

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

SHRIMATI HEMA MALINI: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

The Film Industry (Protection and Promotion) Bill, 2005

SHRIMATI HEMA MALINI (Nominated): Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for protection of the film industry of the country from the onslaught of video piracy of films running the whole industry and denying States of their revenues losing entertainment tax, by way of prevention of video piracy and by providing deterrent punishment for the pirates and exhibitors and for promoting the industry by giving requisite incentives and concessions and for matters connected therewith and incidental thereto.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

SHRIMATI HEMA MALINI: Sir, I introduce the Bill.

The Representation of the People (Amendment) Bill, 2004—Contd.

श्री मूल चन्द मीणा (राजस्थान): उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, माननीय शरद अनंत राव जोशी जी इस विधेयक के द्वारा लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 की धारा 29 ए(1), (5) के अंदर संशोधन कराना चाहते हैं और इसलिए यह बिल यहां लाए हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर जोशी जी ने थोड़ा बहुत सोचा होता, विचार किया होता, तो इस बिल को लाने की आवश्यकता नहीं पड़ती। हमारे संविधान की यह एक मूल भावना है, जिसे आजादी के बाद हमारे संविधान में रखा गया। आजादी के समय जो हमारे विद्वान लोग थे, उन्होंने सोच-विचार कर इस समाजवाद की बात को संविधान में रखा था। अब इस संविधान की मूल भावना को जोशी जी ने समझा नहीं और समाजवाद हटाने की बात कह दी। कोई भी विद्वान व्यक्ति इस बात को स्वीकार नहीं करेगा, जो बिना सोचे समझे कही जाए। यह जो बिल लाया गया है, मैं माननीय जोशी जी के इस बिल का समर्थन नहीं करता बल्कि इस बात का उनसे निवेदन करता हूँ कि जब आप संविधान की इस मूल भावना के साथ छेड़ा-छेड़ी की बात करते हैं या इसमें संशोधन की बात करते हैं तो इस देश के लोगों की भावना के साथ सही न्याय नहीं करते हैं।

महोदय, हमारे संविधान के अंदर लिखा है कि भारत एक सम्पूर्ण प्रभुत्व-सम्पन्न, समाजवादी, पंथ निरपेक्ष, लोकतंत्रात्मक गणराज्य होगा। यह बात जरूर है, जैसा जोशी जी कह रहे थे, समाजवाद को संविधान में रखने के बाद भी उसका पालन नहीं होता है। यह बात कही जा सकती है कि संविधान की मूल भावना का आदर नहीं हो रहा है और इस मूल भावना को लागू

किया जाना चाहिए। यह बात भी सही है कि चुनाव के अंदर, चाहे वे रजिस्टर्ड पार्टी हों या दूसरी बिना रजिस्टर्ड पार्टी, जैसे इंडिपेंडेंट लड़ने वाले लोग हों, उनके द्वारा सही पालन नहीं होता। रजिस्ट्रेशन कराने के समय तो सभी पार्टियां इस भावना का आदर करते हुए रजिस्ट्रेशन कराती हैं, लेकिन जब प्रेक्टीकल रूप में चुनाव में जाती हैं, तो उस समय इसका पालन नहीं होता। हम मानते हैं कि उसका पालन होना चाहिए। आज देखने में यह आता है कि संविधान के अंदर तो धर्म-निरपेक्ष की बात कही गई है, लेकिन कुछ धर्म पर आधारित पार्टियों का भी रजिस्ट्रेशन हुआ है। केवल चुनाव लड़ने के लिए वे धर्म की बात करती हैं, वोट के लिए वे धर्म की बात करती हैं, समाजवाद की बात नहीं करती हैं। कुछ पार्टियां हैं, कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी समाजवाद की बात करती हैं। आज आवश्यकता है समाजवाद लागू करने, संविधान की भावना का आदर करने की और ऐसे लोगों को रोकने की, जो समाजवाद की भावना के अनुसार शपथ लेते हैं, शपथ-पत्र भरते हैं, लेकिन उसका पालन नहीं करते हैं। जरूरी है कि जो राष्ट्रीय दल बने हुए हैं, वे इसका पालन करें। आज हम देखते हैं कि चुनाव के अंदर, जबकि लोक सभा के चुनाव के लिए 20 लाख की लिमिट है, करोड़ों रुपए खर्च करते हैं, वोट प्राप्त करने के लिए कई प्रकार के लोभ देने, कई प्रकार के दूसरे साधन प्रयोग में लाते हैं, चुनाव में कंबल बांटे जाते हैं, साइकलें बांटी जाती हैं। अभी एक बाइ-इलेक्शन हुआ था। नाम से तो समाजवादी पार्टी अपने आपको कहते हैं, मगर उन्होंने साइकलें बांटी। अब यह कैसी समाजवादी पार्टी है, सिर्फ नाम की समाजवादी पार्टी है? क्या लोगों को धोखा देने के लिए पार्टियां अपना नाम रखती हैं? माननीय मंत्री जी, इस समाजवाद की जो मूल भावना है, वह यह है कि जो ऊंच-नीच और आर्थिक रूप से लोगों में भेद हो रहा है, उसको कम करें। यह मूल भावना इसलिए रखी गई थी ताकि हिंदुस्तान के अंदर लोग एक समान रहें, आर्थिक रूप से सबको उन्नति के समान अवसर मिलें, उनको अपना रोजगार चलाने के लिए समान अवसर मिलें। आज उसकी आवश्यकता है। आज उल्टा हो रहा है। हम बात तो समाजवाद की कर रहे हैं, लेकिन गरीब, गरीब होता जा रहा है और पैसे वाला अधिक पैसे वाला होता जा रहा है। इसको रोकने की आवश्यकता है, क्योंकि यह लोकतंत्र के लिए बहुत बड़ा खतरा है और यदि इसे रोका नहीं गया तो पैसे के बल पर लोग संसद और विधान सभाओं को कैप्चर कर लेंगे। इसलिए, जोशी जी, आप ज्यादा जोर समाजवाद शब्द को हटाने के लिए न दें, बल्कि आपको इस पर जोर देना चाहिए कि इसको लागू किया जाए।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज भारत की सम्प्रभुता, एकता, अक्षुण्णता की रक्षा के लिए आगे आना पड़ेगा। इस देश के अंदर संविधान ही नहीं, बल्कि हमारी आजादी पर, हमारे लोकतंत्र पर अनेक बार हमले हुए हैं, हो रहे हैं, इन्हें रोकने के लिए हमें अपने विचारों को विस्तृत बनाना पड़ेगा और संविधान की मूल भावना का स्वयं आदर्श और सिद्धांत की बात करके पालन कराना पड़ेगा। इसलिए जो भी राजनीतिक दल संविधान की मूल भावना का आदर नहीं करते हैं, मेश मानना है कि

