो पाकिस्तानी घुस पैठ को बढ़ावा दे रहे हैं, ऐसे मंत्री हैं जो 1947 तक पाकिस्तान के समर्थक थे, पृष्ठ पोषक थे, ज्यों ही पाकिस्तान बना उनके सिर के ऊपर की तुर्की टोपी बदल कर गांधी टोपी हो गई, वे राष्ट्रवादी बन गए और वे कुर्सी कांग्रेस की ऊंची कुर्सियों पर विराजमान हैं, वे सारे लोग कांग्रेस के, रूनिंग पार्टी के नेता हैं। अगर महाराज बुरे थे, तो हमने प्रताप सिंह कैरों भी देखे हैं, हमने बीजू पटनायक भी देखे हैं, हमने के० बी० सहाय भी देखे हैं। ये सब देवता थे ? बाकियों के अंदर देवताओं की खोज करें और अपनी चारपाई के

[Dr. Bhai Mahavir]

नीचे सौटा घुमाने की तकलीफ भी गवारा न करे, यह न्याय की बात नहीं है, सच्चाई की बात नहीं है ।

मैं इस बात से सहमत हूँ, जैसा धारिया साहव ने कहा कि फ्रीडम फाइटर्स का ध्यान रखना चाहिये, लेकिन क्या इस सरकार ने फ्रीडम फाइटर्स का ध्यान रखा? अभी तीन दिन हुए यहाँ फ्रीडम फाइटर्स का कन्वेंशन हुआ । उनसे पूछिये । फ्रीडम फाइटर्स में से एक का नाम लेना हो तो बैरिस्टर सावरकर का नाम लूँगा, उन सावरकर का जिनकी कुर्बानी आज मंत्रिमंडल के जितने मंत्री हैं उन सबकी कुर्बानी का अगर जोड़ कर लिया जाय तो भी उस सबसे ज्यादा उस वीर सावरकर की कुर्बानी का परिणाम आयेगा, लेकिन उनको उसका परिणाम क्या मिला, उनका भुगतान क्या मिला, यह सब मुझे बताने की जरूरत नहीं है । तो मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि ऐसी स्थिति में हमारी सरकार जो यह बिल लायी है उसका सब से बड़ा रहस्य जो है, वह केवल इस बात में है कि कम्पेंसेशन का क्लेम नहीं बताया गया । कम्पेंसेशन का फैसला करेंगे खुद और कैसे फैसला करेंगे, उसमें कौन भी शतरंजी चालें चली जायेंगी, उसमें कौन से मोहरे चले जायेंगे, कितनी मोहरें लगायी जायेंगी, यह सब प्रधान मंत्री अपने हाथ में रखना चाहती है । जो सारी बातों का लुब्धेलुबाव है, जो केन्द्र है, वह यह है कि सारी शक्ति को, सारी सत्ता को अपने हाथ में रख कर जैसे भी हो कुर्सी पर स्थान जमाये रखना चाहिये इसकी व्यवस्था की जाय । लेकिन ऐसा दल जो ऐसी तिकड़मी चालों से, ऐसी शतरंजी चालों से अपने आपको हमेशा के लिये कुर्सी पर कायम रखना चाहता है, वह हमेशा कायम नहीं रह सकेगा, यह इतिहास बताता है । परन्तु मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि समाजवाद के नाम पर जो प्रचार किया जा रहा है कि यह समाजवाद का इलहाम आज आ गया है । 20 साल पहले यह समाजवाद नहीं था । इन्हीं राजाओं से आप ने यह वायदे किये थे और आज एकाएक लगता है कि यह बिलकुल अनाकिञ्जम है, इतिहास के खिलाफ है । वे

प्यूडल्स हैं । वे तब तक प्यूडल्स नहीं थे । जब तक कांग्रेस के साथ थे । 1967 में पहली बार कांग्रेस ने देखा कि उसका सिंहासन हिल रहा है, उखड़ रहा है, आधा देश कांग्रेस के शासन से बाहर हो गया, तो उस समय कांग्रेस को लगा कि समाजवाद का नाम ले कर जो पार्टियाँ निकल रही हैं, उनकी लगान अपने हाथ में खींचना चाहिये और जो उसका एक हिस्सा भी थी ...

