

**SHRI VAYALAR RAVI:** My point is: they are under you and not under the Prime Minister's Secretariat. So, Sir, I want a ruling on this matter.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I will consider. I was not present. I will look into the matter. I cannot say anything off hand.

Shri Asoke Krishan Dutt.

**THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (PROP. MADHU DANDAVATE):** A ruling was already given yesterday.

**MR. SPEAKER:** He wants me to revise it. I shall look into it. I do not want to say anything about it.

Now, Mr. Asoke Krishna Dutt.

12.14 hrs.

**MOTION OF NO CONFIDENCE IN THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS—contd.**

**MR. SPEAKER:** Now we take up further consideration of the Motion of No-confidence.

Shri Asoke Krishan Dutt.

**SHRI ASOKE KRISHNA DUTT (Dum Dum):** When I began speaking yesterday, I had the painful necessity of saying that the hon. Leader of the Opposition has failed to make out even a *prima facie* case. It is quite understandable because for the last several months I find that my esteemed friend, Mr. Stephen, has remained indecisive. When his Party split some months ago, he first thought that Mrs. Indira Gandhi was authoritarian and he remained with the Congress. Some time later, however, he again changed sides and went over to the Cong. (I). People may doubt the political integrity behind this move but, of course, Mr. Stephen should be congratulated for his foresight. He immediately became the leader of his group and ultimately the Leader of the Opposition. What were the points that Mr. Stephen made out? He said nothing new. We have been

hearing all this throughout the Budget Session and not a single word was said either by him or anybody in the Opposition except the new developments of two small victories in the U. P. Assembly and one single victory in the U.P. Parliamentary seat. This was the only new thing, all the rest was repetition.

The leader of the Opposition began by saying that in these 13 months of Janata Rule, democratic rights were being eroded. We were losing democratic rights of protests. May I ask the hon. leader of the Opposition through you, Sir, does he in all seriousness believe what he was saying yesterday? Does he not remember what happened during the rule of the Government that went on immediately prior to the Janata Government, particularly during those 19 black months of emergency. Has not the the Janata Government restored individual rights? The leader of the Opposition or all the other members in his party or in the opposition are saying whatever they like inside this House, whatever they like outside this House and they are getting full publicity for that. What was the condition immediately prior to that? Most of the Members who are on this side of the House were in jail. Those who were outside, whenever they wanted to speak, and important meetings were called them immediately on that day. Prior to our meeting Section 144 was declared and all those people were arrested. The judiciary did not have the right of freedom. To-day a very eminent Member of the judiciary, one of the luminaries of the Supreme Court who was appointed during the regime of Mrs. Indira Gandhi frankly confesses that he did not have the courage to say at that time what he wanted to say. This was the condition that they had made and yet he says that democratic norms are being eroded now a days. Whatever speeches, either given on the floor of this august House or in any of the Assemblies of the different States, any critical statement against Mrs. Gandhi or her Government were not published in the

[Shri Asoke Krishna Dutt:]

preta. All that was published was that so and so also spoke. This was what was published. Is that the position to-day?

Yesterday, Hitendra Bhai Desai was quoting from the paper 'Surya'. I think it should be named 'Suralya'. Whatever it is, it publishes what ever it likes. It publishes half truths and defamatory allegations against anybody and everybody. I ask the leader of the Opposition through you, could anybody have dared to have published like this during that period of emergency criticising Mrs. Indira Gandhi, in the manner that this paper criticises the Government to-day? Yet somebody like the hon. Hitendra Bhai Desai—when he was quoting from 'Surya' yesterday I felt that with the solemnity that he was doing it, as though he was quoting from the scriptures. He must have had reasons for this. In this paper, it is not *Sanjay oachha*, but he might say Sanjay's better half was saying this. It is therefore better than the scriptures.

I will ask Hitendra Bhai Desai, does his own party colleague Shri Saugata Roy (I do not find him in the House to-day) agree with him? This very same paper from which Shri Hitendra Bhai Desai was quoting yesterday had said that Shri Saugata Roy had been carrying on a racket of selling bogus law degrees from Calcutta University and that he was taking advantage of that. He has brought a Privilege Motion against that. Here Shri Hitendra Bhai Desai comes and quotes from the same paper. I do not know the latest alignment on that side. I do not know whether Shri Hitendra Bhai Desai and Shri Saugata Roy are still in the same party.

**SHRI VAYALAR RAVI** (Chirayinkil): I am on a point of order.

My point of order is now the hon. member, in the name of quoting the newspaper, made a derogatory remark against the hon. member of this House. Of course, if you allow this, I can also quote from anybody in this House.

**SHRI ASOKE KRISHNA DUTT**: I can lay it on the Table.

**SHRI VAYALAR RAVI**: Does he own the responsibility?

**MR. SPEAKER**: He does not say that. He says that that paper has been publishing all sorts of news. He has said that.

**SHRI VAYALAR RAVI**: I request your ruling. Can any Member quote from any newspaper, any document, any derogatory remarks against anybody? I request your ruling on that.

**MR. SPEAKER**: If he quotes approvingly certainly it is wrong to do so without the permission of the House and it cannot be done. But if he quotes disapprovingly there is nothing wrong about it. If he quotes that approvingly that the allegation is true then of course it comes within the mischief of the rule. But if he quotes it as a paper, an unreliable paper, because earlier also they have published and so on.

**SHRI VAYALAR RAVI**: He never said that.

**MR. SPEAKER**: His whole tenor is like that. He said Mr. Desai is quoting it.

**SHRI ASOKE KRISHNA DUTT**: Thank you very much. What I said was that I did not believe what this paper has said. I think it has made false allegations both against Mr. Saugata Roy and also against our leader, against whom Mr. Hitendra Desai was quoting yesterday. This paper consists of only falsehood and they ought to be aware themselves—Shri Hitendra Desai ought to have verified from his own party Member Shri Saugata Roy about the authenticity of this paper, about the correctness of this paper.

**SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE** (Jadavpur): Don't give it importance.

**AN HON. MEMBER**: Ignore it.

**SHRI ASOKE KRISHNA DUTT**: Yesterday the hon. Leader of the

Opposition was very much elated that they have won two assembly seats in U.P.

**SHRI A. C. GEORGE** (Mukandapuram): He is still holding on to that paper. It is in his hands.

**PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR** (Gandhinagar): Though disapprovingly!

**AN HON. MEMBER** Now he has thrown it out.

**SHRI ASOKE KRISHNA DUTT.** Yesterday the Leader of the opposition was very much elated that they have won two assembly seats in U.P. and one Parliamentary seat in U.P. He in his speech said that there is a complete polarisation. The North was on one side and the South was on one side and they had made a great dent in the north by winning one parliamentary seat. May I ask him to recapitulate his memory about what happened in the last few months? He was talking about Karnataka and Andhra. I admit that we have lost the assembly elections in Karnataka and Andhra, but have we not tremendously improved our position in the last one year? In Andhra during last parliamentary elections one year ago we had only one seat. In Karnataka—you know more than anybody else Sir,—we had only two seats and in the Assembly elections in Karnataka we bagged 59 seats and not two like them. In Andhra, we got 60 seats. What a tremendous increase! We have tremendously improved our position both in Karnataka and in Andhra. This shows that the South is also realising what a menace we had during the period of emergency over here. Much was said by the Leader of the Opposition and other Members also—every other speaker from the opposition spoke about atrocities against Harijans. This Harijan problem is a very serious and grave problem in this country and everyone of us is ashamed of it. This has been going on for centuries and this is a matter which should cut

across party lines and this matter should be dealt with at the national level. Yet we find,—we strongly suspect,—that some of those who always try to raise the issue over here are deliberately creating a new situation whereby the elements favouring communalism and casteism take advantage.

Sir, I will give you one instance about what happened in Banaras very recently. Our Defence Minister, Babu Jagjivan Ram had been to Banaras very recently. The manner in which he was insulted there was not only a great shame to the people who publicly insulted him but it had shamed every one of us.

May I ask the Leader of the Opposition as to who was presiding over that function? The function was presided over by a very close relative of Mr. Stephen's counterpart in the Rajya Sabha, his own brother and the whole meeting was organised by the people belonging to the Congress (I), they deliberately created this situation; they deliberately insulted him so that anger might rise and they could take advantage of it. So Sir, I would like to urge upon the Government, the Prime Minister and the Home Minister, particularly, that wherever these atrocities occur, they should not only be curbed forthwith but a thorough enquiry should also be made into it as to who are fomenting this. They are saying R.S.S.

I strongly suspect, that a coterie who has become politically frustrated is trying now to create a communal situation, the situation of casteism, whereby they can take advantage of that disastrous situation. Certain people are suffering from that and these people want to make political use of that and make that community to suffer even more for their own purpose. Sir, the Leader of the Opposition yesterday spoke.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Your time is up.

**SHRI ASOKE KRISHNA DUTT:** Sir, yesterday, I spoke for only one minute.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I have got the record that you spoke for two minutes

**SHRI ASOKE KRISHNA DUTT:** Even then I want five minutes.

**MR. SPEAKER:** No.

**SHRI ASHOKE KRISHNA DUTT:** Sir the hon. Leader of, the Opposition was criticising the Foreign Policy of this Government and, yesterday throughout the debate one speaker after another from that side went on saying that this government has nothing new in regard to foreign policy; that we are following their foreign policy. I would particularly point out what was raised by the Leader of the Opposition. He was talking about Nepal, what has been done with regard to Nepal? The political treaty with Nepal and the trade agreement with them had been treated separately. Nepal is a landlocked country for a long time they demanded trade treaty with this Government and that is what they have done and it is perfectly reasonable and in order. It was what a neighbour like India should have done years ago. It was only because of the bullying tactics of the former Government that Nepal was kept suppressed like that.

Sir, our relationships with our immediate neighbours like Nepal, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka and even with Pakistan have improved and yet, the Leader of the Opposition criticised the Prime Minister about his statement regarding Sikkim.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Your time is up.

**SHRI ASOKE KRISHNA DUTT:** I will take only two minutes.

**MR. SPEAKER:** No. There is a large number of speakers.

**SHRI ASOKE KRISHNA DUTT:** Sir, I was interrupted all the time.

**MR. SPEAKER:** That does not matter.

**SHRI ASOKE KRISHNA DUTT:** About Sikkim, what the Prime Minister said is perfectly correct. Sikkim is an integral part of India. The people of Sikkim wanted to come to India. This could have been done in a fair, proper and regular way. But the bullying tactics that was adopted by Mrs. Gandhi's Government had been criticised by everybody. The Prime Minister was correct to say that the procedure was wrong. We are proud for that courageous and bold statement.

I would conclude by saying that the Opposition was trying to criticise what was going on before the Shah Commission. The Leader of the Opposition said that this is vindictive-ness blood-thirsty hound or something like that. He said that yesterday. I say that what the Shah Commission is doing is a great benefit to the country. Nobody would have known what happened during the 19 months. Some got puzzled.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Now you cannot go on like that. You must conclude.

**SHRI ASOKE KRISHNA DUTT:** I will conclude by saying that all that was being done before the Shah Commission was exposing what went on during the 19 months. Many people did not know anything. I have heard many of my friends opposite, old friends, whom I know for the last 25,30 or 35 years. They are saying, "Oh, you were in jail" and they never knew all these things. How would they have known during that time? They were completely in the dark and they were completely gagged. For instance Mr. Pai was completely gagged for 19 months. Then, Shah Commission gave him an opportunity to come and tell the truth. I think that Shah Commission is not doing anything in a vindictive spirit; it is doing a great service to the country so that, in

future, a single individual or a single family or a small coterie will not have the opportunity of exploiting this great country of ours.

I think that the Opposition has completely failed to make out a case for no-confidence against this Government. And I think it should be rejected outright.

MR. SPEAKER Before I call the next speaker, it may be desirable to dispense with the lunch hour.

SOME HON'BLE MEMBERS No. No

MR. SPEAKER I thought the Prime Minister has to speak in the Rajya Sabha at 5 O'clock. Then lunch hour need not be dispensed with.

रत्ना शर्मा (श्री जगजीवन राम) : स्पीकर साहब कई सदस्यों ने यह पूछा कि यह भविष्यवासी का प्रस्ताव कैसे ? मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि श्री स्टीवन को भी स्वयं मालूम नहीं है कि इस भविष्यवासी के प्रस्ताव की आवश्यकता थी क्या और इनके लिए यह आवश्यक था क्या ? इसलिए कोई मुद्दा खड़ा करने में वे असमर्थ रहे। कई सदस्यों ने स्वयं मान लिया कि इस प्रस्ताव के बारे में वे बहुत सीरियस नहीं हैं। लेकिन शायद उन जगह की परम्परा है कि हर साल एक भविष्यवासी का प्रस्ताव नाना बाहिये सरकार के खिलाफ। उस परम्परा को निभाना शायद विरोधी पक्ष के नेता ने अपनी एक धार्मिक कर्तव्य समझा। इसलिए यह प्रस्ताव लाना उन्होंने आवश्यक समझा। यही बात भवमर की है। सूबे हूये नाले में घोड़ा भी पानी घा जाग, तो उसके भूते से बाहर हो जाता है उन पानी को सम्राज रचना। यही भवमर रहा। 1977 के क्रान्तिकारी परिवर्तन के पश्चात् राजस्थान में चुनाव हुये, उस नाले को पानी नसीब नहीं हुआ। हरियाणा में चुनाव हुये, वही हालत रही। उत्तर प्रदेश में चुनाव हुये, मुख्य मंत्री बहा पर चुन कर प्राये, पानी की बूब नाले में नहीं टपक सकी। बिहार में चुनाव हुये, वही हालत रही, कठ सूबे का सूबा रह गया, आबाज निकलने की गुंजाइश नहीं हुई। अबसर मिलाता कैसे ? अबसर मिस गया। उत्तर प्रदेश में दो चुनाव विधान सभा के हुये और एक चुनाव लोक सभा का हुआ। इनकी जीत हुई, लेकिन इनको ठंडे विल से सोचना चाहिये, इतराने से कोई लाभ होने वाला नहीं है। ठंडे विल से सोचना चाहिये कि यह बोट उनको मिला है क्या और क्या इसे वे टिका कर रख सकेंगे ? इन्हें लगा कि अबसर यही प्राया है, सूबे हुये कंड में कौड़ा नीलापन प्राया है और इन्होंने समझा कि इस का लाभ उठा लो लेकिन जैसा मैंने पहले कहा कि मुद्दा इनके पास कुछ नहीं

था। एक ही मुद्दा है कि जनता पार्टी एक नहीं हो सकी है। इस बात को वे पूरा जाते हैं कि जनता पार्टी का उदय विभव के राजनीतिक दलों के इतिहास में एक अविनव संयोग है। क्या यह बता सकते हैं कि इतिहास ने कहीं भी किसी राजनीतिक दल ने अपने औपचारिक प्रावृध्द्वि होने से पहले ही, उसने एक 92 वर्ष की गठित राजनीतिक पार्टी को उलट दिया हो। कहीं विभव के इतिहास में यह नज्दौर पैस कर सकेंगे कि कोई राजनीतिक दल जिसका औपचारिक तरीके से गठन न हुआ हो। तीस बरस से गठित सरकार को उलट दिया हो। जनता पार्टी ने यह उस वकत किया जब जनता पार्टी का औपचारिक गठन नहीं हुआ था। अगर मेरे मित्र स्टिफन साहब भूलें नहीं हैं तो चुनाव मार्च 1977 में हुआ था। जनता पार्टी का गठन पहली मई 1977 को हुआ था। पैदाइश के पहले मिले जुले उन राजनीतिक दलों का जमाव जो पिछले कई एक दशकों से भापस में लहते रहे हैं, जो पिछले कई एक दशकों से एक दूसरे का परास्त करने में अपनी शक्ति लगाते रहे हैं अचानक एक साथ होकर भापका उखाड़ फेंकने की शक्ति उसमें था जागूनी ? क्या भापने कभी इस पर सोचा है ? भाप कह रहे हैं कि जनता पार्टी का इंट्रोडक्शन नहीं हुआ है। मैं भी कहता हू कि नहीं हुआ है। शायद श्री बंकरासुबैया ने बोट किया था मेरी ही उक्ति से। क्या इसमें कोई आश्चर्य की बात है अगर एक साल के भीतर हम सत्पुंजी रूप से एक नहीं हो सके तो ? भाप तो तीस बरस से यह कह रहे थे, 92 बरस से यह कह रहे थे और अब भी भाप हृदय पर अपना हाथ रख कर कहें कि क्या किसी भी काल में भाप एक थे ? भाप हमको मत भूल जाए। भाप गलत समझ रहे हैं। मैं भापको बता रहा हू कि भाप भी जो कर रहे थे वह एक राजनीतिक पार्टी के लिए करना लाजिमी था। हमारे यहा जो हो रहा है वह भी लाजिमी है। लेकिन भाप जिन बात की कल्पना कर रहे हैं वह अमान की शान्ति की कल्पना है। भापकी सत्त्वा जब तक जीवित सत्त्वा थी तब तक विचारों का टकराव बर्दा भी होता रहा। जनता पार्टी भी एक जीवित सत्त्वा है। जब तक सोचने वाले लोग यहा रहेंगे विचारों का टकराव होगा। उससे भाप यह न समझ लें कि भापको लाभ होने वाला है। अगर भापने ऐसी भासा बाधी है तो भापके हृदय के लिए मुझे विन्ता है और भापको भारी निराशा होगी। मैं मत्तबेद हमारे भापस में और इसलिए है कि यहा सोचने वाले लोग हैं। चुनाव के पूर्व मैंने कहा था कि भापने तो सोचने का काम एक ही व्यक्ति के सुपुर्द कर दिया है।

एक माननीय सदस्य धरणी भी।

श्री जगजीवन राम हितेन्द्र भाई ने कुछ सोचने का काम किया था। सास का साथ नहीं दिया, पर बहु की बातों को प्रामाणिक मान लिया। इससे ज्यादा टिप्पणी की आवश्यकता नहीं है। हितेन्द्र भाई की उम्र ऐसी हो गई है।

[श्री जगजीवन राम]

ऐसा झगर उठनीं किया तो उसमें कोई भी रूपात्मिक नहीं है।

हरिजनों और दूसरे कमजोर वर्गों के ऊपर होने वाले अत्याचारों और अत्याचारों की बात भी कही गई है। उन्हे मिलते तो सोचें आप इस समस्या पर। क्या यह भारतीय समाज में एक नई समस्या खड़ी हुई है? क्या कॉलेज के वासन में जो बटनाए गाजीपुर में हुई थीं बाबा में हुई थीं, और कितने स्वामी पर हुई थी, उन्हें आप पूछ लें? इन वर्गों में ऊपर होने वाले अत्याचार की वे बटनाए किसी राजनीतिक सत्ता का ही नहीं सम्पूर्ण भारतीय समाज का लिए झुका देने के लिए काफी थीं।