उनके प्रति कड़ाई से कार्रवाई करने के लिए कुछ स्टैप, कुछ कदम, कुछ कड़े कानून आपको बनाने चाहिए क्योंकि संविधान की मूल भावना के कारण ही हम आजादी के बाद इस देश को 58 साल तक लोकतंत्र के रूप में, प्रजातंत्र के रूप में आगे बढ़ाते रहे हैं।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं जोशी जी से निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि आप मंत्री जी से आश्वासन ले लें कि वे इसको कड़ाई से लागू कराएंगे। संविधान की मूल भावना के साथ छेड़छाड़ के लिए जो संविधान संशोधन की बात करते हैं, वे लोगों की भावनाओं को दुखाते हैं। इसलिए आप इस बिल को वापिस ले लें और कड़ाई से लागू कराने के बारे में मंत्री जी से आश्वासन ले लें। संविधान की भावना की बात हो, धर्मनिरपेक्षता की बात हो, समाजवाद की बात हो, कोई भी दल या व्यक्ति, वह कैसा भी हो, किसी भी जाति या लिंग का हो, इसका कड़ाई से पालन कराया जाए और यदि वह चुनाव में इस बात का पालन नहीं करता है तो उसके खिलाफ कार्रवाई की जाए।

इस उम्मीद के साथ कि जोशी जी इस संशोधन को वापिस ले लेंगे, मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ।

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI (Maharashtra): Sir, to oppose socialism is a very unpopular thing. But in spite of the fact that I accept the validity of every word that my friend, Mr. Joshi, has said, I would also advise him to drop this Bill. Sir, the strongest point that he has made in that socialism is one of the many economic doctrines that have arisen in this world through out the world's economic history. To say that you are bound down to a particular economic doctrine is to curtail the liberty of a speech, and which is inconsistent with democracy. Therefore, my friend, Mr. Sharad is absolutely right that (a) democracy and socialism cannot be equated, because democracy itself means you are right to say things which others do not accept, as Rousou and Voltaire's famous dialogue was: "I don't believe a word of what you say. But I will give you my life to defend your right to say." That is democracy. Therefore, Sir, my friend is right when he says that you cannot bind down every political party to swear by one economic doctrine. I want to tell my friend that he has no chance of getting this Bill through this Parliament. But, certainly, in the Supreme Court of India, he is bound to succeed on the constitutionality of the provision. You better fight it out in the proper form.

As regards his current speech here, it is a speech which I think, with a little expansion and with a little deletion here and there, he should publish in the form of a book. The book must be made available to every student of political science and every teacher of political science throughout the country. But, I do not expect that this House is going to pass this Bill.

Therefore, let me not waste his time here. Let him go in for more academic pursuits.

But, he is right. Sir, in fact, today socialism and supporters of socialism are becoming unpopular. The current theory is, "Fifty years ago, if you were not a socialist, you had no heart. And if today you are a socialist, you have no head." So, today, this is what has come to be talked of socialism. Sir, there are some political parties which bravely say that they do not believe in socialism. It is their right to say it and they should be allowed to exist. Why must they be compelled to file false affidavits? But, Sir, I think, it is not a practical wisdom to pursue this Bill here. I hope my friend, Shri Shard, will rather have my cooperation in the court where we are bound to succeed.

श्री राशिद अल्बी (आन्ध्र प्रदेश): मैं कोई बहुत लम्बी बात नहीं कहने वाला हूँ। सच बात तो यह है कि मेरा बोलने का कोई इरादा भी नहीं था, लेकिन जोशी जी की बातें सुन कर, उन बातों ने मुझे मजबूर किया कि ऐसे हाउस में, जहां पर सोशलिज्म को हटाने की बात की जा रही है, वहां पर मुझे यकीनन कुछ न कुछ कहना चाहिए। जहां तक फंडामेंटल राइट्स का ताल्लुक है, जोशी साहब, आप सोशलिज्म की मुखाल्फत की बात कह रहे हैं और फेक एफीडेविट की बात कह रहे हैं, इस मुल्क की डेमोक्रेसी का यह सबसे बड़ा सबूत है कि आप इस हाउस के मेम्बर हैं। कॉस्टीट्यूशन के इस प्रिन्सिपल के बावजूद, आप इस हाउस के मेम्बर हैं और आपको यह पूरा इख्तियार है कि उस सोशलिज्म लफ्ज के खिलाफ, जो प्रिन्सिपल का, कॉस्टीट्यूशन का एक हिस्सा है, आप पूरी ताकत के साथ यहां पर आर्गु करें।

हिन्दुस्तान 100 करोड़ से भी ज्यादा बड़ी आबादी का मुल्क है और यह मुमकिन नहीं है कि तमाम लोगों के एक से खयालात हों। मुख्तलिफ़ मज़हब, मुख्तलिफ़ ज़बानें, मुख्तलिफ़ सोचें हैं, सब कुछ मुख्तलिफ़ है, लेकिन यह मुमकिन नहीं है कि कॉस्टीट्यूशन 100 करोड़ विचारों का एक कॉस्टीट्यूशन बना दिया जाए।

सर, मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि जब हिन्दुस्तान आजाद हुआ, कितनी मुश्किलों और कावियों के बाद आजाद हुआ। 14 अगस्त, 1947 को जब पाकिस्तान बना तो पाकिस्तान ने यह डिक्लेयर किया कि वह इस्लामिक कंट्री है, सेकुलर कंट्री नहीं है। उसने यह कहा ही नहीं कि पाकिस्तान के अंदर सेकुलरिज्म चलेगा, लेकिन उससे अगले दिन, यह जानते हुए कि पाकिस्तान ने कहा है कि वह सेकुलर मुल्क नहीं, इस्लामिक कंट्री है, इस मुल्क ने तय किया कि यह सेकुलर मुल्क रहेगा। रिएक्शन हो सकता था, इस बात की मुखाल्फत हो सकती थी कि पाकिस्तान तो बन गया है और पाकिस्तान ने यह भी कह दिया है कि हम एक इस्लामिक कंट्री हैं, क्यों न हिन्दुस्तान को एक

