

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Therefore I say that this motion should be included. Let the Government come out with a motion of its own if it likes to justify its conduct but let us have an opportunity to examine how the emergency measures are being administered in the country in the different walks of life, what abuses are taking place, whether really for building up defence you need extraordinary measures like the emergency powers or we can carry on the task under the normal provisions of the Constitution. These are matters of fundamental importances and should be discussed in the House.

SHRI SATYA NARAYAN SINHA: The hon. Member, I think, already has had his say. So far as we are concerned, we have not received any such notice about it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We have given.

SHRI SATYA NARAYAN SINHA: You might have given. You have not given to us. You might have given to the Secretariat. It takes some time. It has not reached us so far.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am told that it has been admitted only today . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am very glad. He is right.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It will be looked into.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am very sorry that he has not received it but Madam, I would request him through you that this whole question should be seriously discussed in the House in the light of the very many criticisms that have been made about the continuance.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It has been admitted by the Chairman and it will come in due course . . .

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Madam, last week the Minister for Parliamentary Affairs gave us an assurance that time will be found during next week for discussing the food situation and the sugar situation but no mention has been made now by the Minister.

SHRI SATYA NARAYAN SINHA: The Food Debate will be taken up on the 9th. That is the date we have fixed for it

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 2-30.

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

The House reassembled after lunch at half-past two of the clock, THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY) in the Chair.

**THE REPRESENTATION OF
THE PEOPLE (AMENDMENT)
BILL, 1962—continued.**

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Mr. Vice-Chairman, when we adjourned for lunch, I was explaining that so far as I could understand, the object of the measure brought forward by my hon. friend, Shri M. P. Bhargava, is that public attention should be focussed on the question of the return of financial statements, that these statements are not at all according to facts and that this provision of law makes honest people submit statements which are incorrect, and therefore, we have to think of ways and means of dealing with this problem, at the same time keeping in mind the fact that there should not be absolute licence and freedom to spend any amount, because that will also hurt our democracy. I am sure my hon. friend, while replying to the debate, will clear up this issue, because the fact that he has asked only for soma

deletion has led to some comments on this side of the House.

While discussing this question, Mr. Vice-Chairman, certain general issues have been brought in. Although the purpose of the Bill is a limited one, the question came in of the policies of parties. The question was also brought in that though there were days when even a lamp post could be got elected on the ticket of a party, according to Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, even the Qutab Minar cannot be got elected these days leave aside lamp posts. So, these discussions seem to show that there is some confusion in the minds of hon. Members while discussing this matter, if I may be permitted to say so. It is true that during the freedom struggle, the one sacred idea during that struggle was to get rid of the foreigner and the foreign rule. Obviously, as the Congress had achieved that freedom, there was unbounded sympathy and consideration for the Congress.

But now the situation is entirely different and I have no doubt that parties now should have very clear and definite policies. That is number one. The second thing required is the implementation of those policies, and thirdly, according to the changing circumstances of the time, these policies also should undergo changes. Unless these things are there, I don't think any party or any person can stand the test and the public, the voters, will not return him unless his party is very clear about these things. The Congress has accepted the challenge of the time and has taken into its hands the question of removal of poverty. The Congress has taken into its hands the task of doing away with all the miseries of ignorance and poverty. The Congress has taken into its hands the question of illiteracy and many other questions. Now, obviously, there will be clashes. With the best of intentions, the Congress thinks that as poverty is abominable and dreadful, we must move with the greatest possible speed. Our friends (if the Swatantra Party also with the best of intentions, say: "No. We must go

slow. You are going too fast." And our friends from the Communist side say, "No matter what means you adopt, you go with the greatest speed, irrespective of the methods you adopt."

So, in this difficult situation, Mr. Vice-Chairman, we have to pull through. So these factors are not limited only to the question of what amounts are to be spent and what amounts are not to be spent. These are the challenges, I entirely admit. I am not one of those who say that there are no black sheep in all the folds. There are people who do not stand up to the test and they have fallen down and any ruling party will have this kind of difficulties. But I want to emphasise that justice is, of course, the supreme consideration and justice requires the elimination of corruption, the elimination of favouritism, the elimination of all those factors which go against justice.

Another factor which it is absolutely necessary to be kept in mind is that it is not enough if we have only a clear and definite policy, but its implementation is also equally important. And in this respect, I feel, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that we are failing on both sides, on the side of the non-officials and on the side of the officials. On the side of non-officials we think that everything is clear, that the people know for what the Congress or any other party stands and we are very much complacent and we do not take the trouble to go to the people and explain to them our policy, explain to them our work and thus create confidence in them. And then, on the side of the officials, there is the lack of a sense of urgency. Our officers, even at the highest rank, move as if they were living in the time of the Britishers. They do not appreciate how fast we have to go, and a problem that should take half-an-hour they take weeks to solve, going in the same complacent way. These are the problems which our parties have to face. They have to stand this test. If they are to face these challenges, they should have definite policies and they will

[Shri Akbar Ali Khan.]

have to implement those policies with honesty and integrity and with every possible effort so that no misgiving is created in the minds of the public. And as it is generally said, no question of "licence-permit" should influence the people in taking any decisions.

These are the things which every party will have to face and only those parties which stand by their policies and implement them will be returned by the voters. The people will not take the matter lightly. I entirely agree that in order to win the confidence of the people, in addition to tightening up of our election procedure, we have also to see that our moral stature, our intellectual stature and the stature of our service to the people, are also kept up as high as they were kept up in the days of the freedom struggle.

With these words, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I give my qualified support to the motion, qualified in the sense that I hope the hon. Member will clear up the point as to whether he wants to delete the provision entirely or not. If it is entire deletion, then I do not entirely agree with him. I do agree with him that on this question the opinion of the public should be elicited, views have to be entertained and then, ultimately, this august House and the other House will come to the right conclusion. Thank you.

SHRI DAHYABHAT V. PATEL (Gujarat): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I think our hon. friend, Mr. Bhargava, has done a distinct service by tabling this motion for it gives this House an opportunity to express its views and to point out the way the country has been drifting since independence. As was rightly pointed out by my friend, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, when we began, it was the high criterion of sacrifice and service that influenced the voters in the elections, but after fifteen years of power and the same party being in power, things have changed and for this the party in power must take its

full share of responsibility, particularly for not agreeing to the united demand of all opposition parties that limited companies should be prohibited from making donations to political parties. I am aware that there are honourable exceptions on the other side also, people who feel that way, but the party as a whole voted for itself to be in power with the help of money. That let the cat out of the bag. The hon. Shri Jairamdas Daulatram pointed out the things as they were, how they were when we started with these elections and, I think, he gave us a mild warning pointing out the threats and how things are moving today. I do not know whether, in the opinions that we will get because the motion is for circulation of the Bill for eliciting opinion, we would be able to get a correct picture of what the people feel or get only a picture of what the Chief Ministers feel.

Sir, I am sorry I have to repeat the oft-repeated example but that is the way the Prime Minister goes on praising again and again. I refer to the State of Punjab. One election petition against the Chief Minister of the Punjab was not heard at all till the term of the Assembly was nearly over and the second election petition has not so far been taken up even after two years have passed by. Is this how elections are going to be conducted? Is this the way you build up confidence in the people? Is this the way of having free and fair elections? I do not know whether we will get the opinions of the very same people who are responsible for this state of affairs? Surely, an election petition is a thing that can be disposed of very very quickly but in Punjab everything is suited to the person about whom there are so many complaints and when the complaints are to be investigated, there is a long preface of certificates by the Prime Minister given to that very person. What hope there is for democracy, what hope there is for justice in such circumstances, I leave it to this.

august House and the people of this country to judge.

In this world, a^s all religions particularly in our country, point out there is always a tug of war between the forces of the good, what we may call the moral values, and the forces of evil, what may be called between the Devil and the Lord, we may call it Khuda and the Shaitan. This tug of war has been going on for generations. Under Mahatma Gandhi's leadership this country was trained to look to the moral values, sacrifices and what is intrinsically good. Under his leadership and guidance we have enshrined in our Constitution this fact and our motto is Satyameva Jayate. With deep humility, may I ask, where is *satya* today? Do we have *satya* in Parliament? Do we not have repeated instances of Ministers giving utterly false replies without any remedy to the Parliament to ask why such replies are given? Where is our *dharma* going, may I ask? It is necessary . . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: You will agree, Sir, that Members also make such remarks.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: I do not dispute it but, unfortunately or fortunately, Members are not in authority and the only thing that they can do is to raise their voice and point out this but those in authority should not give up this principle and belief in *satya* but should set up an example. Then they would get better support of the House and then it would be difficult for any one not to disregard that high principle. But when people in power and with such a big majority ignore this, how can they blame the others who are handful? I am not defending them and I do not believe in defending untruth under any circumstances. I stand for truth every time but I am pointing out that there is such a large number in authority who persist in using untruth as a means of misleading people, misguiding the

country, it does not lie in their mouth to blame people who have to do so and who do not have all these. I do not justify it; it is wrong on all sides but it is much more wrong when it is done by people in authority, by people who have so much behind them.

When this Bill comes back with the opinion of the people, I hope it will not come back only with the opinions of the Chief Ministers. I do not know whether we are going to get non-official opinions also side by side with the opinions that we will get from the State Governments. We should try to make an effort to get non-official opinion, from the universities, from independent bodies and even from people who conduct business and commerce and industry. I know also that the opinion of the people in business, commerce and industry is going to be influenced by the Government because even though they have money, they have to stand in a queue and perform *arti* before the Ministers and their officers for licences. They cannot do a thing today without a licence and if they displease the Ministers, they will have to shut their shop, incur loss and then they will come in for criticism both from their shareholders and from the Government. Who in business is prepared to take that risk today? So, people in business and people who have got large stakes will only say what Government wants them to say. Therefore, I am inclined to feel that opinion on this subject would be freely available from Bar Associations, universities and independent bodies who have not necessarily got much to do with Government. Is the purpose of this eliciting of opinion going to be getting opinion from such people also? Perhaps this would give us some means for making up our minds when the measure comes up for discussion again before the House.

There are the forces working in this world of money; equally true, there are forces of violence and today the forces of murder, of hate, of violence, have been sugarcoated in the

[Shri Dahyabhai V. Patel]

language of democracy. We have seen how they have worked in many places all over the world. I hope the purpose of the sympathy that is expressed for the democratic forces, for free elections, is not going to be allowed to be misused by such forces but that this country, this Parliament—May God grant light to it—would see the true path that the Father of the Nation gave us and when this comes up for reconsideration with the opinions for which it is being circulated, we will have something to think about and the country and the Parliament would have thought about it on those lines. Thank you.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I welcome this opportunity provided by the introduction of this motion for a general discussion on election procedure in the country. It is true that the motion merely seeks to elicit public opinion with regard to the proposal for deleting the provisions in the Representation of the People Act requiring filing of election expenses. In the course of the discussion, Sir, very many vital issues with regard to elections generally have been raised. It is true also that some of the observations made have vital links with the motion before the House.

Sir, the House will recall that we have been through three general elections successfully with adult suffrage. That is a great credit to any country, and especially to a country like India where nearly 20 million people went to the polls. We can rightly say that we are the largest democracy in the world today but on a review of the three general elections that have taken place in the past we find certain trends working in the country. One is that the electorate is getting more and more educated. I do not refer to the spread of education in schools and universities covering more and more people in the country. I refer to the political education,

thanks to the increase in the number of periodicals, dailies and other media of mass contact. So with forces working for dissemination of information on an ever increasing scale the individual is becoming more and more aware today of the issues on which he is called upon to decide. That is a very welcome trend indeed.

Then, Sir, the population of the country is also increasing. We are growing at the rate of 2 per cent, per annum with the result that the strength of the electorate in every constituency is increasing. For instance, the strength of the Lok Sabha being fixed at 500 under the Constitution, the number of voters in each constituency goes on increasing every five years. In 1952, if I remember right, the average voting strength in a parliamentary constituency was of the order of 3 to 4 lakhs. Now, it has risen to more than five lakhs. At this rate unless we change the total strength of the Lok Sabha the electoral strength of a parliamentary constituency after ten or fifteen years would be one and a half times nearly of the present strength. So this question is also contributing to the general problem of conducting elections on a vast scale. Even as things were in the beginning, that is, 1952, when we first plunged into general elections, our constituencies were probably the biggest in the whole world taking all the countries in the world into account. The United Kingdom has a population of 50 millions and only one legislature and the strength of their Parliament—Mother of Parliaments—is more than 600; that is to say, the parliamentary constituency in the UK is smaller than even the Assembly constituency in India. That is the position, whereas in our own country it is five times the strength of a parliamentary constituency in the UK. [THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

Now, take the world picture as a whole. If you take into account the developing countries, the only stable democracy is to be found in India only. In other places we have demo-

eracia called under various names; guided democracy in one place, basic democracy in another and people's democracy in a third set of countries and so on. Full freedom and democratic practice is to be found only in our own country. And since this is a copy of the practice followed in the advanced democracies of the world, it is useful to compare the election procedures in the advanced democracies and those in our own country. And the very fundamental difference that strikes one when we compare the election procedures in the two sets of countries is that educationally we are backward and secondly the strength of our constituencies is very large, many times larger than that in the West. But as I said, we are trying to catch up with the West in the matter of education of the electorate and it will not be very long before we can say that our electorate is fully educated. It is with regard to the strength of constituency that the House and the country is concerned.

3 P.M.

Madam, much has been said about the power of money in influencing elections. I shall come to that aspect a little later. It does play a very important role in the conduct of elections today. Quite apart from money—money in the sense that it is used to buy voters—what is the extent of resources necessary to organise an election campaign in a constituency of the size of a parliamentary constituency in India? If you have to appoint agents, if you have to contact voters in the entire constituency, if you have to make the other arrangements necessary for a successful election campaign, the cost would be beyond the means of an ordinary middle-class man and this expenditure for organising an election campaign is on the increase, that is to say, if decent people fight elections and if they do not resort to any malpractices just to organise the elections, just to come into contact with the people, they require expenditure

780 RS—3.

which would be far beyond their means. That is the prospect we face today. Now, in addition to such a situation, one has to face formidable opponents backed by money and there is a lot of unaccounted money, not to speak of anything else. At present there is a lot of unaccounted money in the country which according to Prof. Shenoy runs to the tune of Rs. 700 crores. When one contemplates such a prospect, it is easy to see that either money wins or people without means cannot stand for elections. It means one of two things. So, that is the prospect.

