

even before the Emergency she introduced the Twenty-fourth Constitution (Amendment) Bill which I supported; we did not cast aspersions. So, ultimately, in a democratic life, as we proceed further with more and more experience we find that certain amendments become inevitable and that is why from both sides of the House various amendments are coming. So, let us not say that the founding fathers had prepared some Constitution, that was the last word on the Constitution and no further amendment is to be brought.

As far as the core of the Amendment Bill is concerned, I did not refer to any one individual. Some people feel like picking up the cap that is thrown out and putting it put it on their head thinking that cap fits them well. I neither referred to Mrs. Indira Gandhi, nor to Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru nor to Mr. Morarji Desai, nor to any prospective Prime Minister of India at all. I tried to institutionalise that problem and I wanted that in a democratic polity, if the same individual remains at the apex of power for a longer time, it is likely that that individual may get fossilised in continuing power, there might be staleness and if adequate opportunities are to be made available to new and developing individuals, it is a better convention to see that for more than ten years nobody continues as Prime Minister. Not only in this country, but in different parts of the world, public opinion has brought the pressure on the rulers. Even in a country like America where a number of reactionary policies are followed, the rulers were forced to adopt a particular question by the pressure of public opinion.

Sir, I will only read the last paragraph of the Statement of Objects and Reasons of the Bill. It states:

“Even in the United States, public opinion forced the Congress to adopt an amendment limiting the holding of presidential office by any one person to two terms. The power enjoyed by the President under the American Constitution and the Prime Minister and Chief Minister under our own Constitution is so great that it tends to make the executive all powerful and impervious to criticism.”

Only to avoid this situation, with the best of objective I have brought this Bill and it will not be applicable only to Congress (I). Nowhere I have said that it will be applicable during those periods when Congress (I) will be in power. No matter whosoever is in power this particular provision of the Bill will be applicable. I hope rather than casting aspersions on the intentions of the Bill at the very introduction stage, he could avail of the opportunity later on. They could register opposition later on rather than violating the usual convention that as far as possible the Private Bill is not opposed at the introduction stage even by those who oppose the Bill. Therefore, I would request the two hon. Members not to insist on opposing the introduction of this Bill.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

“That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India.”

The motion was adopted.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I introduce the Bill.

CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION BILL*

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide for the establishment of the Crop Insurance Corporation for the purpose of undertaking the business of crop insurance so as to protect the interest of farmers from loss due to unavoidable causes.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for the establishment of the crop Insurance Corporation for the purpose of undertaking the business of crop insurance so as to protect the interest of farmers from loss due to unavoidable causes."

The motion was adopted.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I introduce the Bill.

MONOPOLIES AND RESTRICTIVE
TRADE PRACTICES (AMENDMENT)
BILL*

(Amendment of Section 2, etc.)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act, 1969.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Monopolies and Restrictive Trade Practices Act, 1969."

The motion was adopted.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I introduce the Bill.

REPRESENTATION OF THE PEOPLE
(AMENDMENT) BILL*

(Inclusion of new section 10 B etc.)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Representation of the People Act, 1951.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Representation of the People Act, 1951."

The motion was adopted.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I introduce the Bill.

CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT)
BILL*

(Amendment of article 102, etc.)

SHRIMATI PRAMILA DANDAVATE (Bombay North-Central): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India."

The motion was adopted.

SHRIMATI PRAMILA DANDAVATE: I introduce the Bill.

SOCIAL JUSTICE AND RESERVATION
OF POSTS IN SERVICES AND SEATS
IN EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS
BILL*

श्री. अजित कुमार मेहता (समस्तीपुर): मैं प्रस्ताव करता हूँ कि संविधान के भागों के अन्तर्गत पिछड़े वर्गों से सम्बन्धित नागरिकों के लिए सामाजिक न्याय, विशेष शैक्षिक तथा रोजगार सम्बन्धी अवसरों का उपबन्ध करने हेतु विधेयक को पुरःस्थापित करने की अनुमति दी जाये ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide for social justice, special educational and employment opportunities to the citizens belonging to backward classes within the framework of the Constitution."

The motion was adopted.

श्री. अजित कुमार मेहता: मैं विधेयक को पुरःस्थापित करता हूँ ।