हिन्दू कंट्री बना दिया जाए। लेकिन उन लोगों ने जिन्होंने खून बहाया था, उन लोगों ने जिन्होंने हिन्दुस्तान को आजाद कराया था, उन लोगों ने विचार करने के बाद यह फैसला किया कि यह मुल्क एक सेकुलर मुल्क होगा, इस मुल्क के अन्दर हर धर्म का रहने वाला बराबर का हिस्सेदार होगा और सर, इसीलिए मैं यह बात कहता हूँ कि हिन्दू मजहब से ज्यादा टॉलरेन्स किसी दूसरे मजहब के अन्दर नहीं है, यह उस बात का सबूत था। उस वक्त काँस्टीट्यूट एसेम्बली के अन्दर 90 प्रतिशत से ज्यादा लोग हिन्दू लोग थे। वे रिएक्शन कर सकते थे कि पाकिस्तान ने अगर इस्लामिक कंट्री कहा है तो हम हिन्दू कंट्री बनेंगे। लेकिन इसके बावजूद एक विचार था सेक्युलरिज्म का और 15 अगस्त, 1947 को जब जवाहर लाल नेहरू जो हिन्दुस्तान के पहले प्रधान मंत्री थे उन्होंने तब तकरीर की, उस तकरीर में उन्होंने कहा था कि आज के बाद इस मुल्क के अंदर चाहे हिन्दू हो या चाहे मुसलमान हो, चाहे सिख हो या ईसाई हो वह बराबर का हिस्सेदार होगा। उसके बराबर के हकूक हैं। इसलिए कि सेक्युलरिज्म के साथ-साथ एक सोशियलिस्टिक कंट्री है। आपके जो विचार हैं मुझे ताज्जुब है आपके इस विचार पर, मैं यह नहीं कहता कि इस देश के अंदर हर आदमी सोशलिज्म की मजबूती के लिए काम कर रहा है, मैं इस देश के अंदर ऐसे राजनीतिक दलों को जानता हूँ जिनके नाम सोशलिज्म से जुड़े हैं, जिनके नेता अपने आपको लोहिया और तमाम सोशलिज्म नेताओं के फोलोअर्स बताते हैं लेकिन वे राजनीति कर रहे हैं हिन्दुस्तान के सबसे बड़े पैसे वालों के साथ। अमर सिंह जी, हमारे दोस्त यहां मौजूद नहीं हैं, बात सोशलिज्म की करते हैं लेकिन जो काम करते हैं, देश के अंदर सारा वह करते हैं, जिसका फायदा केपिटलिस्ट लोगों को होता है। अपनी-अपनी विचारधारा अलहदा है इससे कोई इंकार नहीं किया जा सकता। राजनीति, कम्युनल करते हैं, राजनीति धर्म की बुनियाद पर करते हैं। लेकिन इसके बावजूद दावा करते हैं कि हमसे बड़ा कोई सेक्युलर आदमी नहीं हो सकता। मैं जब पिछले हाउस का मेम्बर था तो आडवाणी जी ने एक बार कहा था लोक सभा के अंदर कि मुझे गौरव है इस बात का कि मैं एक सेक्युलर आदमी हूँ और सेक्युलर राजनीति करता हूँ। मैंने तब भी कहा था कि आडवाणी जी, हर आदमी को यह अख्तियार है कि वह अपने बारे में क्या राय रखता है, कि कोई दूसरा आदमी इंटरफियर नहीं कर सकता। लेकिन आप कितने बड़े सेक्युलर हैं, कितने बड़े सोशलिस्ट हैं इसका फैसला आप नहीं कर सकते, इसका फैसला दूसरे लोग करेंगे। अगर दूसरे लोग मानते हैं कि आप सेक्युलर हैं तो आप सेक्युलर हैं, अगर दूसरे लोग मानते हैं कि आप सोशलिस्ट हैं तो आप सोशलिस्ट हैं। आप अपने बारे में काम करें बिल्कुल सोशलिज्म के खिलाफ और कहते रहें कि मैं सोशलिस्ट हूँ, काम करें कम्युनल और कहते रहें कि मैं सेक्युलर हूँ, यह मुमकिन नहीं, ऐसा नहीं हो सकता। देश की जनता जानती है, देश के लोग जानते हैं कि आपका क्या किरदार है, आपका क्या करेक्टर है। मैं क्योंकि लम्बी बात नहीं करना चाहता लेकिन यह अन-फॉर्च्युनेट है कि आपने इस तरह का बिल यहां पर रखा। आपने

कहा कि पौलिटिकल पार्टी रजिस्टर्ड नहीं हो सकती, यकीनन नहीं हो सकती। जो कंस्टीट्यूशन का प्रियम्बल है इसके मुताबिक ही अख्तियार है पौलिटिकल पार्टी को रजिस्टर्ड होने का, उसके अलावा अख्तियार नहीं दिया जा सकता है। आपने कहा कि पुरानी जेनरेशन को इस बात की इजाजत नहीं दी जा सकती कि नई जेनरेशन के मुस्तकबिल का फैसला करें। अख्तियार है आपको, पूरी आजादी है इस हाउस के अंदर आप अपनी बात रखें। अगर इस हाउस के अंदर आपकी बात से अख्तियार करेंगे तो वह होगा जो आप चाहेंगे। कंस्टीट्यूशन में प्रोविजन है। आप पूरे कंस्टीट्यूशन को अमेंड कर सकते हैं, कंस्टीट्यूशन के जिस आर्टिकिल को चाहें आप अमेंड कर सकते हैं। आप जो चाहें कर सकते हैं, जो फैसला चाहें कर सकते हैं। कोई पाबंदी नहीं है कि आने वाली नसलों पर पुरानी नसलें हुक्मत करने का काम करें। आपने कहा कि जो शपथ ली जाती है वह शपथ गलत ली जाती है। आप बिल्कुल गलत कह रहे हैं जोशी साहब, बहुत अदब से कहना चाहता हूँ कि शपथ में सोशलिज्म लफ्ज न आए इससे फर्क नहीं पड़ता लेकिन शपथ ली जाती है कि मेरा पूरा भरोसा और फेथ है कंस्टीट्यूशन आफ इंडिया के अंदर, उसके अंदर वह प्रियम्बल भी आता है जिसके अंदर लफ्ज सोशलिस्ट भी लिखा हुआ है। तो यह कहना कि यह शपथ गलत है मैं आपको इस बात से भी इत्तफाक नहीं करता हूँ। सर, मैं ज्यादा लम्बी बात न करके सिर्फ इतना ही कहूँगा कि इसका पूरे तरीके से मैं विरोध करता हूँ। मैं आपसे यह दरखास्त भी नहीं करता कि आप इसे विद्वा कर लीजिए, क्योंकि आपको अहसास भी होना चाहिए कि इस 100 करोड़ से ज्यादा जनता के इस हाउस के अंदर ऐसे बिल को जो बिल आप लेकर आए हैं जिसमें सोशलिज्म की मुखालफत आप कर रहे हैं उसका क्या नतीजा निकलता है, आपको यह अहसास होना चाहिए। इस हाउस के अंदर कितने लोग हैं जो आपकी विचारधारा से जुड़ सकते हैं, शायद इस नतीजे के बाद आप अपनी विचारधारा बदल लें। थैंक्यू वेरी मच।

SHRI E.M. SUDARSANA NATCHIAPPAN (Tamil Nadu): Sir, I oppose this Bill. I am surprised to see that Joshiji is proposing this Bill when the evolution of Indian democracy and independence is over based on socialism. Even as early as 1929, a resolution passed in the Lahore Congress says, "The philosophy of socialism has gradually permeated the entire structure of the society the world over and almost the only point in dispute is the pace and methods of advance to its full realisation. India will have to go that way too if she seeks to end poverty and inequality though she may evolve her own methods and may adopt the ideal to the genius of her race."