It is this prospect that is leading the country to all kinds of evils. Well-meaning people come forward to take part in general elections in the country and participate in the democratic processes by which the country is governed, but then they are up against insurmountable difficulties). The organised parties naturally go about collecting funds because they cannot set up only the monied class of people for elections. It is in this context that companies are also allowed to contribute to the election fund of parties. I do not defend the practice. It is the state of things obtaining in the country today. In such a state of affairs, when money is sought from all sources, money is not given freely. It is not given from altruistic motives. The giver expects something in return and there is a chain reaction. Standards fall and what is called corruption becomes rampant and affects all layers of the society. We cannot shut our eyes to this state of affairs. And elections are costly when our constituencies are big. Elections become beyond the means of the decent citizen. And when he relies on parties for collection of funds from outside, such a state of affairs will necessarily ensue and when the very process by which we try to lay the foundations of a democratic apparatus in the country is vitiated by this practice, then it is no wonder that corruption affects all departments* I of life in the country.

[Shri N. M. Lingam.]

So, I feel it is time that Government reviewed the entire election procedure, not merely this question of deleting the clauses requiring the filing of election expenses in the Representation of the People Act. I do not know what the thinking of the Government is on the question, but if they have gone through the Reports of the Election Commission after the last two general elections and if they have seen the after effects of the general elections, the happenings during the elections themselves, they will realise—and I have no doubt that they have realised it already—that the trends that are manifesting themselves are not healthy, are not conducive to the proper growth of democracy in the country.

But then, how is one to reduce the power of money in influencing elections? Previous speakers have said and, in particular, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has said that a day should come when the ordinary citizen, the peasant, the artisan, the common man should be able to sit as an hon. Member in this House representing the vast majority of people in the country. That may be a distant ideal and there may be differing views on this question, but then we are primarily concerned here with the problem of eliminating corrupt practices engendered by the rising cost of elections and the growing electorate. He was visualising a state of society where inequalities would have been reduced to the minimum and in such a society everybody would have equal opportunities to spend or not to spend. But then, democracy will not flourish by merely levelling down a society to a low level. The House will recall, in this connection, the famous observations of the then President of the Constituent Assembly, the late Dr. Rajendra Prasad, when he said at the conclusion of the labours of the Constituent Assembly that he had two regrets. One was, he trembled to envisage a situation where because of adult suffrage a set of fools sitting in the

highest forum of the land would frame laws to be interpreted by a set of most brilliant judges sitting in the Supreme Court. That is an extreme position. We want democracy to be of a very high order and at the same time we want the process through which such a democracy is established to be pure and wholesome. I feel that the time has come for the Government to set about thinking seriously how best to bring about such an election procedure. Unless the Government takes the initiative itself or gives a direction to the Election Commission to go about this business, it will be too late before the next elections which are fast approaching. As I said, the problem is snowballing after every election. Now, with regard to the motion before the House, it is extremely limited in scope. If the intention of the mover is to see that there is absolutely no obligation on the part of anybody to file a return of election expenses, which, in other words, would mean that the sky is the limit for getting a seat in Parliament or in the local legislature, I do not think that people would agree with such a prospect. It gives the power to unscrupulous men, men who have made money by means fair or foul to fight the elections and not be accountable for the way in which they won the election. I do not say thereby that the existence of this provision in the present Act is a check on the tendency to spend money freely and buy votes or to indulge in corrupt practices in elections. There is no simple solution to a matter like this. I feel very tempted to say that one of the methods to circumvent or rather to solve the problem is to resort to indirect election to Parliament. But I would not hazard that suggestion before this august House because our pride has been that ours is the largest democracy, that the highest forum in the land is directly elected by millions of people. So, one hesitates to compromise with this process by which representatives have been sent directly by millions of voters all over the land. But that does

not mean that the problem could be shelved or that we should rest satisfied that there is no solution to the problem. It is more than collecting money from individuals and companies. It affects the entire fabric of vast masses of the people, in fact every adult in the land and, as I said, it has repercussions on other departments of life in the country. So it is the duty of the Government to see that our election procedures give rise to the least abuses and that the processes by which our representatives are elected are above criticism and above reproach. That calls for the best genius of the Indian people to evolve the pattern suited to our country. We need not imitate the practices in the West in every detail in this matter. Ours is largely a copy of the practice that is followed in Westminster in this respect, but the conditions under which we function being vastly different, it is up to us to evolve a system which would ensure that not only the election expenses are kept at a minimum, but also that proper and intelligent people are returned to the legislatures of the country. So I would request the hon. Minister who is representing Government here to realise that the matter before the House is not so simple as it looks. That is a very very small part of the election procedure, this, obligation to file the election expenses or not to file it. Many more vital questions are involved and their solution brooks no delay.

Now, the view has been aired here that once the curb is removed, there will be a tendency to indulge in greater abuses, and however defective in its effect the curb may be, it does act as a restraint on election expenses. I do not see eye to eye with such a view Madam. Once in an election, a man loses sight of all fair play, a candidate thinks that all is fair in elections as in love and war. His sole aim is to see that the election is won somehow. That being the human psychology

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: That is Chanakya niti and Krishna niti also.

SHRI N.M. LING AM: My friend is quoting scripture in support of this. That being so, the removal of this curb, namely, the requirement to file an election return is not going to make much difference either way. I would certainly oppose it if this is all the electoral reform that the Government is contemplating. The opportunity given by my friend, Mr. Bhargava, with regard to the review of this provision relating to the filing of election expenses should open the eyes of the Government to the need for re-examining the entire electoral law, and the time for it is now. That is my stand. We may circulate it for eliciting public opinion and opinions will naturally be divided on this question. It is easy to see. I can very well visualise what the opinion will be after some time. Some opinions will be in favour, some against, and the position will be much the same as it is today. It is not going to solve the problem if the Government does not come to grips with the problem, nor is reference of this matter to the public going to solve anything. Even on fairly clear-cut issues, when once it is referred to public opinion, there will be different views, and that is our experience. We have seen it. So that is not going to throw more light on this question. That is my humble submission. But at the same time this motion before the House does give an opportunity to review the entire election procedure, because election practices in the past three elections have given rise to so many evils and have been the subject-matter of discussion or criticism of the Government in one form or another. So, I am not very enthusiastic about the motion itself unless the Government is prepared to go further and review the entire electoral law.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: Suggest some remedies.

SHRI N. M. LINGAM: My hon. friend is egging me on to suggest remedies. It is impossible to suggest remedies off-hand to a complex question like this. Full-fledged democracy to function in a country like ours with its complex and complicated aspects of life, is itself a miracle. So, there is no short-cut to evolving a procedure which will satisfy our aspirations in keeping with the highest norms of democracy. But we have to set about thinking about this problem very seriously. At least we should see that election as a source of corruption is eliminated. If this is done, other forms of corruption could be dealt with more easily.

We believe in perspective planning. We think of our state of economy for ten or fifteen or twenty years and we plan for these stages. I feel that it is necessary to think ahead about the state of our elections in the coming ten or fifteen years, indeed till the end of the present century when our population will be nearly double. Demographers say that the world population will be twice of what it is today at the end of the present century. That means that the population of our country will also be doubled. Then the problems of organising elections, campaigning for elections and ensuring success for democracy are going to be much more formidable than they are today. So, I would be most happy if the Government gives an undertaking that it is seized of the matter and that it is going to review the whole situation, although with regard to the present motion before the House it is going to elicit public opinion. That is innocuous enough, and I have nothing to say for or against but it means precious little.

I only wanted to avail myself of this opportunity to impress upon the House and the Government the need for reviewing our electoral law so that our entire body politic may be clean and healthy.

PROF. A. R. WADIA (Nominated):
Madam Deputy Chairman, I cannot

but admire the courage displayed by Shri Bhargava in bringing forward this Bill. ■ It certainly shows his honesty of purpose and his keen appreciation of the problems before our country. The object of limiting the electoral expenditure is very simple. The object is to enable a man of modest means to stand for election. Even the limit of Rs. 25,000 is by no means a small amount; it will certainly preclude a poor man from standing for election. But I must congratulate Shri Bhargava on his very convincing speech in which he has shown that candidates are not honest in declaring their electoral expenses, that most of the candidates spend much more than Rs. 25,000 and yet pretend that they have spent only up to Rs. 25,000. It certainly shows a moral decay, a definite degeneration, in our public life.

I was very much impressed by the speech of my friend, Shri Jairamdas Daulatram, when he emphasised the importance of moral values in public life. Thus the problem reduces itself to a choice between two things— a high democratic principle on the one hand and the exigencies of practical politics on the other. Unfortunately, the economic system has developed in such a way, especially, in this country that a wide use of licences is practically forcing all businessmen to give large sums of money to the party in power. It is in their self-interest. Everybody knows that an immense pressure is being put on all the companies and wealthy individuals to give as much as they can to the party in power and the businessmen respond, whether willingly or unwillingly, to this call because they know that unless the support of the party in power is there they will not get the licences. And it is impossible for any person today, unfortunately, in India to carry on his business without licences. This whole system of licences is the root of corruption. Only the other day, just a fortnight ago, I was talking to a

very wealthy businessman in South India, and he admitted that he S7as paying fairly heavy amounts to the Congress Party. It is natural because his business interests demanded that he should keep the Congress bosses on his right side. But he gave m_e a shock when he told me that he had also to P*y something to the Communist Party. It is very paradoxical. But the reason is very intelligible. (Interruption). He was afraid that the Communists would create trouble among the labourers and they would foster strikes and, therefore it was a part of his policy to keep the Communists also, if not all very much on his right side, at least some on his right side-

Now, that certainly shows the (extent of decay to which our public life has sunk. I see no reform possible except the introduction of very high principles of morality. Whether it is possible at the present stage, I really do not know. But one thing is clear that if this Bill is referred to elicit public opinion, it will create public opinion. I think most of the people who vote have not got the slightest idea as to how much the candidates are spending. Personally—although I can claim to be an educated man—I had no idea as to how much was being spent on elections till I came in contact with people who had spent money on elections, and I can understand what a great strain it puts on the people. It means that for democracy to be saved from the monopoly of the rich, we must limit election expenses. At the same time to do away with all limit is also a very heroic remedy. In fact my first impression, when I went through the Bill, was that Mr. Bhargava wanted to throw out the baby along with the bath water, and I am afraid that may happen, so that the issue is very confusing, and I share the difficulties experienced by my friend, Mr. Lingam, and so many other speakers. But I do feel that by accepting the circulation of this Bill we shall be able to

find out what the public opinion is, to inform the public at large as to what are the implications of modern democracy. It is true that democracy is the best type of Government. But we are finding that is also the costliest type of Government. Now this expenditure need not be grudged if it really contributes to the advancement of the people. But if it tends to make the rich richer and the poor poorer, there is something wrong with that democracy. This is what we have to guard against, and I personally, would welcome the cultivation of public opinion in this respect.

شری پھارے لال کرہیل دہطالبہ:

(اُتر پردیش) : مہودیہ - آزادی کے بعد تین جنرل الیکشن ہو چکے ہیں لیکن کا تجویز ہمارے سامنے ہے - پہلے چناؤ میں جتنا امیدواروں نے خرچ کیا تھا دوسرے چناؤ میں امیدواروں کو اس سے کہیں زیادہ خرچ کرنا پڑا اور تیسرے چناؤ میں پھر کہیں اس سے زیادہ خرچ کرنا پڑا - جن بدن چناؤ کا خرچہ بڑھتا چلا جا رہا ہے اور کسی غریب یا اوسط درجہ کے آدمی کے لئے ہا دیانیت دار آدمی کے لئے چناؤ لونا قریب قریب ناممکن ہو گیا ہے - چاہتے تو ہم یہ ہیں کہ یہاں جمہوریت ہو صحیح جمہوریت ہو - سچا واد ہو مگر اگر ہم سیدہ پر ہاتھ رکھ کر دیکھیں تو رولنگ پارٹی کی طرف مہرا اشارہ ہے تو وہ خود اس بات کو مانیں گئے کہ الیکشن کا خرچہ دن بدن بڑھتا

شری پیارے لال کرپل دھالب : :

یہ بالکل صحیح ہے - میں انکار نہیں کرتا ہوں - ہماری سوشلسٹ پارٹی کے اندر ایسے لوگ ہیں جو چاہتے ہیں آدھ میں اُنہیں لے - میں اس سے انکار نہیں کرتا ہوں - ہماری سیاسی سماجی زندگی میں دیانت داری تو ذرا بھی ہمارے لیڈران کے اندر نہیں ہے - اگر ہم یہاں پر آتے ہیں قانون بنانے کے لئے آتے ہیں - سیاسی زندگی کو اچھا بنانے کے لئے آتے ہیں - غریبوں کی بھلائی کے لئے آتے ہیں - مزدوروں کی بھلائی کے لئے آتے ہیں - صحیح جمہوری نظام قائم کرنے کے لئے آتے ہیں تو اس لئے ہمارا سب کا فرض ہے کہ ہم یہ کوشش کریں کہ جتنا یہ کریں وہ دما ہے یہ نہ بڑھے -

ابھی دیکھئے جب کہ الیکشن ایکسپینسز کے اوپر پابندی ہے - الیکشن ریٹرنس داخل کرنے پوتے ہیں دیکھئے کتنا پیسہ خرچ ہوتا ہے - اور کتنی غیر دیانت داری سے لوگ یہ ریٹرن داخل کرتے ہیں کوئی آدمی حساب باقاعدہ نہیں رکھتا - شروع سے آخر تک کسی کے پاس ریکارڈ نہیں ہے - میں خود اچھے متعلق کہوں گا - میں نے کبھی باقاعدہ ریکارڈ نہیں رکھا - صحیح بات کہتے ہیں کوئی خرچ نہیں ہے لیکن اتنا دَر ہمارے اندر

[شری پیارے لال کرپل دھالب] جا رہا ہے - اس میں سب سے زیادہ قصور وار دولنگ پارٹی ہے جتنا پیسہ ان کی طرف سے چٹاؤ میں خرچ ہوا ہے اتنا کسی دوسری پارٹی کی طرف سے خرچ نہیں ہوتا - اس چیز کو دیکھیں کہ آخر ایسا کیوں ہے -

ہم تو جمہوری نظام لانا چاہتے ہیں - غریب جتنا کا نظام لانا چاہتے ہیں مہاتما گاندھی جی نے کہا تھا کہ کسان یہاں کا پریذیڈنٹ ہو گا اور مزدور یہاں کی اسمبلی کے ممبر ہو گا وہ قانون بنائیں گے لیکن ہم دن بدن دیکھتے ہیں کہ اسمبلیوں میں لیجسلیٹرز

زیادہ سے زیادہ تعداد میں آدھے ہیں اور آپ کو میں یہ بھی دانا دوں کہ سرمایہ دار لوگوں میں ایک کنسپیرسی ہے اس بات کی باقاعدہ وہ فلت جمع کر رہے ہیں کہ ہم کس طرح سے آئینہ چٹاؤ میں ایسے آدمی چلیں جو کہ ہماری آواز کو اُٹھا سکیں جو کہ سرمایہ دار نظام کو قائم رکھ سکیں - They are penetrating into every political party کے ہر سیاسی جماعت کے اندر ان کے آدمی موجود ہیں - کمیونسٹ پارٹی کے اندر بھی موجود ہیں -

श्री नील मद्र याजी : सोशलिस्ट पार्टी में नहीं है ?

