

[श्री राजनारायण]

जाना दोष है ; क्या यह हमारा संवैधानिक अधिकार नहीं है ; मगर छोड़ना गवर्नमेंट का कर्तव्य था । मधु लिमये ने चव्हाण पर आरोप लगाया था । अगर चव्हाण में जनतंत्र प्रतिभा होती, क्षमता होती तो मधु लिमये को छोड़ते, कहते लोकसभा में आने दो ताकि लोकसभा में आकर जो कुछ कहना हो हमारे खिलाफ़ कहें इसे कहते हैं डेमोक्रेटिक, टेम्परामेंट, जनतंत्री मनोवृत्ति और स्वभाव । जनतंत्र केवल शब्द में नहीं है, जनतंत्र एक प्रथा है ।

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have mentioned your point.

श्री राजनारायण : तो मैं यह आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि जैसे आपने हमें नियम दिया वैसे आप श्री यशवन्तराव चव्हाण से कहें कि कल परी रपट दें, पूरी की पूरी रपट दें । माँ के ऊपर उसके निजी बेटे को लिटाया गया, यह कोई मामूली कांड नहीं है । यह कांड है जो कि हमारे उत्तर प्रदेश में हो रहे हैं और जिसके विरुद्ध प्रदर्शन हुआ और उसमें गोली चली, चार आदमी आन-दि-स्पाट (घटना स्थल पर) मरे हैं । इसलिये मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि आप घर विभाग को आदेश करें कि इस पर खुल कर चर्चा हो । श्रीमन्, आप जानते हैं, श्रीमती सरला भदौरिया यहाँ बैठी हैं, वह इस राज्य सभा की सम्मानित सदस्या हैं, इनको भी गिरफ्तार किया गया, ये करीब डेढ़ महीने जेल में रखी गई । . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have mentioned your point.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I have given you enough opportunity; nothing more.

श्रीमती सरला भदौरिया (उत्तर प्रदेश) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं सारी स्थिति आपके सामने रखना चाहती हूँ ।

ALLOTMENT OF TIME FOR THE MOTION TO DISCUSS CENTRAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES' STRIKE ON THE 19TH SEPTEMBER, 1968 1968

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have to inform Members that under rule 172 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I have allotted one day for the consideration of the Motion regarding the situation arising out of the token strike by Central Government Employees on September 19, 1968.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal) : Sir, I have a submission to make. I was waiting for you to make the announcement. My first submission is : Kindly extend the time limit. In the other House it was more than two days, and I hope they sat up to seven o'clock or half past six. This is my first submission. It is your discretion. Secondly, again and again I am submitting to you—and I seek your assistance and help—that in a debate of this kind taking place after a lapse of two months the Prime Minister should come and make a statement, or intervene in the debate right at the beginning. This is very very essential. As far as we understand from the papers, she could not or did not make her speech in the Lok Sabha for reasons known to the country (*Interruptions*). The opposition was ready to hear her speech but for Mr. Chavan's provocation. She started her speech, with a wrong prefatory phrase because she endorsed Mr. Chavan's statement. And that created confusion. Now, in another set of circumstances we are told that she has something to say. In fact, when people met her, she said she had something to say in her speech. With regard to the question of pending victimisation, i.e. it not proper, Sir, that she makes a statement here, or intervenes in the debate here? Mr. Chavan is absolutely useless; we have heard him; we have seen his behaviour. I was surprised at his performance, (*Interruptions*) It would not be a fair debate if the Government is not represented here by the Prime Minister on this issue. We do not have a no-confidence motion in this House.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta J (*Interruptions*)
 Kindly listen to my suggestion, and I make the suggestion in all humility and without any provocation. The moment the name of Mr. Chavan is mentioned, there is interruption. All I say is that in our House, unlike in some other Upper Chambers, we do not have the no confidence motion.