कुछ ऐसी समस्याएँ हैं जो राष्ट्रीय समस्याएँ हैं और जो समस्याएँ आप जब शासन में थे, जहाँ थी, वे समस्याएँ आज भी बनी हैं। हम आपको उदाहरण देकर के या आपके ऊपर उदाहरण करके सोचें कि समस्या का समाधान हो जाएगा, या आप हमारे ऊपर उदाहरण कर दें कि समाधान हो जाएगा तो इससे समस्या का समाधान होने वाला नहीं है। कुछ समस्याएँ राष्ट्रीय समस्याएँ होती हैं और उनके समाधान के लिए राष्ट्रीय प्रयत्न की आवश्यकता होती है। क्या आप राष्ट्र से प्रयत्न हैं? क्या आपने अभी तक यह नहीं सोचा है कि इस राष्ट्रीय प्रयत्न में हमको भी शामिल होना है? इन सामाजिक कोष्ठ पर, इस समस्या पर हमें एक राष्ट्रीय दृष्टिकोण से पहुँचना पड़ेगा।

इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं है कि जब कोई उत्पीड़ित समाज अपने उत्पीड़न का अन्त करने के लिए खड़ा होता है, कोई शोषित समाज अपने शोषण का अन्त करने के लिए खड़ा होता है तो निहित स्वार्थ ऐसा प्रयत्न करना है कि उनका अन्त न हो। यह निहित स्वार्थ इस प्रयत्न में उत्पीड़न और शोषण को बढ़ावा देना है कि ज्यादा उत्पीड़न करने से शोषित वर्ग की कल्पना खत्म हो जाए। यह समाज के लिए सुलझण है कि जलता पार्टी के उल्लेखना पैदा कर दी है कि समाज के सबसे पीड़ित समुदाय भी आप अपने को मुक्त करने का प्रयत्न कर रहे हैं। क्या यह राष्ट्रीय हित का तकला नहीं है कि आप भी उसमें हाथ बटावें? यह बर्नीय समस्या नहीं है। कुछ राष्ट्रीय प्रश्न होते हैं जिनमें हमको और आपको दोनों को साथ देना पड़ता है। अब वे प्रश्न बाहे हरिजनो का हो या विद्यार्थियों का हो।

क्या आपके जमाने में यूनिवर्सिटीज बन्द नहीं होती थी। यूनिवर्सिटीयों का बन्द होना, विद्यार्थियों का पढ़ाई छोड़ करके आन्दोलन के काम में लग जाना, हमारे और आपके लिए, दोनों के लिए विपत्ती की बात है। यह बड़ी पीढ़ी है जिसके ऊपर राष्ट्र की जिम्मेदारी बाने वाली है। अब इसके लिए हमें और आपको, दोनों को जिम्मेदार नहीं करनी है। क्या हमें और आपको यह

नहीं सोचना है कि यह पीढ़ी, जिसको वेस का राजनीतिक नेतृत्व करना है, समाज का नेतृत्व करना है, प्राथमिक व्यवस्था का नेतृत्व करना है, इस के सभी नेतृत्व जिसके कर्तव्य पर बाने वाले हैं, यह आप मुझ क्यों है? क्या कुछ पीढ़ी की ही आई है उन लोगों के बीच में है? यह बात हमको और आपको दोनों को साधनी पड़ेगी क्योंकि यह बल का प्रश्न नहीं है राष्ट्रीय प्रश्न है और राष्ट्रीय प्रश्न के समाधान में हमों के हित को नीके रखा कर आपने बढ़ना होता है बर्नीय हित से ऊपर उठना पड़ना है। मैं आपसे यही कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह आपके लिए भी विपत्ती की बात है और हमारे लिए भी विपत्ती की बात है।

ठीक इसी तरह से आपने अधिकारी की बात कही। ठीक है। इसे यदि मैं टालना चाहूँ तो कह सकता हूँ कि 19 महीने से बने हैं, धुरलत निम्न के बावें तुफान आया। लेकिन समस्या का इतना सरल समाधान करना ठीक नहीं होगा। हमारे यहाँ सामाजिक और प्राथमिक व्यवस्थाओं जो परम्पराओं से बनी आ रही हैं उनमें प्रामुख परिवर्तन की आवश्यकता है। हमें सोचना होगा कि क्या हम निहित स्वार्थों को बरकरार रखना चाहते हैं या जिनको उनसे परेशानी है, उस पर हमारी को विद्वाना चाहते हैं? समाज और वेस के सभी प्रश्न लोगों का यह काम हो जाता है कि यह या गतिशीलता धारणी है इसक बरण को ह्वे तेज करे और पुरानी परम्पराओं को विद्वाने में सहदेवी बनें। इस बान को भी मत भ्रमित कि जलता पार्टी जब यह प्रश्न कर रही है कि भारतीय समाज को परम्परागत समाज से निकाल कर, प्राथमिक समाज में वे प्रार्थें देविकमान सोसायटी को मोड़में सोसायटी में परिवर्तित कर दें। तो निहित स्वार्थों बानों का हमसे नाराज ना, नाश्वुन होना अवश्यमायी है। मैं नहीं समझत। कि आप या पिछले कई एक वक्ता से प्रगतिशील राजनीतिक संस्था होने का वादा करते रहे हैं और मुझे कहने में हिचकाहट भी नहीं है कि आपके कई एक प्रस्ताव प्रगतिशील रहे हैं, हालाँकि उस पर कायान्वयन करने में आपके बरण उन्नी ही तेजी से नहीं चल पाये थे। आप से उन्नीय की बाणधी कि प्राथमिक प्राथमिक विहित स्वार्थों की प्राधान्य में नहीं मिलेगी जो प्रगतिशील समाज का निर्माण करना चाहते हैं उनकी प्राधान्य में मिलेगी। अभी भी आपसे कुछ धारा है।

एक माननीय सचिव देकार है यह।

श्री जगजीवन राम इसलिए उन्नीय है कि आप बंधित होते जा रहे हैं। और एक बंधित व्यवस्था के क्या प्राधान्य की जा सकती है उन्नीय ही प्राधान्य हम भी आपसे करते हैं। अब हम आपकी तरफ वेधें स्टीफन भी या विहित बार्ड की तरफ वेधें। 30 वर्ष सिद्ध नहीं हैं, उन्नीय अपने व्यवस्था निहित स्वार्थों को अवस्थाएँ किया है। अच्छा होता स्टीफन भी, आप भी उनके साथ चलते। मैं आपके लिए मुझकामना रखता हूँ

इसलिए कि जनता पार्टी देश में एक स्वस्थ प्रजा-  
तंत्र व्यवस्था को मजबूत बनाना चाहती है, और  
प्रजातंत्र की परम्परा को स्वस्थ बनाने के लिए  
एक स्वस्थ विरोध पक्ष की आवश्यकता होती है।  
इसलिए मैंने सुझाव दिया है कि जिसमें आप  
स्वस्थ विरोध पक्ष बन सकें। विरोध पक्ष का काम  
प्रजातंत्र में विचार के विनिमय से देश का कल्याण  
करना होता है। विचार का विनिमय राष्ट्रीय हित  
को सर्वोपरि रख कर करना पड़ता है। राज-  
नीति के इस साधारण तथ्य को समझाने के लिये  
मैंने कह रखा है, बल्कि विषय की सम्भारता को  
कुछ ध्यान बनाने के लिए कह रखा है।  
आमने और सत्ताकूट बन में विबाध हो, लेकिन  
स्वस्थ विबाध हो। और आप स्वयं अपने हृदय  
में स्वस्थ हो जाये कि आप स्वस्थ विबाध उठा  
रहे हैं। कल से आज तक मुझे लगा आपके हृदय  
में स्वयं विस्वास नहीं है कि आप स्वस्थ विबाध  
उठा रहे हैं।

श्री सुरत महामुद राह (बेरी) : ईश्वर इनकी  
आत्मा को शांति दे।

श्री जयजीवन राव : जहाँ तक मैंने उनकी  
आत्मा को समझा है उनकी आत्मा स्वयं में प्रशान्त  
है।

श्री काबालेन बल (जौनपुर) इसलिए प्रभावान  
इनको शांति दे।

श्री शैलत राव (बैरकपुर) और जनता पार्टी  
को प्रशस्त दे।

श्री जयजीवन राव दोनों को।

श्री सुन० राव नारायण राव (करीमनगर) :  
अमेडमेंट ऐकसेप्टेड।

श्री जयजीवन राव मेरा अमेडमेंट नहीं है।  
मैं ज्यादा समय नहीं लेना चाहता। आपने  
स्वयं जिस बल इस प्रतिश्वास प्रस्ताव को सेवा  
आपको भरोसा नहीं था खड़े होने के बल कि  
दिलेन जहाँ भी आपके साथ खड़े हो सकेंगे।  
और सब ने देखा होगा डा० कर्ण सिंह खड़े हुये  
तो भावा ही खड़े हुये।

एक मालमीन सबब : नहीं खड़े हुये थे।

श्री जयजीवन राव : ठीक है, नहीं खड़े हुये थे।  
लेकिन कभी कभी आवश्यक नहीं होता है कि सही  
मुरा ही कौनों को आकर्षित करें। कभी कभी  
पलत मुरे भी आकर्षित कर लेते हैं। इसलिए  
वह आकर्षित हो गये, खड़े हो गये, प्रतिश्वास  
का प्रस्ताव था नया।

जिसकी बातें आपने उठार दीं, मैं उनको बोह-  
राना नहीं चाहता, और न सबका बचाव देना  
चाहता हूँ। यही सब बातें हैं, जो बचक की बहस

के अवसर पर, और जैन की बहस के अवसर  
पर, बोलवाई गई हैं, और सबको ने उनका बचाव  
दिया है। मैं उन बातों को बोलराना नहीं  
चाहता।

लेकिन मैं आपको सिर्फ इतना स्मरण कराना  
चाहता हूँ कि डेमोक्रेसी में, प्रजातंत्र में, विरोधी  
पक्ष का भी उत्तरदायित्व होता है। उस उत्तर-  
दायित्व के प्रति आप जागरूक हैं, मैं ऐसा विश्वास  
करके बसता हूँ। मैं आपके उत्तरदायित्व के प्रति  
आपको जागरूक कराऊँ, ऐसी घुष्टता मैं नहीं  
करूँगा। आप कर सकते हैं। विरोधी पक्ष को  
यह सुधीता रहता है कि हुयेवा कोविन करे कि  
सरकार बालों के काग एंडे दे। लेकिन मैं ऐसी  
घुष्टता नहीं करूँगा कि आपके काग एण्डे। अगर  
आप ऐसे सुझाव दें, जिससे देश का कल्याण और  
साथ हो सके। आलोचना के लिए आलोचना  
करना प्रजातंत्र के लिए उपयोगी नहीं होता है।  
प्रजातंत्र का तकाजा है कि निर्माण के लिए  
आलोचना की जाये, और यही भाषा मैं आपसे  
करता हूँ।

आप स्वयं यह मान कर बने हैं कि आपके  
प्रतिश्वास-प्रस्ताव ने कोई मुरा नहीं है। एक करम  
आगे बड़े और कहें कि खरैर मुझे के इस प्रतिश्वास  
प्रस्ताव को मैं वापस ले लेता हूँ।

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND  
(Chikkodi): Mr Speaker, I rise to  
support the No Confidence motion  
moved by my leader on this side. I  
was really disappointed to hear  
Babuji to-day on the issue. We ex-  
pected something much more from  
him mouth... (Interruptions) that  
is, the kind of opinions which he is  
expressing outside Parliament on  
some occasions. May I ask the Prime  
Minister, who is present here, to put  
his hand on his heart and say whe-  
ther all is well with his Government?  
How can I say that the Government  
which is disunited, which has got  
distrust against each other, which has  
no confidence in each other and  
which, in spite of the dinner diplo-  
macy that he played, is united? What  
picture are a they giving to the  
country? Are they united? They are  
scared to see each other's face, both  
within this House and outside. What  
hope and confidence can this Govern-  
ment give to the country?

I remember that when there was a  
debate going on in this House and  
criticisms were being showered on the

[Shri B. Shankaranand]

Home Minister, there was a demand—not from this side, but from the other—“Why not a Harijan Minister be made the Home Minister?”. And I remember the Prime Minister got up and said: “I was also the Home Minister. I know how to rule the country.” And he defended Home Minister But I want to tell the respected Babuji, “Whatever amount of praise you may shower on the Janata Government and the Janata Party’s performances they are not going to make you the Home Minister or Prime Minister of this country. That is certain.” I am making a little more plain speaking. I know you are all against a harijan leader becoming the Prime Minister and that is why I am repeating. . . (Interruptions) All of you are opposed to Babuji becoming the Prime Minister or the Home Minister. That is the reason why I am mentioning this. . . (Interruptions) We were listening patiently when you were all talking .

(Interruptions)

**SHRI C. M. STEPHEN:** When Shri Patnaik spoke, he described us as sycophant and so on and we kept quiet. But now we find that these friends cannot tolerate even the slightest criticism. Then how can we function here? The wildest allegations were made against us and we kept quiet.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Hon. Members may kindly note that freedom of speech does not mean merely exercising it ourselves. We must protect the freedom of speech of others also.

**SHRI A. C. GEORGE:** Sir, Babuji referred to the physical deformity of Dr. Karan Singh, which was hitting below the belt. It was very unfair. Still, we kept quiet. . . (Interruptions)

**SHRI B. SHANKARANAND:** They have got a majority inside the House. But can they honestly tell us that they hold the same majority outside this House, as they did in 1977? Their

majority is dwindling and the result is being seen in the UP by-elections. You cannot forget that.

May I ask the Prime Minister one simple question? I will ask the same question of other responsible members of the Government. Whom have you served during the one year of your regime? Are the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes happy with you? Are they feeling secure under your administration? Can you honestly tell us that you have done justice to them? Are the minorities feeling secure at your hands? Are the workers, the farmer, or the labourers happy? Whom have you satisfied? Do not forget that when there was a discussion here on the atrocities committed on harijans, even members of the Janata Party asked you to quit. It has gone on record. . . (Interruptions)

What do we see in the country today? Laws are being flouted and decencies are being violated in the name of freedom. One is left to wonder whether the Government remains inefficient in the name of the freedom of expression. There are instances of strikes and labour growing increasingly restive. Go slow and work stoppages are becoming not infrequent, making the life of the common man even more difficult. Already the common man is harassed by rising prices, contemptuous traders, inadequate transport, inefficient and ruthless administrative officers, frequent breakdown of electricity and water supply etc.

Is there any part of the country now living in peace? Right from Kutch to Assam, Kashmir to Kanyakumari, is there any part of the country which is peaceful and progressive?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Karnataka.

**SHRI B. SHANKARANAND:** The people of this country are now on the side of disunity and not unity. I am

very sorry that this no confidence motion is being taken very lightly. I warn this Government that a no confidence motion is never treated lightly either by the opposition or the ruling party.

MR. SPEAKER: You may continue after lunch.

13 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch till Fourteen of the Clock.*

*The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at five minutes past Fourteen of the Clock*

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

MEMBER SWORN

Shrimati Mohsina Kidwai (Azamgarh)—

MOTION OF NO CONFIDENCE IN THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS—  
Contd.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Shankaranand to continue his speech.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): Sir, I want to make a submission. Today, in the List of Business, there is nothing but this No-Confidence Motion and the House is expected to continue till 6 O'Clock. May I request you that the time may be adjusted accordingly? We want to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: It is not possible. The Prime Minister has to go to the other House.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: A little time may be given to us.

MR. SPEAKER: No please; it is not possible.

SHRI A. K. ROY (Dhanbad): My submission is that Unattached members should be given some time.

MR. SPEAKER: One of the Unattached members has already spoken.

Practically, we have given time to two Independent members.

Shri Shankaranand to continue.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: Sir, I was just telling this House that if you look to the countryside, what we see is complete deterioration of law and order. There are robberies, dacoities, atrocities, crimes, all these things, increasing every day. Not only this House but the President of this country has also expressed his concern. This is what the President of India said when he was addressing at the All-India Institute of Medical Sciences. I quote:

"I would like to express my distress at the state of health of the country. Whether it is people being killed in Hyderabad, Amritsar or elsewhere, this is a concrete illness which is more than what institutes like this can cure."

He, further, said:

"I wonder where we are going. I myself do not know and I happen to be the President. I want Mr Raj Narain to convey my grief to other members of the Cabinet."

I do not know whether he has conveyed it to the Prime Minister and his Cabinet colleagues. It is reported:

"The President said that he was appealing as a helpless spectator to all political parties to think carefully before they do anything, because, if the seeds we sow today are poisonous, we will have to reap them tomorrow and what future can we offer to the younger generation."

Again, I quote:

"In the meanwhile, the secretary of the National Federation of Indian Women in a statement expressed concern at the breakdown in law and order in various parts of the country and, particularly, the news of molestation of women in Madhya Pradesh and Tamil Nadu."

[Shri B. Shankaranand]

It said: a Government which could not protect its women should resign immediately. May I ask the Prime Minister who is a Gandhian, who values the values of life, whether he is really happy with the team that he is having? Do they repose confidence in him as the Prime Minister? We are really very sorry that the Prime Minister of this country is being described by the Press as being no longer the Prime Minister but a convenor. It is a shame to this country, not only to the Janata Party. We know Mr. Morarjibhai is an ablest administrator, is a truthful leader. But I do not know what has happened to his party and his capacity.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is due to a wrong company.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND. The whole problem is that of his Ministers and not the Opposition Party. It shows that the Janata Party is punishing him with that company. He has his own problems, the problem of Mr. Charan Singh, the problem of Mr. Raj Narain, the problem of Mr. George Fernandes, the problem of Mr. Jagjivan Ram, the problem of Mr. Shyamnandan Mishra, everybody, everyone, each Minister is creating a headache for him.

SHRI M. SATYANARAYAN RAO (Karimnagar): The problem of Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu,

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: I do not know about it. It is a pity. He has no time to apply his mind to the problems of his country. I do not know whether the Janata Party or the Government has understood the problems of Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu. The marxists of this country are fattening themselves on the pasture of the Janata Party. I do not know whether they know it. They are praising the Janata Party. They do not want to talk anything else because they know that the Janata Party are committing the mistakes and they want to grow stronger by their mistakes. That is

the reason why they are praising the Janata Party, not for love but for their own gains. But I do not know whether Mr. Morarji knows the tricks of the Marxist Party. That is how their leader yesterday spoke. Mr. Samar Mukherjee, said: we are not concerned with the No Confidence Motion. But still he chartered one, two, three, four or so many things against the Janata Party. That is their wonderful strategy.