ضرور رہتا ہے کہ ہم اتنا نہ خرچ کریں کہ الیکشن کے لئے جو ۲۵ ہزار ۱۰ ہزار کی مہمان ہے اس سے زیادہ خرچ ہو۔ ہم تو خرچ کر ہی نہیں سکتے ہیں۔ ہماری پارٹی نہیں کر سکتی ہے پھر بھی وہ آدمی جو زیادہ سے زیادہ خرچ کرتے ہیں ان کے دلوں میں یہ تو رہتا ہے کہ ۲۵ ہزار کی مہمان ہے تو اس سے زیادہ وہ خرچ نہ کریں۔ وہ ایک طرح سے تہوی سی ذمہ داری کا احساس کرتے ہیں ان کے اندر یہ خیال اٹھتا ہے کہ یہ پارلیمانی لگی ہوئی ہے۔ میں تو یہ کہوں گا کہ آپ یہ جو ایک لیمیت ہے اس کو اور کم کریں بجائے ۲۵ ہزار کے پانچ ہزار سے زیادہ۔ چاہے اسمبلی کی سیٹ

ہو اس کے چٹاؤ میں خرچ کرنے کی اجازت نہ دی جائے۔ میں جانتا ہوں بڑی بڑی کلسٹی ٹیونسز ہیں۔ حلقے میں اس کے لئے آپ الیکشن پروسچر کو سمیٹائی کیجئے پولیڈک اسٹیشن بہت زیادہ ہیں

کم کیجئے۔ ٹھیک ہے ایک طرح سے بہت سے لوگوں کو بہت دور دور آنا جانا پڑے گا مگر ہمیں دیکھنا ہے کہ ہمارا درپردہ دیس ہے اور اس میں زیادہ سے زیادہ خرچ نہ ہو۔ لوگوں کے اندر دیانت داری کا جذبہ پیدا ہو۔

بہت سے طریقے ہیں جن سے آپ الیکشن ایکسپنڈسز کم کر سکتے ہیں۔ مگر یہ پارلیمانی اٹھانا میں مناسب نہیں سمجھتا ہوں کہ اس قسم کی پارلیمانی ہٹا دی جائے کہ کوئی الیکشن ریٹرن داخل نہ کرے ہر ایک کو اپنی ذمہ داری کا احساس ہونا چاہئے اور الیکشن ریٹرن کو میلے میں کرنا مشکل بات نہیں ہے۔ مگر میں سنسورلی فیل کرتا ہوں کہ گورنمنٹ کا نظام زیادہ سختی سے کام لے اور الیکشن ریٹرن جو کہ داخل ہوتے ہیں ان کو اچھی طرح سے اسکروٹینائز کیا جائے۔

ابھی حال ہی میں کچھ آرڈرس اشو ہونے کلڈیڈنس کے متعلق کہ انہوں نے جو وسٹرس اشو کئے ہوں ان کی ایک کاپی دستور کے مجسٹریٹ کے پاس اور الیکشن کمیشن کے پاس بھیجی جائے۔ میں کہتا ہوں اور زیادہ سختی سے الیکشن ریٹرن کے بارے میں قانون بنانے کی ضرورت ہے تاکہ لوگ اس کے پابند رہیں اور یہ الیکشن اسمبلیوں کا کھل بن کر نہ رہ جائے۔ کسی غریب آدمی کے لئے یا کہ اوسط درجہ کے آدمی کے لئے چٹاؤ لونا مشکل ہو گیا ہے۔ راجہ سبھا میں تو کھلم کھلا تین تین چار چار لاکھ خرچ کر کے پیسے والے آجاتے ہیں۔ ہم بھی جانتے ہیں اور آپ بھی جانتے ہیں اور ہماری سرکار بھی جانتی

[شری پیمہ کرپل] ہے۔ آپ کوئی قدم ان کے خلاف نہیں اٹھا سکتے ہیں اور آپ اچھی طرح سے جانتے ہیں اس لئے تھوڑا سا قدر ہونا چاہئے لوگوں کے دل میں۔ جیسا کہ کپیبل پلسٹ کے بارے میں لوگوں کو قدر ہے کہ پھانسی لگ جائے گی۔ اگر یہ قدر نہ ہو تو میں لگ لگی گلی میں دیہات دیہات میں مقرر ہوں گے مگر یہ اصلیت ہے حقیقت ہے کہ اس میں تھوڑا سا قدر ہے پھانسی میں چرھنے کا حالانکہ آج کل پھانسی کی سزا کم ملنے لگی ہے کیونکہ کچھ خامی ہے قانون کے اندر کہ جس سے سپریم کورٹ کے اندر جاتے جاتے نوے پرسنٹ آدمی چھوٹ جاتے ہیں مگر پھر بھی لوگوں کے اندر تھوڑا سا قدر رہتا ہے کہ عمر بھر کی قید ہو سکتی ہے۔ اس لئے میں تو اس حق میں نہیں ہوں کہ اس پمپنسی کو ختم کیا جائے۔

اب سنگل ممبر کلسٹی ٹھونسی آپ نے کردی ہے۔ پہلے تو ڈبل ممبر کلسٹی ٹھونسی میں یہ ہوتا تھا کہ کاسٹ ہلڈو کلتیڈیتس جو ہوتے تھے وہ تھوڑا سا خرچہ شہدولت کاسٹ کے کلتیڈیت کا برداشت کر لیتے تھے اور اس کے مقابلہ میں شہدولت کاسٹ والے مصنت اور ہرجا کر تے تھے۔ پھر زیادہ خرچ نہیں کرتے تھے۔

مگر اب تو سنگل ممبر کلسٹی ٹھونسی ہے ہر ایک کو اپنا خرچ خود برداشت کرنا ہوتا ہے۔ ایک گونہ سے دوسرے گونہ تک خود شہدولت کاسٹ کلتیڈیت کو جانا ہوتا ہے۔ کلتیڈیت شہدولت کاسٹ کلتیڈیت میں جو معمولی خرچہ بھی برداشت کر سکتے ہیں۔ رولنگ پارٹی میں جو شہدولت کاسٹ کے لوگ ہیں ان میں کلتیڈیت ایسے ہیں جو برداشت کر سکتے ہیں ان تمام باتوں کو دیکھئے کہ کس طرح ان کو کمپٹ کرنا ہے۔ اگر ایک کاسٹ ہلڈو کلتیڈیت اپنی کلسٹی ٹھونسی میں پوری کھاتا ہے یا دوسرے لوگوں کو دعوت میں بلاتا ہے مہنگے کرتا ہے تو جتنی تعداد میں وہ بلا سکتا ہے جتنی تعداد میں وہ لوگوں کو دعوت دے سکتا ہے اتنا شہدولت کاسٹ کا کلتیڈیت نہیں کر سکتا ہے۔ غریب آدمی نہیں کر سکتا ہے۔

شری اکبر علی خاں: بہت

تھوڑے لوگ ہیں جو پوری اور دعوت کھا کر ووٹ دینگے۔ بہت سے کھسڑ میں تو دعوت کھا کر بھی دوسو نو ووٹ دے آتے ہیں۔

شری پیمہ کرپل: مطالبہ ہے:

میں آنریبل ممبر سے متفق نہیں ہوں۔ یہ بد قسمتی ہے ہمارے نظام کی کہ ہمارے اندر سیاسی بھداری

نہیں - جمہوری سسٹم میں ہم نے
ایڈولٹ فرینڈشپز کیا مگر ابھی ہمارے
یہاں جمہوری ہمداری سیاسی ہمداری
لوگوں میں نہیں آئی - اس کا کارن ہے
Education is the backbone of
democracy جمہوریت کی جو دیوار
کی ہڈی ہے وہ ایجوکیشن ہے اور
وہ ایجوکیشن ہمارے اندر نہیں ہے -
Education itself is not sufficient
ایجوکیشن سیاسی
ہمداری پولیٹیکل ہمداری اور نیشنل
کھریکٹر بھی لوگوں میں ہونا چاہئے -
ذرا سی بات پر ہم بے دیانتی کرتے
ہیں ہمارا کوئی نیشنل کھریکٹر
نہیں ہے ابھی اس کو آنے میں کافی
تالم لگے گا - جب تک ہمارا نیشنل
کھریکٹر نہیں بن جاتا ہے تب تک
ہمیں یہ چھوٹی چھوٹی پابندیاں
لگانی پڑیں گی - غریب تو بالکل
سمجھتا نہیں وہ جانتا نہیں کہ
میں کس امیدوار کو لیاقت کی بنا
پر ووٹ دے رہا ہوں یا اس کی
پارٹی کو دے رہا ہوں - اصلیت یہ
ہے کہ وہ اصول کو نہیں جانتا -
پارٹی کے ممبرسٹر کو نہیں جانتا -
آج مزدور کے ووٹ کو چند سکوں اور
دو روپوں میں خریدنا جا سکتا ہے - و
اتنا غریب ہے کہ اس کے لئے چند
دو روپے زیادہ اہمیت رکھتے ہیں یہ
نسبت اس کی رائے کے - یہ بات
اچھی طرح سمجھ جانتا ہے کہ یہ رائے

دیئے گا جو حق ہے وہ سونے چاندی
میں تولیے کے قابل ہے - اسے سونے
چاندی میں نہیں بیچا جا سکتا -
یہ چیز ہمارے لئے بہت قیمتی ہے -
ہمارے بھوشہ کے لئے ہمارے بچوں
کے لئے اور ہماری اولاد کے لئے بہت
ہی اہم ہے - کتے مزدور ہوں کتے
غریب لوگ ہوں یا عام جلتا ہے
جو اس چیز کو سمجھتی ہے ؟ سرکار
ہم بتاتے ہیں اور جلتا سرکار کے اندر
کریمن ہے جلتی سرکار کے اندر برائی
ہے - سب کچھ ہے اس کے لئے ہم
سب لوگ ذمہ دار ہیں -

اس لئے جو ہماری جلتا ہے وہ
اس ذمہ داری کو نہیں سمجھتی کہ
کس آدمی کو ووٹ دینا چاہئے اور
کس آدمی کو ووٹ نہیں دینا
چاہئے - ہم نے دیکھا ہے کہ راتوں
رات جلتا کی نومنت بدل جاتی ہے -
ساری کلسکی تھونسی میں پہلے سے
ہی اس بات کی چرچا ہوتی ہے کہ
فلان کلتیڈیت جیتے گا لیکن راتوں
رات شراب ہانگی جاتی ہے اور راتوں
رات تمام انتظامات ہو جاتے ہیں -
دراصل جو پھسے والا کلتیڈیت ہوتا
ہے وہ جیت جاتا ہے - اس کو ہم
سب جانتے ہوں اور مہرا خود کا
تجربہ ہے کہوں کہ ہم جلتا کے لئے رات
دن کام کرتے ہیں - جن لوگوں کے
لئے ہم نے زندگی تمام کر دی ہے اور
جن کے لئے ہم جہاں جیت جاتے

[شری پیارے کرپل مطالبہ]

میں ان کے ووٹوں کو سولے کے سکوں کی بنا پر خرید لیا جاتا ہے اور ہمارے خلاف کر دیا جاتا ہے۔ یہ اہلیت ہے اور ہر ایک آدمی اس چیز کو اچھی طرح سے جانتا ہے۔

ان تمام چیزوں کو اور ان تمام باتوں کو دیکھتے ہوئے اگر آپ یہ پابندی ختم کر دیں گے اور الیکشن ریٹرن کو ختم کر دیں گے تو کیا ہو گا۔ اس سے تو الیکشن میں جو خرچ ہوتا ہے وہ کم نہیں ہو گا۔ جیسا کہ میں نے عرض کیا کہ سرمایہ داروں کی طرف سے کنسپنسی ہو رہی ہے اور وہ چاہتے ہیں کہ حکومت میں ان کا دخل ہو۔ وہ چاہتے ہیں کہ حکومت کی باگ ڈور ان کے ہاتھ میں آئے اور ایسے بہت سے لوگ اس دھبے کے اندر موجود ہیں۔ ان تمام باتوں کو دیکھتے ہوئے میں کہوں گا کہ آپ کسی طرح سے بھی اس پابندی کو اور ریستروکشن کو نہ ہٹائیں اور الیکشن میں ریٹرن داخل کرنے کو اہم قرار دیا جائے اور سب کے لئے اہمیت ہو کہ الیکشن میں کم سے کم خرچ کیا جائے تاکہ زیادہ سے زیادہ غریب لوگ الیکشن میں آگ لے سکیں۔ ہم تھوڑے سے بعد ہی اپنے نیشنل کونگریس کو بلا سکیں گے۔ ایک وقت آئے گا کہ ہم سب لوگ اپنی ذمہ داری کو