SHRI M. N. KAUL (Nominated): We have the censure motion.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I wish we had that. In that case it would have been obligatory on the Prime Minister as the Head of the Government to reply to the debate. Today, since we do not have the no confidence motion, she need not even participate in the debate; somebody perhaps on behalf of the Government can intervene. Therefore we should not suffer on the censure that we do not have a provision for a no confidence motion—number one. Secondly, it relates to the Government policy as a whole because we are raising issues which relate to various Ministries, Post and Telegraph, Works and Housing, Home Ministry, Finance Ministry, Railway Ministry in fact all Ministries. Especially in relation to the aftermath of the strike and victimisation one Minister cannot speak for all the Ministries unless it is the Prime Minister. We want to hear the Government point of view at the most authoritative level; we want to hear the Prime Minister speak on behalf of every single Ministry involved in this matter, and of course on behalf of the Government. I do not see as to why the Prime Minister. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, your point of view is there. Now let us begin the debate.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : But what happens to it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your view is already conveyed; your very speech has conveyed it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : But if Mr. Chavan comes and he starts saying the same thing, the same provocative thing which he said in the other House, if I

something happens here then do not blame us. I am suggesting what I have suggested for better conduct of the House. I am not making a suggestion for the sake of making a suggestion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So far as I am concerned, I cannot dictate to the Ministers or the Government what they should do.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You can.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. You have conveyed your view and I am sure your view is before them. They will consider it and do what they like.

SHRI RAJNARAIN (Uttar Pradesh) : On a point of order.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA (Maharashtra): On a point of order, Mr. Chairman.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE (West Bengal) : What happens, Sir, to the suggestion made by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta to extend the debate to two days?

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is your point of order, Mr. Dharia?

SHRI M. M. DHARIA : Mr. Chairman, Sir, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has raised great constitutional points—according to him. As per our Constitution here, Sir, the Cabinet functions. A Minister is responsible to the Cabinet; he speaks on behalf of the Cabinet. Whether it is the Prime Minister or whether it is the Home Minister, it is immaterial. Whenever a Minister will intervene, he will intervene on behalf of the Government. And, Sir, it is because of the politics, the nasty politics being played by the opposition, the Prime Minister could not speak there, in the Lower House, and in the process the Government employees are the sufferers.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I strongly protest against his remarks attributed to the opposition. (*Interruptions*) The Home Minister insulted the Lok Sabha when he spoke.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please do not interrupt him when Mr. Dharia is on his legs. Please sit down, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why did you allow him to say such a thing, 'Sir'?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now let him have his say.

SHRI M. M. DHARIA: Government employees are the sufferers on account of the nasty politics of the opposition who have utilised those employees for their own party politics. Let them examine themselves.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is not party politics. It is giving provocation. Otherwise, we would not hear anybody; it is better nobody speaks for the Government side.

SHRI M. N. KAUL: On a point of order, Sir. There is a very salutary provision in our parliamentary practice that the proceedings in the other House in the current session are not discussed here . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am sorry to interrupt you; it is now Mr. Rajnarain's turn to have his say. I saw him standing even before you.

SHRI M. N. KAUL: I shall take only a minute, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let him have his say now.

श्री राजनारायण : श्रीमान, हमारा एक प्वाइंट आफ ऑर्डर था, इनको कैसे मौका दे दिया।

श्री राजनारायण : आपने कहा मोहन धारिया के बाद बोलूँ इसलिये हम बैठ गये।

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right, you have your say.

श्री राजनारायण : असलमें चूँकि हम हिन्दुस्तानी बोलते हैं इसलिये हमारी मुसीबत यह है कि हमको चिल्लाना पड़ता है, गला खराब हो जाता है।

श्रीमान्, मैं आपके द्वारा अपने मित्र श्री भूपेश गुप्त से कुछ निवेदन करना चाहूँगा। यदि यह कहें कि महिला प्रधान मंत्री के मुखारविन्द से भीठे शब्द निकलते हैं, इनको पसन्द होते हैं,

कर्ण-प्रिय हैं और चव्हाण मर्द के मुंह से कटु शब्द निकलते हैं, कर्ण-कटु हैं, वह तो मैं समझ सकता हूँ मगर सरकारी नीति के सम्बन्ध में श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी कुछ दूसरा वर्जन दे देंगी जिससे कि भूपेश जी को कुछ लाभ हो जायगा इसे मैं समझ सकने में असमर्थ हूँ, मैं इसे समझ सकता नहीं।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: As you wanted to hear Shrimati Sarla Bha-dauria, similarly I would like to hear the Prime Minister; she is the Head of the Government.