I have very little time at my disposal and I have to tell so many things. Mr. Morarji Desai and the Janata friends on the other side think that only Mr. Stephen, the Leader of the Congress I and Mr. Hitendra Desai the Congress Leader have brought this No Confidence Motion. How can they forget that first their own people have brought this and expressed their no confidence in them? I quote Mr. Biju Patnaik first. You listen to what he has said. It is reported in *The Times of India*, dated 11th May, 1978. The headline is: 'Trinity must pack up or quit: Biju'. I quote. "The trinity—Mr. Morarji Desai, Mr. Charan Singh and Mr. Jagjivan Ram—must either make up their differences or quit. If neither happens, the Janata Party will break up." "This was how the Steel and Mines Minister, Mr. Biju Patnaik, one of the stalwarts of the Janata Party who had been a leading light of the Congress reacted to the party's defeat in the by-elections in Uttar Pradesh". I quote Mr. Biju Patnaik. He says: "It is surprising that in spite of the open fighting among the constituents of the Janata Party in U.P., its candidate could poll the votes he did." They said that Janata Party could get so many votes. Your own Cabinet Minister is saying this.

The next is Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee's threat one month ago. The External Affairs Minister, Shri A. B. Vajpayee, has said that "things are not going well; if the Government does not perform well, if we do not correct ourselves, within three months I will resign". He is waiting for another two months,

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Dr. Subramaniam Swamy is also waiting.

**SHRI B. SHANKARANAND:** Dr. Subramaniam Swamy is different.

Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee himself has said that things are not going well and if they failed to correct themselves, he will resign. Is it not an expression of no-confidence?

The next is Mr. Madhu Limaye's attack on his own Party. This is what has appeared in *Navasakti*, a Marathi daily. I quote.

(Quoted in Marathi)

He was addressing in Sunderbai Hall in Bombay. He says, 'I have given up my silence...Yesterday only the Janata Party completed one year.' He further says, 'The people are restless after the one year rule of Janata Party in the country; people are restless, people are not happy.' He further says, 'People are not interested in who becomes the Minister; people are interested in how they are being ruled and what they are getting.' He has stated in this speech that the Janata Government is not performing well, it has not done what it promised when it came to power; this sort of thing between Janata Party and Government will not go on. That is the main gist of it. Is it not expression of no-confidence?

The next is Mr. Charan Singh's letter of resignation. The Home Minister, a leader of the Janata, himself has expressed no-confidence in you. I will quote. It is reported in the *Hindu* dated the 30th April, 1978:

"He makes this point in his letter of resignation from the Janata Parliamentary Board and the National Executive. The letter concludes thus:

'A party whose leadership is not inspired by truth, justice or public interest can never deliver the goods or render any service to the people. You may treat this letter as my resignation from the

National Executive of the Janata Party and the Parliamentary Board."

Is this not expression of no-confidence?

Many Harijan Janata MPs spoke in the House an atrocities. Have they not expressed no-confidence in this Government when they spoke? They have said that the Government should quit.

Shri Jagjivan Ram himself has said today that there is no cohesion in his Party. He does not know that nobody trusts him. He believes that everybody trusts him. That is the fun. J.P. himself has expressed no confidence in this Government. It is reported in the *Sunday Statesman* dated 7th May that, about the Janata Party, Mr. Narayan said:

"It is again said to note that the ruling party is behaving like a loose federation of so many smaller parties. In fact, it is very difficult for me to say what the Janata ideology is. And worse, there is a big gap in what they say and what they do."

The great person who was responsible for the creation of this Party which came to power himself says he has no faith in this Party and this Government. What else do you want? Members on that side say 'Oh, Mr. Stephen has brought this motion only for the sake of politics'. Don't deceive yourselves. If you smile here, that everything is well with the Party and the Government, you are exercising self-deception and your self-deception is going to ruin this country. For that, we are concerned, and for that, we have brought this No Confidence Motion.

So, I support this No Confidence Motion.

**SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR** (Trivandrum): Mr. Speaker, Sir, you were very closely following the debate on this motion and I believe you will agree that there is much truth in

[Shri M. N. Govindan Nair]

what each spoke about the other. Now, the ruling Party—the Janata Party—was accusing the Congress and Congress(I) of excesses during the Emergency and the Leader of the Opposition put forward a number of charges against the ruling Party. So, the picture that emerges from this is that the country and the people were caught between the devil and the deep sea. The escape from the frying pan of the Emergency, they plunged into the fire of the Janata rule.

I was very much pained to hear the speech of the Hon. Minister Shri Jagjivan Ram. The complacent manner in which he spoke and the way in which he retorted all do credit to him as a good Parliamentarian. But, I ask 'what was the performance of the Janata Party?'. More than a thousand lives of Harijans have been lost in one year, by murder. Hundreds of women were raped and overall 1 lakh of people were dispossessed of the land they had. Then, untouchability has been evoked and a ban was imposed on Harijans walking along roads. Are all these matters of no concern? Well, Sir, for this, there was jubilation on the part of the Opposition; And they were hoping that this is an opportunity for a come-back of Indira. Coming back of Indira Gandhi is no solution to the problem because, for all that has happened, they are also to share the blame. What happened in Hyderabad? What happened in Andhra? What happened in Varanasi? Their hands are also not clean. Therefore, the only solution, according to me, as far as this section of the people are concerned, is Gandhiji. Before he took up the leadership of the freedom struggle against racial discrimination, Gandhiji organised a non-violent revolt. That is the way for the Harijans, the Scheduled Castes and the oppressed sections in this country to rise up in militant revolt for resistance. Of course, there are 140—150 million Scheduled Caste people in this country of which, I believe, at least 100 million

people are able-bodied men and women. If 100 people at the rate of one from a million come forward and launch a peaceful resistance, this problem will be solved. There is no other solution. Again, during this one year, more than 400 workers have been murdered, have been fired and have been killed.. (Interruptions)

SHRI B. RACHAIAH (Chamrajnagar): They have no patience to hear. . .

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: I am not going into all those details . (Interruptions)

MR SPEAKER: Is a running commentary necessary at all?

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Not only that, I do not understand this comment also because I do not know Hindi. Why should he interrupt... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Kindly resume your seat.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Kindly talk in a language which I understand, if you want me to understand. Otherwise, you sit quiet.

Now, 300 workers were killed by police firing during this one year. For them also there is only one solution. Trade unions are an organized force in this country. The trade union rights were got after many a heroic struggle by the workers costing many lives. So, I would appeal to them to take up the cause of the right of the workers to agitate till this kind of killing ends.

Now, on your shoulders Mr. Speaker rests the responsibility of safeguarding the sovereignty of this House. I request you to ponder over what has happened during this one year in this House. Are we a debating society or are we a sovereign body? We raised the question of Belchi. What was the answer? All over the country, attack on the Harijans...

SHRI YADVENDRA DUTT (Jaunpur): What happened in Tamil Nadu in 1968?

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: We raised the question of Kanpur. But

what was the result? Bailadilla. There, not only the workers were shot dead but over a thousand huts were burnt and all their properties destroyed...

**SHRI A. C. GEORGE:** Shri Biju Patnaik's work.

**SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR:** We spoke about and discussed in this House about Sambhal. What was the reply? Hyderabad. We spoke about Pantnagar. What was the next answer? Agra....

**AN HON. MEMBER:** You raised Agra...

**SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR:** I am quoting all this because on all these issues, most of the Members from all sides spoke against these incidents. I considered it a mandate of this House that this kind of atrocities was stopped. Was there a government here to heed to this? You say there is a government. Yes, there is. When the bell tolls, I am quite sure all the members will come in, and "Oh", at that time there is unity. Now, is there a Cabinet? The Prime Minister is in one direction, the Home Minister from the Intensive Care ward of the Medical Hospital in another direction. I am not going into all these things. It is their affair. But I appeal to you to safeguard the sovereignty of this House. I appeal to you to see that the will of this House is implemented by a government here...

**THE MINISTER OF STEEL AND MINES (SHRI BIJU PATNAIK):** It is always implemented.

**SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR:** I know that you are a champion who wants to foster parliamentary democracy in this country. But make it meaningful. But if you restrict democracy and democratic rights only to parliamentarians, only to political parties and leaders and leave the ordinary people outside the pale of democracy, parliamentary democracy in this country will be doomed...

**AN HON. MEMBER:** A limited company.

**SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR:** There is another thing. We speak about equality and all that, economic equality and all that. I have no time to go into all those things. But the other day I was astounded to hear the atrocious distortion of our Prime Minister about Gandhian economics, in defence of the monopoly capital. I will not go into all those things because there is no time. But I appeal to you that if you want this parliamentary democracy in this country to survive, then let this right enshrined in this constitution for the entire people of this country not merely remain on paper but in actual life they should be able to enjoy.

We raised the question of the basic right to work. In Pantnagar we requested you to withdraw the PAC from there. We requested you to recognize the union there. We requested you to negotiate with them and settle the matter there. We requested you to extend the judicial inquiry so that the doings of the Vicc-Chancellor may be brought within the ambit. Many days have passed. Is it that the government has not taken note of it. There was a general demand from the people, from many members here and outside this House, that a judicial inquiry should be instituted into the firing in Agra. Well there also it is a basic right.

What is the meaning of your laughing. You should be ashamed.

**THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS (SHRI SHEO NARAIN):** You should be ashamed for the repetition.

**SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR:** Fifty years ago in my State we had to lead struggles for permission for the Scheduled Caste people to work along roads near the temple. I do not know whether he remembers about Vaikom Satyagrah. Even today, in 1978, are we to repeat it after independence?

[Shri M. N. Govindan Nair]

Now, in my humble submission, I make four demands—

1. Immediate judicial enquiry regarding the frings and happenings at Agra.

2. Withdrawal of PAC from the Pantnagar University, bringing the activities of the Vice Chancellor under judicial enquiry.

3. Recognition of the Union and negotiated settlement of the issue thereby.

If that is done (interruptions) by the end of this month, I am not giving an ultimatum or anything, from the agony of my heart I say that I will go on hunger strike before the Prime Minister.

श्री राव बिहास जगजल (हाजीपुर) अध्यक्ष महोदय, धार्य सुबह ही मैंने अपना प्लाइट भाक धारें उठाते हुये कहा था कि जब एक बार फायरेंस बिल पर आपने अपनी शक्ति प्रयोजन कर ली, जिस से भाषको मात्र 64 मत मिले, उसके बंद फिर नो-कॉन्फिडेंस-मोशन का कोई भी फल नहीं रह जाता है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, जबसे इस देश में पार्लियामेण्टी सिस्टम शुरू हुई है, यह 19वां नो-कॉन्फिडेंस मोशन है। मुझे बड़े अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ रहा है कि कम जब स्टीफन साहब ने बड़े जोर से इस मोशन को मूव किया, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि उनके विभाग में यह बात रही होगी कि जब पहले इस तरह का मोशन मूव होता था और सरकार नहीं चाहती थी कि उस पर बहस हो, और तरह-तरह की आपत्तियाँ उस पर की जाती थी, शायद बही स्थिति इस बार भी रहेगी, लेकिन जब प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कह दिया कि मैं एक मिनिट भी धरुन-न-त नहीं रहना चाहता हूँ, इस लिए इस पर तुलना बहुत बुरा हो जाय—उस समय बिरोधी बल के लोगों के पीछे बेकन लाक के, वे क्लार रहे थे, कोई ऐसा प्लाइट शोरखे थे जिससे किसी तरह से इसका समय बर्बाद जाये। वह अपने आप से इस बात का शोतक है कि आप इसके लिए तैयार नहीं थे, आप चाहते थे कि किसी तरह से यह टन जाय।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस सदन में एक नया प्रश्नकी हूँ—जब पहली बार इस सदन में 1963 के अधिनियम प्रस्ताव प्रयाय, उसे भी क्लामामी भी जाये थे, उस समय की सरकार के भी क्लामामी थे, उनकी क्लामामी को सामने रखने के लिए उन्होंने

बहु प्रस्ताव देना किया था। उस समय भीय के साथ ही उन्हें चुनना था उस के बाद देना के एक विचार-नी स्थिति पैदा हो गई थी—उस स्थिति की स्पष्ट ध्यान धारकित करने के लिए उन्होंने उस अधिनियम प्रस्ताव को रखा था। वही तरह से 1975 के अधिनियम प्रस्ताव प्रयाय था, उस समय भी आरो तरफ तयूके देश में इस तरह का शायद-परन पैदा था, जिसमें युवोधिपरी को तहल-तहल किया जा रहा है। मेरे कहने का तात्पर्य यह है कि किसी भी नो-कॉन्फिडेंस-मोशन की एक शर्तिका होती है, लेकिन जिस हलके में के इस अधिनियम के प्रस्ताव को देना किया है— मैं समझता हूँ उसका कोई भी फल नहीं था।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, हमने भी नो-कॉन्फिडेंस-मोशन के सम्बन्ध में पड़ा था कि यह क्या होता है और उसकी क्या शर्तिका होती है। लेकिन जब प्लेसी बार हमारे सामने इस पार्लियामेण्ट में यह मोशन प्रयाय, तो हमने कभी विचारना नहीं। इसके सम्बन्ध में मुझे कोई इन्टरेस्ट बेकन को नहीं मिला, शायद तो फिर भी कुछ शोरखे बंदे होते हैं, लेकिन कम तो सबन किशुब बाली का रहा। इस प्रस्ताव के नाम पर बिरोध पत्र अकर जिन्दा रहना चाहिये—इसमें कोई तन्वेह नहीं है, लेकिन जो भूमिका इस प्रस्ताव के सम्बन्ध में भाषको निभाती चाहिये थी, वह आपने नहीं निभाई—यह बात मैं बड़े अफसोस के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, उप-भूनाय में जो जीतने की बात है, तो उप-भूनाय में हमेशा जनता आपोकी-जन की शिताली है। हमेशा से हम यह बेव रहते हैं। जिस समय बन्धारलाय ने हक जीते स्थान में, उस समय भी आप देखिये कि उप-भूनाय में था। एच नमोहर बेमिधाय क्लामामीयार से चुन कर जाये हैं और शायर्य क्लामामी भी उप-भूनाय में आपोकीजन की तरफ से जीत कर जाये हैं। आपने उत्तर प्रेश में भूनाय शायको में क्या कहा कि एक स्थिति के चुने जाने से कोई सरकार बलली नहीं है और आपकी नेता नहीं जा कर आपका पसरती है कि आपोकीजन के साथ पर हमें मोड दीजिए और इससे कोई सरकार गिरेगी शायी नहीं है। जनता ने एक बगल आपकी शिता शिता तो बैसा भी क्लामामीयार एच जी ने कहा कि आप एक वन हातरा रहे हैं। मैं यह कहता हूँ कि इससे कोई सही जजमेंट नहीं निकलेगा।

मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप के 0 वी० का नाम लेते हैं। जब आप के 0 वी० का नाम लेते हैं और कभी के 0 वी० को बन्द करते हैं। मैं आपको बलगा चाहता हूँ कि आप भी हमारे जैसे लोग के 0 वी० की चुनते हैं। के 0 वी० के बारे में राष्ट्रपति भी विचार करने लिये था।

बहु बेव अधिनियम पुकार रहा बहु शिताल देव का शिता है सपनो का प्रथम जब शकाव भारत का शाय विचारता है।

उस अवप्रकाश के सम्बन्ध में यह भी कहा गया है :

कहते हैं उसको अवप्रकाश जो नहीं मरना ये डरना है अग्नि को बसने देख कुछ डर से बच कर जो पटना है ।

श्रीर धाप उसको जेल में बन्द करत थे । धापको बन्धे नहीं आती तो धारा धाप जे० पी० का नाम लेते हैं । मैं धापका कहना है कि धाप लोगों को वैश्विक अधिकार नहीं है कि धाप उनका नाम नै । धाप तो सजय गांधी की बात करत थे । धाप कहते थे, 'सजय गांधी, सजय गांधी' । श्री नारायण बस तिवारी जब उनपर पत्रक में सजय मंत्री थे श्रीर हमारो यहा डा० जगन्नाथ मिश्र जब मुख्य मंत्री थे, तो क्या होना था । मैं हरिजनता की बात पर भी धाराका, क्योंकि धाप उनके बारे में बहुत हल्ला करते है, कि धापके जमाने में क्या हुआ । डा० जगन्नाथ मिश्र, बिहार के मुख्य मंत्री थे श्रीर इन तरह से सब प्रान्तो में कही मिश्र, कही तिवारी श्रीर कही विपारी मुख्य मंत्री हुआ करतें ५ । जब जनता पार्टी की हकूमत आई तो यह पत्रकी बार है कि सब जगहा पर अल्प-संख्यका श्रीर पिछड़ी हुई जातियों के लोगों द्वारा शान्त बन रहा है । पहले इनका मुख्य मंत्री नहीं होता था । जब सजय गांधी जाते थे तो पता नहीं उनका क्या स्टेटमैण्ट होता था । जब वे जाते थे तो श्री नारायण दल तिवारी एरोडूम की तरफ दौड़ते थे । उनका पाव छूने के लिए । हमारे यहा जब डा० जगन्नाथ मिश्र मुख्य मंत्री थे श्रीर जब हम लोग जेल में बन्द थे, तो जब सजय गांधी पटना जाते थे तो व उनका पांव छूने के लिए जान थे श्रीर सजय धामीबर्दा देना था कि 'जब जब त्रिपुो जगन्नाथ 10 वर्ष एक राज करो' यह पत्रक में बात आई है श्रीर वेपार को कांटिम पढ़ी हुई है । धाप प्राधम निष्कारिपु धीर दक्षिण । उनमें यह लिखा है कि सजय गांधी जब विहार गये तो उन्होंने डा० जगन्नाथ मिश्र को धामीबर्दा दिया कि 10 वर्ष एक राज करो । उनका यह पता नहीं था कि दो लाख बाढ़ के जेल में रहने लेकिन 10 वर्ष राज करने का धामीबर्दा उन्होंने डा० जगन्नाथ मिश्र को दिया । इनलिग में यह कहना चाहता है कि धापके यहा व्यक्ति पूजा है । मैं धीर ज्यादा हम बारे में नहीं कहना चाहता क्योंकि यह छोटा मंह, बड़ी बात हो जागी लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता है कि हमारी जो भूखने प्रधान मंत्री है, उन्होंने क्या किया । धाप कोई ऐसा देखा है जहा इतना बड़ा धारमी मलती करना है श्रीर वह माफी न मांगे । अमेरिका में निक्सन ने माफी मागी लेकिन हमारे यहा इतना बड़ा व्यक्ति इतना बड़ा काइप कर धीर उसके ही नाम पर एक पार्टी बनाई जाए ? बोड़े बिना तो धाप जिन्दा रह सकते है लेकिन सब बिना तक जिन्दा रहने वाले नहीं है एक व्यक्ति की बुद्धाई से कर ।