سمجھیں گے۔ اس کے مطابق کام

کر دیں گے۔ میں نہیں کہتا کہ ہمیشہ ہی ہمارا دھبہ ایسا رہے گا ہمارے ملک میں جمہوریت کا نظام ابھی ابھی آیا ہے اور ابھی لوگوں نے اس کو سمجھا ہے۔ بہت سی ایسی سوسائٹیاں ہیں بہت سے ایسے لوگ ہیں جو یہ چاہتے ہیں کہ ہمارا نیشنل کونگریس بنے اور ہمارے اندر جو چھوٹی چھوٹی برائیاں ہیں وہ ختم ہوں۔ اگر ہم سب لوگ اس اور کوشش کریں گے اور عوام کو سمجھائیں گے غریب لوگوں کو سمجھائیں گے کہ ان کے ووٹ کی کیا قیمت ہے تو اس کے لئے ہمیں کچھ ٹائم لگے گا۔ مگر جہاں تک یہ ریستروکشن ہے اس کے متعلق میں نہایت ادب کے ساتھ شری بھارگو صاحب سے اور سرکار سے یہ کہنا چاہوں گا کہ بجائے اس کو کہ اس وقت جو الیکشن ایکسپنسز ہیں انہیں اور کم کرنے کی ضرورت ہے لیکن ریستروکشن کو قائم رکھنا چاہئے جہاں تک الیکشن میں خرچ کا سوال ہے یہ کم سے کم ہونا چاہئے تاکہ اس ملک کا غریب سے غریب آدمی بھی اس میں آسانی کے ساتھ حصہ لے سکے۔

جناب والا۔ میں آپ کا زیادہ نہیں لوں گا۔ میں آپ کا شکریہ ادا کرتا ہوں کہ آپ نے مجھے دو منٹ بولنے کا موقع دیا۔

†[श्री प्यारे लाल कुरील 'तालिब' (उत्तर प्रदेश) : महोदया, आजादी के बाद तीन जनरल इलेक्शन हो चुके हैं उन का तजुर्बा हमारे सामने है। पहले चुनाव में जितना उम्मीदवारों ने खर्च किया था दूसरे चुनाव में उम्मीदवारों को उससे कहीं ज्यादा खर्च करना पड़ा और तीसरे चुनाव में फिर कहीं उससे ज्यादा खर्च करना पड़ा। दिन-ब-दिन चुनाव का खर्चा बढ़ता चला जा रहा है और किसी गरीब या औसत दर्जे के आदमी के लिये या दयानतदार आदमी के लिये चुनाव लड़ना करीब करीब नामुमकिन हो गया है। चाहते तो हम यह हैं कि यहां जम्हूरियत हो, सही जम्हूरियत हो, समाजवाद हो, मगर अगर हम सीने पर हाथ रख कर देखें—रूलिंग पार्टी की तरफ मेरा इशारा है—तो वह खुद इस बात को मानेंगे कि इलेक्शन का खर्चा दिन-ब-दिन बढ़ता जा रहा है। इस में सब से ज्यादा कतूरवार रूलिंग पार्टी है, जितना पैसा उनकी तरफ से चुनाव में खर्च होता है उतना किसी दूसरी पार्टी की तरफ से खर्च नहीं होता। इस चीज को देखें कि आखिर ऐसा क्यों है।

हम तो जम्हूरी निजाम लाना चाहते हैं। गरीब जनता का निजाम लाना चाहते हैं, हमात्मा गांधी जी ने कहा था कि किसान यहां का प्रेजिडेंट होगा और मजदूर यहां की असेम्बलियों के मेम्बर होंगे वह कानून बनायेंगे। लेकिन हम दिन ब-दिन देखते हैं कि असेम्बलियों में, लेजिस्लेचर्स में, अमीर आदमी ज्यादा से ज्यादा तादाद में आ रहे हैं और आप को मैं यह भी बता दूँ कि सर्मायादार लोगों में एक कान्सपिरेसी है इस बात की—बाकायदा वह फण्ड जमा कर रहे हैं—कि हम किस तरह से आइन्दा चुनाव में ऐसे आदमी चुनें जो कि हमारी आवाज को उठा सकें जो कि सर्मायादार निजाम को कायम रख सकें। They are penetrating into every political party.

†[] Hindi transliteration.

हर सियासी जमायत के अन्दर उनके आदमी मौजूद हैं। कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के अन्दर भी मौजूद हैं . . .

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : सोशलिस्ट पार्टी में नहीं हैं ?

श्री प्यारे लाल कुरील 'तालिब' : यस, बिल्कुल सही है। मैं इंकार नहीं करता हूँ। हमारी सोशलिस्ट पार्टी के अन्दर ऐसे लोग हैं जो आना चाहते हैं, आ रहे हैं, आयेंगे, मैं इस से इंकार नहीं करता हूँ। हमारी सियासी समाजी जिन्दगी में दयानतदारी तो जग भी हमारे लीडरान के अन्दर नहीं है। अगर हम यहां पर आते हैं कानून बनाने के लिये आते हैं। सियासी जिन्दगी को अच्छा बनाने के लिये आते हैं। गरीबों की भलाई के लिये आते हैं। मजदूरों की भलाई के लिये आते हैं। सही जम्हूरी निजाम कायम करने के लिये आते हैं तो इसलिये हमारा सबका फर्ज है कि हम यह कोशिश करें कि जितना यह करप्शन बढ़ रहा है, यह न बढ़े।

अभी देखिये जब कि इलेक्शन एक्स-पेन्सेज के ऊपर पाबन्दी है। इलेक्शन रिटर्नस दाखिल करने पड़ते हैं तभी देखिये कितना-पैसा खर्च होता है। और कितनी गैर-दयानतदारी से लोग यह इलेक्शन रिटर्न दाखिल करते हैं। कोई आदमी हिसाब बकायदा नहीं रखता। शुरू से आखिर तक किसी के पास रिकार्ड नहीं है। मैं खुद अपने मुत्तलिक कहूंगा। मैं ने कभी बाकायदा रिकार्ड नहीं रखा। सही बात कहने में कोई हर्ज नहीं है। लेकिन इतना डर हमारे अन्दर जरूर रहता है कि हम इतना न खर्च करें कि इलेक्शन के लिये जो पच्चीस हजार, दस हजार की मयाद है उससे ज्यादा खर्च हो। हम तो खर्च कर ही नहीं सकते हैं। हमारी पार्टी नहीं कर सकती है फिर भी वह आदमी जो ज्यादा से ज्यादा खर्च करते हैं उनके दिलों में यह डर रहता है कि पच्चीस हजार की मयाद है तो उससे ज्यादा वह खर्च न करें। यह

[श्री प्यारे लाल कुरील "तालिब"]

एक तरह से थोड़ी सी जिम्मेदारी का एहसास करते हैं। उनके अन्दर यह ख्याल उठता है कि ये पाबन्दी लगी हुई हैं। मैं तो यह कहूंगा कि आप यह जो एक लिमिट है उसको और कम करें—बजाय पच्चीस हजार के पांच हजार से ज्यादा—चाहे असेम्बली की सीट हो या पार्लियामेंट की सीट हो उसके चुनाव में खर्च करने की इजाजत न दी जाये। मैं जानता हूँ बड़ी बड़ी कान्स्टीट्यून्सीज हैं, हुल्के हैं। उनके लिये आप इलेक्शन प्रोसीजर को सिम्पलीफाई कीजिये। पोलिंग स्टेशन बहुत ज्यादा हैं उनको कम कीजिये। ठीक है एक तरह से बहुत से लोगों को बहुत दूर दूर आना जाना पड़ेगा। मगर हमें देखना है कि हमारा दरिद्र देश है और उसमें ज्यादा से ज्यादा खर्च न हो। लोगों के अन्दर दयानतदारी का जड़वा पैदा हो।

बहुत से तरीके हैं जिन से आप इलेक्शन एक्सपेंसेज कम कर सकते हैं। मगर यह पाबन्दी उठाना मैं मनासिब नहीं समझता हूँ कि इस किस्म की पाबन्दी हटा दी जाये कि कोई इलेक्शन रिटर्न दाखिल न करे। हर एक को अपनी जिम्मेदारी का एहसास होना चाहिये और इलेक्शन रिटर्न को मेन्टेन करना मुश्किल बात नहीं है। मगर मैं सिन्सीयरली फील करता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट का निश्चय ज्यादा सख्ती से काम ले और इलेक्शन रिटर्न जो की दाखिल होते हैं उनको अच्छी तरह से स्क्रुटनाईज किया जाये।

अभी हाल ही में कुछ आर्डर्स इश्यू हुए केन्डिडेट्स के मुत्तलिक कि उन्होंने जो पोस्टर्स इश्यू किये हैं उनकी एक कापी डिस्ट्रिक्ट मजिस्ट्रेट के पास और इलेक्शन कमिशनर के पास भेजी जाये। मैं कहता हूँ और ज्यादा सख्ती से इलेक्शन के बारे में कानून

बनाने की जरूरत है ताकि लोग इस के पाबन्द रहें और यह इलेक्शन अभीरों का खेल बन कर न रह जाये। किसी गरीब आदमी के लिये बल्कि औसत दर्जे के आदमी के लिये चुनाव लड़ना मुश्किल हो गया है। राज्य सभा में तो खुल्लमखुल्ला तीन तीन चार चार लाख रुपये खर्च करके पैसे वाले आ जाते हैं। हम भी जानते हैं और आप भी जानते हैं और हमारी सरकार भी जानती है। आप कोई कदम उनके खिलाफ नहीं उठा सकते हैं। यह आप अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं इसलिये थोड़ा सा डर होना चाहिये लोगों के दिल में। जैसा कि कैपिटल पनिशमेंट के बारे में लोगों को डर है कि फांसी लग जायेगी। अगर यह डर न हो तो मैं कहूंगा कि गली गली में, देहात देहात में मरडंडरस होंगे मगर यह असलियत है, हकीकत है कि इसमें थोड़ा सा डर है फांसी में चढ़ने का हालांकि आज कल फांसी की सजा कम मिलने लगी है। क्योंकि कुछ खामी है कानून के अन्दर कि जिससे सुप्रीम कोर्ट के अन्दर जाते जाते नब्बे परसेंट आदमी छुट जाते हैं लेकिन फिर भी लोगों के अन्दर थोड़ा सा डर रहता है कि उम्र भर की कैद हो सकती है। इसलिये मैं तो इस हक में नहीं हूँ कि इस पाबन्दी को खत्म किया जाये।

अब सिंगल मेम्बर कांस्टीट्यून्सी आपने कर दी है पहले तो डबल मेम्बर कान्स्टीट्यून्सी में यह होता था कि कास्ट हिन्दू केन्डिडेट्स जो होते थे वह थोड़ा सा खर्चा शिड्यूल्ड कास्ट के केन्डिडेट का बर्दाश्त कर लेते थे और उसके मुकाबले में शिड्यूल्डकास्ट वाले मेहनत और प्रचार करते थे। पैसा ज्यादा खर्च नहीं करते थे। मगर अब तो सिंगल मेम्बर कांस्टीट्यून्सी है हरेक को अपना खर्चा खुद बर्दाश्त करना होता है। एक कोने से दूसरे कोने तक खुद शिड्यूल्डकास्ट केन्डिडेट को जाना होता है कितने शिड्यूल्डकास्ट केन्डिडेट हैं जो मामलों खर्चा भी बर्दाश्त कर सकते हैं। रूलिंग पार्टी

मैं जो शिड्यूलकास्ट के लोग हूँ उनमें कितने लोग ऐसे हैं जो इस खर्च को बरदाश्त कर सकते हैं। इन तमाम बातों को देखिये कि किस तरह उनको कम्पीट करना है। अगर एक कास्ट हिन्दू केन्डिडेट अपनी कान्स्टीट्यून्सी में पूरी खिलाता है या दूसरे लोगों को दावत में बुलाता है, मीटिंग करता है, तो जितनी तायदाद में वह बुला सकता है जितनी तायदाद में वह लोगों को दावत दे सकता है उतना शिड्यूलकास्ट का केन्डिडेट नहीं कर सकता है। गरीब आदमी नहीं कर सकता है।

श्री अकबर अली खान : बहुत थोड़े लोग हैं जो पूरी और दावत खाकर वोट देंगे। बहुत सारे केसेज में तो दावत खाकर भी दूसरों को वोट दे भाते हैं।

श्री प्यारे लाल कुरील "तालिब" : मैं आनरेबल मेम्बर से मत्तफिक नहीं हूँ। यह बदकिस्मती है हमारे निजाम की कि हमारे अन्दर सियासी बेदारी नहीं है। जम्हूरी सिस्टम में हमने एडल्ट फ्रेंचाइज किया मगर अभी हमारे यहाँ जम्हूरी बेदारी, सियासी बेदारी लोगों में नहीं आई। इसका कारण है Education is the backbone of democracy जम्हूरीयत की जो रीढ़ की हड्डी है वह ऐजुकेशन है और वह ऐजुकेशन हमारे अन्दर नहीं है। Education itself is not sufficient ऐजुकेशन के साथ ही शियासी बेदारी, पोलि टिकल बेदारी, और नेशनल करेक्टर भी लोगों में होना चाहिये। जरा सी बात पर हम बेदखानती करते हैं हमारा कोई नेशनल करेक्टर नहीं है अभी इसको आने में काफी टाइम लगेगा। जब तक हमारा नेशनल करेक्टर नहीं बन जाता है तब तक हमें ये छोटी छोटी पाबन्दियां लगानी पड़ेंगी। गरीब तो बिल्कुल समझता नहीं वह जानता नहीं कि मैं किस उम्मीदवार को लियाकत की बिना पर वोट दे रहा हूँ। या उसकी पार्टी को दे रहा हूँ। असलियत यह है कि वह उसूल को नहीं जानता। पार्टी के

मेनिफैस्टो को नहीं जानता। आज मजदूर के वोट को चन्द सिक्कों और रुपयों में खरीदा जा सकता है। वह इतना गरीब है कि उसके लिये चन्द रुपये ज्यादा अहमियत रखते हैं बनिस्बत उसकी राय के। वह यह बात अच्छी तरह से जानता है कि यह राय देने का जो हक है वह सोने चांदी में तोलने के काबिल है। इसे सोने चांदी में नहीं बेचा जा सकता। ये चीज हमारे लिये बहुत कीमती है। हमारे भविष्य के लिये हमारे बच्चों के लिये और हमारी औलाद के लिये बहुत ही अहम है। कितने मजदूर हैं कितने गरीब लोग हैं या आम जनता है जो इस चीज को समझते हैं। सरकार हम बनाते हैं और जितना सरकार के अन्दर करप्शन है जितनी सरकार के अन्दर बुराई है सब कुछ है इसके लिये हम सब लोग जिम्मेदार हैं।