This is the thing followed in the subsequent Avadi Congress, "The Congress affirms its goal of achieving the socialist pattern of society. Since then, two General Elections have taken place and the country has endorsed

the objective of the Indian National Congress." This I am quoting from the speech of Shri Kamaraj as the President, who made it in 1964, in Bhubaneswar Congress, "I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Member to the fact that India is the basis for the socialist pattern of society. We need not be influenced by the communism or any other philosophy which has come from Europe, the social structure of India even in the ancient period is based on the trusteeship and the karta, who is the family head, is a protector of the entire family, not only to protect physically, but economically also; everything is to be divided among the members of the joint family. That is the basic structure on which the Indian democracy and Indian philosophy, especially the Congress philosophy has come up."

Therefore, we cannot say that the socialist word is borrowed from some other literature and, therefore, it may be a thing we need to hate. But I would say that the history of Congress would clearly show how the socialists and the non-socialists were fighting with each other. I would just read one portion from Dr. Rajendra Prasad's speech as the President of Congress in Bombay Congress, in 1934. He says, "My friends, the socialists are keen on a more inspiring ideology and would hasten the elimination of all that stand for exploitation. I should like to tell them in all humility but with all forces at my command, that there is no greater ideology than is expressed by the creed of truth and non-violence and determination of the country not to eliminate the men that stand for exploitation but the forces that do so."

Here, the concept is taken from the Communist ideology. Therefore, there was a clash between the two groups within the Congress. Subsequently, in the Lucknow Congress, in 1936, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru says, "I am convinced that if some world catastrophe does not intervene, this new civilisation will spread to other lands and put an end to the wars and conflicts which capitalism feeds. I do not know how or when this new order will come to India. I imagine that every country will fashion it after its own way and fit it in with its national genius. But the essential basis of that order must remain and be a link in the world order that will emerge out of the present chaos. Socialism is thus for me not merely an economic doctrine which I favour; it is a vital creed which I hold with all my head and heart. I work for the Indian Independence because the nationalist in me cannot tolerate alien domination. I work for it even more because for me it

is the inevitable step to social and economic changes. I should like the Congress to become a socialist organisation and join hands with other forces the world over who are working for the new civilisation. But I realise that the majority in the Congress, as it is constituted today, may not be prepared to go thus far. We are a nationalist organisation and we think and work on the nationalist plane."

This is the evolution of the Congress party during the period of the movement for Independence. The culmination of socialism had come in that way. In the Bhubaneswar Congress, it had been given very clearly that there should be clear mind to focus upon the democracy and the socialism. I quote Kamraj, "How shall we proceed to implement our objectives? We in India hold the twin principles of Democracy and Socialism dear to our hearts. It is our desire that the political and economic organisation of this country should be based on the consent of the people. Then only can we have true Socialist Democracy in action. There can be no inherent conflict between Socialism and Democracy. In the days when Gandhiji led the movement for freedom, many thought that it was not possible to achieve freedom without violence. But freedom was in fact achieved without violence and bloodshed. Thus Gandhiji introduced a new philosophy and technique, for achievement of freedom by the subject peoples of the world. Similarly there are others who think that Socialism cannot be achieved without authoritarianism. We hope we shall also be able establish a socialist society without class conflict and dispel the popular belief that in a socialist State men lose their natural freedom."

So, in this way this evolution has come up. Finally, we can say why this amendment to the Constitution had come in 1976. It can be from the spirit of the Indian National Congress. At that time, what Mr. Barooha, as the Congress President had said, I would like to quote that. About the need for administrative machinery committed to democracy, socialism and secularism, he said, "We have had to depend all these years on an administrative apparatus which was set up for entirely different purposes. It was originally colonial and was meant to subserve British interests and perpetuate British rule. It did not have then the much-published civil services' neutrality. It was very much a rule at any cost. In the post-independence era the administrative apparatus did undergo certain changes but the basic structure remained unaltered. The machinery, in the higher layers, is manned today by the best products of Indian universities and it swears by British

principles and traditions. "In this way it goes to say why the 20-Point Programme which started during Indira Gandhi's period has to be implemented wholeheartedly so that the democracy, socialism and secularism, the three pillars of the Congress policy are implemented in all ways and that was the main plank on which this particular amendment was carried out in the Constitutions. Therefore, Sir, I would like to stress that Mr. Joshi has got a fear that in due course the globalisation may not allow us to have a secular country or a socialists country. Socialism for India is trusteeship. Socialism is for the distribution of economic produce which is meant for the society. It is an equal opportunity not only for casting vote but also for dividing the assets of the community. Sir, you know very well that in the Indian society from the village level to top level, that is, national level, we have community properties and wherever we go we find that community had its own properties and these are manned by the society. For this, we have the Panchayati system in which any person who has crossed the age of 18 can become a person to decide about the property of the community and also the assets of the community. They can rule what the particular necessity of a village or community is. This right has been given by Panchayati Raj system. Gandhiji had taken pride that India has got a unique aspect of having the Panchayati system. It is the unity of the people at the grass-root level and they decide their own economic welfare. Sir, even though we may be going for globalisation or the FDI may be growing and a lot of money may be flowing in but the investment is not for charity. They are coming here because of American interests. They want more return from the money which they are investing here. Their investment in India is because of the reason that in America you cannot get the same interest in the banks or in the industries. The profit making is in India and China. Therefore, they are coming forward to invest money here. Simply one day they can crash the share market, pull back their money, and invest in some other country where they can get quick profit out of it. We cannot depend on the FDI alone; we cannot depend on the WTO alone; we cannot depend on the system where we pray that foreigners come here. I saw a newspaper article, today. Mr. Bill Gates had visited Chennai. During his visit, he was to be taken to the Microsoft City. But he was not taken there because the road was not up to that standard to take Mr. Bill Gates there. What is this, Sir? Even the emperor of Britain could travel this fallow land of India. But a man, who came as a businessman to invest with a view to get more profit, to earn

more, could not visit that place because the road was not in good condition. India is an independent country. Bill Gates could not travel on that road, but ordinary men of India, especially the people of Tamil Nadu, travel on that road day-in-and-day-out. So, this is the situation. This is one of the ways to earn money for the country. No doubt, we need better infrastructure. We need better roads. We need a lot of trains. We need more agricultural produce. We need profitable produce for our peasants. We need employment for our unemployed people.

