

श्री उपसभापति : ठीक हैं, ठीक हैं । ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री लालू प्रसाद : उपसभापति महोदय, मैं डिमांड्स रखने के लिए लोक सभा में था । यह हमारा अपर हाउस हैं, गरिमामय हाउस हैं, इसे देखने के लिए दो एमओएस हमारे यहां उपस्थिति थे, दोनों राज्य मंत्री । ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति : वह आते हैं, आते हैं । ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री लालू प्रसाद : कभी-कभी एप्पियर होंगे, बराबर एप्पियर होंगे, तो फिर आप कहेंगे कि नहीं चलेगा । ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री एस. एस. अहलुवालिया : हम 11.00 से 12.00 बजे के लिए कह रहे हैं । ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति : ठीक है, ठीक हैं । ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री लालू प्रसाद : इसलिए महोदय, ... (व्यवधान) ... आप हमारी बात सुन लीजिए । 12.00 बजे हमारा वहां था । ... (व्यवधान) ... मैं बहुत पंकचुअल रहता हूं । [Shri Shamta Ram Laxman Naik] MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Supplementary Demands for Grants (Railways) 2007-2008.

SUPPLEMENTARY DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (RAILWAYS) 2007-2008

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (SHRI LALU PRASAD): Sir, I lay on the Table a statement (in English and Hindi) showing the Supplementary Demands for Grants (Railways) for the year 2007-2008.

श्री रवि शंकर प्रसाद (बिहार) : मंत्री जी, आप से प्रश्नों के उत्तर सुने हुए बहुत दिन हो गये हैं । ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री लालू प्रसाद : अच्छा ठीक है । ... (व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति : वह उत्तर देंगे ।

PRIVATE MEMBER'S BUSINESS (RESOLUTIONS)

Constitution of a committee for recommending amendments to constitution for adding a new chapter on governance of coalition governments

SHRI SHANTARAM LAXMAN NAIK (Goa): Sir, I beg to move the following Resolution:

"Having regard to the facts that—

- (i) an era of coalition governments at the national and States has crept in;
- (ii) Indian political scenario is not likely to change substantially in this respect in near future;
- (iii) there is no mechanism at present which can effectively find solutions to the problems which arise out of coalition form of Government; and
- (iv) there is a need to ensure that the nation does not suffer on account of delays, uncertainties under such dispensations;

this House resolves to constitute a Committee for the purpose of recommending amendments to the Constitution by way of adding a new chapter on the governance of coalition

Governments providing for the powers, duties and responsibilities of coalition partners, and for providing a code of conduct in the matters where Constitutional provisions may not be practicable".

Sir, in this country, there are nearly 150 registered and unregistered political parties, in some form or the other. Registration of political parties has also become quite easy these days because recognition can come in later, but parties can be registered with submission of their constitution, application, etc. Even such political parties get a common symbol by default. There is a procedure provided for this. Therefore, the number of political parties is increasing day in, day out, I must say, to spoil the political atmosphere in this country. Although they have got every right to form associations and groups, ultimately it leads to spoiling the political atmosphere in the country. We have got diverse culture and people of various castes, communities and religions are residing in this country.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI UDAY PRATAP SINGH) in the Chair.

A famous journalist has, therefore, said, "The real diversity of India often socially proclaimed is now becoming increasingly manifest politically. Coalition politics is the latest political manifestation of this impulse. Whatever, which is there in the country in general terms, has crept in into the political system of this country."

There have been various attempts to form coalition Governments in this country. Some have been successful and some have been successful partly, if you look into the short history of political functioning in this country. The first attempt, as we all know, was made during 1977—80, when the Janata Party ruled for two-and-a-half years; it could not last more than two years for whatever may be the reasons. Then, Charan Singhji came as the next Prime Minister, and his Government lasted for about three weeks. In 1980, the Congress (I) got an absolute majority and we ruled substantially. Again, in 1984—89, we completed the five years' term. Then, in 1989 elections, again a coalition Government headed by Shri V.P. Singh. It lasted for 11 months. Then came Chandra Sekharji, whose Government lasted for four months. Then, in 1990-91, Narasimha Raoji's Government, again a coalition Government, was a successful Government, in spite of all odds in between. Subsequently, in 1996, Vajpayeeji's Government was installed, which lasted for 13 days. Then, the Government led by Shri Deve Gowda lasted for one year. Gujralji's Government lasted for seven months. Then, in 1996, the NDA Government led by Vajpayeeji was a successful Government,— successful, not in the literal term—in the sense that it lasted for five years. Then, now the UPA Government is in power. The question is whether coalition Governments are beneficial for this country or not, that is a matter of opinion. But one must admit that coalition Governments are a compulsion...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): What is your opinion?

SHRI SHANTARAM LAXMAN NAIK: I am saying, from time to time, what happened. I would say that eventually. Let me summarise at the end. Sir, if we look at the system in the Constitutional provisions, coalition Governments become a compulsion. No one can say that coalition Governments are good. If they are there by situation, by compulsion, then, we should see to it that they work out. As it is, let us not pray for coalition Governments. Nobody should pray for coalition Governments. But if it comes as a result of the voting pattern, we have to function under that. That is why I say, they have crept in, and they are going to last for some more time to come. Now, why I am saying that some Constitutional provisions are required is that in the present system, when an election takes place, a party or a group of

parties, which has got a majority, go before the Rashtrapatiiji. Then, there is a question that before going to Rashtrapatiiji, if there is no majority for a single party, to obtain this letter of support, the exercise that political parties has to make is tremendous. A tremendous amount of blackmailing is involved in this process. One cannot deny that. Even after giving letters, signatures are denied. Then, there is a concept of parading in Raj Bhawans at the State level or in the Rashtrapati Bhawan at the Central level. That concept came. Then came the concept of Shri S.R. Bommai's decision. Now, we do not know whether parading is proper or Bommai's formula is proper. So, there exists entire vagueness, uncertainty, even in the present system. Therefore, one thing I feel is that whether you provide for Constitutional provisions or not, every aspect of our functioning should be in line with these provisions. Like, in the event of elections, we have the Representation of People's Act. Everything is provided for in that, right from voting till the scrutiny and counting of votes. But, it states nothing about post-elections. No doubt, we have the Constitution of India. But most of the things in the Constitution are still vague. Therefore, the question arises of parading the people, of Bommai's case, of what the principles involved are, of who has got the majority, of what the discretion of the President of India is, and so on. Even after sixty years of our Independence, everything is vague. This vagueness should be removed. I am not saying that you can write down everything in black and white. But everything that is possible should be put in black and white so that the human discretion is reduced to the minimum. If the human discretion is reduced to the minimum, there will be no scope left for bias, there will be no scope left for partisan attitude. Therefore, these things are required, and required more, in the case of coalition Governments.

Then, in a coalition, one of the important documents, in a way next in importance to the Constitution of India, is the Common Minimum Programme. After a coalition Government comes into power, it takes months together for the preparation of its Common Minimum Programme. A lot of exercise is involved. CPM says their manifesto is this; CPI says their manifesto is this; the other parties say, "You include five items of mine, two of his, three of them" and so on. Ultimately, the programme is chalked out. But if you read each paragraph of the Common Minimum Programme, of whichever coalition, it leaves wide scope for interpretation. Secondly, the most interesting part is that even after agreeing on the Common Minimum Programme, the political parties keep on talking about their own parties' programmes and irritate the Government. Once a Common Minimum Programme has been agreed upon, there is no sense in bringing up your own party's programme again and again, saying that it is still there; it is kept in the cold storage, as it used to happen in the case of Jammu and Kashmir; BJP used to do it. Well, it is either way; I am not blaming anybody. But it used to mention it in some cases. Therefore, as far as the Common Manifesto is concerned, again there must be some certainty and some legality involved as to how far ...*(Interruptions)* आगे बोलूंगा।

Secondly, in a coalition Government another aspect is this. We know that the bureaucracy anywhere in the world is a very strong force. *(Interruptions)* I am only pointing it out. I am not justifying it. But when it is a coalition Government, nobody listens to us. Now, let me tell you one thing. You count the number of letters you have written to the Ministries and the sort of answers you get. Some committee should be constituted and the MPs should be asked to hand over all the letters and an independent body should scrutinise whether the works which have been denied by the Ministries could have been done with a proper application of mind. It should be some third body. I am confident that, at least, in fifty per cent of the cases, if not more, you will find that the answers which are given in the negative by the Ministries are the

works which could have easily been done. Therefore, this happens more in the case of coalition Governments. वे क्या सोचते हैं, उसका कोई ठिकाना नहीं है। उनका आपस में इतना झगड़ा है कि हम अपना राज करेंगे। Therefore, something is required to be done in this matter also.

Then, why I am saying, again and again, that for coalition some regulation is required is because the Cabinet has got a joint responsibility. How far in coalition Governments it is being observed, I do not know. At least, at the national level, it is being observed substantially. But at the State level such things are not observed at all. Immediately after coming from a Cabinet meeting, the Minister or the State-level Minister says anything against anybody, even against a Chief Minister although he has very much agreed on the proposal passed in the Cabinet. As far as coalition partners are concerned, I would like that some type of joint responsibility in the Cabinet should be incorporated for the functioning of the coalition Government. Unless this is done, the coalition Governments will collapse earlier than they are expected to collapse. Ultimately, if coalition Governments are formed, we would like them to continue, because there is no choice; but, in such a governance, they have to create a situation where coalition Governments function.

I would like to touch Goa because Shri Pany wanted me to speak on it. In smaller States, the situation is the worst because there are Constituencies with just 25,000 votes BJP and Congress are the major political parties. If somebody has gone to Dubai for five years, he makes tonnes of money, he returns and feels like contesting. If he contests, if he spends a crore of rupees, whether he wins or not, he can easily take 2,000 votes and he will decide the fate of BJP or Congress depending on who he is. Therefore, winning a seat will not depend on the good work done by the Congress or the BJP, but it would depend on the man who is waiting to come and contest and snatch votes. This has happened in smaller States. Today, our Government is headed by Congress. We depend on 2 MLAs of one political party. The two other MLAs are waiting to come. They too are ready to come. Out of these two MLAs, we have given one MLA the PWD portfolio. He would not agree to anything less than that. Suppose we discard this man, the other two are also willing to come. But again, one of them would like to have the PWD portfolio only. Only PWD. If PWD is given, then these two are coming. The NCP is supporting us and giving us problem. They are saying now that PWD portfolio should not be given to these people, they should go to them. Where do we stand? Therefore, the discretion of the Chief Minister under the Constitution of India to decide to whom the portfolio should go, who should be the Minister is all reduced to nonsense under this system. Therefore, there is a large number of disadvantages in this functioning.

What has happened in Karnataka, we all know. What are these MoUs? We know, only on commercial terms, when two commercial giants meet or between a Government and some commercial organisation. But MoU between two political parties for the purpose of functioning of a Government, all agreements on stamp paper, we did not know! Wherefrom these come, what is its legal value, we do not know. Therefore, this new type of politics which has come to Karnataka has compelled us to think further to find solutions for this coalition Government. Initially the JD(S), for the purpose of forming a Government joined hands with the BJP. Now, they want back the label of secularism, because in elections, that alliance will not serve its purpose. So, they have severed their relationship with the BJP. But, now they want back the stamp of secularism. So, they are now saying that they are ready to form Government with our help.

श्री रुद्रनारायण पाणि (उड़ीसा) : क्या आप अपने साथ ले रहे हैं ?

श्री शान्ताराम लक्ष्मण नायक : हमारे लीडर्स हैं। I am giving you a factual situation. I am not a person who can decide things. But this is the type of politics which is going on.