इसलिये जो हमारी जनता है वह इस जिम्मेदारी को नहीं समझती कि किस आदमी को वोट देना चाहिये और किस आदमी को वोट नहीं देना चाहिये। हमने देखा कि रातों रात चुनाव की नौइयत बदल जाती है। सारी कान्स्टीट्यून्सी में पहले से ही इस बात की चर्चा होती है कि फलां केन्डिडेट जीतेगा लेकिन रातों रात शराब बांटी जाती है और रातों रात तमाम इंतजामात हो जाते हैं। दरअसल जो पैसे वाला केन्डिडेट होता है वह जीत जाता है। इसको हम सब जानते हैं और मेरा खुद का तजुर्बा है क्योंकि हम जनता के लिये रात दिन काम करते हैं। जिन लोगों के लिये हमने जिन्दगी तबाह कर दी है और जिनके लिये हम जेलों में जाते हैं उनके वोटों को सोने के सिक्कों की बिना पर खरीद लिया जाता है और हमारे खिलाफ कर दिया जाता है। यह असलियत है और हर एक आदमी इस चीज को अच्छी तरह से जानता है।

इन तमाम चीजों को और इन तमाम बातों को देखते हुए अगर आप यह पाबन्दी खत्म कर देंगे और इलेक्शन रिटर्न को खत्म

[श्री प्यारे लाल कुरील "तालिब"]
कर देंगे तो क्या होगा। उससे तो इलेक्शन में जो खर्च होता है वह कम नहीं होगा। जैसा कि मैंने अर्ज किया कि समायादारों की तरफ से कान्सपिरेसी हो रही है और वह चाहते हैं कि हुकूमत में उनका दखल हो। वह चाहते हैं कि हुकूमत की बागडोर उनके हाथ में आये और ऐसे बहुत से लोग इस देश के अन्दर मौजूद हैं।

इन तमाम बातों को देखते हुए मैं कहूंगा कि आप किसी तरह से भी इस पाबन्दी को और रेस्ट्रिक्शन को न हटायें और इलेक्शन में रिटर्न दाखिल करने को अहम करार दिया जाये और सब के लिये लिमिट हो कि इलेक्शन में कम से कम खर्च किया जाये ताकि ज्यादा से ज्यादा गरीब लोग इलेक्शन में भाग ले सकें। हम थोड़े समय के बाद ही अपने नेशनल करेक्टर को बना सकेंगे। एक वक्त आयेंगे कि हम सब लोग अपनी जिम्मेदारियों को समझेंगे और उसके मुताबिक काम करेंगे। मैं नहीं कहता कि हमेशा ही हमारा देश ऐसा रहेगा। हमारे मुल्क में जम्हूरियत का निजाम अभी अभी आया है और अभी लोगों ने इसको सीखा है। बहुत सी ऐसी सोसाइटियां हैं बहुत से ऐसे लोग हैं जो यह चाहते हैं कि हमारा नेशनल करेक्टर बने और हमारे अन्दर जो छोटी छोटी बुराइयां हैं वह खत्म हों। अगर हम सब लोग इस ओर कोशिश करेंगे और अराम को समझायेंगे, गरीब लोगों को समझायेंगे कि उनके वोट की क्या कीमत है तो उसके लिये हमें कुछ टाइम लगेगा। मगर जहां पर यह रेस्ट्रिक्शन है उसके मुताबिक मैं निहायत अदब के साथ श्री भार्गव साहब से और सरकार से यह कहना चाहूंगा कि बजाय इसको खत्म करने के इस बक्त जो इलेक्शन के एक्सपेंसेज हैं उनको और कम करने की जरूरत है। लेकिन रेस्ट्रिक्शन को कायम रहना चाहिये। जहां तक इलेक्शन में खर्च का सवाल है यह कम से कम होना चाहिये

ताकि इस मुल्क का गरीब से गरीब आदमी भी उसमें आसानी के साथ हिस्सा ले सके।

जनाबे वाला, मैं आपका ज्यादा समय नहीं लूंगा। मैं आपका शुक्रिया अदा करता हूं कि आपने मुझे दो मिनट बोलने का मौका दिया।]

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण (महाराष्ट्र) : उपसभापति महोदय! सर्व प्रथम मैं अपने मित्र श्री भार्गव जी को बधाई दूंगा कि उन्होंने हम लोगों को इस अहम मसले पर बहस करने का मौका दिया। मुझे स्वयं इलेक्शन में खड़े होने का तजुर्बा नहीं है और मैंने अपने लिये कभी इलेक्शन नहीं लड़ा। सन् १९२३ से लेकर आज तक मैंने पच्चीसों इलेक्शन कांग्रेस की और से लड़े और मैं आपसे नम्रतापूर्वक कहूंगा कि हर एक इलेक्शन के बाद दूसरे इलेक्शन में अधिक खर्च होता रहा। सन् १९२४ के इलेक्शन में जो खर्च हुआ था उससे ज्यादा सन् १९२७ के इलेक्शन में हुआ। इसके बाद सन् १९३६ और १९४६ में तो और भी ज्यादा खर्च हुआ और अब तो उसकी भियाद अति तक पहुंच चुकी है।

श्री शीलभद्र घाजो : मंहगाई भत्ता बढ़ता जा रहा है।

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण : मंहगाई के साथ साथ कहिये या हमारी कमजोरी के कारण कहिये। लेकिन आज इलेक्शन का खर्चा इतना बढ़ता चला जा रहा है कि वह भागवानों की ठेकेदारी बनने को है। आज गरीब इलेक्शन नहीं लड़ सकता। सिर्फ पालियामेंट या असेम्बली के चुनाव में ही खर्च होता है, ऐसी बात नहीं है। ग्राम पंचायत से लेकर म्युनिसिपैलिटी के जितने भी चुनाव होते हैं वे बगैर पैसे के नहीं हो सकते हैं। मेरे यहां ग्राम पंचायतों में ४-५ हजार तक रुपया खर्च होता है और म्युनिसिपैलिटी के चुनावों में एक उम्मीदवार के १० हजार से लेकर बीस हजार रुपये तक खर्च हो जाते हैं।

मैं सन् १९२५ में म्युनिसिपैलिटी के चुनाव का एक उम्मीदवार था और उस वक्त मैंने वोटर लिस्ट खरीदने के लिये सिर्फ़ ड़ाई रुपया खर्च किया था। मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि यह कहना सहज है, कांग्रेस को भला बुरा कहना सहज है, परन्तु मैं आपसे नम्रता पूर्वक कहना चाहता हूँ कि एक भी ऐसा पक्ष नहीं है पोलिटिकल, जो चुनाव में बेहिसाब खर्च न करता हो। कम्युनिस्टों को लीजिये, चाहे वे कुछ कहें, सोशलिस्टों को लीजिये या किसी भी पार्टी को ले लीजिये, मेरा स्वयं का देखा अनुभव है कि विरोधी पक्षों ने क्या क्या करतूतें कीं और क्या क्या खर्च किये। मैंने इन चीजों को अपनी आंखों से देखा है। प्रजा सोशलिस्ट, सोशलिस्ट, कम्युनिस्ट और जनसंघ, एक से एक ऊपर हैं, कोई कम नहीं है और किसी ने भी इलेक्शन में कम खर्च नहीं किया।

अभी मुझे थोड़े दिन पहले का अनुभव है जब मैं फर्रुखाबाद प्रचार करने के सिलसिले में गया था। क्या डा० लोहिया साहब कह सकते हैं कि उन्होंने अपने इलेक्शन में लाखों पैसे खर्च नहीं किया? क्या लोहिया साहब बतला सकते कि उनके लिए मोटोरे के हैदराबाद के भागवानों ने नहीं भजी थीं? मुझे ऐसा कोई भी पक्ष नहीं दिखाई देता जिसने ईमानदारी से इलेक्शन लड़ा हो या बिना पैसे के लड़ा हो। हमारे हिन्दुस्तान के लोकतन्त्र के जीवन में यह एक बड़ी खतरनाक बीमारी पैदा हो गई है और मैं इसे प्लेग की ही बीमारी कहूँगा। जब इलेक्शन का इस कदर खर्च बढ़ता जायेगा तो धीरे धीरे लोकतन्त्र भी खतम हो जायेगा। अगर आपको हिन्दुस्तान को लोकतन्त्री बनाना है तो इलेक्शन का खर्च कतई कम करना होगा। आज हिन्दुस्तान में २० करोड़ मतदाता हैं और कानूनन हर मतदाता को इलेक्शन में खड़े होने का अधिकार है। मैं यह बात जानना चाहूँगा कि पूछना चाहूँगा कि इस २० करोड़ में क्या लाखों दो लाख या कुछ हजार भी ऐसे लोग

होंगे जो स्वयं में स्वादिष्ट करते हों कि हम असेम्बली या पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर बन जायें। ऐसे लोगों को सब से अधिक डर इस बात का लगता होगा कि इतना बड़ा जो खर्चा होता है वह कहां से किया जाय और क्या मैं इतना खर्चा स्वयं में भी कर सकता हूँ? बिना इतने खर्च के क्या मैं उम्मीद करूँ, इच्छा करूँ, आशा करूँ कि मैं असेम्बली या पार्लियामेंट का दरवाजा खटखटा सकूँगा? करोड़ों लोग हैं, वोटर्स हैं, जो इस लोकतन्त्र के सच्चे मालिक हैं, जो चुनाव के हेतुसेदार हैं, स्वयं में भी खड़े नहीं हो सकते हैं और न इस तरह के खर्चों से चुनाव को लड़ा जा सकता है। कहने को यह कहा जाता है कि विधान सभा के लिए ७ हजार रुपया खर्च किया जा सकता है और पार्लियामेंट के चुनाव के लिये २५ हजार रुपया खर्च किया जा सकता है। लेकिन जब चुनाव हो जाते हैं तो क्या आप नम्र होते हैं कि नियत सम्दा में ज्यादा खर्च नहीं हुआ होता है?

आजकल के चुनावों में लाखों रुपया खर्च होता है और इसके लिए अकले उम्मीदवार जिम्मेदार नहीं हैं। उस उम्मीदवार के लिये जो सैंकड़ों और हजारों कार्यकर्ता काम करते हैं, जिस तरह से करते हैं, वे भी बेचारे जिम्मेदार बन जाते हैं। हर दफे रिटर्न्स लिखे जाते हैं। उसके बारे में मैं जानना चाहूँगा क्योंकि मैंने बहुत से रिटर्न्स लिखे हैं। १९२४ में सब से पहले मैंने एक कांग्रेस उम्मीदवार का रिटर्न भरा। और मुझे याद है कि उसको तीन दफे फाड़ना पड़ा था क्योंकि वे नियम ब्रुक्स और रेग्यूलेशन के मुताबिक नहीं भरा गया था। उसमें जितना खर्चा होता है वह चल नहीं सकता है। इसलिए रिटर्न तैयार करना भी एक बहुत बड़ी समस्या है और जिसको इसका विशेष अनुभव होता है, जिसको कानून की विशेष जानकारी होती है, वही इसको अच्छी तरह से भर सकता है। बहुत से बेचारे जिनको इसके बारे में अनुभव नहीं होता वे गलती कर जाते हैं और आगे चल कर पेटिशन में निकल जाते हैं।

श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव : जिन्हें हिसाब बनाना नहीं आता होगा ।

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण : यह बात ठीक है । जो बना नहीं सकते, बनाना नहीं जानते, वे निकल जाते हैं । लेकिन जो कानून को जानते हैं या जो फरेब करना जानते हैं, जो रूल्स रेगुलेशन्स जानते हैं या उल्टा सीधा करना जानते हैं, वे ही बना सकते हैं । इसलिये होता यह है कि रिटर्न ठीक तरह से पहुंचाये नहीं जाते । मैं एक इलेक्शन में पहुंचा था और एक व्यापारियों की सभा में मैंने उनसे कहा कि आप कांग्रेस को वोट क्यों नहीं दे रहे हैं, आप क्यों विरोधी पक्ष को मदद दे रहे हैं और पैसा भी दे रहे हैं । इस पर उन्होंने कहा कि हम तो बेईमान हैं आपने हमको बेईमान कह दिया है, आप कहते हैं कि आप इनकम टैक्स के जो रिटर्न देते हैं वह तो सदा झूठे ही देते हैं, परन्तु मैं आपसे पूछना चाहता हूं कि आपके जो उम्मीदवार इलेक्शन के लिये खड़े होते हैं उनमें से कितने ईमानदारी से रिटर्न दिया करते हैं, तो हमसे आप कहां ईमानदार हैं ? इस तरह का खवाल पूछते ही मैं चुप रह गया और शर्म से कुछ कह नहीं सका । बात सच्ची है, हालांकि दोनों में कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है । वह स्वार्थ के लिये करते हैं और इसमें स्वार्थ भी है, परमार्थ भी है, दोनों हैं, परन्तु उसका कहना ठीक था क्योंकि हम जानते हैं कि हम रिटर्न ठीक सच्चे दे नहीं सकते, लिख नहीं सकते ।

इसलिये मेरा कहना है कि सब से पहली जरूरत यह है कि यदि हिन्दुस्तान के सियासी जीवन में आप किसी तरह से ईमानदारी लाना चाहते हैं तो यह इलेक्शन का खर्च आपको कम करना ही होगा । आज हालत यह है कि जैसा मैंने कहा कि ग्राम पंचायतों से लेकर पार्लियामेंट तक बिना बैजा पैसे के इलेक्शन हो नहीं सकता । इतना ही नहीं, आज यहां आल इंडिया कोऑपरेटिव कॉफेस