श्री उपसभापति : अब आप समाप्त कीजिये । आपका समय हो गया है ।

डा० भाई महावीर : मैं दो मिनट और लूँगा । आपने मुझे दस मिनट दिये थे कम से कम दो मिनट और तो हमारे हिस्से में बच ही जाते हैं ।

श्री उपसभापति : ज्यादा नहीं, आप दो मिनट में समाप्त कर दीजिये ।

डा० भाई महावीर : महोदय, मैं आपसे केवल इतना ही निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि 20 साल तक जो सरकार मौन रही है, किसी कारण से मौन रही है । और आज बिल जिस कारण से लाया गया है, उस कारण को देश जब तक नहीं समझता, तब तक आप देश को बेवकूफ बनाने की कोशिश भले ही करें, लेकिन थोड़ी देर के लिये सबको बेवकूफ बनाया जा सकेगा और थोड़े लोगों को सदा सदा के लिये बनाया जा सकेगा, यह अपने सामने देख कर मुझे लगता है, लेकिन सब लोगों को सदा के लिये बेवकूफ आज तक कोई बना नहीं सका, चाहे वह कितना भी प्रखर व्यक्तित्व हो । और इसलिये महोदय, मैं आज कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस विषय पर विचार करने के लिये एक मानीटरिंग पहलू भी है । एक आर्थिक पहलू भी है । कहा गया दूसरे सदन में भी केवल पैसे का सवाल नहीं है, हमारे यहाँ भी कहा गया कि यह गरीब देश है । इस गरीब देश में पैसे क्यों बर्बाद किये जाय ? क्यों पैसा इन राजाओं को दिया जाय ? मैं समझ सकता हूँ कि इस तर्क के अंदर कोई वजन है । लेकिन आप अपना वचन भंग कर के जो पैसा बचा रहे है, वह कितना है

जरा इसका विचार कर लीजिये। पहली बात तो यह है कि ये 4 करोड़ रुपया कम होता जा रहा है और दस बीस माल के अंदर यह समाप्त हो जाता। आज जो खर्च हो रहा है वह कितना है? यह रुपया उतना है जितना कि आपकी एक पब्लिक अंडरटेकिंग सिंथेटिक ड्रग में जो घाटा हुआ, उसके साथ के बराबर है। अगर हिन्दुस्तान स्टील के घाटे को लिया जाय, तो दस साल तक प्रिवी पर्स उममें से दिया जा सकता था अभी एक माननीय सदस्य कह रहे थे कि फलाने राजा पाकिस्तान की मदद कर रहे थे, हमको पाकिस्तान से जो लेना है, भारत सरकार पाकिस्तान से जो लेने वाली थी, उसे अगर वह वसूल कर सकती तो सौ साल तक हम प्रिवी पर्स दे सकने थे और प्रिवी पर्स सौ साल तक रहने वाला नहीं है। तो नियम और प्राविधान है उनके अंतर्गत हमारे बंगाल में जो बंद होते हैं हमारे भूपेश गुप्त जी की कृपा से, उनमें हर वंद में हमको दस करोड़ रुपये का घाटा होता है। अगर आधे बंद भी नहीं तो यह 4 करोड़ रुपया प्रिवी पर्स का देते बंध बाद भी एक करोड़ रुपया हमारे पास बच जायगा। इतना ही नहीं, जो हमारी पांचवी योजना का खर्चा है, उस खर्च को अगर हम पांच से बांट लें और फिर उसे 365 से बांट कर एक दिन का खर्च अगर निकाल लें तो जो धन आएगा उस सारे का $\frac{1}{3}$ भी नहीं है यह चार करोड़। लेकिन यह सब होने के बाद, यह केवल पैमे का सवाल नहीं है। सवाल इसमें मिट्टा का है और सिद्धांत यह है कि आप वचन दे कर उस को तोड़ रहे हैं।

महोदय, मुझे यह कहना है कि इस वचन भंग का परिणाम हम जो दूसरे लोगों के साथ व्यवहार करते हैं उस पर क्या होता है। आपको जानकारी है, वहां पर बताया गया...