In this process, the regional parties play a big role, whether good or bad. Earlier, people used to vote for regional parties only with respect to regional politics. But when it came to national politics, they used to choose national parties. This was earlier a good trend which was going on but nowadays people vote for regional parties even for Parliament and that has clearly created a situation which has really brought in an era of coalition to stay. It is the votes of the voters which go to the regional parties even for national politics. The situation has become like this. I cannot say that is bad because everyone has got a right but voters have to think, people have to think and they have to choose in a broader manner. No one can deny that right, no one can deny the right of the regional parties to come to national politics. But they should behave with a national outlook. This much right I have got to say. The regional parties if they want to come to national politics have to show their bonafides by having a national approach. As far as our partner, CPM, is concerned, I would like to say with certain *...(Interruptions)...* I am saying honestly. In fact, I give them an example, "You see at the Central level, we have got CPM, they also differ, they also create problems." This is what I tell my Goa people. But I say they do not fight for portfolios. They fight on ideology. I give their example. *...(Interruptions)...* I have not yet finished *...(Interruptions)...* So, I will make this difference and I appreciate the role of the CPM. But I would like to tell them again that they are also going too far, may be, this was earlier, and they are contradicting. Therefore, even a person like me who would like to appreciate their role, it becomes difficult for him to appreciate when their role in West Bengal is different, role in Kerala is different and their role here is different. Therefore, *...(Interruptions)...*

PROF. P.J. KURIEN (Kerala): Actually the CPM is taking advantage of the Government without taking any responsibility and he is appreciating that. *...(Interruptions)...* Therefore, I am requesting the CPM to join the Government. *...(Interruptions)...* That is my request.

SHRI SHANTARAM LAXMAN NAIK: He is right, he is very much right but it is so. *...(Interruptions)...* Sushmaji yesterday called the CPM leadership 'aparipakav', immature, I would not agree with that. Leadership is not like this. They are quite wise, they are quite mature but these days they have become a little arrogant, if you ask me. *...(Interruptions)...* Calling them immature will not be proper but they have become arrogant. I would request them most humbly that this arrogance may be reduced a bit. It would not help the country much. Secondly their views are not consistent. A coalition partner must have consistent views. If I read in a newspapers that CPM has said this today, I am confident that next day, it will be different. Why are they in conformation? It is because consistently there has been inconsistency in their approach. I am even confident that if I read anything on an issue, especially the nuclear deal the next day I will always find that the version is different. Therefore, it is good to expect from a party like CPM that they should stick to whatever they think is right or wrong. They also must admit that they are choosing the ladder or democracy to come to power, but inherently they must admit Communism has nothing to do with democracy. *...(Interruptions)...* Therefore, sometimes they must admit these things *...(Interruptions)...* As far as statutory provision or law or amendment on which I am speaking is concerned, I would say that why it is required; it is functioning, conventions are there, practices are there and it will go on, Fine. You may get shocked if you agree with me. You cannot get shocked if you do not agree with me. Now, what is the present law if a Member of a House associates with any other political party in their activities as per the Supreme Court

judgement which is the law of the land? It is defection. There are a number of cases. If I associate with other parties and go for campaigning it is defection because Supreme Court has interpreted that way, whether it is right or wrong. Now, in coalition politics each one of us goes, we canvass for others. There is no exemption made in the Tenth Schedule for this purpose. Constitution does not recognise this system of coalition, whereas the judgement is still there. What does it mean? It means that we all are disqualified. So, if you agree with me, some thinking has to be done.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Does Constitution recognise only single party rule?

SHRI SHANTARAM LAXMAN NAIK: I am talking about the Tenth Schedule. I am very clear in what I have said. It is a Constitutional provision. The moment such a judgement comes we should try to nullify that judgement. We do not dare to do it. We should bring Constitutional amendment and say, "We don't agree". Nobody does it. In Ravi Naik's case, it is Goa's case, it had been decided that conduct is important. If your code shows that you are associating with any other political party, you are voluntarily giving up membership of the party and, hence, you are finished. So some exemption requires to be done if you are functioning in a coalition Government where you have to go for campaigning for each other. Or, would you like to leave it that way? Therefore, Sir, I have not contemplated on what should be the amendments. I have not given any thought to that except one or two States which I am mentioning because that requires a lot of insight. But, in principle, some regulation is required. As far as oath is also concerned, some new form of oath is required in this Constitution. In some Directive Principles also, certain amendments have to be done and things cannot be covered under Constitutional amendment because there maybe so many functioning of political parties, or it cannot be incorporated in black and white or it cannot be incorporated in the Constitution. Certain things have to be enumerated in a code of conduct and, therefore, my submission is that there must be a Constitutional amendment; add a new chapter to regulate some part of it; and certain other parts should be included in the code of conduct. In this manner, let us function as a good coalition Government and help the nation. Thank you, very much.

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD (Bihar): Hon. Vice-Chairman, Sir, it is good that my good friend, Shri Shantaram Laxman Naik has today given us an occasion to reflect the working of our democracy and the shape of Government that we would like to have. Sir, today I want to raise the debate to a little higher level with a view to introspect as to how our democracy has functioned, what lessons we have learnt and what are the remedial measures which we need to undertake. Sir, when India became free and we had a Constitution in the year 1950, on 24th January to be precise, it was concluded and promulgated on 25th of January, 1950. We had one party rule. Congress was in power at the Centre. Congress was in power in the entire country. I can say that running a democratic Government needs a democratic character and a democratic spirit. When I say that, I will be failing in my duty if I do not appreciate Jawaharlal Nehru. Particularly after the death of Sardar Patel, he having emerged as an unquestioned leader of the Congress Party in the nation. He had every opportunity waiting for him to turn into a quasi-dictator. It was small Opposition; the Opposition parties were small. But he had commitment to democracy. That compliment I need to give him as a student of Indian History. He respected Parliament and he respected democratic behaviour. But I cannot say that with the same degree of certainty about his successors even in the Congress Party. Having said that, with the passage of time, there appeared decline in the Congress Party. For the first time, a Leftist party—there was no

CPM then—came to power in Kerala in 1957. But they were not allowed to survive. I would say, the first constitutional indiscretion was committed in the year 1958 when the Left Government in Kerala was dismissed, Namboodripad ...(*Interruptions*)...

PROF. P.J. KURIEN: You may not be knowing what happened during that period in Kerala, you are reacting without knowing the facts. We have experienced it. I was a student and we have experienced the tyranny.

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: Sir, I respect your seniority and your experience. Still, I would say, as a student of Constitution and Indian Political History, you cannot justify the dismissal of that Government; I say that again.

Having said that, what was the image then? Political parties had come in; the PSP was there, SSP was there, Jan Sangh was there, Left was there. There were jeers at the Congress Party; I remember, when the Jan Sangh Party acquired a corporation, they used to say, 'you are fit to govern the corporation, but not the State or the nation'. A great qualitative shift came in the year ...(*Interruptions*)...

PROF. P.J. KURIEN: Article 356 was put to use by the Morarji Desai Government to dismiss State Governments. Was not your party a part that? Don't try to say that only the Congress Party dismissed State Government. ...(*Interruptions*)...

श्री रुद्रनाराण पाणि : आप थोड़ा ऊपर तो उठिए ।

श्री रवि शंकर प्रसाद : कुरियन साहब, बात निकलेगी तो बहुत दूर तक जाएगी, Let us keep the debate at a little higher level.

गृह मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री श्रीप्रकाश जायसवाल) : सर, शेरो-शायरी ये बहुत अच्छी करते हैं, कृपया इनसे कहिए कि दो-एक शेर और पढ़ें ।

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: It is done once in a while.

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: To Nehru only and not to your party and other leaders!

Now, Sir, thereafter, there was a watershed in Indian politics in 1967 when Opposition parties came to power in Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Bengal and many other States and also in Madhya Pradesh after some time. South still remained under their control. Yes, in 1967, DMK came to power in Tamil Nadu—a State for which I am the in-charge of my party now. Now, those Governments continued for some time and then got dissolved; there were defections. Now, what happened was that a concerted attempt was made from Delhi-by our friends and others, who were in the ruling parties-to convey that the Opposition could not continue in Government for long and therefore, they should not waste their votes. We heard about this campaign. At some places, people accepted it and Congress came back to power; at some others, they did not. But this great churning process in the States of non-Congress parties coming to power continued unabated.

Sir, thereafter, we all heard what happened during Emergency, how Jaiprakashji was put in jail, and before that the JP Movement, during which I had the honour of going to jail and other things are too well-known. Then came the defeat of Mrs. Gandhi in 1977 and Janata Party came to power. Then started a second campaign. They have all got the right to campaign; after all, in democracy, there is the political process. What happened was, a campaign was launched that 'all right, the Opposition can rule a State but it can never rule at the Centre. Even if you vote for them and they come to power, your votes would be a waste; it will be a

short-lived government', And they had certain empirical evidence in their favour. The Janata Party Government of Morarji bhai lasted a short period. This is not the occasion to go into how it happened and when it happened. How it happened? What happened? Today is not the occasion to go into that. Then Charan Singh's Government, then V.P. Singh's Government, then Chandrasekhar's Government, then Mr. Deve Gowda's Government and Mr. Gujral's Government came. They used to support the Government from outside and also used to ensure it fell. That is a different matter at all. But they had empirical evidence in their favour to contend that non-Congress Opposition parties cannot rule the Centre and give stability. The second myth was also exploded, Sir, when Mr. Vajpayee and NDA Government came there and gave a stable Government of five years, which my friend Mr. Naik also acknowledged. Sir, what is the bottom line today? One of the greatest lessons of our democracy is that the people of the country today acknowledge and recognise their power that they can unseat any Government, State Government or the Central Government. People ask us in some seminars, why we don't have any IP-revolution type phenomena again now. I say, people of the country have known their power and they know that they can unseat any Government. Sir, a great positive feature of Indian democracy, I feel, is that the people of the country have recognised that they would give space to any political party which in their judgement is entitled to their votes. The second positive fall out of this is that the Indian democracy has become a great leveller. When the political parties, big or small, come through the political process, they recognise and learn to respect the identity, that is, India. Regional forces come on the national forum; the national forces come close to regional forces and there comes a different kind of understanding. Sir, I say so because I had the honour to be a part of Vajpayee Government for four-and-half years. We used to work with 26 political parties. We could understand their world-view and they understand our world-view. They influence us and we influence them as well. In the process, this healthy reciprocity is very important for the working of a coalition. Sir, let me today reflect upon some of the political positive consequences which have emerged out of it. We had many political parties which used to talk of cession from India and alienation from India. They had agenda and ideology and they are entitled to their ideology. But once the democracy gave them the political space, they realised that alienation is not the answer. Democracy tamed, democracy trained and democracy gave them the larger picture of the identity which is India, historically, culturally, socially and constitutionally. That is why I say democracy is a great learning process and that has been given today. What is the answer to the problem which my friend Mr. Naik has stated today. Let the democratic process answer the challenges which Mr. Naik had just talked about. There are challenges. I remember, Sir, when I was the Minister I had a long tour of North-East. I will not name the State. I had a long talk with the Chief Minister who has asked me for a dinner. Sir, he recounted his experience as an extremist in his younger days. He used to talk of cession from India. But once he became the Chief Minister, he realised the larger vision of India and the profound change which has come to him. I am sure these kinds of examples would multiply if the democratic process is allowed to have its play. Let us not stop it because the moment we put artificial political road blocks in the functioning of democracy, the problem arises. उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आप हिंदी के बड़े विद्वान हैं, एक पंक्ति है—“लोकतंत्र लोकलाज से चलता है।” This concern for public humility, the inbuilt restraint which democracy offers you to work with also has its own great shock absorbing value in the functioning of democracy. The moment we snap that umbilical link of democratic conduct, the problem arises. My friend talked about the dismissal of many Governments. Yes, there have been dismissals in the past when Janata Party Government came to power. Before that, Congress Party dismissed so many Governments. But, what happened. The Court intervened. The

[SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD]

democratic process intervened. And, today, things have stabilised. Sir, I am also a lawyer by profession, but I do not agree with some of the judgements. Yes, there is a provision in the Constitution today that both Houses must ratify any Presidential proclamation. But, taking opportunity of the discussion in the House, let me give you a very concrete example. The Supreme Court, in Bommai's case, has stated that unless both Houses approve the Proclamation, it would remain in suspended animation. This is the additionally which the Supreme Court has added in Bommai's case. Why did founding fathers of our Constitution did not conceive of that? They were eminent lawyers, great visionaries from Dr. Rajendra Prasad to Sardar Patel to Dr. Ambedkar to Pandit Nehru. I think the rationale was, 'let something grow with constitutional tradition'. Today, Sir, let me give a very concrete example. It can happen any day. A political party gets three-fourth majority in Lok Sabha. Okay, it can get. It has two-three seats in Rajya Sabha. Suppose, a particular information comes that a particular State Government in India, the Chief Minister, the Chief Secretary, the DGP are on the pay roll of ISI, a perfect ground for the dismissal of the Government in terms of constitutional scheme and the party in power has got three-fourth majority. But, it has got two seats in Rajya Sabha. Naturally, Rajya Sabha will never approve it. But, the political legitimacy of the popular support and the perfectly-justifiable constitutional ground cannot be acted upon because the Supreme Court has put, with great respect, an artificial roadblock by extending the constitutional provision which was not the intention of the founding fathers. These are the issues to be considered today. Sir, in our democracy, let larger issues be debated, discussed by the political process. I do not appreciate this attitude of the polity of today that shift everything to the Judiciary. Why? Let the political process respond to that. Let the Indian democracy respond to that. Let the people respond to that because conflicting demands on political divide need not be adjudicated by the Judiciary. Let the political process respond to that. That is very important. I regret to say, in my understanding, not a very healthier development is there, be at the national politics or State level politics, छोड़िए न, कोर्ट में चला गया । अब कोर्ट से जो फैसला होगा, मान लेंगे । Does the court always take a right decision politically speaking? They may take a right decision legally. But, Sir, I am very happy to know that the people of the country are realising how to respond to a state of uncertainty. I will give you two instances. I come from the State of Bihar. Post-2005 elections, there was a state of uncertainty. The then Governor—I need not name him—took a decision, wholly arbitral, wholly unconstitutional. The Supreme Court set it aside in the Rameshwar Chaurasia case, well-known case, and also had the occasion to give serious comments against the functioning of the Central Government as well. But, what did the people of Bihar do? They gave a conclusive majority to the NDA Government so that the state of uncertainty did not continue. Take the case of Uttar Pradesh recently/There was a lot of pressure of competitive politics. But, when the election came about, the people gave a conclusive majority to one political party; rightly or wrongly, it is a different part. The people gave the vote. And, a unique feature was witnessed in Uttar Pradesh that after 1991, for the first time, any party could get majority single-handedly. When I say, Sir, that let the political process take care of political consideration, I am talking in that context. People of the country are realising that. But, I agree with Mr. Naik on a larger issue. What is that larger issue? We are investing everywhere in the country, but we are not investing in democracy of the country. Let us acknowledge one thing very clearly. Now, India shall be governed by democracy, political parties, and elections. There shall be no military coup in the country. It has never taken place. It shall never take place. Now, for disastrous experience of Mrs. Gandhi in 1975 and that defeat in 1977, no

politician would dare impose emergency in India. India shall be governed by political parties, by elections. We are investing everywhere; we are talking of reforms everywhere, but we are not investing in democracy of India. That is a larger challenge, which creates serious anxiety for me. We need to invest in our democracy. We need to invite good people with larger vision to participate in the democratic process. We need to make party structure healthier. You just talked about your own State Goa. The state of perpetual uncertainty in Jharkhand, in Goa creates cause of serious concerns. They are good States, wonderfully endowed States. But two people, three people create problem. I think, it will be a great day for India if these people are defeated substantially by the people, by the voters in the elections so that they learn a lesson that party hoppers and party breakers cannot have a promising future.

It is good that it is hapenign in north India. We had a problem in Bihar, a lot of, with great respect, 'rogue' elements. They used to think, "we shall get elected as MLAs and we shall determine as to what course the polity must take." The people responded. We got a majority. I think, in that part of Bihar, the BJP got the highest number of seats ever right from the days of Jan Sangh. This is how the people respond and let us encourage people to respond in that healthy manner.

Now, you have raised concern about a Constitutional mechanism. What can" be the mechanism? Would you stop regional parties from coming to the national politics? You cannot; you should not because if a regional party gets all the seats in Lok Sabha, you will not appreciate that, or, *vice-versa*. I think, we need to trust the judgement of the people of the country. We need to trust the political process, and, that will answer to all this. The people of the country are not happy about it. Go and see the feelings of the people of Karnataka, in particular. Now, we talk of an MoU on a stamp paper. A new kind of lingo has been introduced into the vocabulary of Indian politics. Now, I fail to understand how can a former Prime Minister of the country behave like this. Suppose I put in all the terms and one party violates. What will happen then? Will we file a title suit for injunction, for compensation? What kind of logic is all this? The political process needs to be understood, and, I am quite sure that whenever elections will take place in the State of Karnataka, people of that State, approvingly and convincingly, will give a very fitting reply to all these kinds of perpetual uncertainties. I feel this kind of periodical approval and disapproval by the people of the country is the only answer.

I never doubt your intention because when you stated all these things, you have come with great degree of thought and concerns about the problem. But my concern is larger. If you make certain changes in the Constitution, then, judiciary has got the power to approve or disapprove it with its power of judicial review. Then, what will happen? Every political divide, every political uncertainty will go to the court. Is it fair for the country? Yes, a new trend has developed — a Speaker behaving in an irresponsible manner, people rushing to the courts and courts giving judgements. In Bihar case also, it happened. But it will keep on multiplying and multiplying. This is also not a very healthy situation where judiciary intervenes in the political process on top of the head. The larger principles are there. Now, the larger principles have come about. After the Bommai Judgement, any Central Government is finding it difficult to impose President's Rule. That is a good decision. The principles have been laid down but the working of all these principles must be left in the hands of the political process.

Sir, I am an eternal optimist man. I think that this whole process of uncertainty which is happening would give us a ray of hope for the future and the people of the country would revert to a stable polity where, maybe, two parties dominate and other regional parties would also become a very healthy, cooperative, compatriot on the national scene. This is a transitional

[SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD]

phase. Why I say so, Sir? In conclusion, let me say one thing that the greatest speed of Indian economic progress has been witnessed when India is governed by coalition Governments, be it Mr. Vajpayee's Government or your Government. Yes, Left are Left. It may be that American capital losses its imperial colour when it gets invested in Kolkata. But, it is a problem in Delhi and other parts. It is a different matter altogether. But, Sir, today, let me ask a very interesting question and reflect upon the kind of polity India is witnessing. Some parties are recognised State parties like TDP, RJD, Samajwadi Party, DMK and AIADMK. But, apart from the BJP and the Congress, the other political formulation claiming to have pretence of national outlook was the CPM and CPI. The declining, political status and health of CPI is well-known. Let us not talk about this. But, today, I will ask you a question, why has the CPM not grown beyond Kolkata, Trivandrum and Tripura. I remember, I come from Bihar, CPI was the biggest opposition party after Congress in 50s and 60s. CPM was a big force in Andhra Pradesh and also in Maharashtra. They had a powerful presence in Tamil Nadu. They were very important in Punjab also. But, why is it that today CPM is confined to three States only, one is important, another is second and the rest is a very small North-Eastern State. Why? I think, the people of the country have a very basic instinct to understand which party is capable of being designated as a national party and which party is not. Therefore, by the very political process itself, the BJP and the Congress have emerged as all-India parties. A healthy competition; East Bengal and Mohan Bagan; Good! It is good for the development of the country. And, the coalition era has given the biggest boost to our economic progress. If the policy is good, if you trust the entrepreneurial ability of the people of the country, they will give you regards. These developments offer me a great assurance of future, Sir, and I am quite sure, through the process of democracy, India is destined to become a world power economically, politically, militarily and also spiritually. Thank you, Sir for having given me time.

PROF. P.J. KURIEN: Let me ask one doubt please. I am not opposing you. Are you saying that the economic growth is because of coalition or is it that it is a coincidence?

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: Since you have asked me a question, what I am simply telling you is, if you come with right policy, if you trust the entrepreneurial ability of the Indians, if you allow them to do their business properly, if you allow them to work in a convenient atmosphere, the Indian enterprise, the Indian intellect delivers with heart. That is what I am saying.

DR. K. KESHA RAO (Andhra Pradesh): Thank you, Sir. I have heard Mr. Prasad and also the Mover of the Resolution. Sir, I have not come here with any studied notes. But, I would rather respond. Since you have tried to take the debate to the higher plain of discussion, let us first understand the society that we have inherited it is a stratified society, is a coalition society. We are a multinational nation upto ourselves, the music in Kashmir is not the music of Coimbatore. Or, the kind of food there, is not here. The marriage code, the language, literature, everything is different. Yet, we have been one, which perhaps my friends this side might oppose. What is that spirit that has Seen holding us together? If a society could be held together with these diversified social groups, why can't it be translated into politics? Since Mr. Prasad referred to the tall personality, Panditji, Congress itself is a coalition party. All things to all people. I could be an extreme left in the Congress with an extreme right man presiding over. I can understand that you are trying to rely more upon a political process and set democratic process to its tune. I want Mr. Prasad and others of his ilk to understand that very interpretation and functioning of democracy is undergone a lot of different interpretations.

First of all, democracy inherits clashes. Then, there is the inevitability of clash that is innate in democracy. Let us understand that first. If I am to prove that I have a majority over you and thus entitled for power. I have to go to the people, fight amongst ourselves and prove to people after a fight for one month — Or. Gill *sahib* would give us the rules that I have a majority. Next, nobody says, as he said, neither the Constitution says, how I should behave. He told me how I could come here. I can only come after using my *lathi* or my muscle or my money or my caste or my region or whatever it is to gain majority over my rival. This kind of a clash is inherent in democratic process, election Process. Then next process of democracy is how do I function in a House where the polity is controlled. Now that is what exactly the Mover of the Resolution was concerned with. While what you have said is true that the founding fathers of our Constitution had never envisaged, if not visioned, this kind of 200 parties coming into play and each one trying to compete with each other, and in this competition their eyes are glued was nothing but seat of power. The seat of power being the centre of attraction, all these issues which crop up need to be sorted out. I am not trying to immediately suggest that there has to be a change in the Constitution or bring an amendment to the Constitution. Nor the Mover of the Resolution said this. What he has said is that if there is a need for it. why not it be taken up. If the Constitution amendment is not helping us, can there be a code of conduct, to which you have referred? A code of conduct is nothing but a democratic process. Sir, how do we give shape to this democratic process is another issue which concerns all politicians. Sir, I was wondering whether in present globalised era, are we able to still talk about some kind of a complete sovereignty? Are we not to shed this sovereignty at all? Let us take climate changes. A particular UN committee might come and ask you behave in such and such fashion. You give up your sovereignty. So, things are changing. Whether you accept them through the Constitution, or accept them through the debates, or accept them through changed rules, it is not the question here today.

The democracy, about which Mr. Prasad talked firstly, the underpinning of such democracy should be that it should be responsive; it should be responsive to the needs of the time. If democratic process, or democracy as such, is not able to respond to the times, then it losses all its strength, meaning and content. That is what exactly the Mover of the Resolution has in view. And it is very imaginative of Mr. Naik to make this House exercise its mind over the tilings that are coming to. This is what exactly we are trying to discuss today. We, all politicians, in a coalition era are short-term maximisers. We want to attain everything within a short time. And I totally agree that coalition is nobody's choice. If everybody wants to give me full power, I will enjoy it. But things are not so. What is required therefore in this age when coalition has becomes compulsion is that we develop what Mr. Prasad referred to as, enduring traditions. Let me tell you that even the founding fathers did not depend too much on constitutional amendments. They depended on these conventions, if you were to read the Constitution between the lines and Understand its spirit, it is the founding fathers who always thought the evolution of democracy in this country would be through developing conventions. But the blurred conventions, which Mr. Naik has listed out, have failed us. So what is the answer? A day would certainly come when a healthy two party-coalition would be there. I understand that BJP and Congress Party, which are pan-Indian, will be there but others have to join them. I would certainly agree to it. But on what basis? Will it be on the pre-poll basis or will it be on the post-poll basis like the CMP that you would evolve? Whatever it is, what you take up will depend on how you respond to the people's needs. This, exactly, what the democracy has to do. Sir, Mr. Naik has referred to the Representation of the People's Act. It is true that it has done very good. It has got some kind of a democratic element into our

[SHRI K. KESHAVA RAO]

Parliamentary system of governance. But, it has not bothered as to see who came in although it tried to see that the best man comes in. And, as is said, money plays a role at some places; muscle plays a role at some places. They could not be stopped that. They tried. But, you have your own methods of countering and overcoming them. This is what exactly is happening. That is another aspect which the Mover of the Resolution wanted to take note of.