हो रही है, कोऑपरेटिव सोसाइटीज में पैसा खर्च किये बगैर इलेक्शन नहीं हो पाता । हजार, दो हजार और पांच-पांच हजार रुपये खर्च करते हैं तब कोऑपरेटिव बैंक के डाइरेक्टर बन सकते हैं । और भी एक अजीब हालत मैंने देखी कि उनका हर साल इलेक्शन होता है जब कि यहां चार वर्ष या पांचवां वाद इलेक्शन होता है । तो आपने यह इलेक्शन के लिये पैसा खर्च करने की बीमारी सारे देश में गांवों तक फैला दी है और यह बीमारी इतनी फल गई है कि इस बीमारी से बचने के लिये आपको खास मार्ग अख्तियार करना होगा । इसलिए मैं सरकार से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि आप ऐसा कोई जरिया निकालें जिससे इलेक्शन में पैसा कम खर्च हो । जैसा कि इलेक्शन के लिये आपके बहुत से निर्बन्ध हैं कि यह नहीं करना चाहिये, वह नहीं करना चाहिये, व्हेकिल्स नहीं लाना चाहिये, सभा नहीं करनी चाहिये, इसी तरह से आप बहुत से नियम बना सकते हैं जिससे खर्चा कम हो सकता है । विधान सभा या पार्लियामेंट के इलेक्शन के आखिरी दिन कैंडिडेट्स बूथ के बाहर तम्बू लगाते हैं, डेरे लगाते हैं । इन तम्बूओं के लिये कितना खर्च होता है, इसका आप अन्दाजा नहीं कर सकते । आप ऐसा कर दीजिये कि वहां किसी का तम्बू नहीं लगेगा और वोटर को सीधे अपने बूथ पर जाने का अख्तियार रहेगा और आसपास कोई नहीं रहेगा । तम्बू भी नहीं रहेगा और चिट्ठी भी नहीं दी जायगी । इस एक बात से ही हजारों रुपये बच जायेंगे । यह तो मैंने उदाहरण के रूप में कहा ।

इस तरह की बहुत सी बातें आप उसमें दाखिल कर सकते हैं और बहुत से छोटे मोटे निर्बन्ध लगा सकते हैं ताकि आपको यह मोघम कहने की नीबत ही न आये कि आप सात हजार खर्च करिये या दस हजार खर्च

करिये या बीस हजार खर्च करिये। जब आप एक अंक निश्चित कर देते हैं तो फिर जहां निश्चित निर्बंध आ गया वहां निर्बंध से निकलने के लिये अकल सोची जाने लगती है। कंट्रोल के साथ साथ कंट्रोल से बचने का उपाय आदमी सोचता रहता है। यदि आप उसी पर छोड़ देंगे, भला बुरा बनने की या करने की जिम्मेदारी उसी पर हो, ईमानदारी और बेईमानी करने की जिम्मेदारी उसी पर हो, वह अपने दिल की बात सुने, उस के अंतःकरण में जो परमात्मा या परमेश्वर है उसकी बात सुनने की उसको आदत रहे तब तो वह कुछ सुधर सकता है। परन्तु जब ऊपर से कानून का डरावना निर्बंध रहता है तो वह अपने परमेश्वर को भूल जाता है और उसमें से बचने की ही कोशिश करता रहता है। इसलिये मैं कहूंगा कि खर्चा कम होना ही चाहिये। परन्तु खर्चा इस तरह से कम नहीं हो सकता कि आप कानून में एक कड़ा निर्बंध रख दें। आप कानून में निर्बंध रख देंगे तो उसका परिणाम यही होगा कि उस निर्बंध से निकलने की कोशिश हर एक करता रहेगा। हम आज इतने अकलमन्द बन गये हैं कि हम यह अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं कि उसमें से छूटने का क्या उपाय है। यह एक इलेक्शन की बात नहीं है। हमारे इर्दगिर्द हमारे आर्थिक जीवन में, सामाजिक जीवन में, राजकीय जीवन में, सियासी जीवन में इतने निर्बंध हैं कि हम रात दिन यही सोचा करते हैं कि इन निर्बंधों से छूटें कैसे, इनसे बचें कैसे। और डर के मारे निर्बंधनों से खुद को बचाने की आदत बन जाती है। अंतःकरण हमारा क्या कहता है, हमारे दिल में जो भलाई की भावना है वह क्या कहती है, यह हम भूल जाते हैं। विवेक शक्ति मर जाती है। इसलिए मैं यह कहूंगा कि आप इन निर्मम निर्बंधनों से बचाइये और अच्छी विवेकपूर्ण आदतें डालने की लोगों को शिक्षा दीजिये। आज पोलिटिकल एजुकेशन की आवश्यकता है।

780 RS—4.

मैंने अपने प्रदेश के पार्लियामेंटरी बोर्ड में कई वर्षों तक और कई इलेक्शंस में काम किया है और कुछ आल इंडिया बेसिस पर भी मैंने काम किया है। आप यह न समझें कि जिस वक्त हम कोई कैंडिडेट निश्चित करते हैं, उस वक्त यह ध्यान में लेते ही नहीं कि वह कितने पैसे खर्च कर सकेगा। कैंडिडेट का नाम जब सामने आता है तो और बातों के साथ यह प्रथम सोचते हैं कि यह कितने पैसे खर्च कर सकेगा, यह खर्च कर सकेगा या नहीं, इसके पास पैसा है या नहीं, इसको पार्टी से कितना देना पड़ेगा, कितना नहीं देना पड़ेगा। इन तमाम बातों को हम सोचते हैं।

श्री मुल्क गोविन्द रेड्डी : पहले यह सोचते हैं कि वह पैसे वाला है या नहीं।

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण : वही मैं कह रहा हूं कि यह हम सोचते हैं। क्योंकि हमें इलेक्शन जीतना है। हम यह नहीं सोचते हैं कि हमें वहां लियाकत देख कर काम करना है।

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: Merit becomes secondary.

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN: That is what I have said.

तो मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि आप जब तक मेरिट को, ईमानदारी को कोई कीमत नहीं देंगे सार्वजनिक जीवन में, तब तक यही होगा कि पार्लियामेंट आदि में भागवानों और धनाढ्यों की ठेकेदारी बनी रहेगी। लाख, दो लाख खर्च कर के वह खुद नहीं खड़ा होता, वह दूसरे को दे कर के खड़ा करता है और फिर कोई भले ही कहता रहे कि हम सोशलिस्ट हैं, हम कम्युनिस्ट हैं, लेकिन वह उस पैसे वाले का गुलाम है इस में कोई शक नहीं है। यह मैंने देखा है कि वैसे तो हम बड़ी लम्बी चौड़ी बातें करते रहेंगे, लेकिन जब वक्त आयेगा तब फिसल जायेंगे। यह हर एक पार्टी की हालत है। ऐसा नहीं है कि यह कांग्रेस में ही है औरों

[श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण]

में अधिक है। जब हम पैसे से ही इलेक्शन जीतेंगे तो पैसा अपना राज जमाये बगैर रहेगा नहीं, वह चाहे कम्युनिस्ट हो या कोई हो, कम्युनिस्टों की तो और भी अजीब हालत है। कांग्रेस वाले तो खुल्लमखुल्ला खर्च करते हैं, लेकिन कम्युनिस्ट जो कुछ करते हैं वह सीक्रेटली करते हैं क्योंकि उनकी किताब में—बाइबिल—में यह लिखा है कि “Secrecy is no sin. (Interruptions)” इस तरह दुनिया को धोखा वे बहुत अजीब तरह से दे सकते हैं।

इसलिये मेरा तो आखिर में यह कहना है कि यह बात बहुत दूर तक पहुँच गई है। सारे सियासी जीवन को हमारे इस पैसे ने बिगाड़ रखा है। ग्राम पंचायतों का इलेक्शन भी हम वगैर पैसे के नहीं जीत सकते। इसकी वजह से हुआ क्या है? आप ग्राम पंचायतों में चलिये, आप म्युनिसिपैलिटियों में चलिये, या तो वहाँ धनवानों का राज है या गुंडों का और यही दो पार्टियाँ वहाँ हैं। आज देश में खास कर के ग्राम पंचायतों में और म्युनिसिपैलिटियों में या तो गुंडों का राज है या धनवानों का राज है, तीसरी कोई पार्टी वहाँ नहीं है, भले ही वे किसी नाम से पुकारती रहें अपने को या कोई किसी नाम से खुद को पुकारता रहे। इसलिये इस पैसे की माया से बचने की तरकीब हमें सोचनी चाहिये। वह सिर्फ कानून में ७ हजार या २५ हजार रुपया रखने से नहीं होगा, वह तो खुद के दिल की ईमानदारी का सवाल है, खुद के कॉशियंस का सवाल है, खुद के दिल के अन्दर जो ईश्वर है उसका सवाल है और उसको खुद को मौका मिलने चाहिये सोचने का, समझने का। हमारे सार्वजनिक जीवन में जिससे मॉरल वैल्यूज बढ़ें ऐसी आदतें हम लोगों में पैदा हों और इसकी हमें कोशिश करनी चाहिये। यह काम कानून से होने वाला नहीं है। आज आपको पता है, मिनिस्टर साहब को पता है, सरकार को

पता है कि ६० टका कैंडिडेट मियाद से ज्यादा खर्च करते हैं।

4 P.M.

और कितनों पर आपके प्राजिक्यूशंस होते हैं? मेरे खयाल से एक पर भी नहीं, गलती से शायद पेटिशन के नाम से दो, चार हो जाते हों तो हो जाते हों परन्तु आप जानते हैं कि सैकड़ा पीछे ६५ इस कानून को भंग करते हैं और कानून को भंग करते हुए भी कोई नहीं पकड़ा जाता है। कोई अनजान में गलती कर के कानून को भंग करे तो और बात है मगर समझ बूझ कर, होशियारी से भंग करते हैं और धोका देते हैं। आप भी मानते हैं कि धोका दे रहे हैं और आप धोका खा रहे हैं, यानी दोनों मिल गये हैं धोका देने वाले और धोका खाने वाले, आज दोनों की दोस्ती हो गई है। इस सियासत में जब तक यह दोस्ती है तब तक हम आगे बढ़ेंगे और हिन्दुस्तान की आम जनता का हित कर सकेंगे यह मुझे अशक्य सी बात मालूम होती है। भले ही हम कहें: “Government of the people, for the people, by the people.” मगर आप अपने दिलों में सोचिये कि २० करोड़ वोटर्स हैं जिनके लिये कहा जाता है कि उनका राज्य है और उनके लिये राज्य है परन्तु कौन राज्य करता है? कौन जानता है कि कहां से आता है और किस प्रकार से जाता है, वोटर्स बेचारे यह समझ नहीं सकते हैं और न वोटर्स को समझाने की कोशिश होती है, वे तो समझते हैं कि मेरे पास कल के लिये खाने तक का तो इंतजाम है नहीं मैं क्या एलेक्शन लड़ूंगा। होता यह है कि जब दो, चार या पांच रुपया वोटर को मिल जाता है तो वह भी तैयार हो जाता है और अब तो यह आदत बढ़ रही है कि ले लेते हैं दोनों या चारों से और मत देते हैं किसी तीसरे को।

तो हमारे यहां यह हालत है। अब इलेक्शन के बगैर हमारा काम चल नहीं सकता क्योंकि जब हमने डेमोक्रेसी को मान लिया है

लोक तंत्र को मान लिया है तो इलैक्शन का होना स्वाभाविक है क्योंकि लोकतंत्र की आत्मा इलैक्शन है, इलैक्शन लोकतंत्र का आधार है। लोकतंत्र इलैक्शन के बगैर चल नहीं सकता लेकिन इसको मानने के साथ ही साथ हमें यह भी देखना चाहिये कि इसका बुरा असर न हो, यह बुरी आदतों में परिणत न हो जाय, इससे नुकसान न पहुँचे और आम जनता को इससे लाभ ही लाभ पहुँचे। इस तरह हम सोचते तो मुझे उम्मीद है कि आज जैसी हालत नहीं होती कि कहने को तो २० करोड़ वोटर्स हैं परन्तु न २० करोड़ का राज्य है और न २० करोड़ इसको समझ सकते हैं और न २० करोड़ में से २ लाख भी यह सपना देख सकते हैं कि कभी वे पार्लियामेंट में जा सकेंगे।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : २० करोड़ का राज्य कभी नहीं हो सकता।

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण : इसलिये मैं मंत्री महोदय से कहूँगा कि यह ७ हजार या २५ हजार का सवाल नहीं है, निर्बन्धों का सवाल नहीं है, यह हमारे नैतिक मूल्यों का, हमारी ईमानदारी का, हमारी ज़हिनियत का और हमारे कैरेक्टर का सवाल है। आज यह भ्रष्टाचार सारी जगह फैल रहा है, धंधे में, रोजगार में और उसका कारण यह है कि आज पैसा हमारा परमात्मा बना हुआ है और तमाम बातें पैसे की गुलाम बन गई हैं। यह हालत हिन्दुस्तान में महात्मा गांधी के बाद पैदा हो गई है और उनकी जो शिक्षा है उसका हम खयाल भी नहीं करते हैं। महात्मा गांधी होते और वह यह सुनते और देखते....