I read one more article. The people of India, who have gone for employment to other countries, send 23.8 billion dollars every year to their country. It is the topmost statistics. China and other countries are coming down because we produce intellectuals. We allowed the IITs to come up. We allowed the institutes of excellence to come up. We make our students learn even without paying a paisa. We provide them shelter; we provide them dress; we provide them food, and what not. Even sometimes we pay to the parents also to sent their children to learn. But after learning, after mastering the art, they go to foreign countries, and make the USA, Canada and other European countries rich. Our intellectual property is ruling the world. But, at the same time, we are fortunate, at least, to the level that we are getting back 23.8 billion dollars to our country because some patriotic persons, who are employed in foreign countries, are reinvesting their money in their own country.

This is a passing phase, Sir. One day, India will be a Super Power. We can utilize our intellectual property, our intellectuals for our own utility, for our own development. We need not have the BOPs, then, I saw an article on the KPOs. People, all over the world, are receiving knowledge from the people of India, who had studied in India. In fact, we make excellent people for the world utility. Whole world is using that. They are becoming richer, but we are praying for their investment, which is created by our own intellectuals. Our intellectuals have gone to America and European countries and making them rich. And, that money comes to us in the form of FDI. We are very happy that everyday we are having the FDI. They are utilizing our KPO. Sir, India may be a poverty-stricken country in terms of economy, but we are rich in knowledge, we are rich in human resources, we are rich in culture. That is the basic system on which the socialistic pattern of society has to come, the Constitution proclaims. Indiraji had brought forward this because we want to be proud to say that a democratic

4.00 P.M.

country, a country of socialists, where the entire assets of the country have to be divided among the people, and invest for their development. That is the main thrust on which this Amendment Bill has come.

Sir, you know the history of the judicial system. The Supreme Court had struck down the Privy Purses Abolition Act. The Nationalisation of Banks Act was also struck down by the Supreme Court because, at that time, that was the mindset of the Supreme Court. Now, the same Supreme Court says that the word 'socialist' should not be removed. That is the judgement of the Supreme Court. The same Supreme Court says that the word 'secular' should not be removed. India is a secular country, it is a socialist country. That is the verdict of the Supreme Court. Therefore, the changing society needs the word 'socialist' because we proclaim that. Our system may be coined in some other words as 'Hinduism' or 'Indianism', but 'socialist' is a word which we borrowed from the Europeans. At the same time, we practice it in our own method. In India, we want to say that, here is a society common to all. We can utilise the opportunities that come up, and we can develop India, we can develop the assets of India. With this perspective, the knowledge of Indians should be utilised for India. The 'Socialist, Democratic Republic', these words will give spirit to the future of India to say that wherever we earn, we will bring back the money here. Even if our knowledge is sold elsewhere, we will bring it back here. It will be a socialist country, it will have a joint family system where everything will be divided among the children, among the brothers and sisters. This is socialism. Thank you very much.

SHRI JAIRAM RAMESH (Andhra Pradesh): Thank you Mr. Vice Chairman, Sir. Sir, I would not have spoken this afternoon, but I was provoked by some of the remarks that Mr. Sharad Joshi made. I was also provoked by the fact that the Opposition Benches are totally empty except the two ladies; the two distinguished ladies of the Opposition, and they more than make up for the absence of the Ahluwalias of the world.

Sir, Mr. Joshi, has moved the Bill. He has got every right to move the Bill. We can have a debate on the Bill. He is fighting a case in the Supreme Court, and as Mr. Ram Jethmalani said, he may well have a strong legal case. But, in the course of the discussion; in the course of, actually, introducing the Bill, I think, he made a series of generalisations on the

recent economic history of the country, which, I feel, should not go unchallenged.

I think the most important charge he levelled was that before 1991 the India Economic Policy was based on socialism, which was an imported ideology. Sir, I think, this is a gross misreading of the whole planned development in the country, and it is a gross misreading of the economic policy that this country adopted after 1947 on which there was a consensus, I would say, not only in this country, but elsewhere that India was a poor, agriculturally backward country which required State-led industrialisation, which required the Government to play a very important; not just a very important, but a central role in planning and in execution of development projects. This was true not only of the Congress Party, it was true of foreign intellectuals who came to India to advise the Government. It was, certainly, true of Dr. Ambedkar. Many people do not know that the first Economics PHD of India was Dr. Ambedkar. He got a PHD in Economics in 1916 from the Columbia University, and he went on to get a second PHD in 1922 from the London School of Economics. I am glad that Mr. Paswan has walked in when I am talking of Dr. Ambedkar. Many people look at Dr. Ambedkar only as a messiah of social justice, but he was a great economist and he is not given enough credit for this. And, even Dr. Ambedkar talked about State-led industrialisation, planned industrialisation and development based on the primacy of the Government. So, the point I want to make to Mr. Joshi is, it is very easy now to sit in judgement of what happened or what did not happen in the last 40-45 years. But the point I do want to make is that when this country became independent, there was a consensus, cutting across the political spectrum, that the development of India required a strong Government, that the development of India required a strong public sector, that the development in India required public investment in infrastructure, in basic industries and the private sector, which does not have the financial or the managerial resources to fulfil this role. So, this is the first point. I would like to request Mr. Joshi to be sensitive to. There was this consensus. There were occasionally dissenting voices. Dr. B.R. Shenoy was a dissenting voice. Prof. C.N. Vakil was a dissenting voice. But I think, barring these one or two dissenting voices, 99 per cent of the people; politicians, economists, the media, civil society, everybody was convinced that India required planned development, India required a strong

public sector. Now, sir, the fact that we became a democracy, the fact that we became an open, pluralistic, representative democracy—in 1952, we had our first General Elections in which over a 100 million people voted—should, once and for all, give the lie to this propaganda that we were a socialist country to begin with, because no socialist country in the early 50's, Sir, was a democratic country. India was a unique country. Our basic ethos, our basic political commitment was a parliamentary form of democracy. Now, within that parliamentary form of democracy, the economic policy that we adopted was undoubtedly, based on the success that the Soviet Union had of a transition from a backward agricultural country to a World Super-Power and even Shri Sharad Joshi cannot deny the fact that in 30 years, the USSR went from being a backward agrarian economy to one of the two major economic powers in the world. Of course, they have paid a very high political cost. Of course, they have paid a very high social cost. I am not here to sit in judgement on the USSR, but we cannot negate history. The fact is that the economic development of USSR was indeed very impressive, but we did not adopt the Soviet model lock, stock and barrel. We were impressed with the Soviet Union, we tried to get from the Soviet Union the necessary financial and technological resources, but at no point of time, if you look at economic history, can you say that India transplanted the Soviet model of development into India. This is simply not true. This is not true of industry, certainly, in which both the public sector and the private sector existed and prospered, and it was, certainly, not true in agriculture where cooperative and joint farming was not introduced. Now, I know what Shri Sharad Joshi will say. I know Shri Sharad Joshi will say that there was a strong element in the Congress Party that wanted joint farming, that wanted cooperative farming, and that it was only Shri Charan Singh and Rajaji who held back the Sovietisation of India agriculture. Yes, I acknowledge the fact. I acknowledge the fact that there was a big debate in this country in the 50's on the future of Indian agriculture. I acknowledge the fact that there was a very influential school of thought which believed that the future of Indian agriculture lay in cooperative and joint farming, but, ultimately, wiser counsels prevail; ultimately, the views expressed by people like Rajaji and Shri Charan Singh prevailed and India retained a peasant proprietorship model. India remained a country in which farms were owned by individuals, whether they were proprietors, or share croppers or tenants, that is a separate issue, but we did not introduce

collectivisation of agriculture, of the type that was introduced in the Soviet Union and China with disastrous consequences.