धाप योजना की बात करत है । मेरे पास योजनाओं की पूरी लिस्ट है जो योजनाये धापने बनाई हैं । उन योजनाओ का ही यह नतीजा है कि 1951 में जिस टाटा के पास 116 करोड़ रुपया था, वह धाप 1,000 करोड़ रुपये का मालिक बना हुआ है । जिस बिरला के पास 1951 में 159 करोड़ रुपया थे, वह धाप का योजनाओ के कारण धाप 1,200 करोड़ रुपये का मालिक बन गया है श्रीर जिस मफत दाल श्री रामदत्त 13 करोड़ रुपया थी वह 1975-76 में 284 करोड़ का मालिक बन गया है, जिस माटिन बने के पास 11 करोड़ रुपया थे, पता नहीं धाप उनके पास कितन ज्यादा करोड़ रुपया हो गये है । इस तरह से मेरे पास जाये वड़े परिवार हैं उनमें सरकारी धाकडे हैं । मैं हमसे श्रीर ज्यादा नहीं जाना चाहता लेकिन यह धापकी योजनाओ का फल है । धापने उल्टी दिशा बनाई श्रीर धाप कन्स्युअर रहे । बनी कडा कि खेतों की तरफ ध्यान दो श्रीर कभी किसी धीर चीज पर । इन देश में करोड़ों एकड़ जमीन फाजिल है धीर उन समय धापके नेता कहते थे कि गमना में लेनी करो, छतों पर खेनी करो । इन तरह की योजना धापने बनाई श्रीर मही दिशा में धाप नहीं गये श्रीर जब हमारी सरकार गयी दिशा में जा रही है तो धाप कहते है कि गमन दिशा में हम जा रहे है । उल्टी दूडि है धापकी, तो हम लोग क्या करे । हिनकुरात गावो का देश है धीर गावो में बनना है । हम लोग गावो की तरफ ध्यान देना चाहते है, तो धाप कहते है कि गमन काम है । हम लोग कहते है कि श्वी इन्स्टी के जिम्मे उनका काम रहे कि छोटी इन्स्टीज पर उसका इम्पैक्ट न पड़े, छोटी इन्स्टीज उनसे प्रभावित न हो । छोटी इन्स्टीज के काम-नाम में बाधा नहीं होगी । धापकी नीति उल्टी है जा धापको मुबारक है ।

प्रधम महीदय, छप्पाचार की बात कहते है । हमने ज्यादा छप्पाचार क्या होगा । धाप लोगों ने पडा होगा कि हमारे बिहार के एक एम० एम० एम० थे—धीर नवल किशोर जी । उनकी धीर बातों का तो छोड़ दीजिए, उन्होंने पटना का नेम्बे स्टेशन धीर गांधी मैदान सिक्की रज्य दिशा धीर होना के नाम पर देना उठा लिया । मैं तो धापने रेल मंत्री जी से कहना कि वे पटना जखन के बारे में इक्याथरी बनाय । प्रधम महीदय, यह सब एक एम० एम० एम० का काम था । (अवधान) मैं तो कहता है कि जनता गवर्नमेंट ने गमना से धापने के बाब एक ही गलती की । जनता गवर्नमेंट को चाहिये था कि इन्दिरा गांधी श्रीर सजय गांधी को धीर धाप में से कुछ लोगों को मीमा में बन्द कर देती जिसमें धापको पता चल जाता कि मीमा क्या होता है । जनता सरकार ने धापको इतनी उट दी थीर धाप उनका इतना मात्राजय फायदा उठा रहे हैं ।

प्रधम महीदय, सा एण्ड धांडर का प्रस्न उठाया जाता है धीर कडा जाता है कि सगरब है ।

[श्री राम विलास पासवान]

हिन्दुस्तान में सा एण्ड घाटें क्यों खराब हैं? मैंने उस दिन भी कहा था कि सा एण्ड घाटें को खराब करने के लिए एक प्रायद्वी काफी होता है।

एक ही उल्लू काफी था बर्बाद गुलिस्ता को करने

हूर बास पर उल्लू बैठा है प्रजाम गुलिस्ता क्या होगा ?

देश में एक ही प्रायद्वी सा एण्ड घाटें को खराब करने के लिए काफी है। जब इविरा गांधी सत्रय गांधी से लेकर आप सब लोग कमर कस कर खड़े हो गए हैं कि इस देश में सा एण्ड घाटें की सिचायनन उत्पन्न की जाए हरिजनों पर जल्म डाले जायें तो इसको कौन रोका जा सकता है। अभी एक माघी मुझ से कह रहे थे कि बतारम में कापस के लौगों में ही रामायण को जला दिया और जब उसके मजदूरोंक पड़ने तो कह दिया कि हरिजन में इसको जलाया है। इन्होंने कहा कि यह मामला पेश में आया है। आप चाहते हैं कि देश में ऐसा वातावरण फैले, हिंसा देश में फैले। आप हरिजनों के कंधों पर रख कर बहूक चलाना चाहते हैं। कल हमारे साथी ने बताया कि तमिलनाडु में 1965 में 42 हरिजनों को जिन्दा जला दिया गया। यह मामला कभी धक्काबार में नहीं आया। जब अनुसूचित जाति और अनुसूचित जन जाति कमिश्नर ने अपनी रिपोर्ट पेश की तब यह मामला सामने आया। आप बहुत नेचकी की दुहाई देते हैं। आप यहां हरिजनों की बहुत बात करते हैं। आपकी धर्म नहीं प्राती कि आपने टाइम केपसूल गाहा था। उस समय आप भूल गए कि डा० अम्बेदेकर जो इस संविधान के निर्माता है, उनका नाम तो हम केपसूल में रख दें। किसी का नाम याद रहा हा या न रहा हो लेकिन उनका नाम तो आपका याद रहना चाहिए था। आप केवल धासू बहाने के लिए हरिजनों का नाम लेते हैं।

अध्यक्ष महाशय, कोई भी घटना घटती है तो वह किसी के बम की बात नहीं है। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी या हमारे होम मिनिस्टर हमारे लिए बाहर पहरा नहीं दे सकते हैं। अब कोई प्रायद्वी सबन के बाहर हम को मार दे तो ये लोग क्या कर सकते हैं, कानूनी कार्यवाही ही कर सकते हैं। प्रायद्वी के जमाने में जब हरिजनों पर घटना घटी थी तो आपने क्या कदम उठाये थे और जनता पार्टी की सरकार क्या कदम उठा रही है, इसको हमें देखना है। आपके जमाने में गोरपुर में घटना घटी तो बहुत हल्ला करने पर आपने दो-बो हजार रुपया दिया था। प्राय हरिजनों पर कही भी किसी प्रकार का जुल्म होता है तो गुरस्त सरकार की तरफ से पांच पांच हजार रुपया दिया जाता है। इसकी गुरस्त घोषणा कर दी जाती है। आप केवल हरिजनों के कंधों पर रख कर बहूक चलाना जानते हैं उनके लिए कुछ करना नहीं जानते हैं।

अध्यक्ष महाशय, कहा जाता है कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी डायरेक्टर प्राय बोर्ड हैं। लेकिन मैं कहता हूँ कि हम अपने प्रधान मंत्री जी को डिप्टी डायरेक्टर नहीं बनाया चाहते हैं। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी, हमारी टीम के केप्टन हैं और वे टीम के केप्टन की तरह काम कर रहे हैं।

मैं विदेश नीति के सम्बन्ध में भी कुछ कहना चाहता था लेकिन समय नहीं है, इसलिए समाप्त कर रहा हूँ।

SHRI RAGAVALU MOHANARAN-GAM (Chengalpattu) Mr Speaker, Sir, I am very glad to-day that you have given me this opportunity to speak on the motion of no-confidence tabled by the Leader of the Opposition Shri Stephen

One of the Janata Party Members while speaking on this motion said that they can't understand why no-confidence motion is being tabled like this in the last thirteen months' Janata rule?

Mr Speaker, Sir, in the Tamilnadu Assembly, within six months a no-confidence motion was moved and that was supported by the Janata Party Members on the floor of the House. If that is the case, I do not understand why the Members of the Janata Party are creating so many complications whenever they speak on the no-confidence motion. I do not want to go into details of what has happened in the last thirteen months' Janata rule. I would of course like to point out only two or three major points. Due to constraint of time limit, I would only ask first of all as to why, as Mr. Stephen just now pointed out, they have increased by 2 paise per k.w. of power. It was discussed already by the Leader of the Opposition Shri Stephen and so I am not going to touch that point

But, with regard to the procurement price of paddy, I would like to say that it was Rs 75 whereas the price for wheat has been increased to Rs 112. We had been asking for the past six months for a rise in the procurement price of paddy. With the

coming into power of the Janata Government, I thought they would definitely increase the procurement price of the paddy. But, for the past one and half years or so, the same has not been increased at all whereas the price of wheat is unnecessarily and deliberately being increased. It may be for the simple reason that in Southern States, we consume only paddy but in North they consume wheat.

It is no exaggeration if I point out one thing. During the recent natural calamities in the Tamilnadu and Andhra Pradesh, they were not given proper assistance by the Centre. They had given Rs. 37 crores for Tamilnadu—not as a grant but as a part of the plan allocation. We had been suffering very much in Tamilnadu. Our party is ruling the Tamilnadu for more than one year or so but still we are not getting proper assistance from the Central Government.

I will now come to the language issue. I do not know why our top leaders speak in Hindi. This morning exactly at about 12 noon or so Shri Jagjivan Ram stood up to speak. I thought he would speak in English. He has been a Minister for the past thirty years or so and I thought he would speak in English. But he spoke in Hindi. My mother-tongue is Telugu. I can understand Telugu. I could have understood properly if he had spoken in English—international language. I do not want to use ear-phone to listen to the translation because that is not perfectly all right.

The main thing I want to stress is the language issue. As regards procurement price of paddy or any other thing at any time we can solve that problem. I lay stress on the language issue only. Thirty years have gone by. Mr. Speaker, I am not a citizen of Tamilnadu—I am a citizen of India; according to Indian Constitution, Dual citizenship is not allowed. I have been coming to Parliament all the way from Madras. I hear the leaders

speaking in Hindi and not in other Indian languages. I would not be surprised even if Mr. Morarji Deesai, while replying to the debate, speaks in Hindi. That is all that is going on here. I want that advantages and disadvantages should be equally distributed. I know Tamil language. Our forefathers spoke Tamil quoted even scripture in Tamil Even if Mr. Ramachandran wants to speak in Tamil I would definitely ask him to speak only in English. I am not having such a mean mentality. The English language is a force through which we can express our ideas in this House. Why should I unnecessarily speak in a language which is followed only by a handful of Members. Mr. Dubey who has passed his B.A. (Hons.) in the year 1934 from the London University speaks in Hindi. Our Prime Minister speaks in Hindi. Almost all the Ministers who know English only speak in Hindi. I hope all the Ministers and Members who know English will start speaking in English and thereby make other Members understand as to what they speak.

Mr. Speaker, it is not the intention of my party to topple or just make the Janata Party get down from power but it is our intention to point out the defects and ask them to rectify the same. Whenever there is a change for me to point out the defects I try to point out the defects but now in the name of No Confidence Motion I was given an opportunity to point out the defects and so I have done it. I hope the Janata Government would definitely rectify those defects. With these words I conclude my speech.

श्री मोहनदास शंकी कुरेशी (अनन्तनाथ) :  
स्वीकर साहब, आप ने थापती मर्जी के मुताबिक एक सेक्टर मोशन भूष करने की इजाजत दी है। लेकिन कल से ऐसा लग रहा है कि यहाँ पर दो नो-कॉन्फिडेंस मोशन चल रहे हैं। एक हमारी तरफ से जो एक जिन्दा हुकूमत के खिलाफ है जो हाकई फजान कर रही है, उसके खिलाफ नो-कॉन्फिडेंस है, दूसरी तरफ से उनका नो-कॉन्फिडेंस है एक ऐसी गवर्नमेंट के खिलाफ जो थाप मौजूद नहीं है, मोडो-कॉन्फिडेंस कर रहे हैं।

[श्री मोहम्मद काफी बुरेकी]

द्विपरा गांधी की गवर्नमेंट के साथ। आप यह देखें जो तकरीर इनके बड़े-बड़े म्हालफाउंडेशन की हैं उसमें सिराफ हमके कि पिछली गवर्नमेंट ने क्या किया, क्या नहीं किया, और कोई मबाव नजर नहीं आता। कल हमारे दोस्त क्याम बाबू ने कहा हिज्जे मुश्तालिक आप्रीमीशन की तकरीरों में दम नहीं है। हम यह मानते हैं। हमें इसका गम नहीं है कि हम में दम नहीं है। लेकिन कमाल तो हम बाव का है कि आपका दौर में आप तक जीन हैं, हमें ता यही ताज्जुब हाना है कि जीने कैम है ?

मोरारजी देसाई का मैं बहुत गहतर्म करना हूँ, बहुत बजुर्ग है। उन्होंने रफा है कि अगर हुकूमत चलनी करे तो आपका हक टाना है कि मेरे कान खींचे। मैं उनका बान तक पहुंचना नहीं चाहता क्योंकि वह बहुत बजुर्ग है, मैं उनके बराबरे तक भी पहुंचना नहीं चाहता क्योंकि वह मैं नहीं चाहता, लेकिन भूधे अफफाम है, जब भी उनमें पूछा कि आपने क्या किया ता वह हमेशा यह कहते हैं कि हमन बहुत कुछ किया, लोगों की उबाने हमने खोल दी है। लोगों की जवान आपने खोल दी है मोगारजी भाई, लेकिन अपने बान बन्द कर लिया है। हमें तो अफफाम इस बात का है कि लाग जतनी ज्वादा आबाज से आपका पुकारन है उतन ही ज्वादा आपके कान बन्द हो चके हैं। टोटै मिलिटरी जो आपके हैं उनके छोटै तरीके पर कान बन्द हुए हैं आप तो नडी बुर्मा पर हैं, आपके बान तो खुले हाने चाहिए थे, आपको तो बात सुननी चाहिए थी और चाहिये थी।

मैंने मालम है कि जो यह अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव है यह अफफामन का पाम एक बहुत बड़ा हथियार होना है। इनका इस्तमाल नहीं तरीके से करना चाहिए। मैं इस बान में जाना नहीं चाहता, इंग्रिज के मामले में, मुस्लिम के मामले में य जल्ज होले रहें हैं और अगर यह आपकी पामिसी जारी रहती तो ये जल्ज होते रहेगे। लेकिन आपका एक बात की चेतावनी मैं देना चाहता हूँ कि आज हिन्दुस्तान का गरीब और बड़ा हुआ इमान जाग उठा है। दुनिया की कोई ताकत उसे अब मुला नहीं सकती न आप मुला सकते हैं, न हम मुला मकन है। नीस चालीस करोड़ आदमी आज हिन्दुस्तान में गेमे हैं जो सुबून के नेबेल के नीचे हैं, जो गरीबी की रेखा के नीचे हैं। तोम चालीस करोड़ इमानो को हमन हमेशा मज्जबाग दिखायो। मेरी बकीरे आजम साहब ने यहाँ विनती है कि अगर आपने इन लोगों के लिए कुछ नहीं किया तो यकीन रखिए कि जिम तरीके से जनता ने गुस्से में आकर हमें हटा दिया था, जनता का गुस्सा आपके ऊपर भी उतर सकता है और आपको भी हटाया जा सकता है। आज पामियामेंट के हाथ से मुश्मामला है, कल क्या होगा मालम नहीं। आपने अपनी पामिसी की बजह से मालम सटकी और बाजारी पर पहुंचा दिया है। मैं

एक ही बात आपसे कहूंगा और एक ही बात काफी है आपको इस बात के लिए कि आप इन हुकूमत से इस्तीफा दे और वह यह कि जनता का विश्वास आपसे उठ सकता है। लोगों का एक एतफाद बज्ज हो चुका है। लोग आज ममझते हैं कि यहा पर कोई हुकूमत नहीं है। खुद आपकी अपनी पार्टी वाले जब भी कभी बोलना चाहते हैं मबाई से अपने दिल पर हाथ रख कर उस बकन उनके दिल से मन्की आबाज निकलती है और ममझता हूँ कि यही एक बड़ा वजह है जिसकी बिना पर हमें यह अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव आपके खिलाफ लाना पचा। मुझे आपका एहनराम है। आप हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री हैं। हिन्दुस्तान की मरफदो की डिफाज्जल करन बाने हमारे नोजवान दिन-रात हिमालय की पहाड़िया पर, बर्फानो चाँदिया पर यह बह कर हिन्दुस्तान की मरफदो की डिफाज्जल करन है कि यह हमारा मुक है, यह हमारी धरती माना है। आपने उनको भी नहीं बरखा है कुछ बयानात आपने गेमे दिये है जिससे मुल्क में अन्दर और बाहर आपने आकक पैदा कर दिये है। लेकिन आपने एक जम्मा बह कर उनका विश्वास अज्ज कर दिया है। आपने कहा कि हमन मारिकम को इम्मानन रीर-इखलाबी तरीके से गनेकम किया है। अदारा मझे बताइये कि ता मिपाही क्या पर मौजद है और भारत की मरफदो की डिफाज्जल कर रहे है, क्या अब वह उमी तरह पूर यकीन के साथ हमारी मरफदो की डिफाज्जल करेगा। क्या आपने उसके दिल में यह बहम नहीं छाल दिया है कि हमने इस टेंगेटी पर कब्जा कर रखा है और वह एक प्रावुपाइड इनाका का डिफंड कर रहा है ? आपने इस किन्म में खयालात मुल्क में फैलाये है। इस बिना पर भी आपको हट जाना चाहिए।

15 hrs

बाहर के मुल्का में जो खुद-गनमारी, सेल्फ-रेमायिम, या एटमार्किथर हिन्दुस्तान ने बनाया था आपने उनको भी टुकड़े टुकड़े कर दिये हैं, उनको भी पाग-पाग कर दिया है। आपको पामे गत टन यूरेनियम के लिए अमरीका के मामले में भिन्नानियो की तरह आपनी सोली फैलाती पडती है। (अव्यथान) आपने साईम और टेकनालोजी का गला घोट कर यह माबित करना चाहा है कि हिन्दुस्तान का हबाग बरस पीछे चला गया है। आज बाहर की दुनिया में हमारा मबाक उठ रहा है।

मुझे अफफाम है कि बिदेश मन्त्री यहाँ पर नहीं है। लेकिन हमें मालम है कि गम की आबाज को भरन में अपने तल्ल पर रखा था। उसकी एक पामर्या है। हम उस पर फज्ज करने है, हम उसकी इच्छत करते हैं। लेकिन हमें यह मालम नहीं था कि आप अमरीका में एक गेसा राजदूत भेजेंगे, जो बिसेख लिबियन