श्री राजनारायण : तो ठीक है, भूपेश गुप्ता जी ने हमारी बात मानी, इनको नीति के सम्बन्ध में कुछ नहीं है, खाली इतना चाहते थे कि प्रधान मंत्री जी यहाँ रहें, वह मीठी मीठी बाणी से इनके कानों में मीठी आवाज, रसभरी आवाज दे दें, मगर मैं एक बात श्री भूपेश गुप्त से कहना चाहता हूँ कि चव्हाण गलत है इनके कहने के अनुसार, चव्हाण ने बूचर किया, हत्या की, मारा, तो क्या इस का दोष उस प्रधान मंत्री पर नहीं आता जिसने इतनी नर-हत्या कराने के बाद भी चव्हाण को हटाया नहीं। इस लिये मैं भूपेश जी से कहना चाहूँगा कि वह आपत्ति अलग हुई, वह अपना सजेशन वापस लें और आप यशवन्तराव चव्हाण को बुलाइये या सरकार के पक्ष को जो भी यहाँ अच्छी तरह से प्रस्तुत कर सके उसको बुलाइये, क्योंकि हमारा मतलब साफ है कि यह जाइंट रिसपांसिबिलिटी है सरकार की जो नीति होगी वही चव्हाणजी कहेंगे, वही इंदिराजी कहेंगी, इसलिये उस विवाद में नहीं जाना चाहिये।

मैं एक और निवेदन करूँगा अपने मित्र धारिया जी से। उन्होंने सारे अपोजीशन को दोष दे दिया . . . सारे अपोजीशन को कह दिया कि सारे अपोजीशन की यह टैक्टिक्स हैं। इस समय श्रीमती इंदिरा नेहरू गांधी और श्री यशवन्तराव चव्हाण के बीच में जो रस्साकशी हो रही है उसमें वह मजा लें तो मैं बता दूँ हमें मजा नहीं है। हमने कभी नहीं कहा कि नेहरू जी अच्छे और काँग्रेस खराब, हमने कभी नहीं कहा कि इंदिरा नेहरू अच्छी और काँग्रेस खराब . . .

SHRI KRISHAN KANT (Haryana):
Sir, is it all relevant?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Rajnarain, we have heard you. Now, let the debate begin. Mr. Muniswamy will move the motion.

SHRI B. K. GAIKWAD (Maharashtra) :
Sir, before we start I want to rise on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are too many points of order; they are all points of disorder.

SHRI B. K. GAIKWAD: Unless we rise on a point of order you don't allow us to speak. I want to draw the attention of the House and also remind the House that in the last session it was decided that the motion regarding the Committee on the welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes would be taken up for consideration on the first -lay of this session. It was to be moved on that day itself but unfortunately there was some misunderstanding and the House was adjourned *sine die*. Now in this session the first day is gone, the second day is also going. I want to know when that Government motion is going to be taken up. That is a Government motion and . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is there on the agenda. Immediately this is over it will come.

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI): It was there on the first day's agenda but yesterday the House decided that this should be taken up today.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, it is there and it will come. There is no question of evading.

MOTION RE THE SITUATION ARISING OUT OF THE TOKEN STRIKE BY CENTRAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES ON 19TH SEPTEMBER 1968.

SHRI N. R. MUNISWAMY (Madras): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I beg to move—

"That the situation arising out of the token strike by Central Govern-

ment employees on September 19, 1968, and the action taken by Government in relation thereto be taken into consideration."

Sir, it really pains me to make any observation about this unusual situation that has arisen as a result of the strike.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) in the Chair.]

If in the course of my observations I make any remarks which might wound the susceptibilities of Members there or if I transgress in any way the limitations I hope they would excuse me because the situation arising out of this strike is not a happy one to be narrated in any form or in any shape. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Government employees numbering about 26 lakhs, if I am right, and there are three main services, Defence, Post and Telegraph and the Railways besides a host of others which I am not going to mention. Sir, the strike was brewing for a very long time and this was only to be a token strike just for a day though it might have been extended for some time or even made into an indefinite one. The trouble that has been caused as a result of this is so enormous that anybody would shed tears. The population of India is about 500 million of which about 2 to 3 million people are the servants of the entire community. About 498 million people were virtually kept at bay as a result of this strike by these two million odd people who comprise the Government employees and who went on strike. Basically it was said that it would be a very peaceful strike for about 24 hours from 6.00 A.M. to 6.00 A.M. the next day. But unfortunately it has led to various ramifications. Committing one error after another this strike resulted in loss of life and damage to property. If only we have got the patience to think we will find that the leaders or the sponsors of this strike mostly happen to be outsiders. Here I should be very charitable to the workers and I would say that excepting for a few of them I should say they are all loyal to the Government and to the service to which they have