So, I think, the second point I want to make is the fact that we opted for a political democracy is a very important argument to negate this view that we adopted socialism. Because had we been socialist in the true sense of the term, we would not have been democratic, we would not have had an open adult franchise, universal suffrage model in which over a 100 million people, actually, exercised their choice in 1952. So, I think, again, Sir, it is being slightly unfair, because, right now, it is very fashionable to rewrite Indian history, whether it is to rewrite Indian social history, or, whether it is to rewrite Indian economic history. It is very easy to say, 'oh, we were socialist in the past, and, now we are not socialists.' I think this is a gross misreading of what our planners, of what our founding fathers envisaged socialism to be. Socialism was not seen only as the ownership of the means of production, which was an important point, but socialism in the India context meant equality of opportunity. Article 16 in the Indian Constitution talks of equality of opportunity. True socialism meant equality of opportunity; true socialism meant the negation of privilege; true socialism meant the fact that merit determined where you went education determined how you progressed and not the accident of birth. To that extent, if you look at socialism through this perspective, I think, we remain a socialist society today. Today, we are still fighting the battle for equality of opportunity. Today, we are still fighting the battle of extending the benefits of education and health to a large sections of our people. So, anybody who says that I am not a socialist is, today, in my view, being totally oblivious of the social and economic realities of India. Socialism does not necessarily mean the ownership of production; socialism does not mean having a large public sector. Now, there may be some people who believe that occupying the commanding heights of the economy meant that you were socialist. But the dominant view in India ultimately, one has to distinguish the view that gets expressed in doctrine and dogma and the view that actually gets expressed in actual practice. And, it is a remarkable tribute to the pragmatic nature of our founding fathers that nowhere did we say 'we were socialist.' After all, even the *Avadi* Resolution of 1955 commits the Government to a socialistic pattern of society. It is not committing the Government to socialism, but to a socialistic pattern of society. And, a socialistic pattern of society means equality of opportunity, brotherhood, fraternity, equal

access to health, equal access to education, the abolition of untouchability the abolition of the notion of birth as a guarantor of privilege and the establishment of education as the means of social advancement.

So, Sir, I don't want to carry this debate too long, but I feel Mr. Sharad Joshi, in his exuberance, in his enthusiasm, in my view, created an unnecessary environment of scare, as far as economic history is concerned. His sweeping assertion—he comes from a political party which believes that controls have strangled Indian agriculture—is again doing gross disservice to the people who brought about the Green Revolution in this country, to people like Lal Bahadur Shastri, to Indira Gandhi, to C. Subramanian, to M.S. Swaminathan, all these people. What was the Green Revolution? The Green Revolution was not the magic of the 'market place' like President Reagan once said. The Green Revolution was possible because of investments in irrigation, in Bakhra Nangal, in Hirakud. The Green Revolution was possible because of investment in Agricultural Universities, in Ludhiana, in Coimbatore, in Pant Nagar. You yourself are aware of the investment that was done in Pant Nagar. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir. So, the Green Revolution was based on the Food Corporation of India, on Minimum Support Price, on procurement price. Now, today, you might argue that that system has run its course. You might argue that today that system requires reform. But to say that the entire Green Revolution in India was 'market force' is, in my view, a totally wrong view. If there was no Government, if there was no political leadership, there would have been no Green Revolution.

So, Sir, with these few remarks, I would request Mr. Sharad Joshi not only to withdraw the Bill, but also to do some self-introspection and not condemn all of pre-1991 as a 'socialist dark period' and all of post-1991 as some sort of a 'market nirvana'. Neither was pre-1991 so bad, nor is post-1991 so good, as he is making it out to be.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI K. VENKATAPATHY): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I am extremely happy that the attention of this august House has been drawn to one of the cardinal principles embodied in our Constitution by Shri Sharad Anantrao Joshi, hon. Member of Parliament, by way of the Representation of the

People (Amendment) Bill, 2004, introduced by him in this House on 17th December, 2004. The hon. Member has sought omission on the word 'socialism' from sub-section (5) of Section 29A of the Representation of the People's Act, 1951.

According to the Statement of Object and Reasons appended to the Bill, the hon. Member has given the following reasons which have necessitated the present Bill:

"Section 29A(5) of the Representation of the People's Act, 1951 compels an association or a political party to bear allegiance to the principle of socialism as a pre-condition to it applying for registration as a political party. It has the effect of hindering and inhibiting the formation of a political party with full advantage of registration and its functioning in the political arena of the country unless it conforms to a certain point of view of socialism. Such a proposition is not even provided by Fundamental Rights under Article 19 of the Constitution which guarantees freedom to form association and expression. It makes little sense, in this era of market-oriented economies, to deny non-socialists the possibilities of organizing themselves as a political party in order to be able to contest elections.

Socialism, a part of Section 29(A)-5, is also discriminatory, since an individual without affiliation to any political party can contest election without bearing any allegiance to the principles of socialism. But, it prevents an association of such individuals from doing so as a registered political party unless it bears allegiance to the said principle. Under the scheme of the Constitution, the right of a non-socialist citizen to hold his personal views, and be entitled to all the privileges enjoyed by the socialist fellow citizens cannot be denied. His access to the legislative body, as an individual and as a party, cannot be hindered by denying him privileges of being registered as a political party. Moreover, if there is faith and allegiance to the Constitution, do we need to do anything more?

Therefore, Section 29(A)-5 may be amended to remove the anomaly."

The Section, 29(A), of the Representation of the People's Act, 1951, deals with the registration of political parties and sub-section 5 of the said section, *inter alia*, provides that 'an application for registration as a political party shall contain a specific provision that the association or body shall bear true faith and allegiance to the Constitution of India, as by law

established, and to the principles of socialism, secularism and democracy, and would uphold the sovereignty, unity and integrity of India.' In this connection, attention is also invited to the Preamble to the Constitution of India, which, *inter alia*, provides that "We, the people of India, having solemnly resolved to constitute India into a SOVEREIGN, SOCIALIST, SECULAR, DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC....".

Sub-section (5) of Section 29(A) of the Representation of the People Act, 1951, apart from stressing true faith and allegiance to the Constitution, lays stress on the principles of socialism, secularism and democracy, which can be described as the soul of our Constitution as laid down in the Preamble to the Constitution.