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : उनके वक्त भी यह होता था, आप करते थे, हम करते थे और आपने स्वीकार भी किया है कि पहले से ही हमने यह जाल बनाया है, यह आज का नहीं १९२१ से यह बना है। आपने यह कहा है।

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण : आपको पता नहीं है। महात्मा गांधी ने हम से कहा था कि इस जाल में न फँसो, हमने जहाँ तक नहीं माना वहाँ तक जाल में फँसे और अगर मानते तो इसमें नहीं फँसते। आप को पता नहीं होगा, महात्मा गांधी आखीर तक कहते रहे आखीर में मरने से पहले उन्होंने हमसे कहा—आपको सियासत तो करनी है, देश का राज्य करना है पर देश का राज्य तो चुने हुए नुमाईदे करेंगे उनके ऊपर असर किसका रहे तो असर उन सेवकों और लोकसेवकों का रहे जिन का मॉरल-इंफ्लुएंस रहे, जिन के मॉरल इंफ्लुएंस के कारण आप अपना रास्ता न भूल सकें और सीधे रास्ते पर रहें। आखीर में उन्होंने यह रास्ता दिखाया था और उस रास्ते को हमने नहीं अपनाया, यह आप भूल जाते हैं। महात्मा गांधी का नाम लेना ठीक नहीं है, इस दलदल में महात्मा गांधी को हम खींचना नहीं चाहते। कृपा कर के आप इतना ही सोचिये कि महात्मा गांधी ने क्या कहा था और क्या नहीं कहा था।

तो मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है कि आज यह बीमारी गांवों तक पहुँच गई है, बिना पैसे के ग्राम-संचायतों तक का चुनाव नहीं हो सकता है। आप करप्शन की बात करते हैं मगर करप्शन कहाँ नहीं है? व्यापार में, धंधे में, रोजगार में, दूकान में, सब जगह है, कहाँ नहीं है? इसको तो आप करप्शन ही कहियेगा? जब बीमारी इतनी फैल जाये तब उससे बचने के लिये रामबाण उपाय ही हमें खोजना चाहिये और ज़रूरत पड़े तो हमें आपरेजन भी करना होगा।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : डंडा चाहिये।

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण : डंडे से काम नहीं चलेगा।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : उसी से चलेगा।

श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण : डंडे से काम नहीं चलेगा। मैं डंडे को मानने वाला नहीं हूँ, यह आप भी जानते हैं। मैं मानने वाला हूँ हृदय परिवर्तन में, कनवर्शन ऑफ हार्ट में।

[श्री देवकीनन्दन नारायण]

हमें पैसों की गुलामी की आदत छुटानी होगी और उसके लिये लोगों में नैतिक ताकत लानी होगी, लोगों के हृदय में ताकत लानी होगी ताकि दिली ताकत से वह भागवानों के पैसे का सामना कर सकें।

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

यदि आप को गरीबों को अपने पैरों पर खड़ा करना है तो उनको स्वाभिमानी बनाइये, उन के दिलों को मजबूत बनाइये और उन को सिखलाइये कि ईमानदारी क्या चीज है, सत्य क्या चीज है, उन्हें बताइये कि किस तरह से अपनी बुराइयों से वह और भाइयों का नुकसान कर सकते हैं और कैसे उन्हें नुकसान से छुड़ा सकते हैं।

मेरी आखिरी प्रार्थना मंत्री महोदय से यह है कि यह कोई छोटा सवाल नहीं है, यह बहुत बड़ा सवाल है, यह गहरा सवाल है, यह बीमारी सारे देश में फैल गई है और आज तो ऐसी स्थिति है कि इस बीमारी से ईश्वर ही हमें बचा सकता है लेकिन मैं मंत्री महोदय से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि आप गहरी नज़र से इसको देखें और सोचें, खाली इधर उधर के निबन्धों से काम नहीं चलेगा। आपको सारी दुनिया को बदलना होगा, आपको हिन्दुस्तान की आम जनता को बदलना होगा, उन्हें एजुकेट करना होगा, उनमें ताकत पैदा करनी होगी—सिर्फ एजुकेशन से ही काम नहीं चलेगा, बल्कि उनमें दिली ताकत पैदा करनी होगी और दिली ताकत से ही वह इस बुराई का सामना कर सकेंगे। श्री भागवत जो यह प्रस्ताव लाये उस प्रस्ताव ने हमें यह मौका दिया कि हम यहाँ इस बीमारी की चर्चा कर सकें और इस बीमारी से किस तरह जनता को बचा सकते हैं उसकी भी चर्चा कर सकें। जब यह बिल सरकुलेट हो तब दुनिया और हम आप सब सोचें समझें कि क्या किया जाय। आम जनता में भी जब यह सवाल पहुँचेगा तो हजारों के दिमागों में यह बात पैदा होगी कि इस में से हम किस तरह से निकल सकते हैं। धन्यवाद।

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, the House is really thankful to Mr. Bhargava for having given us an opportunity to discuss this very important question. The question of election expenses is one of the important questions in the electoral systems of our country. We have had three general elections for the Lok Sabha and the State Legislative Assemblies and we have gained some experience after having gone through these elections. As the hon. Member, Shri Lingam, has put it, the number of voters in the constituencies for the parliamentary elections has increased. So also the number of Voters in the Assembly constituencies has increased.

Therefore, it is time that we review the whole situation afresh. When the number of voters that the candidate will have to approach is larger than what it was in 1952, then naturally, he has to spend much more than what he had to spend in 1952. There is a case for increasing the maximum that is to be allowed to a candidate to be spent either for a parliamentary constituency or in a State Legislative Assembly constituency. But I do not agree with the proposal of Mr. Bhargava that this matter of filing of election returns should be completely done away with, though I do agree with him that most of the candidates who contest these elections have not the courage to file correct election expenses, because that would attract the disqualification clause in the Representation of the People Act. But is it any remedy to allow the candidate to continue to spend large amounts lavishly and continue to corrupt the voters and thus get elected? We have to examine whether this system will be conducive to the preservation of democracy. Mr. Vice-Chairman, as we know, India is the largest democracy in the world. In South-east Asia India is now surrounded by countries where democracy has been given the go-by and where dictatorships have assumed power. We should learn the lesson and see that the democracy

that we cherish is preserved and strengthened. For that we must have free and fair elections and money should not have much to say in the conduct of elections.

In 1951, the framers of the Representation of the People Act advisedly inserted certain clauses in this head, "Election Expenses" but in 1956, some of them were amended so that many loopholes were created through which large sums of money could be spent even without deleting this particular clause. The candidates, with the connivance of the political parties, can spend any amount of money without any restriction. Though the limit that is prescribed under the Act is Bs. 25,000 for a Parliamentary seat and Rs. 6,000 to Rs. 9,000 for an Assembly seat, depending upon the State in which a Member is contesting, expenses incurred by the parties on behalf of the candidates in particular constituencies are not accounted for. Virtually, what Mr. Bhargava wants was conceded by the Government when they amended the Representation of the People Act which they should not have. The political parties now are spending large sums of money, particularly the ruling party which has got power and authority to distribute patronage can afford to spend large sums of money. Time and again we have been pleading that the donation by companies to political parties should be done away with, that the company law should be so amended that donations by companies are not allowed or encouraged. As has been mentioned by my friends, many courts have already pointed out that these companies donate large sums of money to political parties, particularly to the ruling party, with an ulterior motive and this was clear in the statement that was filed by Tata Sons in the High Court of Bombay. Whatever may be the high ideals, they are liable to be circumscribed by the impact of influence that these companies and big business concerns will have. If

you want to save democracy from the clutches of big business concerns and from the clutches of exploiters, it is but necessary to see that this particular provision in the company law is so amended as not to allow donation by public companies to political parties any further.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, the Second Report of the Election Commission, after having gone through two general elections, gives certain important facts as to how some of the candidates were not able to file election returns and how they were disqualified. They have also pointed out the need for amending the Act so that expenses that are now permitted to be incurred by candidates are slightly increased instead of doing away with that provision at the present moment. They want certain more restrictions to be imposed because the amendment of 1956 had so much liberalised the provisions that so many loopholes were available to the candidates to spend as much as they wanted. If this Bill is accepted, and if this particular clause is deleted from the Representation of the People Act, then it would mean that the entire chapter on corrupt practices that is now adumbrated in this Act would have to be deleted. The candidate can very well go on corrupting the voters to any extent possible. It is not that they are not doing it now; they are doing it under certain limitations but if these limitations were removed then they would spend as much as they like.

It is, therefore, necessary for us to see that the voters are not corrupted. I know they are being corrupted now. Mr. Kureel gave us instances of how the poor voter is paid some sum so that he would vote for a particular candidate. Or a party, how drink and other things play a vital role in influencing the voters in general or by-elections. My charge is that the Government has failed in its primary duty. After having been in power for the last sixteen or seventeen years,

[Shri Mulka Govinda Reddy.]

it has not educated our voters with regard to their rights and responsibilities. We have seen, Mr. Vice-Chairman, that about fifty to fifty-six per cent, of the voters go to the polls during elections. I am sorry to say that in most of the constituencies the intelligentsia does not go to the polls at all. This section also has failed in its duty to the country but the Government has failed miserably in not having educated our voters with regard to their rights and responsibilities, particularly with regard to their right to elect representatives once in five years who will either safeguard or jeopardise their interests. I plead that more effective steps should be taken by the Government to educate our voters properly in regard to their rights and responsibilities.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, we have said that the ruling party has come to power with a minority vote, with less than fifty per cent, of the vote. In effect, it does not represent the majority of the people of this country. So, the time has come for us to decide whether we should not think of revising the very electoral system, the system of voting and whether we should not introduce the system of proportional representation. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Mr. Mani pointed out that if the candidates are asked to file their election returns with an affidavit, most of the candidates would be obliged to file proper election returns. That was one of the provisions which existed in the enactment of 1951 but, for reasons best known to the Government, this was amended in 1956. I read from page 182 :

"Under the old law, a candidate had to make a declaration on oath before a Magistrate and file it along with the return of his election expenses. This declaration has been dispensed with."

This is a very wholesome clause, a very useful one, which will act as a deterrent on the erring candidates. It

would be better, if the present Act is amended, to include this provision that was deleted from the Act in 1956. Under the 1951 Act whatever expenses were to be incurred by a political party were to be included in the election returns filed by the candidate but in 1956 it was removed. This is what the Election Commission says:

"The result is that no expense, however large the amount may be, which is incurred by a party organisation in furthering the prospects of a candidate supported by it is required to be entered in the account of the election expenses of the candidate. So long as he can make out that such expense was not authorised by him or by his election agent."

Under this any amount of money can be spent by a candidate or by a party in an assembly election or in a parliamentary election. So the power of money will be so effective that the merit of the candidate is taken away and many a time the illegal practices that will be resorted to by the candidate or by the party will pay rich dividends and defeat the very purpose of democracy, the very purpose of free and fair elections. (*Time bell rings.*) This is a Bill, Mr. Vice-Chairman, on which I can speak as long as I like.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN) : There are other speakers.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: I know it can be continued on the next non-official day.

The Commission has also recommended that the maximum limit of election expenses may for instance be revised liberally to a higher figure and all expenditure incurred on behalf of the candidate by his party or his well-wishers with his constructive consent may be made accountable

This is a very salient recommendation made by the Commission and the Government should think of amending the Representation of the People Act to include this salient provision so that you can limit the election expenses to be incurred by a candidate in a particular constituency. I would also suggest that it should be made obligatory on the candidate when he files his nomination paper to file a declaration of his assets both movable and immovable. Then you will come to know the Worth of the candidate—the financial aspect—before he entered into the election field and after he completes the election process you will come to know how much money he has spent. This is one of the ways by which the election expenses of candidates can be checked. This you should do if you are really sincere that democracy in India should thrive, that democracy coupled with the objective 'of a socialist society should thrive, that the power of money bags should be curtailed, that there should be fair and free elections without the help of Big Business and without resorting to helping big industrial concerns and getting go'od rewards from them; otherwise democracy will be a mockery and will be in name only.

I would like to quote an instance. Under this Act the election expenses for an Assembly candidate in Uttar Pradesh is limited to Rs. 9,000. Mr. K. D. Malaviya, former Minister of Mines and Fuel, collected Rs. 10,000 from Serajuddin & Co, which is more than the legal limit that has been allowed by the Act. Thus he himself, may not be directly but indirectly, has committed a corrupt practice.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: That is only one of the known sources. There may be many others too.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: New, this is one instance. There are so many other instances which have come to light. Only the other day the Home Minister was pleased to accept that there was another

entry of Rs. 50,000 as having been paid to the former Secretary of Mr. Malaviya which may have been meant for election purposes or for some other purpose. So this is very important. If you want to prevent the ruling party ----- (Interruption) ----- or the Ministers in authority—whoever he is, whether he is a PSP Minister or a Congress Minister—from encouraging such black-marketeers and unsocial elements you should prevent them from taking donations from industrial concerns and companies so that they will not be obliged to go out of the way in helping these unsocial elements and big business. Therefore, it is necessary that we should fix a limit. It is already there; if necessary we may increase it but the elections should be as cheap as possible, otherwise it will not be a battle of parties or battle of ideologies but it will be a battle of resources and it is not going to be a go'od augury for Indian democracy. With these words, I close my speech. Thank you.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Mr. Vice Chairman, the provisions of the Representation of the People Act limiting election expenses have a salutary principle behind them. The object of incorporating those principles as explained by Prof. Wadia is to see that representation of the people is not within the reach only of a few who have ample means but is within the reach of those who have either moderate means or have no means at all. It is just with this pious object that these principles have been incorporated and our experience in these three elections shows that the object 'of incorporating these principles has not been achieved. Elections have been becoming more and more expensive and it is becoming more and more impossible for people of moderate means to seek the opportunity of representing the people. It is only people with ample means, big money bags, that can hope to come unless they belong to organised parties. Even in organised parties also, as was being mentioned by an hon. Member who

[Shri M. Govinda Reddy.] spoke before me, the eye is for one's pocket and not for the merit so much so that the man who really wants to represent the people, who comes from the masses, and who can really give them the best service, is put beyond the pale of representation. This is our experience.

Now, we have to see first whether these provisions are enforceable and secondly whether they are really enforced. They are enforceable in the sense that election returns are made obligatory to be submitted. That is true; in that respect these provisions are enforceable but are they really enforced in the spirit and the letter of the law? Nobody can say that they are enforced in the spirit and the letter of the law. That is because no election return—perhaps in most cases if not, all,—conforms to reality. That is why very many Members have dwelt upon this at length to show that it has not been practicable to submit true returns of election expenses or that it is not a fact that these provisions have been complied with. If that is so, the fact which agitates the mind of some of the Members, and has surely agitated the mind of Mr. Bhargava, is in a young democracy like that of India where there is urgent need for setting up good traditions before the people, are we setting up a good tradition by making it openly known to the entire mass of the people that those who go to frame legislation go there themselves by violating the law? Is this a good tradition? Is this something which deserves to be placed before the people or should we do something about it or not? If legislators, those who go to frame legislation and in whose hands the destiny of the country lies, are the first people to violate the law, then are the people receiving proper training? Can we expect a generation, laying their foundations upon such a political training as this in the election campaign, to play the role of a good, true and honest citizen? It is this that, we have to look into, not the financial aspect. I

do not think that any Member would say that this is a position which should be tolerated. It should be remedied.