(Time bell rings)

केवल एक आखिरी मिनट और लूंगा... भूटान के अंदर जब हमारे मंत्री गये, तो भूटान के राजा ने कहा कि आप प्रिवी पर्स समाप्त कर रहे हैं, हमारे साथ जो तुम्हारा समझौता है उन पर कहां तक टिकोगे तुम, उनका क्या

वनेगा, हमें यू० एन० ओ० के अंदर स्पांसर कीजिये नहीं तो हम और देश से स्पांसर कराने का प्रवृद्ध करें। वचन-भंग से देश को क्या-क्या हानि पहुंचेगी, इसको समझ लेना है।

(Time bell rings)

महोदय, मुझे आखिर में याद आती है एक बाबा भारती की कहानी। बाबा भारती से एक डाकू ने कहा था कि मैं तुम्हारे घोड़े को ले जाऊंगा इसलिये इसे तुम दे दो। उसको उन्होंने नहीं दिया, तो वह डाकू एक बार भिखमगा बन कर, अपाहिज बन कर, सड़क के किनारे बैठ गया। जब बाबा भारती घोड़े पर निकले तो उसने उनको इशारा किया कि मैं थका हूं, अपाहिज हूँ, उठ नहीं सकता, चल नहीं सकता, दया करो, मुझे घोड़े पर बिठा दो। उन्होंने उसको घोड़े पर बिठा दिया। जब बिठा दिया और वह चलने लगे तो उसने घोड़े पर एड़ लगाई। उसने बाबा भारती को कहा कि तुमने मुझे पहिचाना। बाबा भारती ने कहा कि नहीं। उसने कहा कि मैं वही डाकू हूं, मैंने कहा था कि मैं तुम्हारा घोड़ा ले जाऊंगा, अब लिये जा रहा हूं। बाबा भारती ने कहा कि एक मिनट ठहरो, उसने कहा कि ठहरता तो हूँ, लेकिन घोड़ा वापस नहीं करूंगा। बाबा भारती ने कहा कि मैं घोड़ा नहीं मांगता, केवल यह वचन मांगता हूँ कि तुम घोड़ा बेशक ले जाओ, परन्तु किसी को तुम यह नहीं कहना कि तुमने यह घोड़ा छीना है, यह बताना मत, क्योंकि अगर तुम यह बता दोगे तो सड़क पर जो अपाहिज, दीन-दुःखी पड़े हैं, उनके ऊपर भरोसा करना लोग छोड़ देंगे, तुमने जो उनकी आज क्रेडिट है, जो उनकी साख है, उसको समाप्त कर दिया। इसलिये महोदय, सरकार जिस रास्ते पर चल रही है वह रास्ता बहुत खतरनाक है, वह रास्ता खोल देता है, वचन-भंग करने का।

(Time bell rings)

मेरे मित्र ने कहा कि प्रापर्टी को खत्म करता है, प्रापर्टी सुधार के रास्ते में रुकावट

[डा० भाई महावीर]