कार्टर के पांव से पड़ कर उसकी कपल का नाप लेया। किसे मालूम था कि हजारों बरसों के बाद हिन्दुस्तान में एक ऐसी हुकूमत घायिगी, जो भारत को खडाऊ का सबक भूल कर एक ऐसे शासन से, जो हिन्दुस्तान का राजदूत बन कर बहा पर गया है, जो हिन्दुस्तान की इज्जत और आबक का राजदूत बन कर गया है, अगर वह आज लिलियन कार्टर के पांव चाट सकता है, तो कन वह कार्टर के पांव चाट सकता है, किसी बड़े से बड़े सरभायादार मुल्क के लीडर के पांव चाट सकता है। आपने बाहरी मुल्कों में हिन्दुस्तान की इज्जत को कम कर दिया है।

कन किमी सदस्य ने कहा कि हिन्दुस्तान का होम मिनिस्टर एम्परेर नहीं है। अगर हिन्दुस्तान का होम मिनिस्टर एम्परेर नहीं है, मगर वह एम्परेर बनन का स्वाभ उम्मेद देख रहा है। मुझे शकसात इस बात का है कि जब भी उनमें बात की जाती है कि आप हिन्दुस्तान की ला एट्ट आर्डर मशीनरी का पूरा खयाल रखिये, तो बड़ कहते हैं कि इसमें मेरा ताल्लुक नहीं है, हममें ता स्टेट्स का ताल्लुक है। लेकिन जब स्टेट्स की मिनिस्ट्रीज का डिमार्शन करने, या उन पर हमला करने, का मौका आता है, जो कि कानूनी तौर पर जायज है, तो उस वकन वह हिन्दुस्तान के होम मिनिस्टर है। लेकिन जब गरीब मजदूरों और श्रमिकों का मारा जाता है, तो उस वकन वह कहते हैं कि यह मामला मेरा नहीं है, यह तो स्टेट्स का मामला है। मिमट-सिमटा कर वह दिल्ली के होम मिनिस्टर रहते हैं। लेकिन जब दिल्ली में कोई खराबी हा जाती है, तो वह कहते हैं कि यह मेरा मामला नहीं है, यह ता दिल्ली प्रजातन का मामला है। तो एक ही होम रह जाता है, और वह उनका अपना घर है, जिनके वह मिनिस्टर हैं। अगर आप मसलत है कि आपका होम मिनिस्टर सिर्फ अपने ही होम का मिनिस्टर है, तो आप क्यों नहीं उनको मिनिस्टर बनीर पोर्टफोलियो बना देते ? क्यों हमारी उम्मीद ऐंभे शासन पर लगा रखी है, जियने आज नक मजदूरों, गरीबों और बने हुए सबके के लोगों को टियर गैस, लाठी-चार्ज और गोसियों से जबाब दिया है ? इस बात पर भी आपको इस्तीफा देना चाहिये।

खेत हो या खनिजान हो, कालेज हो या मुनिशपिटो हो, दफतर हो या कारखाना हो, सबक हो या कृषा हो, हर जगह हा-हाकार मचा हुआ है। आज कानून की शक्तिया उडाई जा रही है, कानून का मजाक उडाया जा रहा है। मैं इस छोटी बात में नहीं जाऊंगा कि आप ने इतने शक्तिरत्नों को मारा और इतने मजदूरों को गोली से उडा दिया। लेकिन आप कल्लुण की "राजतरनिष्ठी" को पहिये। काश्मीर के लोगों को पहली बफा हक मिला था एक राजा बनने का। उन्होंने एक राजा चुन लिया, लेकिन राजा की प्यास तभी बुझा करती थी,

जब बहा पर हर रोज एक बलि होती थी। एक इंसान की बलि दी जाती थी। आप अपना एक मान और तीन महोने का घस्रा ले लीजिये। आप बिल्लुण उसी हिमाव से एक नहीं, बल्कि दो-दो इन्सानों की बलि रोज ले रहे हैं। अगर कोई कमी होम मिनिस्ट्री को तरफ से हुई है, तो उनका रोजने मिनिस्ट्री न पूरा कर लिया है, क्योंकि हर हुपत और हर रोज कोई न कोई चुपेटना हाती है, जियमें लोग मरते रहते हैं। आखिर आप बुधमन क्यों बनना चाहते हैं ? हमें आपने बड़ी उम्मीद और तबबकु है कि आप इग मुल्क में जम्हूरी निजाम और जम्हूरी कब्जे का मजबत बनायेंगे। और हम हममें भी आपका माय द सबने है।

रेल मंत्री (प्रो० मधु बंधवते) नव में बडा एफिमेट 26 जन 1975 को हुआ।

श्री मोहम्मद शफी कुरेशी फिर बरी बात ! स्पिकर साहब, यह ऐसी बात है, यही दलील हिन्दुस्तान के होम मिनिस्टर देते है कि 1965 में 600 हरिजन मारे गये थे, आज तो 200 ही मारे है 100 की और गुंजाइश है मारने को। इस किस का बात आप करते है। मैं कहना है कि आपको जब हुकूमत मिली है तो आप अपने आपका हुकूमत करने के काबिल साबित करे। पिछली हुकूमत की नुस्तान-चीनी करने से आपको कुछ नहीं मिलेगा। आपने जब हुकूमत सभाली आपन कानूनी हुकूमत का ऐलाज किया।

इसमें सबसे ज्यादा आप यह कहते है कि आप इमाफ करण। यहा कानून क मंत्री बैठे है। आपने कहा कि इग एक आदमी के साथ इमाफ करण। लेकिन इमाफ आपने क्या किया ? क्या यह हकीकत नहीं है कि मुल्कम को मिनिस्टर बनाया ? उनके जा गुनाह थे उन पर परखा डाल कर आपने उन विश्वास को तोड दिया है जो आप लोगों ने कायम करना चाहते थे कि आप इस मुल्क में इमाफ की और कानून की हुकूमत लायेंगे। मेरे पास होम मिनिस्ट्री का एक जबाब थाया है एक मंत्री के बारे में, मैं उनका नाम नहीं लेना चाहना, उनके खिलाफ एम्बेजमेंट का एक केस था। मैंने प्रधान मंत्री को भी लिखा था। लेकिन उसका जबाब क्या है :

"These cases have been dragging on for the last 13 years. The Delhi Administration were advised that in case the infringement of the law was only of a technical nature and there was no evidence to show that the individual against whom prosecution was instituted had personally benefited, there would be justification for withdrawal of these cases."

### [श्री मोहम्मद सफी कुरेशी]

केवल प्रभावशाली से कहे हैं, एक्टिव प्रभावशाली में होती है लेकिन प्रभावशाली की एक तरह कोष कर की प्रभावशाली बहा पर नवाहों के हुए हैं उसकी प्रायः काल करता है ? दिल्ली एक्टिविस्ट्स का बौर वह प्रभावशाली करता है कि इस सबी को मुजरिम करार बिना जाये या न करार दिया जाये । आपने कानून की प्रणियवा उठा दी है । आपने गरीब धारणी के विनाश में यह यकीन पैदा कर दिया है कि आपका कानून आपके सबी के लिए नहीं है जो मुजरिम मानित हुआ है, आपका कानून बेबना और बेबसी के लिए है । इन्फिग में कल्ला है आज यह तो एक बहुत बड़ी बजह है कि आपकी दुश्मनी के खिलाफ यह प्रविष्टिवा का प्रस्ताव बिलकुल हकबजाव है । इसमें कोई डा गाय नहा है मकतो कि आप इन्फिग पसन्द नहा । आपका कानून मी के लिए प्रलय और गरीब के लिए प्रलय है ।

इसमें बाद मूल प्रपनाम है कन कुछ सोया न सो मिनाने वा है यहा पर जो शमनाम है एक माहब न यह कना मुडा ता वह पन्त हुए शम धानी है मरनी मनोर जागी गान्ध न कहा कि एक गांध धम रहा वा । म ता कहा है कि इस मत्व म एक हा माड प्रमना है जो जनता का मान है जो गगा है जिसकी न मुरत है न शकल है । हा यह जगर बात है कि उमने पीछे पीछे गरीब प्रभाव प्रभा प्रभाव प्यागा प्रभाव मजदूम जनता चमती है । लेकिन इस सार व और डिस्स न बह हात विनाश बहा होता ता वह कुछ समझ नकता वा । (स्वप्रवास)

श्री एच० एस० पटवारी (मंगलदाई)  
वह साड नहीं है शेर है । गाय क पीछ प्रमने बायो माय रको वह शेर है ।

श्री मोहम्मद सफी कुरेशी मरी एक ही दरबान्त है कि पटवारी साहब जब बोला कर ता खडे हा जाया कने यही पता नहीं लगता कि वह खडे है या बैठे हैं । जनता कागज का शेर है ।

श्री एच० एस० पटवारी यह देखिए इतिहा गांधी क्या कर रही हैं गाय क्या कर रही है ?

श्री मोहम्मद सफी कुरेशी मैंने होम मिनिल्ट्री और देलवे मिनिल्ट्री के मुतास्विक बोला सा इकारा ही किया लेकिन आज जब हम प्रलय प्रलय मिनिल्ट्री की कार्यकर्मी देखते हैं कि प्रलय प्रलय मिनिल्ट्री किस तरीके से काम करती है तो मुझे अफसोस होता है कि कोई भी मिनिल्ट्री अपना काम पूरे तरीके से नहीं कर रही है । लोगों का एलमाव गवर्नमेंट से बरख होता जा रहा है । जब एमपी मिनिल्ट्री के जो मिनिल्टर हैं उन्होंने किसी से शिकायत की है कि जब वह कैबिनेट की मीटिंग में बैठते हैं तो क्योंकि तमाम बातें

वहाँ किसी में होती है इसलिए वह नहीं समझ पाते कि वहाँ पर क्या फैसले होते हैं । वह कहते हैं कि जो जोकोमी की मारी है जिसकी बजह से मीटिंग के, कटिनाइवर के और दूसरी चीजों के कारनामे प्रायः बैठ गये हैं, वह नहीं जानते कि हुकूमत उतने क्या करना चाहती है । क्योंकि वह जनता में पराये लगते हैं । वह हाक मारी मिनिल्टरो का है ।

मैं इनमें नहीं आउगा कि जनता पार्टी एक रगनी है या रगनी है । जनता पार्टी अमर रटना है ता गटे लेकिन मूल नहीं टटना चाहिए । इन मन्त्री व माय में हम प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करता हूँ और इस हुकूमत से इतिहा करना है मोघरवाता कि हम मन्त्र का बरिशाप बहुत कुछ प्रस्ताव कर सकें । वयन उस मिला । व - बहुत कुछ बन दी वा ।

### شہری متحد شہوم قریبی

انگ ( سمہکو صاحب - آپ نے اپنی مرضی نے مطابق ادک سنڈر مرشن صوة کوئے کی اشارت دی ہے - لیکن کل سے ایسا لگ رہا ہے یہاں ہر دو نوکونسیڈینس حل رہے ہیں - 'یک ہماری طرف سے دو ایک رمدہ حکومت کے خلاف ہے - جو واقعی لٹکھ کر وہی ہے - اس کے خلاف نوکونسیڈینس ہے - دوسری طرف ان کا نوکونسیڈینس ہے - ایک ایسی گورنمنٹ کے خلاف - و آج موجود نہیں ہے - شہدو پیاکسنک کر رہے ہیں اندرا گاندھی کی گورنمنٹ کے ساتھ مگر آپ یہ دیکھیں جو تقریریں ان کے ہرے ہرے سٹالوائزوں نے کی ہیں ان میں سوائے اس کے بچھلی گورنمنٹ نے کیا کیا - کہا نہیں کیا - اور کوئی مواد نظر نہیں آتا - کل ہمارے دوست شام ہاہو نے کہا کہ جلد ہی مخالف اپوزیشن کی تقریروں میں دم نہیں ہے - ہم یہ مانتے ہیں ہمیں اس کا دم نہیں ہے کہ ہم میں

دم نہیں ہے - لیکن کمال تو اس بات کا ہے کہ آپ کے دور میں آج تک چوتھے ہوں - ہمیں تو یہی تعجب ہوتا ہے کہ چہتے کسے ہوں -

شری مزارچی دیسائی کا میں بہت احترام کرتا ہوں بہت بزرگ ہوں - انہوں نے کہا ہے کہ اگر حکومت غلطی کرے تو آپ کا حق ہوتا ہے کہ وہ میرے کان کھینچے - میں ان کے کان تک نہیں پہنچتا چاہتا - کیونکہ وہ بہت بزرگ ہیں میں ان کے دروازے تک نہیں پہنچتا چاہتا - کیونکہ وہ بھی نہیں چاہتا - لیکن میری افسوس ہے کہ جب بھی ان سے پوچھا کہ آپ نے کیا کہا وہ ہمیشہ یہ کہتے ہیں - کہ ہم نے بہت کچھ کہا - لوگوں کی زبانوں ہم نے کھولدی ہیں - لوگوں کی زبانیں آپ نے کھول دی ہیں مزارچی بھائی - لیکن اچھے کان بند کر لیتے ہیں - ہمیں تو افسوس اس بات کا ہے کہ لوگ جنٹلی زیادہ آواز سے آپ کو پکارتے ہیں - اتنے ہی زیادہ آپ کے کان بند ہو چکے ہیں - چوتھے ماسٹر جو آپ کے ہیں اتنے چوتھے طریقے پر کان بند ہوئے ہیں - آپ تو بڑی کرسی پر ہیں - آپ کے تو کان کیلے ہوئے چاہئے تھے - آپ کو تو بات سنانی چاہئے تھی - اور چاہئے ہی -

مجھے معلوم ہے کہ جو یہ اوشراہی کا ہوستا ہے وہ اپوزیشن کے پاس ایک

بہت بڑا مہنگا ہوتا ہے - اس کا استعمال صحیح طریقے سے کرنا چاہئے - میں اس بات میں جانا نہیں چاہتا ہری جن کے معاملے میں مسلم کے معاملہ میں یہ ظلم ہونے رہے ہیں - اور اگر یہ آپکی پانچویں جاری رہی تو یہ ظالم ہوتے رہیں گے - لیکن آپ کو ایک بات کی چھتارنی میں دینا چاہتا ہوں کہ آج ہندوستان کا دہا ہوا فریب اور دہا ہوا انسان جاگ چکا ہے دنیا کی کورٹ طاقت اب اسے مٹا نہیں سکتی - نہ آپ سا سکتے ہیں - اور نہ ہم انہیں سلا سکتے ہیں - تیس چالوس کروڑ آدمی آج ہندوستان میں ایسے ہوں جو فریب کے لیول سے نیچے ہیں - جو فریبی کی دیکھا کے نیچے ہیں - تیس - چالوس کروڑ انسانوں کو ہم نے ہمیشہ سب سے باغ دکھایا - میری وزہر آغلام صاحب سے یہ بتتی ہے کہ اگر آپ نے ان لوگوں کے لئے کچھ نہیں کیا تو تمہیں دکھئے کہ جس طریقے سے جلنا نے قصے میں آکر ہمیں ہٹا دیا تھا - جلنا کا قصہ آپ کے اوپر بھی آو سکتا ہے - اور آپ کو بھی ہٹایا جا سکتا ہے - آج پارلیمنٹ کے ہاتھ میں معاملہ ہے - کل کہا ہوا - یہ معلوم نہیں آپ نے اپنی پالیسی کی وجہ سے یہ معاملہ سوکوں اور بازاروں تک پہنچا دیا ہے - میں آپ کی بات آپ سے کہوں گا اور ایک ہی بات کافی ہے - آپ تو اس

[شہری مصمد شفقی قریبی]

ہات کے لئے کہ آپ اس حکومت سے استعفیٰ دیں اور وہ یہ جڈنا کا وشواہی آپ سے اتہ چکا ہے - لوگوں کا امتقاد ختم ہو چکا ہے - لوگ آج سمجھتے ہیں کہ یہاں کوئی حکومت نہیں ہے - خورد آیکی اپنی پارٹی والے جب بھی ہولنا چاہتے ہیں سچائی سے اپنے دل پر ہاتھ رکھ کر اس وقت ان کے دل سے سچی آواز نکلتی ہے - اور میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ یہی ایک بڑی وجہ ہے کہ جسکی بنا پر ہمیں یہ اوشوہ کا پرستار آپ کے خلاف لانا پڑا -

مجھے آپ کا احترام ہے کہ آپ ہندوستان کے پردھان منتری ہیں - ہندوستان کی سرحدوں کی حفاظت کرنے والے ہمارے نوجوان دن رات ہمالیہ کی پہاڑیوں پر برفانی چوٹیوں پر یہ کہہ کر ہندوستان کی سرحدوں کی حفاظت کرتے ہیں کہ یہ ہمارا ملک ہے - یہ ہماری دھرتی مانا ہے - آپ نے ان کو بھی نہیں بخشا کچھ بہانات آپ نے ایسے دئے ہیں - جس سے ملک کے اندر اور باہر آپ نے شکرگ پھدا کر دئے ہیں - لیکن آپ نے ایک جملہ کہہ کر ان کا وشواہی ختم کو دیا ہے - آپ نے کہا کہ ہم نے سکم کو اصول فہر اخلاقی طریقے سے انہکس کہا ہے - خدارا مجھے بتائے کہ جو سہاہی وہاں پر

موجود ہیں اور بھارت کی سرحدوں کی حفاظت کر رہے ہیں کہا اب وہ اسی طرح پورے یقین کے ساتھ ہماری سرحدوں کی حفاظت کرے گا - کہا آپ نے ان کے دل میں یہ وہم نہیں ڈال دیا ہے کہ ہم نے اس علاقہ پر قبضہ کر رکھا ہے اور وہ ایک اکیوٹیڈ تھری ٹری کو ڈیڈینڈ کر رہا ہے - آپ نے اس قسم کے خیالات ملک میں پھیلائے ہیں اس بنا پر بھی آپ کو ہٹ جانا چاہئے -

باہر کے ملکوں میں جو خود اعتمادی، سلف ریلانوس کا ایٹمو سلہر ہندوستان میں بڈایا تھا - آپ نے اس کے بھی ٹکڑے ٹکڑے کر ڈئے ہیں - ان کو بھی پلہ پلہ کر دیا ہے - آپ کو ہونے سات تن ہورینڈھا کے لئے امریکہ کے سامنے ہیکاریوں کی طرح اپنی جھولی پھیلانی پڑتی ہے - (انٹرنیشن) آپ نے سائٹس اور ٹوکیولوجی کا کلا گورنٹ کر یہ ثابت کرنا چاہا ہے کہ ہندوستان ۲۰۰۰ برس پھچھے چلا گیا ہے آج باہر کی دنیا میں ہمارا مزاق از رہا ہے -