Now, I will come to examine whether it is practicable at all. As some Members, who have spoken before me, have said, our people are not used to accountancy. The majority of them coming particularly from the rural areas are not used to accountancy. Our constituencies are large. Then, the time given for carrying on an election campaign is small, it is little. During this period is it possible for a person to keep an exact account? A man may be scrupulously honest. A candidate may be scrupulously honest. Maybe his election agent may forget to bring to his notice one item of expenditure or forget to furnish him two or three vouchers and maybe his opponent or rival knowing this fact will bring him into trouble. It is not practicable to keep true and exact accounts even if one really intends to be very honest.

Thirdly, it is also not practicable to limit the expenditure to the present levels in most of the constituencies. Wherever there is an organised party fighting, it is possible to limit it, but where there are strong rivals who have plenty of money to spend and who know fully well that these provisions of the Representation of the People Act are really not enforceable and that they cannot be taken to task for submitting false returns, it is not practicable. So, when he comes and spends freely, the candidate who has taken some risk in contesting and spending money, cannot afford to lose the constituency on that account. So, he will have to spend. All these possibilities have to be considered.

Now, in order to prevent such a state of affairs, it is very difficult to find a solution. There is one solution and that is the lure of money should be taken away. The socialist countries have done this trick. Beyond a certain sum money cannot fetch anything there and, therefore, there is no temptation for them to earn more

money. But we are far from that stage. Now, the next thing is the office of a member of a legislature, either member of a State Legislature or a Member of Parliament, is influential. As long as the Government enters into every sector of the life of the individual and as long as these positions are positions of influence, they are tempting places and we cannot render them less influential as long as the object of the Government is social welfare. So, that is also not possible.

The next solution would be better examples, examples of selfless men contesting elections and serving the public in the right spirit as in England. For example, in England, if a candidate is not willing, the people of the constituency go and petition to him, wait on deputation and request him to represent them. Then, they collect funds and carry on the campaign for him. Such a happy position we cannot dream of because such selfless, devoted examples are few. Even in organised parties the examples are few. If there are many such examples, it is possible that the people will see those examples and thus get wise. They will not give their support to money or moneyed people if they are not desirable, but such a position is not there.

Then, the only other possibility is for the respective political parties to come together and evolve a code of conduct in this matter to see that their candidates give proper election returns and carry on a decent election campaign. From what we have seen of political parties, including mine, I do not exempt mine, such a step is not possible. There was an attempt made for the political parties to come together just before the last election to evolve a code of conduct, but I do not think it came to much. If such a position could be brought about, if a code of conduct could be evolved, it is possible that a salutary atmosphere could be created, but I do not think in

the present position of the political parties such a solution could be achieved.

Now, some hon. Members were referring to political education that we should give to the people. Well as I told you, the political education that we are giving in our election campaigns is not of the right sort. So, the position is really hopeless. It looks as though we have to carry on as we are and time alone can educate the voting public. We see an improvement in the mentality of the electorate from the First Election to the Second Election and from the Second to the Third Election. In the last two elections, we have seen that some individuals, however powerful they were, however influential they were, however much money they spent—if they were not desirable—were repulsed by the electorate. There have been such instances. I think the electorate is getting wise on those lines and time may perhaps give them better education. If this Bill is sent for circulation—and I am for sending it for circulation—I am sure the people will not be for deleting these provisions. That is because they do not want the moneyed people to get the field of election entirely for themselves. Whatever it is, it is good to assess public opinion and be guided by public opinion.

Thank you, Mr. Vice-Chairman.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I rise to oppose the Bill. When I hear Congressmen quoting Gandhiji, it reminds me of a saying in English, namely, "Devil quoting the Scripture". Those who follow his principles ought to quote him, but you have forfeited that and when it pays dividends the Congress Party takes advantage of Gandhiji's name. When it comes to living up to his principles, those are left in the air. So much so, here is a piece of legislation which contemplates to omit an innocent restriction like the submission of election returns. The rules are not as stringent as they ought to be. Under the Representation of the People Act,

[Shri Lokanath Misra.]

the candidates only are supposed to file election returns, while the party does not have to take any responsibility about it. The party can spend any amount and the candidate will escape under the pretext that all other expenditure which has not been included in his election expenses account, has been spent by the party and not by himself and that he does not know anything about it. In regard to this I shall quote something which has already been quoted once in this House. It is the statement of one of our ex-Chief Ministers of Orissa, Shri Naba Krushna Choudhury who is otherwise a very respected man in this country, and he is now one of the topmost leaders in the Bhoodan movement. He says:

"Securing funds from big businessmen for winning the elections not only resulted in the filing of false election returns when actual expenses were much higher than permissible statutory limits but also led to the keeping of duplicate accounts to conceal such transactions from tax collectors . . . Emphasizing that no businessman would part with his money without expecting something in return, Mr. Chaudhury felt Congress leaders were encouraging businessmen to indulge in such practices."

This leads us to believe that the double-edged weapon of corruption works both ways simultaneously. The ruling party which is collecting funds from the capitalists is corrupting both the sectors, the capitalists as well as the voters. Not that they corrupt any one of them, but simultaneously they corrupt both. By exacting funds, by milking the companies and enterprises to the maximum extent, they corrupt them because, as has been said earlier by my revered friend, Prof. Wadia, under the present economic circumstances in the country, each businessman has to look forward to the Government for a certain quota or licence or permit without which he cannot go

a step forward. If he has to set up a new factory, he has to look to the Government for the permission for it, then for the licence, for cement, for rods, and for a number of other things that are necessary for building the factory. Further he has to look to the Government for raw materials. Then he has to be on the watch regarding the labour legislations and their compliance. Naturally, if the entire Government machinery is not kept in good humour, each step will be a step of horror for him. So, between incurring the displeasure of the ruling party and parting with funds each businessman would prefer to part with funds rather than incurring the displeasure of the ruling party. That is how corruption has crept in. No businessman chooses to become a blackmarketeer. No businessman wishes to indulge in malpractices unless he is forced to do that. Under the circumstances, when he is pressed to pay much beyond his capacity he has to pay it or else the only other alternative left to him is that he has to incur the displeasure of the ruling party and the rulers. Naturally, he prefers the first, and he tries to find out ways and means to replenish whatever has been paid to the ruling party, and the ruling party shuts its eyes to all this till somebody from the opposition raises the issue. And only when it becomes very difficult for the ruling party to conceal it, then it comes with a flash of news that some malpractice has been unearthed. Unless this law becomes more stringent, we will go on corrupting the businessmen. On the other hand what happens? When the money is collected, it is to be spent for the elections. After its taste of power, the Congress Party is now thinking to perpetuate itself whatever may be the means. At least that is one of the lessons that the Congress Party has learnt from the Communist Party; that is the only one lesson. Whatever may be the means, we must stick to power. Even if it means that the entire country gets corrupted, it does not matter if we can perpetuate ourselves. Particularly in my state, Sir, what has come

to my notice is that contractors were appointed to get ballot papers. Villages now have political contractors to get the ballot papers, and each ballot paper is paid according to the number of voters that will vote in favour of the ruling party.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW (SHRI BIBUDHENDRA MISRA): When was it practised?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: It was practised during the mid-term elections, during the parliamentary elections and even during the bye-elections where I had been there myself.

SHRI BIBUDHENDRA MISRA: I would like to correct the hon. Member. He ought to know that the ballot paper cannot be brought out now. It has to be marked in the presence of the returning officer. My friend in his ignorance said that.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: I am coming to that. That is not very difficult, even now I will explain it. I am sorry to mention this. I had been to all the bye-elections.

SHRI A. M. TARIQ (Jammu and Kashmir): Was it marked as Swatantra ballot paper?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: It was marked as Kashmiri ballot paper. I am sorry to say that I had been to the bye-elections in Orissa, whereas my hon. friend, the Minister, had not. I had the privilege of going and working in the elections because I happened to be the President of the District Swatantra Party.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: How did it happen?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: It is happening. That is what I was going to explain. He did not allow me to explain. This was evident again from the forecast that the ruling party made and it was actually tallying with the figures which came out. Supposing a forecast is made that

their candidate is going to win with 12 000 votes, in actual practice you get the election results the next day that the candidate has won with 12,000 votes. Without appointment of contractors . . .

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: Everywhere that is possible.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: This does not become possible unless this is done . . .

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: We are discussing the Bill and not the ballot paper. It is all irrelevant.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: It seems that Mr. Yajee does not probably follow the proceedings. Because we are discussing election returns, because we are discussing how it affects the people, naturally these things have to come in. If Mr. Yajee does not follow the proceedings, I would request him to follow the proceedings at least if he sits in the House. *(Interruption)*. The ballot paper can now be taken only because it is sealed in the presence of the presiding officer, and a separate apartment is allotted where they have to mark it, and after marking it they take it out. I have also taken the information from the different villages where I happened to go.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: What were your representatives doing then?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Our candidates did not have the money bags. That is what I am coming to. You must allow me to say that.

SHRI A. M. TARIQ: I would like to know from him . . . *(Interruptions)* .

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

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: The hon. Members would kindly leave it to the Minister to reply. Let them not reply themselves.

SHRI A. M. TARIQ: I would like to have one information from him. Does he mean that all Swatantra candidates are sleeping beauties and they do not know what is happening?

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: We left the Congress beauties as they were. Because they were beauties they were left, who would adorn all the legislatures, that is why we left them. Then, Sir there is a news item in The Hindustan Times which does not come from the Swatantra Party nor can it be objected to by the hon. Members of the Congress Party here because it comes from one of their top men. It is a news item from New Delhi. It says: —

"A clash between Mr. K. Hanumanthaiya, former Mysore CM, and the West Bengal Congress leader, Mr. Atulya Ghosh, over the means adopted by Congressmen to acquire position occurred at the All-India Congress Committee session today." (Interruption)

We had the privilege of having such an ambitious man in Orissa. The news item goes on:

"Mr. Hanumanthaiya said that he had heard that a Chief Minister had attained his position by 'spending a few lakhs.' He had also heard that if one could spend a few crores one could even become the Prime Minister."

That is where the ruling party stands. (Interruption). I said that we had the privilege of having an ambitious man in Orissa. He is no longer the Chief Minister there. I am happy he is ambitious enough. (Interruption).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Please do not interrupt.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: I would point out one thing, Sir. Any irrelevancy that occurs in my speech is due to my Congress friends because they provoke me to say something in answer to their interruptions.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): YOU stand up to their provocation.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY: You are not bound to utter irrelevant things.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: This is where we have come to. If in a democratic set-up money bags are counted as the factors to finally determine who the elected member would be, then naturally, the ambitious man can boast of becoming the Prime Minister one day and if there is a competition between this ambitious gentleman and Messrs. Birlas, he has to withdraw himself in the contest because there would be other people capitalists, who can get into the Prime Minister's shoes more easily through this method. Is it where we are heading to? And here is somebody from the Congress who boasts of it. He knows naturally the weaknesses. He knows where the soft spots are. I would like to have very stringent measures. But here is somebody who wants to relax even the least restriction that we have in this connection. (Interruption).

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): No, no, don't interrupt.

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: Therefore, I would impress upon the hon. Members not to be guided by all the arguments put forward for the elimination of this provision. But on the other hand, if we want to check corruption among the capitalists, if we want to check corruption among the voters and if we want to strengthen the democratic set-up, in the country, then we need much more stringent measures. Even we can go to the extent of punishing offenders with rigorous imprisonment for ten or five years if he submits a wrong election return. As has been suggested by Shri Mani, if he does it on an affidavit, it is by far better because that would probably solve the problem. Now, as it is, no candidate who files his election return on wrong figures can be prosecuted but once he makes

it on an affidavit, then prosecution can be launched against him.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: What about Rs. 150?

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

SHRI LOKANATH MISRA: One thing more. The hon. Member who has brought forward this Bill gives us an explanation that since everybody is exceeding the limit, we should do away with it. But I am not satisfied with that explanation. Now, Sir, thieving is punishable but all the same there are so many thieves. Would that guide us in eliminating punishment for thieving? On the other hand, we must make the law more stringent. People are exceeding the limit and the Government is helpless about it, that is no argument to be put forward for the elimination of this innocent restriction. Naturally, I oppose it.

SHRI N. VENKATESWARA RAO (Andhra Pradesh): Sir I rise to support the Bill moved by my hon. friend, Shri Bhargava. As has been pointed out by more than one Member from both sides of the House, ours is the biggest democracy in the world. In fact, it is the biggest democracy in history. In a fine speech full of relevant facts, my hon. friend Shri Lingam mentioned that as many as 20 million voters were going to the polls in our country. It is obviously a slip of the tongue; I am sure what he meant was 20 crores of people. Sir, the population of the United States is about 18 crores. The population of the U.S.S.R. is about 20 crores. Our Voters are thus as numerous as the populations of these two mighty countries of the world. When millions and millions of voters are there, our constituencies are bound to be large. As Shri Lingam himself has pointed out, our Parliamentary constituency is five

times as big as that of Great Britain. A candidate either for our Assembly constituency or for our Parliamentary constituency has to cover hundreds of miles and has to meet thousands of people. For him to approach each individual voter and then to appoint his election agents at every polling booth, is no easy matter and the expenditure involved is necessarily heavy. No candidate, however scrupulous and honest he may be, would be able to confine himself strictly within the prescribed limit of expenditure. Under these circumstances, most candidates are now obliged to underestimate their expenditure while submitting their returns. As it was pointed out by Shri Bhargava in the Statement of the Objects and Reasons for his Bill, this is taking place on a very large scale. It is I believe, Sir, no exaggeration to say that 99 per cent, of the candidates are not now submitting correct return.

Now, Sir, in countries where there is only one party and only one candidate for each constituency, it is easy for one not to spend much on his election campaign. Also, in those countries with the so-called countries of guided democracy or controlled democracy, where the franchise is limited to a few thousands of people, it is easy not to spend much. But when we are trying to establish in our country a real democracy based on adult franchise, with crores and crores of voters, the election expenditure is bound to be rather large.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): YOU will continue your unfinished speech on the next Bill day. The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. on Monday, the 2nd of December, 1963.

The House then adjourned at five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Monday, the 2nd December 1963.