है। (Time bell rings) यह खतरे की घंटी है, इस खतरे की घंटी से सजग करने के लिये हम अपनी आवाज उठा रहे हैं। इस मौके पर सारे देश को सजग होना पड़ेगा, सचेत होना पड़ेगा और इसलिये हम इस बिल का विरोध कर रहे हैं कि हम सरकार को भी बताना चाहते हैं, इस सदन को, इस सदन के सदस्यों को भी और देश को भी बताना चाहते हैं कि इस तरह की सरकार की जो मनोवृत्ति है वह देश को गलत रास्ते पर ले जा कर के किस तरह से हानि पहुंचायेगी और इसलिये इसका विरोध करना हमारे लिये आवश्यक हो गया है, हमारा कांग्रेस मरा नहीं है, वह उसी तरह कायम है, ठीक है कि वहां कांग्रेस नहीं है लेकिन हमारा कांग्रेस है वह कांग्रेस यहा सदा रहेगा।

SHRI MOHAN LAL GAUTAM (Uttar Pradesh) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I rise to support this Bill. My reasons are very simple and I have not to discuss the merits or demerits of the Bill, the propriety or impropriety of the proposition. I as a Congressman, am bound by the decisions taken by the undivided Congress at the AICC meeting. The AICC, at its meetings on June 23-25, 1967, adopted the ten-point Programme, and the 10th point was regarding the Privileges and Privy Purses of ex-rulers.

SHRI R. S. DOOGAR (West Bengal) : May I know, Sir, if Mr. Mohan Lal Gautam is getting the time from my party's quota?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Not from your party's quota.

SHRI MOHAN LAL GAUTAM : And the decision taken on the 10th point reads as follows :

"The privileges and privy purses enjoyed by the ex-rulers are incongruous to the concept and practice of democracy. The AICC is of the view that the Government should examine and take steps to remove them."

This is the decision of the united Congress, Sir. Then, after the split in the Congress, we met at Gandhinagar near Ahmedabad on December 21 and 22, 1969, at the Seventy-third Session of the Indian National Congress, and what we decided was this : on Economic and Social Policy.

"The profile of the economic and social policy advocated by the Congress has been firmly drawn. The ten-point programme is a part of this profile. To impart it effectiveness and reality is the urgent task today." * * *

I need not read any further. Sir, this is the position that, as a Congressman, when these decisions are there, it is not for me to discuss whether the commitments given by Sardar should be honoured or not. The real occasion for these discussions was when these things were moved in the AICC meeting, when they were moved in the Congress sessions. If we had, at that time, discussed it, it would have been all right. Some people might have voted this side or that side, but after it was passed both by the united Congress and the separate Congress, I, as a Congressman, with a standing of fifty years, accept it. I joined the Congress movement as a whole-timer in October, 1920 and I have been a whole-timer since then. There are one or two persons who may claim to be senior to me, but not many. Then, if somebody wanted to oppose this, it was very easy for the Congress (O) to have convened a meeting of the Working Committee. Although, I think, the decisions of the open session cannot be rescinded by the Working Committee meetings, the Working Committee could have met and said : "No, we stand by the commitments of Sardar Patel and we will honour them. We will not go back on them." Then, all these arguments of our friends, who advocate that we should continue the privileges, would have been quite appropriate. But we have passed that stage. We took a decision, right or wrong. Unless that decision is rescinded, unless we change that decision...

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA : Also in Goa they took a decision for prohibition. Was it taken up by the AICC?

SHRI MOHAN LAL GAUTAM : I am coming to that. When I finish, you may please put questions.

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : No questions.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, order, please. No interruptions.

SHRI MOHAN LAL GAUTAM : Mr. Deputy Chairman, I have made my point very clear. This ten point programme was hastily drawn up. These are not the top priority ten points and I venture to say, according to my judgment, even if we achieve this ten-point programme, it is not going to bring socialism to this country. But I am helpless. What can I do? So long as these decisions are there, I have to abide by them. As it is there is no option for me but to support it. It will be a flagrant violation otherwise.

SHRI T. V. ANANDAN (Tamil Nadu) : We are proud that we have a Gandhian amongst us.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Let him finish.