In the end, what is happening is, that, democracy is adjusting itself slowly. Sir, it is evolving itself. We need to look into that. Sir, let us take the Central Government of today or of the past, it encapsules the polity of coalitions in it, be it a one-party Government or a two-party Government or the coalition Government. That is how it really evolved itself. That has been our experience right from the beginning. It is not that coalitions have come only in 1970s. In 1950-51 also, in Cochin and Travancore, we had them. In Andhra, in 1953, we had a coalition Government. In 1967, we had SVD Government. PEPSU had in 1951-52. Punjab had it. So, almost all the States in the country had coalition Governments and they ran well. But, that was based on traditions. But, the values have changed; techniques have changed; the needs of politicians have changed; the greed of the politicians has changed. In that context, what do we do? If Avesta was to give everything, there was no need for Hinduism to emerge. If Hinduism was an answer to all, there was no need for Taoism to come. If Taoism was an answer to all the ills of the society, there was no need for Christianity if Christianity was an answer to all this, there was no need for Islam to come. If Islam was an answer, the Sikhism would not have come. Social philosophy tells us. That whenever there is some kind of a crisis in the society which transcends time and space, new philosophy emerge. That needs to be understood and tackled. In a polity, that exactly is the situation. After all, what is politics? Politics is nothing but a social order. You reflect the social need. We always talk about politicians. At least, I know, when I went to a village and asked for a school, people branded me as a social worker. But, I did not get the school at that time. Then, I collected signatures of the people for it. People called me a public worker. When I did not get it and went on to become a Sarpanch to get a school, they called me a political worker. It is an evolution of a social worker into a political worker. That is what we say that all these politicians are trying to behave. But, there have to be some rules to the game. That is what the Mover of the Resolution wanted us to understand. We have examples to learn. We have many countries in Europe which have these coalitions. We have them in Africa, in Latin America, etc. Only thing is we need to know how they functioning? At the same time, if Gill Saheb were to be asked, he would say that they are not a healthy as they look from distance. The question today is: What is tickling us? I know your concern arose because although we join initially on a good tenor and tone, the moment we get into power, our own compulsions, our sectarian approaches and our own timely needs will make us use some kind of pressure or which you might call blackmail the other party or twist the arm of the govt, to get things done. That exactly has made you concerned and unhappy. There are, for example, inter-State river water disputes, allocation of funds, devolution of powers for the States etc. Paradoxically, what is happening is, every leader in the State wants coalition at the Centre, but autonomy at the State. We don't want any interference from any quarter at the State level. At the same time, because the Centre has to run the Government, and only the Congress and the BJP can do it, they join one party or the other as a compulsion. So, they want the coalition at the Centre and autonomy in the State. This is our political psyche of evolving democracy. In such a situation, something must come in. As 5 told you about the religion, the Constitution is another bigger religion, so some kind of a rule, which needs constant monitoring. I am not trying to say that

there should be some kind of a constitutional amendment. Even if it is coming, let it come. There is nothing wrong in it. But even as a voice, what kind of an understanding you would enter into although I am not trying to talk about MoUs that it talks about, and of which stamp paper MoUs you are talking about. When you can talk about black magic in a State changing the Chief Minister, MoUs don't make greater fun. So, let us forget about it. So, the question today is, nobody is desiring to have a coalition, but it has become inevitable. Since it has become inevitable, let us understand the compulsion of coalition and rules to run it. Compulsion of coalition is leadership. Are we able to give this leadership? Does this leadership come from the personality or does it emerge from the agenda? If it is coming from agenda then what kind of democratic process or what kind of political process you are trying to opt so that the people are with you in the agenda. So, it is not the leader, if the personality is taken out, it is the people who matter. You do not have the 'recall system', you don't have a system where you are able to reject a main midway. My entire thrust is, try to take all people into consideration because this is a country whose social structure is different are trying to talk, is a country where you have not seen 7 per cent of people who live in places which are not connected to roads. For instance, the tribals in the remote areas where there are no roads and you will not be able to see them for another 10 years to come. That is the real situation. Mere talking would not help. This is a society where touching another human being was a crime under some kind of a dharma. We need to take all these things into consideration, while fighting them.

श्री रुद्रनारायण पाणि: केशव राव जी, आप जरा चेयर को एड्रेस कीजिए न, आप हमको क्यों एड्रेस नहीं कर रहे हैं। ऐसा लगता है कि आप केवल शान्ताराम जी को ही एड्रेस कर रहे हैं।

डा. के. केशव राव : मैं इसलिए एड्रेस कर रहा हूँ, ताकि वे लोग एग्री करें।

श्री रुद्रनारायण पाणि : आप उनके एड्रेस कीजिएगा, तो फिर हम लोग आपस में बीतचीत चालू कर देंगे। आप चेयर को एड्रेस कीजिए, ताकि हम भी महसूस करें।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI UDAY PRATAP SINGH): Mr. Rao, how much time will you take?

DR. K. KESHAVA RAO: Another 3 minutes. I will not take much time. Since my friends is becoming impatient, I would not do it. I will only look into his eyes as sought and talk now. The question today is, if you are able to build up a polity which is inclusive, that inclusive polity, must include the peoples' agenda; that agenda should include nothing but the development about which we have only been talking, but which we have not been able to translate into practice. That would give us some kind of a back up mechanism, but that is not a foolproof mechanism at all. That is what exactly, perhaps, Mr. Ravi Prasad said when he referred to democratic process. That democratic process or the political process need to understand two issues the personality and also the agenda. Against such a background, I would rather say that when you are taking up the problem of the crisis of Coalition Governments and when you are really interested to solve this problem, you have two schools of thought before you. One is, either go through the constitution amendment or code of conduct or try to evolve a polity that is going to be an answer it. Sir, I can understand the apprehension of Mr. Ravi Prasad, who said, the moment you codify, these changes in the Constitution. Are we not running into the trap of the Judiciary? I totally agree with him. Let Mr. Ravi Prasad know this. Mr. Ravi Prasad, I want your attention.

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: Mr. Rao, I am Ravi Shankar Prasad. I am not Ravi Prasad. Therefore, I am not listening. That is the problem.

डा. के. केशव राव : एक बात हैं। आपने कोर्ट की बात की I can give you one example. I say that we can go without even Supreme Court or courts. Let me tell you. The present courts which serve the rich more than poor should be changed. When I said this, the Supreme Court wanted to issue a contempt notice against me. But it was dropped. It is not that through this kind of codifications or through this kind of arrangements that we are not driving them to a trap. But, at the same time, there must be some kind of a referee who can tell us, with the kind of powers needed. That kind of thing must come.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI UDAY PRATAP SINGH): Please conclude.

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: Sir, this is part of the proceedings. Should I correct? Did the hon., Member say that we do not need Supreme Court and High Courts?

DR. K. KESHAHA RAO: I didn't get you.

SHRI RAVI SHANKAR PRASAD: Did you just say that we don't need the Supreme Court and the High Courts?

DR. K. KESHAHA RAO: What I said is this. I want you understand the spirit of it. What is said was that I don't want to run into the trap of the Courts. Through these codifications. The condifications that Shri Shantaram Laxman Naik talked about should be such that they should not come under judicial purview. This can be thought of. That is why what is required is for the experts to sit together, put their heads together and consider the entire issue in a cool and composed manner so that they can workout the answers to the entire issue. Thank you very much.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Ravi Shankar Prasadji, if the Supreme Court and the High Courts are not there, what will happen to our livelihood?

उपाध्यक्ष (श्री उदय प्रताप सिंह) : वैसे इनके बाद बृजभूषण तिवारी जी का नम्बर हैं, लेकिन अगर तिवार जी कहें, तो राजनीति प्रसाद जी को पहले बोलने दूं ?

श्री बृजभूषण तिवारी (उत्तर प्रदेश) : ठीक हैं, सर।

श्री राजनीति प्रसाद (बिहार) : धन्यवाद, उपसभाध्यक्ष जी। आज जो रिजोल्यूशन आया हैं, मैं उसके पक्ष में बोलने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूं। आज मैं आपके सामने एक महान नेता का नाम उद्धृत करना चाहूंगा, जिसने एक coalition government की कल्पना की थी। आज से 40 साल पहले coalition government की कल्पना हुई। श्री शान्ताराम लक्ष्मण नायक जी ने अमेंडमेंट के विषय में जो बात की हैं, उससे मैं सहमत भी हूं। डा. राम मनोहर लोहिया ने coalition government की कल्पना की थी। सन् 1967 में पूरे देश में तथा जो हिन्दी प्रदेश थे, उनमें कांग्रेस पार्टी बहुत बड़ी पार्टी थी। आजाद के बाद कांग्रेस पार्टी एक बहुत बड़ी पार्टी थी। वे पार्टियां खत्म हो गई और coalition government coalition government जब आई, तो उसके अपने एजेंडे थे और एक सीमा के अन्दर वे लोग काम करते थे और इसीलिए एक साल में, दो सालों में या छः महीनों में सरकार गिर जाती थी। श्री शान्ताराम लक्ष्मण नायक जी ने इसको बहुत सोच कर लाया हैं। पूरे देश में ...**(व्यवधान)**... अब आप थोड़ा सा और बोल लीजिएगा। हमें बोलने दीजिए। ...**(व्यवधान)**... आप हमें बोलने दीजिए, डिस्टर्ब मत करिए ...**(व्यवधान)**... जब श्री रवि शंकर जी बोल रहे थे, तब मैं बहुत ध्यान से सुन रहा था। हमको बोलने दीजिए ...**(व्यवधान)**...

मैं यह कह रहा था कि coalition government की जो कल्पना हुई थी, वह डा. राम मनोहर लोहिया जी ने लाई थी। उनकी सोच आज भी प्रासंगिक हैं, ऐसा नहीं कि वह मर गई। वह इसीलिए प्रासंगिक हैं क्योंकि जो बड़ी पार्टियां आजादी के बाद आई, उन्होंने हिन्दुस्तान को, हिन्दुस्तान के लोगों को, राज्यों को, जो अपेक्षित राज्या थे, जो गरीब राज्य थे, चाहे वह बिहार हो, चाहे उत्तर प्रदेश हो, केरल हो, चाहे पश्चिमी बंगाल हो — जो बड़ी पार्टियां थी, वे सब वहां ध्वस्त हो गईं वे इसलिए ध्वस्त हो गईं, क्योंकि उनकी जो महत्वाकांक्षा थी, आजादी के बाद उनको जो रोशनी मिलनी चाहिए

थी, इन पार्टियों से वह नहीं मिल पाई। इसलिए उनके अंदर भाव उत्पन्न होता गया, उनके अंदर गुस्सा उत्पन्न होता गया और फिर रीजनल पार्टीज तैयार हो गयी। जब रीजनल पार्टीज तैयार हो गयीं तो फिर उनका छोटा या बड़ा अंश सरकार में महत्वपूर्ण भूमिका अदा करने लगा। महोदय, आप जानते हैं कि सरकार बनाने में दो-दो, तीन-तीन सदस्य भी महत्वपूर्ण भूमिका अदा करते थे। रवि शंकर प्रसाद जी ने कहा कि झारखंड में दो तीन आदमी डिस्टर्ब करते हैं। उन्होंने कहा कि उनको वोट नहीं दिया जाए, लेकिन यह बात होती नहीं है। उनको वोट तो मिलता ही है। अगर वे डिस्टर्ब करते हैं तो उनको वोट मिलने से कोई रोक नहीं सकता। वह डिस्टर्ब इसलिए करते हैं कि उनको वोट मिलने से कोई रोक नहीं सकता। वह डिस्टर्ब इसलिए करते हैं कि उनको वोट मिलता है और वोट आपके हैं तो उनको वोट मिलने से कोई रोक नहीं सकता। वह डिस्टर्ब इसलिए करते हैं कि उनको वोट मिलता है और वोट आपके कहने से नहीं मिलेगा। इसलिए श्री शान्ताराम लक्ष्मण नायक जी ने कहा है कि कोइलीशन गवर्नमेंट का एक नियम होना चाहिए। जो लोग बड़ा पार्टियों के साथ मिलकर कोइलीशन गवर्नमेंट बनाएंगे, वे ऐसा महसूस न करें कि हम छोटी पार्टी के हैं या हम पीछे बैठने वाले लोग हैं, हमारी सरकार में कोई पूछ नहीं है। इसलिए नायक जी ने यह एक बढ़िया संकल्प लाया है और उसमें कहा गया है कि इस के बारे में कोई कानून बनना चाहिए, कोई नियम बनना चाहिए। क्योंकि आज की यही डिमांड है। उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं यह कहना चाहूंगा कि इस कोइलीशन गवर्नमेंट में जो छोटी कोइलीशन पार्टियां हैं, उन की भी इज्जत होनी चाहिए। अगर आप उनकी इज्जत नहीं करेंगे, उनकी भूमिका की इज्जत नहीं करेंगे तो फिर यही होगा कि कोई सरकार दो दिन में, कोई एक साल में और कोई छः महीने में गिर जाती है। जब सरकारें गिरती हैं तो उसका प्रभाव हमारे exchequer पर होता है, हमको इलेक्शन में जाना पड़ता है और कभी-कभी तो 5 साल में दो-दो बार चुनाव होता है। इसलिए नायक जी ने जो अमेंडमेंट लाया है, उससे सहमत होते हुए मैं दिनकर जी की दो पंक्तियां कहते हुए बताना चाहूंगा कि :