مجھے افسوس ہے کہ ہڈیشی منتری یہاں پر نہیں ہیں - لیکن ہمیں معلوم ہے کہ رام کی کھواروں کو بھرت نے اپنے تخت پر رکھا تھا ان کی ایک پرہ پڑا ہے - ہمیں ان پر فخر ہے ہم اس کی عزت کرتے ہیں - لیکن ہمیں یہ معلوم نہیں تھا کہ آپ

امریکہ میں ایک ایسا راج دولت  
 بھجھانگے جو مسٹر لیامین کاؤٹر کے  
 پاؤں میں پڑ کر اس کی چھل کا  
 ناپ لیتا - کسی معلوم تھا کہ ہٹاؤں  
 برسوں کے بعد ہندوستان میں ایک  
 ایسی حکومت اٹھے گی جو بھرت کی  
 کوڑوں کا سبق نول کر ایک ایسے  
 شخص سے جو ہندوستان کا راج دولت  
 بن کر وہاں گیا ہے - جو ہندوستان  
 کی عہت اور آبرو کا راج دولت بن کر  
 گیا ہے - اگر وہ آج وہ لیامین کاؤٹر کے  
 پاؤں چات سکتا ہے تو کل وہ کاؤٹر  
 نے پاؤں چات سکتا ہے - کسی بڑے  
 سے بڑے سرمائے دار منک کے لیڈر کے  
 پاؤں چات سکتا ہے آپ نے باہری  
 ملکوں میں ہندوستان کی عہت کو  
 کم کر دیا ہے - کل کسی سندسہ نے  
 کہا کہ ہندوستان کا گڑا منتری ایمپور  
 نہیں ہے اگر ہندوستان کا ہوم منتری  
 ایمپور نہیں ہے مگر وہ ایمپور بلجے کا  
 خواب ضرور دیکھ رہا ہے - منجھ  
 افسوس اس بات کا ہے کہ جب ہی  
 اس سے بات کی جاتی ہے کہ آپ  
 ہندوستان کی لائیڈ مشینری کا خیال  
 رکھے تو وہ کہتے ہیں کہ اس سے میرا  
 تعلق نہیں ہے - اس سے تو سمیت کا  
 تعلق ہے - لیکن جب سٹیمس کی  
 منسٹریز کو تسمس کرنے یا ان پر  
 زیادتی کرنے کا موقع مل جاتا ہے  
 جو کہ قانونی طور پر جائز ہے تو اس  
 وقت وہ ہندوستان کے ہوم منسٹر  
 ہیں - لیکن جب فریڈم، مظلوموں

اور اقلیتوں کو مارا جاتا ہے تو اس  
 وقت وہ کہتے ہیں کہ یہ میرا معاملہ  
 نہیں ہے یہ تو سمیت کا معاملہ ہے -  
 سمیت سٹا کر وہ دلی کے ہوم منسٹر  
 رکھے ہیں لیکن جب دلی میں کوئی  
 خرابی ہو جاتی ہے تو وہ کہتے ہیں  
 کہ یہ میرا معاملہ نہیں ہے یہ دلی  
 پورشاشن کا معاملہ ہے - تو ایک ہی  
 ہوم وہ جاتا ہے اور وہ ہے ان کا گھر -  
 جس کے وہ منسٹر ہیں اگر آپ  
 سمجھتے ہیں کہ آپ کا ہوم منسٹر اپنے  
 ہی ہوم کا منسٹر ہے تو آپ کہیں نہیں  
 ان کو منسٹر بھیر پورٹ فولیو بنا  
 دیتے - کہوں ہماری امید ایک ایسے  
 شخص پر لگا رکھی ہے جس نے آج  
 تک مظلوموں اور فریڈم اور دیے ہوئے  
 عدل کے لوگوں کو تھکر گھس لاتی ہے  
 چارج اور گولیوں سے جواب دیا ہے -  
 اس بات پر ہی آپ کو استعفا دینا  
 چاہئے -

کھیت ہوں یا کھیاں ہوں کالج  
 ہو یا برنہورسٹی ہو دفتر ہو یا  
 کارخانہ سوک ہو یا کوچہ ہو ہر  
 طرف ہا ہا کار مچا ہوا ہے - آج قانون  
 کی دھجھیاں اڑائی جا رہی ہیں -  
 قانون کا مذاق اڑایا جا رہا ہے - میں  
 اس بات میں نہیں چاہتا کہ آپ نے  
 اتنے ہی جلدوں کو مارا اور اتنے مظلوموں  
 کو ڈلی سے آڑا دیا - لیکن آج آپ  
 کلہن کی راج ترنگلی کو پڑھیے -  
 کشمیر کے لوگوں کو پہلی نعمت حق

[شری محصد شفیع قریشی]

10. تھا راجہ چلنے کا - انہوں نے ایک راجہ چن لیا - لیکن راجہ کی یہاں تب ہی بچھا کرتی تھی جب وہاں پر ہر روز ایک بلی ہوتی تھی - ایک انسان کی بلی دی جاتی تھی - آپ ایسا ایک سال تین مہینے کا عرصہ لے لیجئے - آپ نے بالکل اسی حساب سے ایک نہیں بلکہ دو دو انسانوں کی بلی ہر روز لے رہے ہیں - اگر کوئی کمی ہوم منسٹری کی طرف سے ہوتی ہے تو ایسے ریپورٹس منسٹری نے پورا کر دیا ہے - کیونکہ ہر ہفتے اور ہر روز کوئی نا کوئی درگھٹانا ہوتی ہے جس میں لوگ مرتے رہتے ہیں - آخر آپ لوگوں کے دشمن کہوں بلنا چاہتے ہیں - ہمیں آپ سے بڑی امیدیں اور توقع ہے کہ آپ اس ملک میں جمہوری نظام اور جمہوری قدروں کو مضبوط بنائیں گے - اور ہم اس میں آپ کا ساتھ دے سکتے ہیں -

ریل منسٹری پرنسپسز مدو دنڈوتے :

سب سے بڑا ایکسپڈیٹ ۲۶ جون 1970 کو ہوا -

شری محصد شفیع قریشی : پھر

وہی بات - سیکر صاحب یہ ایسی بات ہے یہ دلیل ہندوستان کے ہوم منسٹر دیتے ہیں - کہ 19۶0 میں ۶۰۰ ہریجن مارے گئے تھے - آج تو

۲۰۰ ہی مارے گئے ہیں - ۲۰۰ کی اور گھنٹا گھنٹے کی - اس قسم کی بات آپ کرتے ہیں - میں کہتا ہوں کہ جب آپ کو حکومت ملی ہے تو آپ اپنے آپ کو حکومت کرنے کے قابل ٹاہیں کریں - پچھلی حکومت کی نقطہ چینی کرنے سے آپ کو کچھ نہیں ملے گا - آپ نے جب حکومت سنبھالی آپ نے قانونی حکومت کا اعلان کیا -

اس میں سب سے زیادہ آپ بہ کہتے ہیں کہ پ انصاف پسند کریں گے - یہاں ڈالوں کے ملتوی ہوتے ہیں - آپ نے کہا کہ ہر ایک آدمی کے ساتھ انصاف کریں گے - لیکن انصاف آپ نے کیا کیا - کیا یہ حقیقت نہیں ہے کہ ملزم کو منسٹر بنایا - ان کے جو گناہ تھے ان پر پردا ڈال کر آپ نے اس وشواہ کو توڑ دیا ہے جو آپ لوگوں میں قائم کرنا چاہتے تھے کہ آپ اس ملک میں انصاف کی اور قانون کی حکومت لائیں گے - سرورے پانس ہوم منسٹری کا ایک جواب آیا ہے - ایک ملتوی کے بارے میں - میں ان کا نام نہیں لیتا چاہتا - ان کے خلاف ایمپولسینٹ کا ایک کیس تھا - میں نے پردہاں منسٹری کو بھی لکھا تھا - لیکن اس کا جواب کیا ہے -

"These cases have been dragging on for the last 13 years. The Delhi

Administration were advised that in case the infringement was the only of a technical nature and there was no evidence to show that the individual against whom prosecution was instituted had personally benefited, there would be justification for withdrawal of these cases.'

کیسز عدالت میں پڑے ہیں -  
ایویڈینس عدالت میں ہوتی ہے  
لیکن عدالت کو ایک طرف چھوڑ کر  
جو بیانات وہاں پر گواہوں کے ہوئے  
ہیں - اس کی جانچ کون کرتا ہے -  
دلی ایڈمنسٹریشن اور وہ فیصلہ کرتا  
ہے کہ اس ملحد کو مجرم قرار دیا  
جائے یا نہ قرار دیا جائے - آپ نے  
نانوں کی دھچھیاں اڑا دی ہیں -  
آپ نے فریب آدمی کے دماغ میں  
یہ یقین پیدا کر دیا ہے کہ آپ کا  
قانون آپ کے ملتوی کے لئے نہیں  
ہے - جو مجرم ثابت ہوا ہے - آپ  
کا قانون بے بسوں اور بے کسوں کے لئے  
ہے - اس لئے میں کہتا ہوں کہ آج  
یہ بھی ایک بہت بڑی وجہ ہے کہ  
آپ کی حکومت کے خلاف یہ اوشواس  
کا پرستاؤ بالکل حق بجانب ہے -  
اس میں کوئی دار رائے نہیں ہو سکتی  
کہ آپ انصاف پسند نہیں - آپ کا  
قانون ملتوی کے لئے الگ اور فریب  
کے لئے الگ ہے -

اس کے بعد مجھے انسوس ہے کہ  
کل کچھ لوگوں نے ایسی مثالیں دی  
ہیں یہاں پر جو شرمناک ہیں -  
ایک صاحب نے یہ کہا - مجھے تو

کہتے ہوئے شرم آتی ہے - مرلی ملوہر  
جوشی صاحب نے کہا کہ ایک سائڈ  
کہوم رہا تھا - میں تو کہتا ہوں کہ  
اس ملک میں ایک ہی سائڈ گھومتا  
ہے جو چلتا کا سائڈ ہے - جو بھدھنکا  
ہے - جس کی نہ صورت ہے اور نہ  
شکل ہے ہاں یہ بات ضرور ہے کہ  
اس کے پدچھے پھر ہے فریب عوام  
بھوکا عوام اور پیاسا عوام اور مظلوم  
چلتا چلتی ہے - لیکن اس سائڈ کے  
اور حصے نہ پڑے ہوتے دماغ ہوتا تو  
وہ کچھ سمجھ سکتا تھا -

شری ایچ - ایل - پٹواری : وہ  
سائڈ نہیں ہے شہر ہے - گائے کے پدچھے  
کہونے والو یاد رکھو وہ شہر ہے -

شری محمد شفیع قریشی : مہدی  
ایک ہی درخواست ہے کہ پٹواری  
صاحب جب بولا کریں تو کہتے ہو  
جایا کریں - یہی پتہ نہیں لگتا کہ  
وہ کہتے ہیں یا بھتے ہوں - چلتا  
کافڈی شہر ہے -

شری پٹواری : یہ دیکھئے اندرا  
گاندھی کہا کر رہی ہے - کتے کہا کر  
رہی ہے -

شری محمد شفیع قریشی : میں  
نے ہوم منسٹری اور ریلوے منسٹری  
کے متعلق تھوڑا سا اشارہ ہی کیا لیکن  
آج ہم الگ الگ منسٹری کی



तरफ पूंजी का केन्द्रीयकरण होगा और दूसरी तरफ लोग बूझे रहेंगे। लेकिन आज जो देश में समस्यार्थ हैं उनको पैदा करने वाला कौन है? हम तो उन समस्याओं का निराकरण करने के लिए आये हैं। आपकी तरफ से राय के साथ उस राय का निदान भी सुझाया जाना चाहिए। आप केवल रोग का बखान कर रहे हैं। मैं पूछना हूँ क्या हिन्दुस्तान की सड़क केवल रोग पर ही बहस करती रहेगी या कभी निदान पर भी यहाँ पर बहस होगी? हमने दिनों तक यहाँ पर रोग का बखान किया गया कि हिन्दुस्तान में गरीबी है, भ्रष्टाचार है, बकासी है, बेराजगारी है लेकिन क्या कभी आपकी ओर से यहाँ पर निदान के सुझाव भी दिये गये? क्या आपकी तरफ से कभी कोई सुझाव दिया गया है कि जनता पार्टी ने यह गलत दिशा पकड़ ली है जिसके कारण समस्या बढ़ती जा रही है और उसका यह निराकरण हो सकता है? आने कहा कि आज छात्र प्रभुत्व है, विश्वविद्यालयों में अल्पता है लेकिन उसके लिए कौन ज़िम्मेदार है? आज हिन्दुस्तान में जा छात्र प्रभुत्व है वह प्रभुत्व मना के खिलाफ नहीं है, वह छात्र प्रभुत्व व्यवस्था के खिलाफ है।

15-14 hrs.

[MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

मला एक अलग चीज है, व्यवस्था अलग चीज है। हिन्दुस्तान में अन्दर से बतमान व्यवस्था है, उस व्यवस्था के प्रति छात्रों में असंतोष है। वह कौन सी व्यवस्था है? जिसने टांग हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर लगातार हुए योजना में 50 लाख लोगों को बाध बनाने का काम किया गया, हिन्दुस्तान के करोड़ों लोगों को गरीबी की रेखा के नीचे धकेलने का काम किया गया—उसी कारण आज असंतोष है। हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर आपने कबल भोग की व्यवस्था बना कर रखी है, एक नरक भोग और विनाशिता की वस्तु को टकटकी करते जाते हो और दूसरी तरफ त्याग का उपदेश देने का काम करते रहे—यही प्रभुत्व का कारण है। क्या इसकी दूर करने के लिये आपके समय में कभी कोई उपाय किया गया या अभी भी उस छात्र प्रभुत्व को दूर करने के लिये आपने कोई सुझाव जनता पार्टी के सामने रखा है?

इस प्राविश्वाम प्रस्ताव को रखने समय विदेशी कम्पनियों की चर्चा भी हुई। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर जा विदेशी कम्पनियाँ हैं, क्या वे विदेशी कम्पनियाँ आज हिन्दुस्तान में पैदा हो गई हैं? आज हिन्दुस्तान में लगभग 477 विदेशी कम्पनियाँ हैं, मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ—क्या इन विदेशी कम्पनियों को पिछले 13 महीनों में जनता पार्टी ने नारसैम दिये हैं या ये विदेशी कम्पनियाँ पहले से, आपके उमाने से,

हिन्दुस्तान में चली जा रही हैं? उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह कौसी विश्वम्भना है—पिछले तीस सालों में जिन तरह में इस देश को बनाया गया—जहाँ अमरीका जैसे पूंजीवादी देश में 10 प्रतिशत बड़े लोग 27 8 प्रतिशत राष्ट्रीय आय का लेते हैं और हिन्दुस्तान में, जहाँ गरीब देश है, वहाँ 10 प्रतिशत आदमी 16.5 प्रतिशत राष्ट्रीय आय लेते हैं? आपके द्वारा जो योजनाएँ बनाई गईं—यह उसका परिणाम है कि हिन्दुस्तान का 10 प्रतिशत आदमी राष्ट्रीय आय का 37 प्रतिशत अपने ऊपर लेता है और बाकी जो बचता है, यदि उसका बन्नाग कर तो फिर हिन्दुस्तान के पिछले कारोबी शासन का इतिहास यह बननाता है कि 10 प्रतिशत लोगों की राष्ट्रीय आमदनी 2,391 रुपय 9 पैसे रही है और मजदूर मजदूर के आदमी की आमदनी केवल 117 रुपये रही है। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ—यह कहा का न्याय है कि हिन्दुस्तान के 10 प्रतिशत लोगों की आमदनी 2400 रुपय रहे और मजदूर मजदूर के तब तक आमदनी की आमदनी 117 रुपय रहे। यह विषमता किमन पैदा की, किमन हम विद्वानों का अन्वय दिया, हम सामाजिक विषमता या अन्वय करने के लिये आपके समय में क्या किया गया?

आज भी इन्दिरा गांधी दक्षिण भारत में जाती है तो हरिजनो को पिछड़ों का नाम लेती है, आरक्षण की बात करती है, लेकिन जब उत्तर भारत में जाती है तो हिजा का मरगन करने की, चाहे जगन्नाथ सिंघ हो, निवारी हो, पातरु हो, पाटे हो, गुब्बना हो, हा हो उनका समर्थन करती है और वहाँ आरक्षण को चर्चा नहीं करती है बल्कि आरक्षण के सामाजिक आधार का विचार करती है। इन बातों का लेकर ही अन्वय हिन्दुस्तान का शासन किया, यही उत्तर है। स्वल्प है।

आज बिहार के अन्दर बर्परी ठाकुर की सरकार है, जनता पार्टी में सरकार है—बड़ा बेवफा का नाम लेकर बिल्ना है। मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ—बर्परी ठाकुर की सरकार ने अलग कहीं भी हरिजन पर अत्याचार हुआ तो मात दिन के अन्दर उस काम को समाप्त हो यादर भेज दिया, वाजिसाँट फाइन कर दी और मेहनत के ट्रायल करा दिया। जहाँ कहीं भी हरिजनो पर अत्याचार हुआ है, अत्याचारियों के खिलाफ वहाँ से कड़ी कार्यवाही की जा रही है। उन सरकार ने घोषणा की है कि—यदि कहीं भी हरिजनो पर अत्याचार होगा, तो वहाँ सामूहिक जमाता किया जायगा। लेकिन उसी बिहार से जब इनका शासन था, तब क्या हुआ? पिछड़ी जातियों और हरिजनो के बेटे, जिनकी छात्री चौड़ी थी, निकल कर बाहर आये, तो उस सरकार ने आशाबाद हरिजनो के बेटों में 200 से 300 के लगभग हरिजनो के बेटों को नक्सलाइट्स के नाम पर गोली से उड़ा दिया। यह सब किसके

[श्री हुकम देव नारायण शर्मा]

राज्य में हुआ था, क्या उस वक़्त इसके विपक्ष आपने धारा 148 उठाई थी? सच्चाई से आपको कोई मतलब नहीं है, तथ्यों से आपको कोई मतलब नहीं है, आपका मतलब तो केवल हम जान से है कि आप मानन से भ्रमण हो चुके हैं, किसी तरह से आपको कुर्सी चाहिए।

सुरदास जी ने कहा था—जब कृष्ण के जाने से गोपियों को बिचोग हुआ तो वे कड़ती हैं—

निमित्त दिन बरमत नयन हमारे,  
सबा रहत पावन ऋतु हम पै, जब ते श्याम सिधारे,  
कजुकि नहीं सूखत मजदारे, उर विष बहत पनारे।  
जब ते श्याम सिधारे।

आपकी कुर्सी छिन गई। अब श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी वह पक्ति गाती फिरती हैं। जब से यह कुर्सी छिन गई है, तो यह मामला लगा हुआ है। मैं यह निवेदन करना कि मत्ता की राजनीति बहुत दिनों तक चली है आपकी। अब आप सच्चाई के साथ, ईमानदारी के साथ, न्याय के साथ मानवता के साथ विरोधी पक्ष के सभी कर्तव्यों का निर्वहन कीजिए। मैं तो यह कहूंगा कि जिस तरह से मदन के नेता के खिलाफ, सरकार के खिलाफ भविष्यवाणी का प्रस्ताव प्राना है, तो सबन को यह भी देखना चाहिए कि विरोधी पक्ष ने बैठ कर प्रारण आप मही विरोधी पक्ष के नेता के कर्तव्यों का निर्वहन नहीं करत हैं, तो मदन को यह भी कहना चाहिए कि मदन का विश्वास विरोधी पक्ष के नेता में नहीं है और आप उस नायक नहीं हैं। इसलिए आपको विरोधी पक्ष के नेता की कुर्सी छोड़ देनी चाहिए।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं हम प्रस्ताव का विरोध करता हूँ।

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola):  
Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the motion of no-confidence not in a spirit of trying to denigrate the Government because by bringing this no-confidence everyone knows that the Government is not going to fall. So, the spirit in which we have got this no-confidence is to perform the duty as representatives of the people to invite the attention of the Government to the reality of the situation in the country, that the confidence which the people had reposed just a year back in this Government, is getting shaken day by day. No person in his honest senses will disagree that the general situation in the country is such that the people are

feeling disturbed, disenchanted, disillusioned about many things that are happening in the Janata Government.