SHRI MOHAN LAL GAUTAM : My friends who do not know me must know that I have suffered for something. There are only three persons in the country who withdrew their candidature to the Constituent Assembly, though they were selected by their local units of their States. They refused to go to the Constituent Assembly—myself, Acharya Narendra Dev and Kamaladevi Chattopadhyaya. We have suffered for socialism. We have suffered for our convictions and I venture to say that I have not sought favours either from Sardar Patel or Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru or from anybody else. I have suffered at the hands of both, but I have stood for myself and I have got a clear conscience. I have lived a clean political, economic and intellectual life.

Well, Sir, much has been said about these commitments. Some people have praised the Princes very high which is, I think, not the whole truth. Some people have condemned them. I am of opinion that it is also not the whole truth. I was closely, watching although not connected, but very close, when I was there in the Constituent Assembly. Some of the Princes took a patriotic stand and joined the union. There were patriots amongst the Princes even when the Britishers were there and they suffered on that score. Then,

there were far-sighted people who surrendered. They thought of the forces that were coming up against them and they surrendered. Then there were some weak persons who resisted, resisted very mildly and surrendered immediately. There were some who resisted to the last and then police action had to be taken. Therefore, let us not discuss all that. What is the use of talking whether they are good, bad or indifferent? Now it is a question of abolition of the privy purses and privileges. The credit must go to Sardar Patel. When I used to go abroad as Vice-President of the Inter-Parliamentary Union in 1949, 1950 and 1951, the gist of achievement of the country was put just in one small sentence: the greatest achievement of India today is the integration and democratisation of the Indian States. That was the achievement, and the credit for that must go to Sardar Patel. Even if we give the credit to some of them or all of them, it does not matter much.

What is this Bill? This is a very simple one. It has only three clauses. Something is said about the quantum and how it will be negotiated and all that. The Prime Minister in the Lok Sabha openly declared that the formula will be placed before the Parliament, and we will have the time to discuss that. The second point is the privileges. These privileges made these princes untouchables. There are two types of untouchables: one, the lower grade whom we do not touch; and the other, those who cannot be touched. If a prince commits a crime, he cannot be prosecuted unless we get the sanction of the Government of India in the Home Ministry. He is also unapproachable, untouchable. What we want to do is, what this Bill wants to do is to make them honourable citizens and equal citizens like others.

Then about the question of the word 'ruler', I think as some friend said it is a misnomer. There are no rulers. The नवाब वेमुल्क है इसलिए इसमें कोई खास फर्क नहीं पड़ता है।

objections that have been raised are that the whole picture is not clear. I will not say that I hold this view or that view, but I agree that if the entire picture was

[Shri Mohan Lal Gautam]

clear before us, it might have been better. But if the whole picture is not clear, what is to be done? Suppose one hundred per cent is not given to me and only 50 per cent is given to me, how can I reject? I am very clear on this point that it is not a minus quantity, there is some plus point; whether it is 90 per cent, 70 per cent or even 5 per cent, there is some plus in its favour, there is no minus. If it was minus, I might have opposed it, I would have opposed it. But there is something that they get according to the decisions taken.

(Interruption)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order. order.

SHRI MOHAN LAL GAUTAM: Another point that is raised is that it should be made justiciable. I am one of those who advocated abolition of the zamindari system and I had to suffer imprisonment in 1934. When these zamindari were to be abolished, Pantji was very particular and he tried his best to see that some provision was made in the Constitution that the quantum was not negotiable. If it were made negotiable, it would have been very difficult for the UP people to abolish Zamindari or other estates. So when we want to abolish the privileged class, and if it becomes justiciable, we know what it means. Delay, delay and delay. Therefore, we tried and we were successful because we did not allow the quantum of the Zamindaris, after their abolition, to be justiciable. Now, there is something which is not justiciable. How can I say that it should be made justiciable? I cannot say. Therefore, I am not in favour of making it justiciable.

Sir, some people think that they can go to the International Court. I am not a lawyer, and I am not prepared to give my opinion whether they could go to the International Court or not, at the time of Independence, when they were in a way independent States, they could have got that status. But after merging themselves within the Union, after having enjoyed the rights and privileges of normal citizens for 23 or 24 years and after becoming members of the legislatures and taking oath to the Constitution and all that, I do not think

they will be justified in going to the International Court.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: They can not do it.