“समर शेष है नहीं पाप का भागी केवल व्याध

जो तटस्थ हैं समय लिखेगा उसका भी अपराध।”

महोदय, मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि जो कानून बनाने वाले लोग हैं, जो संविधान बनाने वाले लोग हैं, जो संविधान को अमेंड करने वाले लोग हैं, पता नहीं क्यों इतने दिनों में भी उनके दिमाग में यह नहीं आया कि कोइलीशन गवर्नमेंट आज के समय में जरूरी है। महोदय, रवि शंकर प्रसाद जी ने बहुत अच्छी बात कही है और उनकी कुछ बातों से मैं सहमत भी होता हूं। उन्होंने सी.पी.एम., सी.पी.आई और किसी पार्टी के बारे में कहा कि ये पार्टियां बिहार में क्यों समाप्त हो गयीं? वह कहना चाहते थे कि हमारी पार्टी क्यों आगे बढ़ गयी, लेकिन यह उन्होंने कहा नहीं। रवि शंकर जी, सी.पी.आई. इसलिए खत्म हो गयी क्योंकि उनके पास मंदिर का मुद्दा नहीं था, लेकिन कह नहीं पाए, लेकिन आप याद रखिए कि पूरी लोक सभा में आप को एक स्पीट थी। महोदय, आदरणीय माननीय अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी ने लोक सभा में भाषण करते हुए कहा था कि मैं इकलौता आदमी हूं। आप की पार्टी तब हार गयी क्योंकि आपकी पार्टी का बहुत बड़ा कार्यक्रम नहीं था। आपका एक कार्यक्रम था और वह था मंदिर का कार्यक्रम। आप मंदिर के कार्यक्रम से ही इतना आगे बढ़ गए...(व्यवधान)...

श्री रुद्रनारायण पाणि : उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, यह घोर आपत्तिजनक है। यह कह रहे हैं कि भारतीय जनता पार्टी का...(व्यवधान)...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री उदय प्रताप सिंह) : आप ने अपनी बात कह दी।

श्री रुद्रनारायण पाणि : उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, यह कह रहे हैं कि भारतीय जनता पार्टी का एक सदस्य था...(व्यवधान)...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री उदय प्रताप सिंह) : आपने अपनी बात कह दी, अब आप उस बात को छोड़िए।...(व्यवधान).... हो गया, आपकी बात मान ली...(व्यवधान)...

श्री रुद्रनारायण पाणि : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह कह रहे हैं कि भारतीय जनता पार्टी के एक सदस्य थे, किस साल में भारतीय जनता पार्टी के एक सदस्य थे। सर, वे इस प्रकार की गलत बात रहे रहे हैं...(व्यवधान).... भारत के इतिहास में कब बीजेपी के एक मੈम्बर थे।

श्री रवि शंकर प्रसाद : महोदय, मैं एक आग्रह जरूर करूंगा कि योगायोग से इस बहस का स्तर बहुत बढ़िया है और राजनीतिक पूर्वाग्रह भी हैं...(व्यवधान)...

श्री राजनीति प्रसाद : सर, पूर्वाग्रह नहीं है, उन्होंने जो कहा है, उसका मैं जवाब दे रहा हूँ। आप भूल गए कि इन्होंने कहा कि सी.पी.आई. कैसे खत्म हो गई, उन्होंने कहा, प्रोसीडिंग में देखिए, कैसे खत्म हो गई ...**(व्यवधान)**...

श्री रुद्रनारायण पाणि : गुप्ता जी, आप कहिए ये बार-बार मंदिर, मंदिर ...**(व्यवधान)**... लालू जी ने कहा कि न्याय मंदिर पर आक्रमण हुआ है, क्या मंदिर गलत बात है। मंदिर-मंदिर आप क्या बोलते हैं। महोदय, सबसे पहले मुझे इस बात का उत्तर दिया जाए कि कब इस देश में भारतीय जनता पार्टी के केवल एक मंत्री थे, इनको राजनीतिक इतिहास पता नहीं है, इनको तथ्य पता नहीं है, भारतीय जनता पार्टी 1980 में बनी और भारतीय जनता पार्टी की शुरुआत 16 सदस्यों से हुई थी।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री उदय प्रताप सिंह) : प्लीज बैठिए, बैठिए।

श्री राजनीति प्रसाद : महोदय, इसको मैं वापस ले रहा हूँ।

श्री प्रेम चन्द गुप्ता (बिहार) : Sir, he is expressing his view. जब रवि शंकर प्रसाद जी बोल रहे थे तो हम सब लोगों ने सुना, किसी ने कुछ नहीं कहा। Let him speak, आप बैठिए।

SHRI RUDRA NARAYAN PANY: He is distorting history while expressing his views.

प्रो. राम देव भंडारी (बिहार) : हमको लगता है कि भारतीय जनता पार्टी ...**(व्यवधान)**... केवल चिल्लाने के लिए ही हाऊस में आते हैं ...**(व्यवधान)**...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री उदय प्रताप सिंह) : प्लीज बैठिए, बैठिए।

श्री राजनीति प्रसाद : Sir, the amendment is "The House resolves to constitute a Committee for the purpose of recommending amendments to the Constitution by way of adding a new chapter on the governance of coalition governments providing for the powers, duties and responsibilities of coalition partners, and for providing a code of conduct in the matters where constitutional provisions may not be practicable." "उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, यह शब्द किस लिए लाया गया क्योंकि कोलिशन में दो आदमी आता है, चार आदमी, पांच आदमी, जो क्षेत्रीय जगह से जीतकर आता है तो ऐसा नहीं समझे कि हम मूक हो गए, हम छोटे आदमी हैं, अगर हमारा सहयोग आप लेते हैं तो हमारा मान-सम्मान भी होना चाहिए, संविधान में इसे लाने के लिए अमेन्डमेंट होना चाहिए, संविधान में ऐसी बात आनी चाहिए। अगर ऐसी बात आती है तभी मेरा मान-सम्मान होगा।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री उदय प्रताप सिंह) : राजनीति प्रसाद जी, आपके चार मिनट थे, आप आठ मिनट बोल चुके हैं, अब आप इसको कनक्लूड कीजिए।

श्री राजनीति प्रसाद : सर, चार मिनट में तीन मिनट तो उन्होंने ले लिया। अभी मैं कनक्लूड करता हूँ।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री उदय प्रताप सिंह) : ठीक है, कनक्लूड कीजिए।

श्री राजनीति प्रसाद : उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं फिर एक बार कहना चाहूंगा कि आदमी को दंड नहीं भरना चाहिए और बोलते समय इस बात का ख्याल रखना चाहिए कि जो आदमी सुन रहा है, वह उस बात का जवाब भी देगा और उसको टोलरेंस भी रखना चाहिए। ये भूल गए कि अंग्रेजी के शब्दों का ज्ञान हमको भी है, अंग्रेजी नहीं बोलते हैं क्योंकि हम लोग पार्लियामेंट में अंग्रेजी नहीं बोलेंगे। आप जानते हैं कि डा. राम मनोहर लोहिया अंग्रेजी बहुत बढ़िया बोलते थे लेकिन उन्होंने कहा कि जो संसद है, लोक का संसद है, वहां हमें अंग्रेजी नहीं बोलनी चाहिए, लेकिन मुझे समझने में कोई दिक्कत नहीं होती है, क्योंकि मैं भी कानून का विद्यार्थी रहा हूँ। कानून के बारे में जो बारे में जो रवि शंकर प्रसाद जी ने कहा, वह मुझे याद है इसलिए मैंने कहा।

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री उदय प्रताप सिंह) : प्लीज, प्लीज, आप इस बिल तक सीमित रहिए।

श्री राजनीति प्रसाद : महोदय, हां, मैं इस बिल तक सीमित हूँ, वे बिल तक सीमित नहीं थे इसलिए मैं बोल रहा हूँ सर, मैं आपको कह रहा हूँ कि संविधान में ऐसा कानून बनना चाहिए, संविधान में कोई संशोधन होना चाहिए, अगर संशोधन

होगा तब ये सरकारें नहीं जाएंगी सर, आज क्या हो रहा है, अभी से दो महीने, तीन महीने पहले (समय की घंटी) हम लोग यह सोच रहे थे कि न्युकलीयर डील पर सरकार चली जाएगी, बिल्कुल प्रचार हो रहा था। अगर कोलिशन गवर्नमेंट का कोई फण्डामेंटल हमारे संविधान में लिखा रहता, कोई नियम बनाया रहता, तो यह तो तीन-चार महीना, पांच महीना, छः महीना, जो संशय की स्थिति थी, वह नहीं रहती, पांच साल सरकार चलती पांच साल सरकार चलती, लेकिन चार-पांच महीने जो सरकारी अफसर थे, जो बड़े लोग इसमें थे, उन लोगों ने अपने दिमाग में बना लिया कि सरकार तो जा रही है, सरकार तो जा रही है, इसलिए मैं श्री शान्ताराम लक्ष्मण नायक जी को धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ कि उनके दिमा में यह बात आई है और मैं इसका समर्थन करता हूँ कि **coalition government** को बनाने के लिए जो रीजनल पार्टी के लोग हैं, उनको भी मान-सम्मान दिया जाए और उनके लिए अलग से संविधान में संशोधन किया जाए, धन्यवाद।