First and foremost, let us take a correct perspective of what happened. When the Janata Party was elected, it is agreed, I believe, that the Congress was defeated and the Janata Party placed in power on what was called, a negative vote. The anger of the people registered against the Congress Government for its commissions and omissions or alleged commissions and omissions which the people believed in those days and, therefore, they punished the Congress Government and the Congress Party. I remember the words of a kisan when I went recently to Karnal during the election. He said:

माहब, ये सुमरे कौन होंगे है मजा देने वाले इन्दिरा गांधी को। हम ने उन का गजा दी है, जनता ने सजा दी है इन्दिरा गांधी को कि सब से बड़ी गद्दी से उतार कर जमीन पर उतार दिया। इस से बड़ी सजा क्या हो सकती है जो हमने दी है। ये कौन होते हैं मजा देने वाले।

He said, "Did we elect these people to persecute Mrs. Indira Gandhi? We elected them in the hope that they will look to our problems, solve our economic problems. But what has happened". This is what he said.

हमारा गन्ना खेतों में सूख रहा है। उसका दम नहीं मिल रहा है। गल्ले का दाम इतना घीर गये का दाम 6 रुपये घीर उस पर भी मिल वाले नहीं लेते हैं। सरकार के कान में जूँ तक नहीं रेगती है। इमको कोई देखने की तैयार नहीं है। क्या हमने अपने किसान के बेटे को इसलिए चुना था कि कोई देखे नहीं। वह गृह मंत्री बन गया है। उसे हमारी तरफ देखने की पुरतन नहीं है।

All the energies are on one-point programme: how to persecute Mrs Indira Gandhi? They have caught themselves, unfortunately, in their own hypnotism. They created a ghost. And now they are possessed by the ghost themselves. They do not know how to get out of it. All energies are spent on that one issue. Not an iota of evidence during all the period has come out. But in a hurry,

the Home Minister announced, because of the pressure of certain friends from the Janata Party who wanted him to go out for blood, that there was a serious charge and that he was going to arrest her. Arrest he did. But you know what happened. It boomeranged on them.

I had hoped that when the Janata Party got elected as the American people did to Nixon, they would forget Mrs. Indira Gandhi, not a word to mention about her from the next day. If you had done that, you would have seen that, probably, this country also would have forgotten Mrs. Indira Gandhi. But no, Sir I thank the Janata Government for what they did. There has been more publicity of Mrs. Indira Gandhi during their regime than during the entire Emergency.

I am amazed. Is the Janata Government looking to the price issue? What is happening? Every day, we are told by the Finance Minister and the Prime Minister as well that the prices are stabilised. Are they? Go and ask your wives. Milk prices have gone up; water rate in Delhi has gone up; electricity charges have gone up; soap has disappeared from the market; you do not get even Vanaspathi ghee. Ask an auto-rickshaw man. He has to buy Rs. 75 worth tyre in the black-market for Rs. 175. What do the common people say? Ask them. Then, you will know. They are feeling already the pinch of price rise. You want to close your eyes to reality. Which section of the people have you benefited, let me know? Kisans? You talk so much of kisans. You say that you are going to invest more for them. Are kisans getting remunerative prices for their commodities? You talked of Rs. 130 for wheat. Ultimately, what have you given? Only Rs. 112. You talked of protecting the interests of sugarcane growers, jute growers and cotton growers. I ask:

which kisan is getting a remunerative prices? Can any kisan get up and say that he is getting a remunerative price? Take the case of paddy producers. Are they getting a remunerative price? Take the case of labour. Is the working-class today happy and satisfied? Let any labour man put his hands on his heart and say, yes, the working-class of this country is happy.

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE): You had denied bonus to the workers and we have restored it.

SHRI VASANT SATHE Mr. Minister, are your workers happy? They have already declared that they will be going on strike. Then you will blame us. Are the students in this country happy? What the trade unions have decided, including your trade union? They have decided to boycott the Bhoothlingam Commission. Are they happy? Are the students in this country happy? Have you solved the problems of unemployment or done anything for them? Tell me which section of the population today is happy? Can anybody say with confidence that since the Janata Government came into power, yes, he is happy and there is progress in a particular section?

Yesterday, Shri Biju Patnaik, called the Leader of the Opposition Syco-phiant. Let me tell him what he had to say. On the 16th of October, 1976, in a written statement to the Press, he said:

"The Bharatiya Lok Dal leader, Mr. Biju Patnaik, said here today that extraordinary powers assumed by the Government had brought in distinctive gains."

While describing the distinctive gains, he further said:

"Highlighting the gains of Emergency, Mr. Patnaik said that nearly Rs. 2000 crores of floating money had been brought to account, trade

[Shri Vasant Sathe]

balance had improved to Rs. 1100 crores in spite of steep rise in international oil prices the buffer food-stocks had risen to an all-time high quantity worth \$ 2.5 billion, smuggling curbed, galloping inflation arrested and rupee made stronger day by day. In addition, general discipline had been enforced and thousands of inept officials removed."

Then the climax comes. He described the 20-point economic programme as a "health socio-economic programmes which has been floated and backed by unusual Government instance on its implementation." Who is a sycophant? Who would be the greater sycophant than this and yet today he is one of your most honoured Cabinet Ministers.

Then comes the great Mr. Kanwar Lal Gupta to be criticised. Here is a gentleman who attacks the credibility of others. Here is a gentleman who resigned Jan Sangh in 1954 and contested as an Independent. In, 1962, and lost his deposit. Then he came back in 1966, and again stood in 1967 against Dr. Bhai Mahavir as an Independent when he had lost his deposit. Here is a man of credibility. He has never changed the side. He is blaming others. Do not point one finger on others. You are simultaneously pointing three fingers on yourself. Prof. Madhu Dandavate, please do not get away. The leader with whom I came is sitting behind your back. Here is a gentleman, when his brother who is the President of the Wholesale Traders Association was changed by no less a person than the Defence Minister, Shri Jagjivan Ram for adulterating dal. This gentleman did not have a word to say against. Why? Because that President happens to be his real brother. What an integrity! Therefore, why are you talking of integrity? I want to say.

**SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA** (Delhi Sadar): Sir, on a point of personal explanation.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** He may do it later.

**SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA:** On a point of order.

जो बार्ज श्री साठे ने मेरे खिलाफ लगाया है वह बिल्कुल बेवजियाद है जो मेरे भाई के बारे में आपने कहा है। मैं उस समय भी सदन का सदस्य था, मैं उनमें कहा था माननीय अगजीवनराम जो उस समय कांग्रेस में थे, और इन्होंने कुछ बात कही थी। उस समय भी मैंने यह कहा था कि मेरा भाई के साथ कोई ताल्लुक नहीं है, और उनके बाद भी कांग्रेस सरकार ने मेरे भाई के खिलाफ कोई कार्यवाही नहीं की क्योंकि उनके पास कोई मीटीरियल नहीं था। (स्वयंश्रुति)

मैंने कभी भी जनसभ नहीं छोड़ा, यह मैं साफ कर देना चाहता हूँ। और मैं किसी पार्टी का मيم्बर नहीं रहा सिवाय जनसभ के और जनता पार्टी के।

**THE MINISTER OF STEEL AND MINES (SHRI BIJU PATNAIK):** Mr Sathe made an allegation here. It needs to be corrected because the record must be set right. I will take only half a minute.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** I am not yielding. You have made a press statement. (Interruptions)

**SHRI BIJU PATNAIK:** Please read the whole lot.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** I do not want to read whole lot.

**SHRI BIJU PATNAIK:** What does the whole lot say? It says that some good things may have been done by this kind of dictatorship but if cannot carry on. Mr. Sathe, read the last sentence, the last paragraph. I have said that did not believed that Mrs Indira Gandhi would be a dictator, but she had proved me wrong, not only proved me wrong but she tried to be and she continues to be. Therefore, the sycophancy lies there, not with Biju Patnaik. The sycophancy lies there, not here.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** Then comes the darling of the Janata Party,

the External Affairs Minister, the most popular person, with whose coming the foreign policy of this country has never been so good as it is today! But then why did this sweet External Affairs Minister have to commit this faux pas the other day by talking about some secret agreement, about which leave alone the Minister of Pakistan, leave alone the then Foreign Minister of Pakistan, Mr. Agha Sahi, leave alone the ex-Prime Minister of our country, even the present Prime Minister of your Party does not know anything, does not know what that secret document is. That is what he is alleged to have said.

But what I am told is, 'Yes, there was a secret agreement'. That secret agreement was between Shri A. B. Vajpayee and Mr. Zia when he met him. Before Mr. Bhutto was sentenced, it is said—he can contradict if he likes—that Mr. Zia pleaded with Mr. Vajpayee, 'Please make some statement about this secret agreement so that Mr. Bhutto will stand condemned and my hands will be strengthened! He thought he could hit two birds with one stone. With that temptation, he came out with the story of a secret agreement—and that document, he has not been able to disclose. If he has courage, he can show it even now.

There is only one thing more, about these Commission. I do not want to name anybody, but what is the minimum elementary test of a person who will be the head of a Commission? The test is, at least impartiality. A person who is the head of a Commission must be known and must appear to the people to be an impartial person. Do you know of a case where a person, who has already declared himself against, and opposed to, a particular person, openly and publicly, and against Emergency, was made the judge in the past? Can you get justice from such a person? Do you know of a person who has been impeached....

1123 LS-4

बी एच० एन० पटवारी : क्या इन को बना देंगे?  
(अवधान)

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Do you know of a person who has been impeached by 200 Members of Parliament against his integrity with an open charge....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Your time is over.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: There is no other person from our side.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You have taken already over 20 minutes.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Now, you never heard this thing: if there is a particular charge against a particular accused, did you ever hear of a case of mixing and hob-nobbing with the accused publicly and openly? Here is a photograph of such a person. This is the 'On-looker' with Morarji Bhai's big photograph on the front page.

I am not on the point of what Morarji Bhai had said or did. Let us not go into how many crimes were committed how many persons were killed, who did what etc., but you should settle down at least now to the task of leading the country and to the economic problem. Or else, you will slip into the grip of that self-hypnosis from which the man in the Intensive Care Unit is suffering. It is dangerous: that is what I wanted to say. Whenever he goes to the Intensive Care Unit or to a hospital, something very staggering comes out. When he went there last time his resignation and an open charge against the leadership of partiality and untruth came out. Now again he has gone there: I do not know what is going to come out.

I am afraid, the way you are going, you are leading this country and your party towards instability. For Heaven's sake we want you: please continue till your term is over. We are not in a hurry to dislodge you, but if you are in a hurry to sink, what can I do?

[Shri Vasant Sathe]

Therefore with these words I support the No Confidence Motion as a warning to the Government. Wake up at least now.

**SHRI SAUGATA ROY** (Barrack-pore): As has been said earlier, we do not bring this no-confidence motion to bring down the Janata Government. In fact, we have brought this no-confidence motion to bring this government to its senses not to bring it down, but to bring it to its senses which is sadly lacking in this motley crowd that goes in the name of a government

To-day, Sir, I had the privilege of hearing Babuji speaking on the no-confidence motion and this is the first time that I hear Babuji speaking on the no-confidence motion. But I know from some other friends that Babuji has always been called to defend no-confidence motions whether government remains the same or it changes. He also spoke for the emergency resolution when it was moved in this Parliament and to-day the fact that they have made him to speak means that like Mrs. Indira Gandhi in 1975 this Janata Government does not place its trust on him. That is why they have made him speak on the no-confidence motion.

I have great respect for Babuji. He has been in the Congress for such a long time, even before I was born and, when he left the Congress and formed the Congress for Democracy shortly known as CFD, we felt that the atmosphere in the country has changed. Because of our umbilical ties with the Congress we could not be as courageous as he was but we appreciated it as a gesture. Then, in May 1978 we found the famous photograph of Babuji raising his hands with the other leaders to merge his CFD into the Janata Party. Then, a friend came and told me what the meaning of CFD actually was. It was not for defending the Congress not for defending democracy but CFD stood for Chemicals, Fertilisers and Defence and since these

portfolios are taken over by Babuji and his people it is called CFD.. (Interruptions)

I speak for those in the Congress who have inherited a great legacy, and that is the legacy of Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru and in the light of the appeal in the motion our hopes were raised that there would be some vibration in the hearts of the people in the Janata Party who share this legacy though to-day they may be wrong rubbing shoulders with the murderers of Gandhiji in order to remain in power. We have to say this because to-day I have got a statement from Damodaran Nair who is going on a fast for atoning for Prime Minister, Morarji Desai's sins. This Damodaran Nair was sacked from his job in Gandhij Smriti. For what? Because he said that it was the RSS which murdered Mahatma Gandhi and for that he was thrown out of his job.

As I said earlier, when the Janata Party was voted to power people voted for it, for two reasons. People were unhappy with the happenings during the emergency. It is not that they had any great expectations from the Janata Party. It had only two expectations. One was that the Janata Party had come into power in the wake of Jayaprakash Narayan's Nav Nirman agitation. So, it will have some moral values. No. 2—It expected the Janata Party will become a cohesive party in a difficult national situation—that is to stay on together when Morarji Bhai were to become the Prime Minister. People thought that the country will have great morals and Morarji Bhai showed it by sticking to his own old panacea of prohibition as a cure for all the ills of the country. And then bang, came this statement from our friend there, Dr. Subramaniam Swamy, that 12 out of 19 Ministers in the Janata Party are alcoholics. I do not know how far the pollution has spread. But Morarji Bhai is very moral.

Then Sir, I do not agree when he spoke that the merger of Sikkim was wrong. He said, he personally felt that the annexure of Sikkim was wrong. That was how he demoralised our troops fighting on the frontiers. But, may I ask Morarji Bhai what happened in Sikkim after the General Elections? The Congress Party was voted to power in Sikkim and in 1977 after the Janata Party came to power the whole Congress Party became the Janata Party in Sikkim. But Morarji Bhai with all his morality—did he protest that people elected on Congress ticket should not be allowed to defect. This has happened not only in Sikkim but in Tripura also the Congress Party did become the Janata Party. In Andhra, Congressmen who pledged to serve three generations of Nehru-Gandhi have become Janata men. None of this Morarji Bhai's morality came to the fore then and only now they are bringing in the anti-defection Bill. When they knew that the popularity of the Janata Party was on the downhill and when nobody would go to them, they are bringing in the anti-defection Bill. So complete the defection before that. This is for morality.... And about unity less said the better.

Somebody was saying that there was an emperors in India and there are no emperors in India. But Shri Morarji Desai reminds me of an emperor. He reminds me of Shah Jahan imprisoned in the fort of Agra looking at Taj Mahal. He reminds me of Shri Morarji Desai sitting here in the throne and Janata Party fighting among themselves on the floor of the U.P. Assembly. He reminds me that Shri Devi Lal brings a bus load of Haryana legislators to prove his support. He reminds me of similar things—M.L.As from Madhya Pradesh wanted resignation of Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee and Shri L. K. Advani and he watches and he stays on as Prime Minister. He looks to me a another emperor of by gone times. That is why I was saying that this government is no govern-

ment. This is rule by abdication. You have abdicated your authority. There is no administration existing in large parts of the country. Why has it happened? Why is it that the Janata Party which was voted to power on the wave of such popular upsurge have become so unpopular in such a short time. You are stewing in your juice. You practised the politics of populism. You raised great hopes in the minds of the people, while you had no capacity to fulfil those hopes. That is why you had to fire at workers in Pantnagar, in Bailadilla in Agra, to keep them peccified. Whoever has practised this populism, met a certain fate. I am sure the same fate will fall to the Janata Party.

Look at Andhra. In seven days after a new government was formed it had to call out army in Hyderabad to quell that. I say if political health of the country has to be restored, this language of populism must be given up. Responsibility must take over while populism must end. The politics of names must be ended once for all.

I shall not be very long. But here is one Hero of Janata Party who waxed eloquence about the unity in the Janata Party. I have brought with me the *Times of India* of to-day. Its editorial says 'in calling upon the Janata Government trinity, Mr. Morarji Desai, Mr. Charan Singh and Mr. Jagjivan Ram to make up their differences or quit, Mr. Biju Patnaik has clearly spoken only for himself.' So, there is an emperor Shah Jahan and mind you in Biju Patnaik you have Aurangzeb who wants to throw out Shah Jahan. Here Shri Patnaik comes and says this Bailadilla iron ore export to Japan has gone down. That is why they had to retrench people. I have got figures from Visag Port. It has been seen that the export of Iron Ore tonnes in the year 1977-78. And you go on retrenching workers and when those retrenched workers protest you

[Shri Saugata Roy]

fire on them. This is the way you run the Government.

Last but not the least I took your permission to-day to do one very unpleasant task. I have to mention two names. It was said that in the times of emergency a caucus ruled the country. The caucus centred round the Prime Ministers: Secretariat. The caucus consisted of Shri R. K. Dhawan and Sanjay Gandhi. A new caucus is rising in the country to-day. What does this issue of Blitz say about Tehran—connection of Shri Kanti Bhai Desai? Prime Minister's plane on way from Moscow made an unscheduled halt at Tehran and why did one passenger get down there? What did Shri Kanti Bhai do at Tehran? It is not for castigating the Prime Minister. I have every respect for him. It is a question of the country. It is not the question of the Prime Minister of the country. The whole honour of the country goes down ...

(Interruptions)

What is happening with Shri V. Shankar in the Prime Ministers Secretariat?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Saugata Roy, there is a point of order.