SHRI MOHAN LAL GAUTAM: They have not got the status to go to the International Court

It is said that by negotiations we could do it. Last year at the time of the Bangalore Session, I raised this question in the AICC. We met in July, 1969, at Bangalore. The Deputy Prime Minister and the Home Minister were entrusted with the job of negotiating with these friends and there was no agreement. My remark was that if he were the Home Minister at the time of Sardar Patel, then the integration would not have taken place because all this would have taken very much time and Sardar Patel could do all these things in no time. Now, if we were to go in for negotiations, we may be successful or we may not be successful. But it is for the Government to do it and not for us.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: There was a mass movement.

SHRI MOHAN LAL GAUTAM: There were many factors, I know. I am acquainted with all of them.

Now, Sir, people say that there are poor Princes, there are rich Princes. But when we abolished the Zamindari system, we did not take all these things into consideration. And there is one fundamental difference between the Princes and the zamindars. There were zamindars in UP at least—I can speak of UP—who invested their hard-earned income and bought a few acres of land, and then they sub-let them. These lessees became the proprietors, and this meant that injustice was done to them. Suppose there are two lawyers. They served a lakh of rupees each. One invests in buying shares or establishes some industry. His share is quite safe, his money is quite safe. The other man invests in land, buys land. That is confiscated practically. Therefore, injustice was done to the people. There was not a single Prince who invested his money who did anything to improve the conditions. Therefore, this question of poor people and our hearts bleeding for them, has no meaning now. And when the

question of social justice comes, we have to do something; some will have to suffer and do suffer. Therefore this question of pity and all that is of no use.

Sir, we as Congressmen have been taking decisions and we are past-masters in not implementing them. We are guilty of many omissions. But this is the only time when we are likely to commit an act of commission. I do not want to be guilty of it. I am guilty of omissions many a time or you can say whatever you like. We have professed many things but we have not done many things. We are guilty of omissions, but let us not be guilty of commissions also. Therefore, as a Congressman I would appeal to all Congressmen to support the Bill.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : I congratulate Shri Mohan Lal Gautam for his bold and correct stand and appeal, through you, Sir, that all Congressmen who have been freedom-fighters should follow the example of Shri Mohan Lal Gautam.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : If they give up reaction they could be reunited.

SHRI HAMID ALI SCHAMNAD (Kerala) : Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, let me at the outset express my deep sense of appreciation for the Government in bringing forward this progressive, simple and a good Bill to abolish the privy purse. It is a landmark in the history of India and in the history of parliamentary democracy. Shrimati Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister of India, has shown to the world that India could reach finally the goal of socialism through parliamentary democracy alone, without torpedo democracy, without indulging in violence, without the people taking the law into their own hands. She has shown that through parliamentary democracy alone we will reach the goal of socialism. This has been proved beyond reasonable doubt by the Prime Minister of India today.

Sir, the Princes not only received the privy purses but have also enjoyed special privileges which are now sought to be abolished. Today, Sir, these privy purse and privileges are outmoded. In a democratic country how can we allow a particular section of India or a few individuals to enjoy special privileges when even the tallest man of India, the President or the

Prime Minister, or the smallest man, has got only one vote? Every one of us, be it a millionaire or a pauper has only one vote. How can you have special privileges for a few individuals of this country? So, morally and legally the introduction of this Bill is justifiable. I am very glad, Sir, this will definitely give a lesson to the seekers of violence, the land-grabbers, the Naxalites and so on that they need not take the law into their own hands. Instead, let them come to Parliament through parliamentary democracy and achieve what they want.