श्री वृजभूषण तिवारी : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं यह समझता हूँ कि शान्ताराम लक्ष्मण नायक जी ने जो यह संकल्प रखा है, वह बहुत ही अच्छी नीयत से रखा है। यह सही है, जैसा कि रवि शंकर प्रसाद जी ने अपनी आशंका जताई कि इसका कुछ लो दुरुपयोग भी कर सकते हैं। लोकतंत्र की जो बुनियाद है, वह यही है कि हमें जनता के विवेक पर और जनता के फैसले पर विश्वास करना चाहिए। हमें याद आता है, एक बार गांधी जी से एक अंग्रेज ने कहा था कि आप देश की आज़ादी की बात करते हैं, परंतु आपको यह पता नहीं कि आपके देश में कितनी अशिक्षा है, कितना अज्ञान है और लोकतंत्र एक जानकार और पढ़े-लिखे लोगों की व्यवस्था है, आज़ादी का अर्थ वे ही समझ सकते हैं, तो आप भारत देश की आज़ादी के लिए क्यों बात करते हैं? तब गांधी जी ने दो टूक शब्दों में जवाब दिया था कि हां, यह सही है कि हमारे देश की जनता अशिक्षित है, परंतु इसका यह मतलब नहीं कि हमारे देश की जनता में समझदारी की कोई कमी है और उन्होंने दूसरी बात कही कि आज़ादी का यह मतलब है कि हम गलती कर सकते हैं। आदमी गलती भी कर सकता है, परंतु जो आज़ाद होता है, उसे गलती सुधारने की आज़ादी होती है और जो गुलाम होता है, वह मालिक के इशारे पर काम करता है, यह गांधी जी का कहना था। मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारे देश में जो लोकतंत्र की स्थापना हुई साठ वर्ष में बहुत उतार-चढ़ाव आए, परंतु आज भी तमाम कमियों के बावजूद मैं बहुत ही दावे के साथ कह सकता हूँ, घमंड के साथ, गर्व के साथ कह सकता हूँ कि हमारे देश में लोकतंत्र या लोकतांत्रिक व्यवस्था जिस तरीके से चल रही है, उससे मैं आशान्वित हूँ कि किसी न किसी दिन जनता का विवेक, जनता का फैसला सही रूप में आएगा और वह राजनीतिक दलों को भी और सरकारों को भी मर्यादित, नियंत्रित और संयमित करने का काम करेगा।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, बहुत से विद्वानों ने यहां अपनी राय रखी है कि यहां पर बहुत दल हो गए हैं, तमाम रीजनल दल। हर आदमी एक पार्टी बना लेता है इसलिए यहां पर राष्ट्रीय स्तर पर कम से कम केवल दो या तीन दल रहने चाहिए। अभी रवि शंकर जी जिस तरफ इशारा कर रहे थे कि इस समय गठबंधन का जो स्वरूप आया, वह दो दलों या तीन दलों का स्वरूप आया, मैं मानता हूँ कि वह उनकी गलतफहमी है। यह वक्ती तौर पर है, मगर जैसा कि ठीक अभी हमारे पूर्व वक्ता ने कहा कि भारत एक बहुत विशाल देश है और ऐसे विशाल देश में विभिन्न भाषाएं हैं, विभिन्न संस्कृतियां हैं और लोगों की तमाम प्रकार की आकांक्षाएं हैं। यह इंग्लैंड नहीं है या फ्रांस नहीं है या यूरोप का छोटा देश नहीं है। यह बहुधर्मी देश है, बहुभाषी देश है और ऐसे देश में केवल एक या दो राजनीतिक दल हों, यह असंभव है। इंग्लैंड के लोकतंत्र और संसदीय व्यवस्था के विकास का इतिहास देखें और भारत के संसदीय व्यवस्था के विकास का इतिहास देखें, तो मुझे इस सच्चाई की जानकारी बहुत ठीक तरीके से होगी। जब देश आज़ाद हुआ, तो गांधी जी ने क्या सलाह दी? गांधी जी ने कहा कि कांग्रेस पार्टी को तोड़ देना चाहिए। उन्होंने ऐसा क्यों कहा? वह इसलिए कहा क्योंकि कांग्रेस सलाह दी? गांधी जी ने कहा कि कांग्रेस पार्टी को तोड़ देना चाहिए। उन्होंने ऐसा क्यों कहा? वह इसलिए कहा क्योंकि कांग्रेस पार्टी, जैसा कि अभी हमारे पूर्व वक्ता ने कहा कि कांग्रेस कोई राजनैतिक दल नहीं था, कांग्रेस आज़ादी हासिल करने का एक मंच था। विभिन्न विचारों के लोग, विभिन्न सिद्धांतों के लोग, विभिन्न दृष्टियों के लोग उसमें शामिल थे। इस प्रकार हमें जीत प्राप्त हुई और हमने आज़ादी हासिल की। इसलिए गांधी जी का ख्याल था कि अगर कांग्रेस पार्टी खत्म हो जाएगी और अपनी नीतियों, विचारों, कार्यक्रमों के आधार पर जो राजनैतिक दल गठित होंगे, वे समानता के आधार पर चुनाव में हिस्सा लेंगे और जनता को भी एक विकल्प मिलेगा कि वह किस पार्टी को, किस दल को पसंद करती है। किन्तु कांग्रेस के लोग नहीं माने। क्या ऐतिहासिक कारण थे, मैं उनकी चर्चा नहीं करना चाहता किन्तु मैं सदन को यह भी बताना चाहता हूँ कि 1945, 1946 और 1947 का जो समय रहा है, उसमें भी गांधी जी और पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू जी में बहुत तर्क-वितर्क हुआ, उन दोनों के विचारों में बहुत बुनियादी अंतर था। गांधी जी जिस व्यवस्था को लाना चाहते थे, गांधी जी जिस बुनियादी आधार पर इस देश की पूरी व्यवस्था को खड़ा करना चाहते थे, नेहरू जी उसके ठीक विपरीत थे। गांधी जी ने कोशिश की कि ऑल इंडिया कांग्रेस कमेटी की मीटिंग में उनके प्रस्ताव पर चर्चा हो लेकिन मीटिंग नहीं हो पायी। उन्होंने लिखकर दिया। उन्होंने अपने पत्र में एक जगह नेहरू जी को लिखा कि मैं इसलिए लिखता हूँ ताकि आने वाले पीढ़ी को यह पता

[श्री बृजभूषण तिवारी]

चल जाए कि हमारे और हमारे शिष्य के बीच किन विचारों, किन नीतियों और किन सिद्धांतों को लेकर क्या मतभेद हैं ताकि आगे कि पीढ़ी उसी के हिसाब से अपने इतिहास को रच सके। किन्तु कांग्रेस पार्टी को खत्म नहीं किया गया और कांग्रेस का वर्चस्व कायम हो गया-दिल्ली से लेकर ग्राम सभा तक, गांवों तक। क्यों? क्योंकि कांग्रेस ने आज़ादी की लड़ाई का सारा श्रेय स्वयं ले लिया, सारी कमाई वह खुद खा गयी। एक सिद्धांत उस ज़माने में बड़े-बड़े विद्वान लोग गठित करते थे जिसका नाम था-**indispensability**, व्यक्ति, परिवार और दल-ये अनिवार्य हो गए। अगर ये नहीं रहेंगे तो देश टूट जाएगा और वह सिलसिला बहुत दिनों तक चला। अभी केरल के बारे में रवि शंकर प्रसाद जी ने चर्चा की। जहां कहीं थी सरकार में अगर इस प्रकार की कोई स्थिति आयी कि वहां गठबंधन की सरकार बन सकती थी, कांग्रेस पार्टी ने और केन्द्र की सरकार ने उन सरकारों को नहीं चलने दिया। क्यों? क्योंकि उनको यह खतरा था, उनको यह लालच था कि उनका जो वर्चस्व है, उनका जो अधिपत्य है, जो उनका अधिकार है, वह अक्षुण्ण रहे, उसमें किसी प्रकार का कोई ह्रास या क्षरण न होने पाए। वह स्थिति बहुत दिनों तक चली। जैसा कि अभी राजनीति प्रसाद जी ने कहा कि डा.लोहिया ने गैर कांग्रेसवाद की बात कही, तो लोग उनका मज़ाक उड़ाते थे। कहते थे कि यह तो utopian हैं, काल्पनिक हैं, यह संभव नहीं हैं क्योंकि कांग्रेस पार्टी ने हमेशा राजनैतिक दलों के बीच नकली दीवार, उनमें आपस में मतभेद पैदा करने की कोशिश की। जैसा कि आप जानते हैं कि कांग्रेस पार्टी राइटिज़ भी थी और कांग्रेस पार्टी लेफ्टीज़ भी थी। वे दोनों प्रकार के लोग थे। वह सत्ता का काम भी करती थी और विरोधी दल का भी काम करती थी। इस तरह विरोध पक्ष कभी भी उभर ही नहीं पाया, कभी मज़बूत ही नहीं हो पाया, जबकि संसदीय लोकतंत्र की बुनियादी शर्त है, अनिवार्य शर्त है कि यहां पर राजनैतिक दल मज़बूत हो और कई राजनैतिक दल हो ताकि मतदाताओं को, यहां की जनता को विकल्प ढूँढ़ने में, विकल्प चुनने में आसानी हो। लेकिन कांग्रेस पार्टी ने कोई मज़बूत, सशक्त विरोधी दल या राजनैतिक दल को पनपने नहीं दिया, भ्रष्ट किया, लोगों को खरीद पद देकर, लालच देकर, चुनाव में उम्मीदवार बनाकर और वह तरीका चला। इसलिए लोहिया जी ने कहा कि जो कांग्रेस की धारावाहिकता है, इससे जो लोकतंत्र है, उसमें ऊर्जा आ रही है, लोगों में चेतना नहीं आ रही है। चुनाव के प्रति जो गर्मी और जो रुचि आम जनता में होनी चाहिए, वह नहीं हो रही है इसलिए उन्होंने तर्क दिया कि परिवर्तन की आवश्यकता है और परिवर्तन तभी होगा, जब कांग्रेस पार्टी का एकाधिकार खत्म होगा। और वह अक्सर तर्क देते थे और मुझे याद है कि वे ग्राम की सभाओं में कहते थे कि जैसे रोटी को उलट पलट दो तो रोटी अच्छी होती है उसी प्रकार से लोकतंत्र में सरकारों का भी उलटना पलटना जरूरी है। वह यह कहते थे। लेकिन लोग कहते थे कि यह तो बेवकूफी की बात है, यह मज़ाक की बात है। मान्यवर, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि 1967 में लोहिया जी ने समाजवादी पार्टी का जो घोषणा पत्र निकाला उसमें उन्होंने इस बात की तरफ इशारा किया था और इशारा ही नहीं किया उन्होंने कहा कि आज आम लोगों में, आम जनता में सरकारों के प्रति अविश्वास पैदा हो गया है। एक तरफ तो सरकारों और जनता के मन में यह दृढ़ विश्वास हो गया कि चाहे चुनाव जो भी लड़े लेकिन जीतेगी कांग्रेस और सरकार कांग्रेस पार्टी की ही बनेगी। दूसरे दलों को कोई जगह ही नहीं मिलती थी। फिर दूसरे लोगों में यह हुआ कि अगर सरकार कांग्रेस की ही बननी है तो कोई परिवर्तन नहीं होगा। अजीब प्रकार का यह वातावरण था लोभ का, लालच का, अवसरवादिता का, यह पनपता रहा। इसलिए लोहिया जी ने अपने दर्शन में रखा कि आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि अगर कांग्रेस का एकाधिकार खत्म होगा तो जनता के अंदर चुनाव के प्रति और सरकार के प्रति एक विश्वास पैदा होगा और इसके लिए जरूरी है कि जो गैर कांग्रेसी सरकार बने, जो गठबंधन सरकार बने वह केवल सत्ता चलाने के लिए नहीं, केवल सरकार चलाने के लिए नहीं, बल्कि उनका समयबद्ध कार्यक्रम हो तथा वह सरकार कार्यक्रम के आधार पर बनेगी, वह केवल राजनीतिक स्वार्थों और छोटे हितों के आधार पर नहीं बनेगी, कार्यक्रमों के आधार पर बनेगी। वह भी जो कार्यक्रम होंगे वे टाइम बाउंड होंगे समयबद्ध होंगे। फिर उसका एक प्रयोग हुआ। उसके बाद वह प्रयोग ज्यादा दिन नहीं चला। लोहिया जी ने इस बात की भी भविष्यवाणी की थी कि खट्टे-मीठे अनुभव होंगे। परन्तु अन्त में उन्होंने यह विश्वास व्यक्त किया था कि हम आगे जाकर एक ऐसी स्थिति में पहुँचेंगे जहां हम एक नए विकल्प की स्थापना कर सकते हैं। जिसको आज हम देख रहे हैं, शुरू से ही देख रहे हैं। अगर आप उसके पीछे जाइए तो सही है कि जितने भी परिवर्तन हुए गैर कांग्रेसी सरकार बनी मगर उन गैर कांग्रेसी सरकारों की संख्या बल ज्यादा नहीं रहती थी। कभी-कभी कांग्रेस ने उसमें दखल किया और अगर कांग्रेस की मदद से भी कोई कांग्रेसी सरकार बनी तो कांग्रेस ने उस सरकार को चलने नहीं दिया, चाहें चौधरी चरण सिंह की सरकार हो और चाहे चन्द्रशेखर की सरकार हो। छोटे-छोटे मसलों पर, कोई नीतिगत मामले नहीं थे, कोई ऐसी बड़ी