The hon. Member has singled out word 'socialism' possibly in the background of globalisation of the national economy. In this connection, it may be stated that in view of the widespread poverty and economic disparity, socialism will always remain relevant to the Indian social condition. Any Government or political party cannot administer this country remaining oblivious to the plight of the general public. The policies being formulated or followed by any Government, though, may, at times, look capitalist in academic terms, but in the long term, they are addressed at raising resources, which can be put to use for ameliorating the existing social disparity.

In view of the above, it may be seen that the goal of socialism for political party in the governance of the country as per the Constitution of India as by law established remains the same; the only difference would be as may be the measures taken to achieve the same.

It may, thus be seen that in the Indian context, there is no role or scope for a political party, which does not have faith in the concept of socialism as reflected throughout in the Directive Principles of State Policy.

Now, I would like to thank all the hon. Members who have participated in the debate on this Bill. Hon. Member, Shri Moolchand Meena, has aired his opinion that an amount may be specified to be spent during elections. It is not followed. We must respect the spirit of the Constitution. That is what he has said. Shri Ram Jethmalani said that it has to be fought in the court of law, instead of being fought in the Parliament. Shri Alvi too made a speech. The fact that you could make a speech against socialism is

itself evidence that this right has been conferred by the Constitution. Hon. Member, Shri Sudarsanan Natchiappan, has reiterated that the Lahore Congress, Avadi Congress, and Bhubaneshwar Congress -- all these conferences expressed confidence in socialism and they have introduced a socialistic pattern in the society. Therefore, that principle is our policy. India is the basis for this socialistic policy. It was not borrowed from any other nation. It is not a new order has come to India. That is what he has reiterated.

He has also further stated that here is a society common to all. Though the hon. Member, Shri Jairam Ramesh, has put it in precise terms, he has completely covered all topics in an interesting manner because for social justice we are including social justice, economic justice and political justice. Therefore, there was a consensus that the development of India requires public sector and he spoke that 99 per cent of the people were convinced that India requires strong public sector. India was a unique country where economic policy was adopted from the Soviet Union. Therefore, we have followed certain principles which have got close adherence to the socialistic pattern of society. Therefore, collectivisation of agriculture was not followed. We have got our own pattern of principle. Therefore, equality of opportunity and equal distribution, on merit, should be counted. So, all these merits and battle for equality and everything is provided in our Constitution only because of that word. So, when we come to the Constitution, our Directive principles of state policy also insist that socialistic pattern should be adopted. Therefore, in adherence to that policy, we have to follow the principle of socialism and, as has been already pointed out by me, socialism is one of the cardinal principles embodied in our Constitution as is evident from its preamble. Hence, it may be very difficult to subscribe to the view of the hon. Member that the word 'socialism' should be removed from sub-section (5) of section 29A of the Representation of the people's Act, 1951. Hence, it is not possible to accept the Bill in its present form or with any modifications. In the circumstance, I fervently appeal to the hon. Member to withdraw the Bill.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI KALRAJ MISHRA): Shri Sharad Anantrao Joshi, are you withdrawing the Bill?

SHRI SHARAD ANANTRAO JOSHI: No, Sir.

उपासभाध्यक्ष : जोशी जी, आप इस का उत्तर देना चाहें तो दें?

SHRI SHARAD ANANTRAO JOSHI: I feel very bad about having to say 'No' to the hon. Minister, but there are things of principle which are far more important than the personal courtesy, and I have been very busy being correct both politically and academically to be polite. I must thank all the Members, my colleagues, who participated in the debate. I got an impression that there is some error in my expression and that most of the people did not understand the purport of the Bill and even the Minister did not. There are two points. I will firstly deal with the points made by some hon. Members. Meenaji said that at the time of Independence the general sentiment, the consensus of the people in India, was in favour of socialism that is something which was partly repeated by Mr. Natchiappan and Mr. Jairam Ramesh. I stoutly deny that. There were some notes of socialism in Lahore Resolution and here and there in the speeches of different people. But as Mr. Natchiappan himself read out in an extract, Nehru himself admitted that socialism is not the majority view in the Congress. That was only a personal view and I can quote any number of books in which people like Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel has said that socialism was a personal fad of Pandit Nehru. It is on record. So, to say that in 1947 the general sentiment in India was for having a socialist Republic is incorrect. If it were correct, then in the original Preamble itself the word 'socialism' would have appeared and as was the consensus in those days we would have called ourselves 'the Socialist Republic of India' which we did not. At that time, the entire freedom movement, as I pointed out in my first speech, was fought under Gandhian ideals. Nehru is on record, as saying that he does not subscribe to the economic policies of Mahatma Gandhi and Mahatma Gandhi has replied to him that if you stand for this kind of a philosophy, then after Independence I would have to fight with you. This is also on record. Gandhi necessarily stood for predominance of the primordial importance of villages, agriculture, farmer and the individual. Gandhi, as an individual, was a great anarchist. Nehru, after independence, after Gandhi was gone, made a sort of a coup d'état, and, tried to turn to a socialist pattern in which not the villages but the cities became important, and, not the agriculture but the heavy industries became important, and, not the individual and the freedom but the public sector became paramount. This change, was brought about without debate. But to say that that was the current philosophy right since 1991 is distorting history. Till 1947, you can ask anybody, India was predominantly Gandhian. Maybe, it was wrong, maybe, it was right; that is not the question. Maybe, Nehru was quite right; I never said that Nehru's

taking the country to socialism was wrong. At a given point of time, there were decisions that had to be taken, and, that were taken. Certainly, if in the globalisation epoch, we are able to give the kind of shining performance that we are, then some of the infrastructures that were laid down under the socialist era, have some credit for that; as the Chinese can give credit to a discipline developed under the Communist epoch for the gains that they are making in the present epoch. But, to say that the socialism was the general consensus and sentiment at the time of independence is wrong. There is a whole history of it. Even hesitatingly, we talked of the Socialistic pattern. At that time, I was a student of Economics. I remember those days, and, I also remember the days when Nehru deliberately tried to bring about collectivisation of agriculture, the word used was collectivisation' and which was repulsed by the Congress itself, and, therefore, we were lucky, I think, if something saved India from becoming a sort of second Soviet Union, it was the decision in the Nagpur Congress not to accept collectivisation of land, and, that is a major history. Then, after that, we had the era of planning, but even at that time — Hon. Ramesh Jairam mentioned so many economists like B R Shonoy — Kumarappa, the name I would like to mention, advocated the Gandhian type of planning, and, the writings of Kumarappa show that Gandhians, in a general way, were very, very unhappy about the kind of turn that Nehru had given to the Indian economy. Now, I come to the second point. I can only thank Mr. Ram Jethmalani. My case is already before the Bombay High Court, I don't see particular advantage in going to the Supreme Court, and, I have always counted on Ram Jethmalani's help for fighting my legal suits. But, I cannot accept his advice to withdraw the Bill.

(MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN *in the Chair*)

Hon. Mr. Alvi talked more of secularism. I don't know, why? I have never objected to the concept of a secular India, I have never objected to the concept of a democratic India. As a liberal, I stand for democracy; as a liberal, I stand for secularism. What I don't stand for is the compulsion that I should swear by socialism.

Mr. Jairam Ramesh made a point that I am blaming everything that happened before 1991 and I am praising everything that is happening after 1991. Mr Ramesh, you are wrong. I never said that. Since I used the word 'historic defeat of socialism', I would say that as a whole, after 1991, Arrow's theorem has been proved to be right. And, as against that, you

have the Indian Nobel Laureate in Economics, Dr. Amartya Sen. What is happening right now? The conflict that is happening in India is the conflict between Arrow's theorem and the Indian Nobel Laureate, Dr. Amartya Sen who emphasized the role of the Government at, activism particularly, with regard education health and famines. So, that is the conflict that is taking place.

All the things that were said by different speakers point out that there exist even more shades of socialism that can be enumerated by me, for example, removal of untouchability. Is it socialism? No. But it is certainly a step towards socialism, and, nobody will deny it. Did I say that socialism was wrong? I categorically say that I never said it. I never said that. All that I said is since you in the Congress always talk of pluralism—I represent here the Swatantra Bharat Party—you always abuse the BJP people for the monolithic Parochial view that they take, and, want you to accept pluralism.

Now, all that I am saying is, as you are being pluralistic in the matter of secularism, religion and faith, why are you not becoming pluralistic even about the economic doctrine? Socialism may come out to be right, and, probably, what you are doing is right. But, do I have not the right to say that I do not believe in socialism? I said that I turned away from the socialism after visiting USSR because I wanted to protect my right to be a dissenter. And, in this democracy, if you call it a democracy, have you got the right to say that all of you have to swear allegiance to socialism? You can say that if you want to live in this country, you have to respect every citizen and you cannot discriminate against anybody because of his birth. But, you can't say that you have to accept an economic doctrine if you want to be registered as a political party. All that I said was, I have nothing against socialism—after 1991, probably you will come out to be better than before 1991, even though if I were to believe the Prime Minister, then, that is not so—but, I was wondering whether Dr. Manmohan Singh would today stand up and say that I am a socialist. I would like to see that happen. If you are so much worked up about the word 'socialism', I would like to see even Mr. P. Chidambaram saying proudly that I am a socialist. There is some kind of hypocrisy in it. You are not socialist. Your Prime Minister is not a socialist. Your Finance Minister is not a socialist. You only depend upon the creches of some of the Leftist parties. But, none in the Congress Party is a socialist. Therefore, what I am

saying is, consistent with the glorious history of the Congress Party, which is essentially pluralistic, you may believe in socialism, you carry out your socialist programme, but, permit me the right not to be socialist. That is all that my Bill was about. And hence, I would not certainly withdraw the Bill for the simple reason. In 1995, in one of the conferences of our party, somebody made a speech and said, "Do you know that liberalism and the kind of economics you are talking about is politically impossible". And, he cited the fact that even such a competent and honest person like Dr. Manmohan Singh, when he stood for elections in an elite constituency like South Delhi, was defeated. He said, "Your thought is politically impossible. Distribution of cycles is politically correct, politically justified. Talking of socialism, talking of poverty eradication, is good politics. But, talking of market and talking of justice for those who work hard and those who are capable of producing results, is not good politics". And I said, "I know, it is not good politics". But, I am determined to keep the flag of freedom flying until what is politically impossible today become politically inevitable. And, I am quite sure, I mean that who would have believed, let's say, by 1980 that we would have come to a time where socialism would have become a ridiculous concept, and, generally it is considered a ridiculous doctrine world over. The important thing is my time is still to come. Rajaji said that. The first Swatantra Party probably came several decades too early. But, if you read the writings of B.R. Shenoy and Rajagopalachari, you will see that we unnecessarily went through a very torturous process and came to a situation where everything was in a short supply because of the so-called policies followed in the name of socialism. If we had stuck to Rajaji and if we had stuck to Masani, we would have certainly taken a lesser time to arrive at the present stage. Sir, number one, I said that the word 'socialism' does not have any meaning. And, I read out a list. All the people who spoke here added to the list of various shades of meaning that can be attributed to socialism which proves my charge that the term 'socialism' is vague. And, if it is vague, you cannot expect anybody to swear by it and declare his allegiance to a concept which you don't know yourself. Out of the five people from Congress, who spoke, everybody gave his own meaning to the word 'socialism'. And, if that is so, then, asking anybody to swear by it is wrong. That is number one. Number two, if you are socialist, remain socialist. If Congress is socialist, be it precious to you. All that I am asking is, please give me my right not to

be a socialist. It is as simple as that. But if you say that this is something that cannot be accepted, then I would say that you are worse than Stalin, because even in Stalin's era, it was possible to have a non-socialist party, which your party is now denying. That is what I wanted to say. I don't know what the procedure is, but if it has to be voted out, then I will prefer to be voted out.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is the only way, because you are not withdrawing it.

SHRI SHARAD ANANTRAO JOSHI: I prefer to be a martyr on the subject than withdrawing it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Sharad Anantrao Joshi is not withdrawing the Bill. Now, I shall put the motion moved by Shri Joshi to vote. The question is:

That the Bill further to amend the Representation of the People Act, 1951, be taken into consideration.

The motion was negatived

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, Shri Kalraj Mishraji.

The Commercial Advertisements on Electronic Media (Regulation) Bill, 2005

श्री कलराज मिश्र (उत्तर प्रदेश): उपसभापति महोदय, मैं प्रस्ताव करता हूँ:

“कि विज्ञापनों के लिए ऐसे सन्धियों और मानकों जिनका अनुपालन किसी उत्पाद या सेवा का विज्ञापन करते समय इलेक्ट्रॉनिक मीडिया में विज्ञापनों के प्रसारण में लगे सभी प्रसारकों द्वारा किया जाएगा, का प्रावधान करके, इलेक्ट्रॉनिक मीडिया पर वाणिज्यिक विज्ञापनों को विनियमित करने तथा तत्संसक्त अथवा उसके आनुषंगिक विषयों का उपबन्ध करने वाले विधेयक पर विचार किया जाए।”

मान्यवर, मैं इस विधेयक पर विस्तार से 23 दिसम्बर, 2005 को अपने विचार व्यक्त करने का अनुरोध करता हूँ। अगर मुझे इसकी अनुमति मिले तो आपकी बड़ी कृपा होगी।

श्री उपसभापति: अनुमति है। Further consideration on this Private Member's Bill will be continued on Friday, the 23rd December, 2005, the next and