Sir, much has been said about the ex-Rulers of this country and I do not want to say any more about them. We all know what they have done. There are only a few Rulers who have sacrificed their lives such as the Tipu Sultan of Mysore. He died fighting against British imperialism instead of surrendering. His lesson to the coming generation was that he would surrender only his dead body.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : The Rani of Jhansi was betrayed by Gwalior.

SHRI HAMID ALI SCHAMNAD : As against him there have been Princes like the Nizam of Hyderabad who enjoyed his wealth and did not care for his subjects. He was the henchman of the British. There were so many other Rajas and Kings whom I do not want to name. There has been

Sir C. P. Ramaswamy Iyer, and 7 P.M. others too. We need not say that all those people have sacrificed for the good of the country. A few have sacrificed for the good of the country. (Interruptions) What has it to do with Muslim League? Why should you say about it?

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : How long will you take?

SHRI HAMID ALI SCHAMNAD : Ten minutes. There are unnecessary interruptions. Even the Syndicate Congress has gone to the Muslim League in Kerala. They are wooing us. We refused. We told them "You are reactionary forces, we are not with you."

SHRI S. N. MISHRA : We are not smugglers.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, please.

SHRI HAMID ALI SCHAMNAD : I know whether smugglers are in the Syndicate Congress or not. (Interruptions) No less a person than the son of Mr. Morarji Desai has been clubbed with smugglers.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : I would appeal to the hon. Members not to get agitated. Let the hon. Member finish his speech.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR : Mr. Deputy Chairman, at least the Leader of the Opposition should have consideration for a new Member.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : Order, please; let him continue.

SHRI HAMID ALI SCHAMNAD : Now, much has been said about the sanctity of the contract or treaty. I would say, we cannot call it a treaty. It was a transitional arrangement made by Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel, with the ex-Rulers in those days, nothing more than that. There is no question of breaking promises. The abolition of the zamindari system has already been referred to. Was it not a contract? The zamindari system has been abolished. The Supreme Court held that it was against the Constitution. So, the Constitution was amended by the Parliament to give legal validity to the abolition of zamindari system. Similarly, the Land Reforms Act of Kerala was struck down by the Supreme Court. To give legal validity, again the Constitution was amended and the Act was included in the Schedule to give constitutional protection to agricultural lands. We think of the Princes. What about the small landholders? The man, purchases the land, gives it to another man to cultivate with a registered lease deed and asks him to pay an annual rent of Rs. 50; and the tenant pays him back the rent due to him. We brought an enactment and said "Do not pay the rent back. The land is yours." It was asked "What about the registered lease deed? We have agreed to pay rent to the landlord." We said "Nothing do-

ing. The land belongs to the tiller." What about the compensation? The fair rent had been fixed. Ten times the fair rent would be the price of the land payable within a certain period of time. In Kerala it is being implemented stage by stage. Is it not breaking the contract between the two parties after the registration of the lease deed? Between the two persons the tenant agrees to pay the rent to the landlord. He takes possession of the land. But the Government interferes and says, don't pay the rent. That is for the welfare of the country as a whole. This is the system which is being introduced.

Take the instance of another enactment. The Debt Relief Act has been brought into force. What is debt relief? Even that debt relief is being given in instalments to the agriculturist in such a way that it is to the detriment of the country, to the detriment of the people, to the detriment of the nation as a whole. So many enactments have been brought. In the Constitution itself there is a provision that you can amend the Constitution if it is for the welfare of the country. We can amend the Constitution if it is for the welfare of the nation as a whole. And when the question of the abolition of privy purses comes, I do not know why some people are not in favour of that measure. Just to mention an example, has anybody spoken anything against the small landholders? Not that I am not in favour of it. When that is so, it is highly immoral on the part of any free citizen of this country to oppose this Bill. The nation as a whole, the people as a whole, today want that the Privy Purses should be abolished. It is the duty of the people to see that the Privy Purses are abolished. The Government of India should only respond to the wishes of the people of our country. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : We will continue this tomorrow.

The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at seven minutes past seven of the clock till eleven of the clock on Saturday, the 5th September, 1970.