बात नहीं थी केवल अहम का मामला था और इसलिए इन सरकारों को चलने नहीं दिया। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज गठबंधन की सरकार को अनिवार्य मानने लगे हैं। कांग्रेस जो अपने को समझती थी कि हम तो अनिवार्य हैं, आज कांग्रेस का भी दिमाग बदला है और वह मानते हैं कि यह गठबंधन की सरकारें आज अनिवार्य हैं। इस संकल्प में भी यह बात कही गई है। परन्तु इनको कैसे प्रभावी बनाया जाए, इसके लिए दो-तीन बातें आवश्यक हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह कानून के जरिए नहीं होगा, पीपुल्स रिप्रजेंटेटिव एक्ट में हमने बहुत परिवर्तन किया, पिछली बार भारतीय जनता पार्टी के लोगों ने एक ऐसा प्रस्ताव कर दिया कि जब तक किसी दल का तीन चौथाई हिस्सा डिफेक्ट न करे तो फिफेक्शन हो ही नहीं सकता। हमने बहुत कोशिश की, लेकिन हो क्या रहा है। इसीलिए हमें दो-तीन बातों पर विशेष तौर पर ध्यान देना होगा। एक तो जो राजनीतिक दल हैं उनकी कार्य प्रणाली कैसी है, नम्बर-1, राजनीतिक दल प्रभावी हो रहे हैं या नहीं हो रहे हैं, नम्बर-2, राजनीतिक दलों का काम क्या है? राजनीतिक दलों का काम केवल चुनाव लड़ना नहीं है उनको प्रशिक्षण का भी काम करना है, संगठन का भी काम करना है। क्योंकि जो राजनीतिक दल धीरे-धीरे निष्प्रभावी हुए जा रहे हैं और उसी का नतीजा है कि जो दूसरे ऐसे तत्व हैं चाहे आप उनको नक्सलपंथ कहिए, चाहे अपराधी तत्व कहिए और चाहे जिस प्रकार के भी तत्व कहिए वे तत्व हावी हो रहे हैं। इसलिए राजनीतिक दलों को अपनी कार्य-प्रणाली और सारे तरीकों पर विचार करना होगा और उसमें सुधार करना होगा। दूसरी बात यह है कि हमें कोई एथिक्स-आचार संहिता बनानी चाहिए। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ, सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ कि हर दल केवल किसी तरीके से पॉवर में आ जाए केवल उसके सामने एक ही लक्ष्य है। उसके सामने केवल एक ही लक्ष्य है, अक्सर यह देखते हैं कि अगर एक पार्टी ने अपने उम्मीदवारों की सूची जारी की और जो दूसरे दल होते हैं, उसकी उस सूची पर नजर होती है। अगर कोई इम्पोर्टेंट आदमी है, अगर उस सूची में उसका नाम नहीं है, तो तुरन्त दूसरा दल उस आदमी को टिकट दे देता है। वह आदमी चुनाव लड़ेगा और उसकी ताकत है तो चुनाव जीतकर आ जायेगा। कम से कम एक बुनियादी बात पर तो आचार संहिता बन ही जानी चाहिए के अगर कोई दल किसी आदमी, किसी उम्मीदवार को चुनाव में अपना उम्मीदवार नहीं बनाता है, तो कम से कम उस चुनाव में कोई दूसरा राजनैतिक दल उसको अपना उम्मीदवार नहीं बनायेगा। इससे कम से कम एक मामला तो यहां पर रूक सकता है कि जो लोग तुरन्त बंदरो की तरह डाल पर उछलते कूदते हैं, वह बंद हो जायेगा।

दूसरी बात यह भी है कि जब कोई आदमी लोक सभा का था विधान सभा का चुनाव हार जाता है, तो उसे तुरन्त राज सभा में भेज देते हैं, उसको तुरन्त मिनिस्टर बना देते हैं। जो कमजोर दल हैं, छोटे दल हैं, उनको तोड़ने में, उसका कमजोर करने में, यह स्ट्रेटजी काफी कारगर होती है, इस पर भी रोक लगानी चाहिए। इस प्रकार की कोई आचार-संहिता बननी चाहिए। यह कानून से नहीं हो सकता, यह आपस की समझदारी से हो सकता है और आपस की समझदारी से जो तय हो, उस पर आचरण करके यह हो सकता है। मैं ऐसा मानता हूँ कि आज अगर यह गठबंधन की सरकार नहीं होती, अगर कांग्रेस का एकाधिकार खत्म नहीं होता, तो आप जानते हैं कि ऐसे कर्पूरी ठाकुर पैदा नहीं होते, मुलायम सिंह पैदा नहीं होते या जो आपके नीतीश कुमार हैं, वे पैदा नहीं होते या कु.मायावती भी कभी गद्दी पर नहीं बैठ सकती थी, कभी और दूसरे लोग नहीं आ सकते, केवल एक परिवार और एक दल का एकाधिकार रहता और सारा इतिहास उन्ही का होता, दूसरों का कहीं अता-पता नहीं होता। ...**(सयम की घंटी)**... इसलिए मैं एक फिर यह कहते हुए और अपना विश्वास प्रकट करते हुए अपनी बात समाप्त करना चाहता हूँ कि गठबंधन अनिवार्य है। मैं ऐसा मानता हूँ कि अगर ठीक तरीके से काम होगा, तो सचमुच एक विकल्प हमारे सामने आयेगा और एक ठीक तरीके से, कार्यकारी रूप से इस प्रकार की सरकारों के गठन की एक प्रक्रिया शुरू होगी। मैं इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ अपनी बात खत्म करता हूँ। बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज (मध्य प्रदेश) : उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मैं आपकी अनुमति से एक बात कहना चाहती हूँ कि जब हम लोगों ने बम विस्फोट का मामला यहां उठाया था, तो संसदीय कार्य राज मंत्री ने कहा था कि वह फैक्ट्स कलेक्ट कर रहे हैं और वस्तुस्थिति से अवगत करायेंगे। आगे शनिवार, रविवार आ रहा है, कल और परसों सदन की बैठक नहीं होगी, इसलिए मैं आपके माध्यम से सरकार को केवल इतना निर्देश करवाना चाहती हूँ कि आज सदन की सभा उठने से पहले, स्थगित होने से पहले जितने भी फैक्ट्स, जितने भी तथ्य उनके पास इकट्ठे हो गये हैं, उनको जरूर वे कम से कम हमारे साथ शेयर करने का काम करें।

कार्मिक, लोक शिकायत और पेंशन मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री तथा संसदीय कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री सुरेश पचौरी) : सम्मानित उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, आदरणीय सदस्य महोदय हैं जो चिंता व्यक्त की हैं और उस सदन ने भी इससे

पहले जो जिज्ञासा व्यक्त की थी, तदनुसार मैंने गृह मंत्री जी से आग्रह किया है कि वह जल्दी से जल्दी वहां से जानकारी एकत्रित करके सदन को अवगत कराये।

SHRI SHARAD ANANTRAO JOSHI (Maharashtra): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, let me start by felicitating Naikji for having moved this Resolution at this particular time and on this particular forum. Had it happened in the Rajya Sabha as a result of a political proposition, then, the discussion would not have been as free as it would be today. The timing again is important because the party to which Shantaramji belongs is now in doldrums and thinking whether the policy that they followed since 2004 of having an alliance is going to work at all. In the last AICC at Delhi, there was a clear instruction given to the workers of the party that they should try and have an exclusive Congress Government so that the Congress can do its will. Before 2004, Sir, the Congress had rejected the possibility of a coalition and this coalition, which is working today, was somehow put together after the results of the elections were out. That was exclusively with a desire to avoid the rule of, what they called, 'a communal party' and they claim to be secular. There is no secular party in this country. And, what can be said is that there was a majority party and, in order to avoid the rule of majorityist party, because if they had come back then some of the top leadership of the Congress would have to quit politics and, possibly, even leave this country. They, somehow, managed to put together a Common Minimum Programme (CMP), which was the old equivalent of what is called the Memorandum of Understanding. There is no difference between Deve Gowda's Memorandum of Understanding and...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, Joshiji, is speaking on the subject or is he speaking about the Congress Party and Congress leaders? He is saying that Congress leaders would leave the party and the country ...(Interruptions)... There has to be some sense in what we are talking ...(Interruptions)... He is saying, 'leave the country', 'leave the party' ...(Interruptions)... He has got some kind of obsession in his mind about the Congress Party ...(Interruptions)... That is the problem ...(Interruptions)...

श्री रुद्रनारायण पाणि : सर, श्री शरद अनंतराव जोशी बहुत ही विद्वान हैं और सही विषय पर बोल रहे हैं।
...(व्यवधान)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI UDAY PRATAP SINGH): Mr. Narayanasamy, you listen to him ...(Interruptions)...

श्री रुद्रनारायण पाणि : आपकी पार्टी राजनीतिक पार्टी नहीं है। यह केवल सरकार चलाने वाली पार्टी है।
...(व्यवधान)...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: This forum cannot be used to criticise a political party without any basis...

SHRI SHARAD ANANTRAO JOSHI: I am not criticising the party.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: ...or the political leader. Sir, can you accept that the statement that the Congress leaders will leave the country? The kind of statement he is making is unfortunate ...(Interruptions)... He is a very senior leader ...(Interruptions)... He has got some obsession in his mind about the Congress Party ...(Interruptions)... He is talking about the Congress Party ...(Interruptions)... Let his remarks be removed from the record if there is something objectionable. One cannot insult the political leaders like this.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI UDAY PRATAP SINGH): I will look into it.

SHRI SHARAD ANANTRAO JOSHI: I am only describing the character of the present alliance and the experience that we have so far.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: And, you are saying that Congress leaders will leave the country. The Congress leaders will leave the party. What is this? We will not leave the country. We will rule the country whether you accept it or not. A single Member going on criticising a political party is not good.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री उदय प्रताप सिंह) : नारायणसापी जी, कांग्रेस पार्टी बहुत पुरानी हैं । ... (व्यवधान)...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: He does not understand that. Kindly educate him.

SHRI SHARAD ANANTRAO JOSHI: The experience of the National Democratic Alliance was quite different, because the alliance was formed before the election and there was an understanding between a certain number of parties to contest the elections together. And, care taken at that time was that the parties which were coming together essentially believed in a certain degree of nationalism and that they would not go against the integrity of the nation under any circumstances. This was the commonality. When the UPA was formed, they, of course, try to say that they are secular. But, while gathering the secular parties, we had alliance with people who have dictatorial record who never believed in democracy and believed in armed revolt. And, therefore, some of the problems are coming together. They also have some parties which recently passed a resolution that the hands of a Bangladeshi writer should be chopped off for what she had written. We have that kind of fundamentalist parties in the present alliance. We have non-democratic parties in the alliance. And, that is where the alliance becomes shaky. Sir, there is again a tone in Shantaram's Resolution that somehow the coalitions are an aberration and obnoxious thing and the single party rule is a natural and good thing. I very much question that. I think, the coalitions are not an aberration. They are the normal political system in the world over. Whether you go to Latin America—I am not talking of only England—or the European countries which are even smaller, which have a single language, they have a single religion in most of the cases. All the same Germany has the coalition since the Second World War, France had a coalition since the second World War. So, coalition Governments is normality and in India, particularly, where we have regional diversity, we have so many languages, so many faiths where the natural thing would have been multiplicity of parties and some of the parties coming together. Now, this kind of natural thing has been avoided by the introduction of an institution. You can see the discussions in the Constituent Assembly for this purpose. It was deliberately decided that, in our elections, we would follow the system of the United Kingdom where the elections take place in a geographical constituency and the candidate elected is the one who is the 'first past the post.' You will find in the debates of the Constituent Assembly that everybody had recognized that this was statistically an aberrant system and this results in a situation where a party, which gets only thirty per cent of the votes, gets 60 per cent of seats. When the Congress Party got the largest majority under late Shri Rajiv Gandhi, it had not got majority of the votes in the elections, but, all the same, they got something like 75 per cent of the seats in the Lok Sabha. That is an aberrant system. And, I must bow down to the wisdom of the Constituent Assembly at that time. It was deliberately decided that in the early days after freedom, we would need stability and if we had really representative quality, then, we would not have that stability. At that time, that decision was taken. But once that period was over, after fifty years of independence, we don't have that kind of emergency. Therefore, we should have really thought of some kind of an alternative system.

The second point, which I would like to make, is that to think that the stable Governments have been the best Governments is, again, not correct. When the first Government came, it was called the Congress Government. However, it was not really the Congress Government; it was under the leadership of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru. But it represented all kinds of forces. It included John Mathai; it included Shanmugham Chettiar; it included some Shyama Prasad Mukherjee; it included Baba Saheb Ambedkar. It was still called a Congress Government because, at that time, the Congress was really a catholic institution that provided scope for all kinds of people to come. Little by little, as the leadership became narrower and narrower, the Congress ceased to be a catholic platform and became a narrow political party with the result that several people thought that they could not get proper expression in the national platform and, therefore, we have a multitude of parties. 120 parties or 160 parties is relatively a small number in a country of 120 crores because what a party is, Sir. A party is not a confluence of economic and social interests along. A party represents certain commonality of worldview, certain commonality of philosophy about the society. Therefore, to say that all people, whether they have the same worldview or not, should come under a single party is not correct. You have to have a political system which will provide for a multitude of parties, representing different points of view.

The next point, I would like to make, Sir, is that was made by Shri Ravi Shankar Prasad that the majority Governments that had the absolute majority had not been the best Governments. Late Shri Rajiv Gandhi got the largest - this is not a criticism of either Congress or Shri Rajiv Gandhi; we are talking only of facts—ever majority. And, all the same, the decisions taken were such that the party lost the power in the immediately following elections. The lesson is that this kind of majority, this kind of complete domination of one party does not necessarily give the best results. And, I will tell you 'why'. In 1991, our present Prime Minister was the architect of economic reforms. All the same, even though we had to get the gold stock back, the economy did not take off. We continued to have the Hindu rate of growth of about 3 per cent. So, it is a fact that we switched over from the Hindu rate of growth of about 3 to 3.5 per cent., not immediately after 1991, not even under RV. Narasimha Rao's Government, but only in 1998. This is a statistically verifiable fact when the entrepreneurs in this country, the traders in this country, for the first time, got an impression that a first really, genuinely non-Congress Government had come in, therefore, the structures that belonged to the Nehruvian socialist era were likely to be demolished and that we had become free for ever. That was the reason why the Indian multinationals came on the scene. This is the reason why, Mittals conquered the steel of the world. That is why, the Indian IT professionals conquered the steel of the world. That is why, the Indian IT professionals conquered the United States just because for the first time under the non-Congress Government, the entrepreneurs got an impression that they were free to open their wings and fly. Today, Today, Sir, the party which gets the maximum rate of growth is not the party which intervenes to the maximum extent in the economy. You get the highest rate of growth when you intervene the least. The more you allow people to open their wings and assert their entrepreneurship, and assert their capacity for adventure, the better the results that you get. And therefore, Sir, a coalition Government, if they have been less active in the socialist sense, that is really what has made it possible for us to shift from the Hindu rate of growth to the present rates of growth of 9 per cent, 10 per cent and even 11 per cent. This was not possible under monolithic rules. We could not have imagined that. We could not have imagined that we will have a surfeit of foreign exchange. We could not have imagined that we will have so many dollars that we will not know what to do with it. We never thought that we will

have a day when the rising exchange rate of rupee would be a problem for us. This could not have been imagined in the socialist days of Nehru. We have come to this because we are now getting governments which are intervening less and less. And, I think, that is where the advantage of having a coalition Government comes in.

Sir, I would like to make a very important point. I know that at present if there are some doubts raised about the coalition Government, it is because of the constitutional or physical inability of a dynastic rule to put up with the idea of coalition. I am making a statement which is based on historical facts and this can be verified. Sir, Jayakar, Sapru and Jinnah had prepared a formula and if that formula had been accepted, — I think, possibly, Mr. Gill will be able to support these facts because he was very much active at that time — under which we would have a coalition Government under the dominion status no doubt. But, we would have a Government where no community or no Governments could impose any laws that will affect other communities without the consultation or without the consent of that community. Now, it was Jawaharlal Nehru's physical incapacity to stand that kind of a compromising agreement and his desire to dictate his own personality over the others that made that formula not workable, and that, Sir, is why we had Pakistan at all. If only we were capable of maintaining the coalition Government, then, we would have had at that time itself a coalition Government which should have made it quite unnecessary to have a partition. Sir, I think, that is what is happening again. If you think that the Congress Party — I am taking that name here only because that happens to be the ruling party now, Mr. Narayanasamy, you need not get offended — should have powers to determine the fate of this nation exclusively, what you are in effect saying is, that Congress is in your hands, and whatever you do, there will be people who will stand by you. Therefore, by conquering Congress alone, you should be able to conquer the whole country. I think that kind of a dictatorial attitude is the repetition of Nehru's incapacity to be really democratic. Shri Ravi Shankarji, you mentioned about Nehru's democratic spirit. I would like to make a point on Nehru. He was indeed a highly democratic person. He was a liberal par excellence. But, his liberalism and his democracy was limited to the extent that he was confident of the benign openness and malleability of the Hindu culture, which is this malleability and this is this openness that makes it possible for India to have till recently a Muslim President, a Sikh Prime Minister and a Roman Catholic as the head of the UPA. This is not possible in any other country in the world. It is, essentially, the openness of the Hindu culture which makes it possible. And, Nehru counted on that. As long as it was a Hindu country, he was able to enforce Hindu Code Bill, but he dared not prepare what is a directive principle in the Constitution, to have a common civil code. Because he could never get that consent, and he was not prepared to work in a system where there was a certain degree of intolerance. That is why, he could not work with Liaquat Ali. That is why he could not work with Jinnah. That is why he allowed partition to happen and Pakistan to be created because he got his own playground where he could impose, keeping aside Mahatma Gandhi, impose socialism which had no basis and no sanction in any case. But that kind of Nehru's intolerance, you will see Shri Ravi Shankarji, in the manner in which he imposed socialism in this country. Had it not been for his temperament, I think, the coalition Government that *happened...*(Interruptions)...

DR. E.M. SUDARSANA NATCHIAPPAN (Tamil Nadu): Sir, I think, he is going out of the topic.

SHRI SHARAD ANANTRAO JOSHI: No, I am still talking of ...*(Interruptions)*...

DR. E.M. SUDARSANA NATCHIAPPAN: Unnecessarily, he is bringing a controversy regarding a very great personality. Why is he going out of the topic?. *...(Interruptions)...* We are not discussing about Shri Nehru's ethics; we are discussing about the coalition..*(Interruptions)...*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI UDAY PRATAP SINGH): Mr. Joshi has made his point. Now, he is concluding.

DR. E.M. SUDARSANA NATCHIAPPAN: Coalition has come only now *...(Interruptions)...* He can come down to the day-to-day affairs. *(Interruptions)...*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI UDAY PRATAP SINGH): He is concluding. *(Interruptions)...*

SHRI SHARAD ANANTRAO JOSHI: All that I am saying is that coalition requires democratic spirit. *...(Interruptions)...*

SHRI RUDRA NARAYAN PANY: Sir, Mr. Joshi is speaking on the subject matter ... *(Interruptions)...*

DR. E.M. SUDARSANA NATCHIAPPAN: He is singing about the old things.

SHRI SHARAD ANANTRAO JOSHI: Okay, coalition requires a democratic spirit which we did not have at a certain time *...(Interruptions)...*

DR. E.M. SUDARSANA NATCHIAPPAN: Have you. *...(Interruptions)...*

SHRI SHARAD ANANTRAO JOSHI: And we are having a reappearance of the same spirit. *...(Interruptions)...*

DR. E.M. SUDARSANA NATCHIAPPAN: That is why we have been hearing you for the past fifteen minutes. *...(Interruptions)...* Otherwise, we would not have heard it. They are clapping because you are attacking certain party, but we are not clapping.

SHRI SHARAD ANANTRAO JOSHI: I call them a majority. *...(Interruptions)...*

DR. E.M. SUDARSANA NATCHIAPPAN: Kindly come to your point.

SHRI SHARAD ANANTRAO JOSHI: I call them a majority list Party; I attack them also. I call you a minority Party, because you are pampering minorities and they are pampering majorities; that is the only distinction I know. *...(Interruptions)...* I am talking of the essentiality of coalition Government and the spirit that is required for that.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI UDAY PRATAP SINGH): Mr. Joshi, either support the Resolution or oppose the Resolution, but stick to the Resolution only.

SHRI SHARAD ANANTRAO JOSHI: Okay, Sir. Now, let me come to the operative part of the Resolution. Having said this, I would say that none of the remedies suggested of appointing a Committee to modify Constitution are relevant in these circumstances. This is number one. Sir, the Committee can, of course, be a wiser body and they can possibly find out some solution. Some remedies have been suggested. For example, recently, our hon. Arun Shourieji wrote a book about it, that in order to avoid the phenomenon of falling Governments, one of the solutions possible is to have a Presidential system. That is one of the solutions. Do you want that? I am opposed to that. Because I don't think that corresponds to pure the Indian culture. The other thing would be to have a registration of alliances instead

of having just the registration of Parties under the People's Representation Act; we can think of registration of alliances. But this is again in the power and in the scope of the Election Commission. We do not need another Committee. I think what is really required is that the Election Commission ought to take initiative on this, and, so far, the Election Commission has taken initiatives on this side. That is why, even though regional parties are able to have national broadcasts on the Doordarshan, I think this is a matter which belongs to the Election Commission and we don't need to have another Committee on this. So, while I support the motivation of the Resolution, I think, I would request Mr. Naik to reconsider the solution he has suggested and say that this matter should be referred to the Election Commission. Thank you, Sir.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Serial blasts in Uttar Pradesh

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI SHRI PRAKASH JAISWAL): Sir, today, serial blasts took place in Uttar Pradesh at Lucknow, Varanasi and Faizabad. All blasts took place in court premises, details of which are as under:

1. Lucknow: Low-intensity blast took place at 13.05 hours near cycle stand, Court Complex, Lucknow; no casualty reported.
2. Varanasi: Three high-intensity blasts took place in between 13.18 hrs. to 13.20 hours in court premises, Varanasi. Ten persons were injured and one is reported to have died.
3. Faizabad: Two high intensity blasts took place in Faizabad court premises at about 13.25 hrs. Two persons died and fifteen injured.

All these six blasts took place adjacent to court premises, and particularly, in all the three places, nearby cycle stand, situated in court premises. Affected areas have been cordoned off and police and bomb disposal and detection squad under supervision of senior police officers are conducting thorough search. So far, no information has been received regarding the type of explosives, mechanism and involvement of any group, or, organisation. According to the information from the police authority, high alert has been issued. Thank you, Sir.

PRIVATE MEMBER'S BUSINESS RESOLUTIONS — (Contd.)

Constitution of a committee for recommending amendments to constitution for adding a new chapter on governance of coalition-governments

श्री एस. एस. अहलुवालिया (झारखंड) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारे विद्वान साथी श्री शान्ताराम लक्ष्मण नायक जी ने जो संकल्प प्रस्तुत किया है, मैं उनके इस संकल्प पर बोलने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ।

महोदय, “देर आयद, दुरुस्त आयद”। उन्होंने अपने संकल्प के पहले भाग में लिखा है कि राष्ट्र और राज्य स्तर पर गठबंधन सरकारों का युग आ गया है। महोदय, इन दो लाइनों के इस भाग को सामने रखने के पीछे, इसके इतिहास को देखना बहुत जरूरी है। ऐसा युग क्यों आया और उसका मूल कारण क्या है? राष्ट्रीय पार्टियों के साथ-साथ क्षेत्रीय पार्टियों का उदय क्यों हुआ? महोदय, उसका मुख्य कारण एक ही है कि जब उस इलाके का क्षेत्रीय स्वार्थ, क्षेत्रीय उत्थान या विकास का ध्यान न रखते हुए राष्ट्रीय पार्टियाँ, राष्ट्रीय सरकारें चलाती रही, तो क्षेत्रीय इलाकों में असंतोष पैदा हुआ। उनको ऐसा लगने कि हमारा गांव, शहर से दूर है और शहर से हमारे राज्य की राजधानी बहुत दूर है और राजधानी से राष्ट्र की राजधानी दिल्ली बहुत दूर है। हमारी आवाज वहाँ तक नहीं पहुँचती है, हमारी भावनाएँ वहाँ नहीं पहुँचती हैं,