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA (Patan): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to draw your attention to Rule 353. Can an hon. member make an allegation of a defamatory nature to a person who is not in a position to defend here? We can understand an allegation against a Government servant. The Minister can reply here. But a private person cannot reply here. My point of order is this: This should not be allowed.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Saugata Roy has written to the Speaker that he would refer to Mr. Kanti Desai and Mr. Shankar.

SHRI SAUGATA ROY: What about the 100 Mps charge on polyester filament yarn import? What about these?

It is in the interest of the country that the Prime Minister should seriously go into these charges. It is not my purpose to find fault with the Prime Minister. The other day my friend Mr. Vayalar Ravi mentioned about a raid on ashram in Kerala in which Shankar was involved. But today V. Shankar is controlling all the important appointments. It was at his behest that J.R.D. Tata was removed from Air India. It was at his behest that Dr. Shankar was made the Director General of Health Services superseding ten other people. It is at his behest that all the top appointments in the country are made. I say this. I say that a new caucus should not emerge in this country. If there was a caucus before we have been the sufferers. We do not want in the political health of this country a new caucus to emerge. We want this Government to stay. We want them to rule for 5 years. But let them mend their fences. Let them repair their houses. Let them stop giving press statements. Let them rule in the interests of lakhs and lakhs of downtrodden people, in the interest of Harijans who are butch red. Even today one Harijan leader has been shot dead at Bareilly. In the interest of them, let the Government rule with firmness, rule with dignity, rule with honesty and rule with sincerity and justice. And that way only the country will survive.

SHRI DAJIBA DESAI (Kolhapur): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, this is a good opportunity that I am getting to speak at the fag end of the discussion on the No-confidence Motion.

15.58 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

I can speak basing my views on the speeches made by other hon. Members. I would like to recall the period one year back when the Janata Party was voted to power.

**MR. SPEAKER:** You have only 5 minutes.

**SHRI DAJIBA DESAI:** I want 15 minutes.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Prime Minister has to reply. He has to go to the other House.

**SHRI DAJIBA DESAI:** Mr. Saugata Roy was given 15 minutes.

I should not be penalised.

The Janata Party came to power with the slogan of total revolution. But I could not see any action being taken on the basis of total revolution. I have listened to the speeches from both sides. In the last three or four Lok Sabhas there were discussions on no-confidence motions. The Congress Ministers opposed the no-confidence motions and defended themselves in the same language which I hear today. The Ministers are the same; the language is the same and they are advising the opposition in the same language.

So, I was thinking about it whether there was any difference between the Opposition and the Ruling Party.

16 hrs.

In fact, I have come to the conclusion after one year's of experience that there is no difference—no basic difference—between the policies of the Janata Party and the Congress. There may be differences of opinion in some administrative problems or something like that. Actually the people who wanted a total revolution with the coming into power, they are following the policies of *status quo*.

For example, when we were discussing the Plan we could hear the same speeches from both the parties. There were certain conclusions to which the Planning Commission came. But, what is the remedy? The First, Second, Third, Fourth and even the Fifth Plan came to the same conclusion namely,

rise in inequality, rise in unemployment, rise in poverty. The provision made in the Draft Plan is again the same with only increased allocation in the Sixth Plan.

The Janata Government is yielding power on the slogan of total revolution. Now it is coming to the position of *status quo*. To our surprise and to our disillusionment, the Janata Government started the programme of *Samaj Parivarthan*—social revolution—but there is no revolution. On the contrary the problems have become national problems. Atrocity on harijans is a national problem; poverty is a national problem; law and order is a national problem. We have been facing these problems for the last thirty years and no solutions were found by the previous ruler. Again there are no solutions offered by the new ruler.

Perhaps I might say that this is the basic point why I am inclined to support the no-confidence motion. I am not supporting the no-confidence motion on the grounds which Mr. Stephen and State had stated. I support this motion perhaps because there is actually no difference. We were opposing the Congress Government. Now the time has come when we have to oppose the Janata Government.

There are certain problems to the ruling party. When we look to the present position, the Members of the Ruling Party here give slogans in one voice; they speak in one voice but with different hearts. Outside they speak with different voices. There are certain people like that.

This is not exactly democracy.

**SHRI H. L. PATWARI:** This is democracy.

**SHRI DAJIBA DESAI:** This is chaos. This Government, in a chaotic condition, cannot rule properly this country. Shri Saugata Roy had expressed that they should rule with

[Shri Dajiba Desai]

honesty, justice etc. Can he expect justice; can he expect honesty and can he expect sincerity? There are various programmes before the country—there is law and order problem here. As stated by some of the Members here, we are here to discuss the law and order problem because this is a state subject. Law and order problem is after all a problem which the ruling Janata Party has to face.

The ruling party must have one political approach in every State. In one State they support the backward classes; in another State they support the scheduled castes and yet in another State one section of the party supports the higher class whereas the other section of the party supports backward classes. If the party tries to divide or bifurcate the various sections or various communities on caste lines it will not be possible for them to implement any positive decision.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, take the question of education. The previous ruling party based its education policy on Kothari Commission. The Janata Party has also based its education policy on Kothari Commission. The previous Government relied on the Agricultural Prices Commission the Janata Government is also doing the same thing. So, my point is that the Janata Party is trying to continue the economic policies of the Indira Gandhi Government. Indira Gandhi came out with a 20-point programme. The Janata Party has come out with a minimum need-based programme of 7 points. The points are the same. Only difference is that they declared that they will implement them vigorously. They could not implement it vigorously. Then where lies any difference.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am warning this Janata Government. The Janata Party started with a slogan of total revolution. For that they must have a socialist approach. Some people in the Janata Party are eloquent about it but they succumb to the

majority in the Janata Party. If they accept socialism then they will have to change the entire structure of planning. Inequality cannot be abolished by giving some alms to the poor and guaranteeing good profit to the industrialists. Plan has ensured a fair return to industrialists but at the same time there is no guarantee of remunerative prices or need-based wages to the agricultural labour or the working class. The present No Confidence Motion is a warning to the Janata Government. They will have to change everything. I am expressing this warning on behalf of my party.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI MORARJI DESAI): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have been patiently hearing all that has been said by the Leader of the Opposition and all others who have spoken in support of the No Confidence Motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

I thought I would benefit by what he said and that it would help Government in rectifying mistakes which required to be rectified. The Opposition has a right of moving No Confidence Motions—whether they do it responsibly or irresponsibly it is their business. It is not for me to judge. It is not for me to object to it. That is why I welcomed it immediately and said, let it be discussed immediately. But then I heard nothing now I have been hearing all these things ever since this Government assumed office.

The same things are being repeated over and over again from the very beginning. I can prove it by records if they want to have any proof. It is there if anybody wants to see the record. But I do not want to take the time of the House in recounting these things all over again. Only two new arguments were advanced, two new charges, if I may say so. It is good that they have come out with these

charges so that the people may know what the truth is. The two new charges are that my Principal Secretary is running the whole show. There was a caucus before and there is a caucus now and that my son is doing something like this. Now, there cannot be a more fantastic statement than whatever has been said in this connection. The Principal Secretary has nothing to do with the selection of officers. The appointment of officers emanates from the Ministries concerned and the decision is made by three persons, namely the Minister concerned, the Home Minister and the Prime Minister. This is not a new practice. This practice has been there since 1947. And there is no question of my Principal Secretary trying to influence me in any way. If he tries to interfere, he will not remain in my office even for a day. I would, therefore, be obliged to the hon. Members if they can give me one instance where he has influenced my decision and got one man in who should not have got in I shall be very thankful for it.

AN HON. MEMBER: He could influence.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: Whom did he influence? That was the old style. This is not the style now. Even the Prime Minister does not influence other Ministers. They are free to make the recommendations that they want. And I have never suggested any name to the Ministers. Therefore, what is the use of saying this kind of thing? And then a case was made about my son making an unscheduled flight at Tehran. I do not know what is unscheduled flight....

AN HON. MEMBER: Halt.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: It was the plane which stopped over at Tehran. It was not done for him. When I had gone earlier, there was also unscheduled halt then. It was not for him. What is the meaning of saying that he made an unscheduled flight? He

went to London from Moscow via Tehran. If he had come here and then gone there, it would have cost him more money. It was not the Government money that was spent on him. I have made it clear so many times before whenever somebody asked me about it. Then it was asked why he went there. This was in September last. He went there at his own expense to sever the last connection of business he had acquired in 1970. He used to go there before every year with the full knowledge and permission of the Reserve Bank of India. He wanted to get out of it so that there is no connection left with any business whatsoever. He had severed all other connections with business here in 1964, but this had remained. He thought that it was necessary that he should get out even from this so that nobody could raise a finger. But what can one say of people who always want to see something wrong in everything which they want to imagine?

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Why is Chaudhuri Charan Singh wanting to try him?

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: It is between him and me.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: It is a matter of national concern, a Minister writing to you that he wants to try such and such person... (Interruptions)

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: That is a different matter altogether. The Home Minister can say and I can also tell him. That shows the freedom with which we work among ourselves; it does not mean anything else.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: It is a public matter.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: If anything *prima facie* is established, I would be the first man to prosecute him.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** The Home Minister says that there is *prima facie* case.

**SHRI MORARJI DESAI:** He has not said that; That is all wrong. He has never said so; that is a lie if anybody says so.

**SHRI A. C. GEORGE:** What does he say?

**SHRI MORARJI DESAI:** I am not going to tell you and oblige you in this matter. My hon. friends depend upon Blitz--God help them--a paper which has always been a tissue of lies...*(Interruptions)*

**SHRI SAUGATA ROY:** It was a question raised in Parliament.

**SHRI MORARJI DESAI:** I have known Blitz for the last thirty years and I always treated it with contempt. I do not want to take notice of yellow papers; nor do I want to take notice of those who deal in yellow journalism. I can only sympathise with them for their want of prudence. But if they don't have it, who am I to give them prudence? I do not want to offer any advice in this matter. But this shows on whom the opposition depends to show that there is no confidence in this government. What have they come to? I thought that they would change by years' experience and give up their old methods. But I find that they are still fond of them. I cannot help them. Who am I to say that they should not do so? But if they feel that by this method they will be able to break the Janata Party, they are very much mistaken. I agree and I would not say that there is nothing wrong with us. I will be the last man to say so; no party can claim that there is no difference anywhere, in any party. Show me any party, even in England, even in America, even in Germany wherever you go, you will find differences. There were no open differences during the last few years in their party. But I was told of the inner differences that were there. I do not want to speak

about them; I am not like them. I do not believe in resorting to such methods to condemn anybody. But these are matters where if they were careful, I do not think they would have done what they have done here. I cannot compliment them on their performance. What have we done, they ask. Is this not a great change, the change that has taken place? The change is so remarkable that the world knows it. If there is no full satisfaction, I can understand. I cannot say that there is full satisfaction nor can I say that full satisfaction can be given in a year in every matter. But there is nothing of which we have to be ashamed nor is there anything that we have not done which we could have done or that we have failed in doing it. There is no item on which anybody can say that.

They cited many things. They cited prices. Are not prices more this March than what they were in March last? If they deny the figures what am I to do? We do not claim that they have one down. If they have to go down they have to be stable first. And if after ten years record of inflation every year, barring six months of Emergency, we have halted rise in prices, is that not some achievement?

But why should they admit it? They, they have to condemn themselves which they are not yet prepared to do. Yes, I know, there are several hon. Members on the other side who had quietly suffered all kinds of things during the Emergency and even before. They have now begun to admit, some in public and some in private, that Emergency was wrong and should not have been there.

They say now that there is no change. Is this a small change that everybody is free to say what he likes throughout the country? Is it not the greatest change from the times when we tried to point out the

shortcomings of the Government but were taken away in the darkness of night, whisked away somewhere without letting anybody know where we were taken? Thousands of them were taken away and crowds were brought here in lorries and trucks, Government military trucks to prove that people had confidence in them.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the Kisan rally?

(Interruptions)

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: How can I give any sense of shame to people who do not know what shame is? (Interruptions) How can I give it? It is not possible for me to give any sense of proportion when there is none? How am I to do it?

It is my misfortune that I have to reply to this debate. It is no pleasure for me to have to say these things. I am not happy but I have to reply to it; otherwise, things will go by default. The change you see is that can go about without let or hindrance, they can say whatever they like.

SHRI A. C. GEORGE: May I just say one sentence? The fearlessness had led to one thing in the United States. I may just quote a few lines from 'India Abroad'. An advertisement has appeared in it and it is this:

"SERVICES—We deliver rupees in India. Competitive rates—fast action. Any amount, at any place. Transaction thru banks, Easiest way of doing it—everything done by telephone. Personalized services, satisfaction guaranteed. H. Parikh (Financial Consultant) Orient Express, Journal Square, Jersey City."

An advertisement has come that they will make compensatory payment. That is where the fearlessness had led to. This is published in the United States. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: You have mentioned that.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: These are legacies which we have received from my hon. friend and it is that legacy which is making it difficult for this Government to get over everything and make faster progress. (Interruptions)

SHRI A. C. GEORGE: Since he mentioned about fearlessness, I mentioned that. An advertisement is put that rupees will be paid in India for dollars in 'India Abroad', a magazine published in the United States and so many Indians read it.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: They are sorry that we are undoing the wrongs that they heaped upon us people. We have not yet been able to remove all wrongs completely and that is our misfortune. But the wrongs are so many that they cannot be removed quickly. What we could do quickly, we have already done and you see the result of it.

There is complete freedom of press, so much so that what we say may not be published but what they say is published with big headlines. I can prove it by production of those news papers, if they want to see.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: That is why the yellow press is there.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: It is not the yellow press. yellow press is a very small part of it. A large part of it is not yellow press. Then, on the media who is getting publicity? It is given to everybody. If at all, they get more publicity than they deserved at any time. Was opposition ever heard on media before? Yet they say there is no change. It has been done for the first time in this country, that in the elections the Opposition had the facility of speaking on the radio as much as the ruling party. For the first time this is done.

We are also trying to see that media become independent and do

[Shri Morarji Desai]

not remain subservient to Government. But it requires careful consideration. We had appointed a committee. The report has come. We will soon take a decision. But to say that we have done nothing, has no meaning.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** Media has been captured by one organization.

**SHRI MORARJI DESAI:** By whom has it been captured? The agencies were merged into one in the past regime. There was one 'Samachar' only; and all were bundled into it, and made to do what they liked. All that has been separated and they are made independent. And we don't interfere with them in any manner whatsoever. Not only that. I have told the Press: 'If you want to have your own arrangement, you must have it. I don't want to nominate anybody on the Press Council. You should look after the Press yourselves and regulate it yourselves. If any law is violated, certainly Government will step in. But that is only when law is violated; and the action can be taken in a court of law. But for that, we will not interfere in any manner whatever.' I have never asked any Editor or Correspondent to see me, unless he wanted to come and see me. And there also, I have never said, "You should do this or should not do that". I only say, "You better ascertain the facts and write as you like." We don't want to interfere with the freedom of the Press in any manner.

**Take the Opposition.** Is the Opposition now in the same cramped state in which it was before? The Leader of the Opposition has been recognized fully. And it was for the first time in history that the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker were elected unanimously in this House.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** The credit goes to the House.

**SHRI MORARJI DESAI:** I agree that credit goes to the House. The Opposition would have been willing to

do that even before; but it was never consulted. Not only that. It was defamed in every possible way. We don't believe in retaliation. Not only that. The President has also been elected unanimously. (Interruptions) I don't say that the credit is not due to you. I say that credit goes to all.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** Dr. G. S. Dhillon was elected unanimously.

**SHRI MORARJI DESAI:** The Speaker was not elected unanimously—not in the real sense. Therefore, to say that nothing has happened, is only denying facts. I can say nothing more than that.

**Look at food supplies.** There is more food available to-day. And those whom I met in Bombay and in other cities have said that whenever they wanted things, they get them. Formerly all those things were not available. There is now more production. Industry is doing better. It has not done enough, I am quite sure. But it takes time. A year or 13 months is not enough to change everything and bring Heaven in this country. We have never promised that. We don't do it.

**There is Education.** It requires to be changed; but we cannot change it by ourselves, as they were doing. We want to taken the educationists with us in this matter. Therefore we are discussing education with those who are concerned with it and trying to come to a consensus in the same manner as we are doing in this House on many matters. That is why it takes time. The Constitutional Amendment should have been done much earlier. But we did not want it without taking the opposition with us, as much as possible. We have been able to come to a large measure of agreement even in the anti-Defections Bill; it is delayed because we wanted to consult the Opposition so that it has a smooth

passage and it becomes more effective. I must say I was very happy this morning when in our discussions we could come to agreed conclusions and reached a consensus. That is why we have to have patience in this matter.

If my hon. friends think we can wash out every wrong thing they did in thirteen months, then I would like to say that we have washed out some; other things still remain to be washed out. That takes a little time; but it will not take more than a year more to wash out the remaining dirt.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** Do not wash them in public.

**SHRI MORARJI DESAI:** That is left to you. If you want me to do it, I do not know whether you will be able to stand up to it. This, I know; but it is not my business to expose anybody. I have never done it and I would not do it. If you come to me privately, I will tell you what I know, on condition that you do not publish it. But this is not the way to do it.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** What about your secrets?

**SHRI MORARJI DESAI:** I have no secrets. If I have, let anybody find them. But, somehow, over the years I was close with many of them. So, I know what they really are. That is how the world is. I do not find fault with them. We all have feet of clay; everybody has some failing or the other. Who am I to find fault with them? But they want us to be saints whereas they want to remain what they were. I think that is not the way to increase our capacity or make the Government more effective.

Let there be responsible dignified criticism. Criticism can be made, provided it is made with dignity. When they go on shouting at those who speak from here, they do not see anything wrong in it; they say that is their right. But when some people

from here have a dig at them, all of them get up and ask "what is going on?" This is not the way to meet arguments (*Interruptions*) What does the hon. Member think he is doing? He is demonstrating how he interrupts all the while. I have not interfered with anybody; I have not interrupted anybody. This is not the way to do it. But they pop up and down all the while, because that seems to be the only exercise they know. If it had been really an exercise in dignity with cogent arguments, I would have been very thankful to them.

As I said before, I welcome this no-confidence motion, because I am glad that it brings the two factions together. Those who have factions are now talking about factions? In my party where are the factions? Yes, there are differences of views as my colleague, Shri Jagjivan Ram, said, it is an unprecedented thing in history that five parties, differing from one another but all believing in democracy, fighting against one another for 30 years, criticising one another, come together voluntarily without any pressure from anybody, except the pressure of the people, who wanted democracy to be saved. Therefore, we came together and emerged practically as a new party, which was not fully formed constitutionally in the normal sense, wins the Lok Sabha elections in a striking manner, which opens the eyes of the world, but not the eyes of my hon. friends. Those who have eyes, but do not see—what can I tell them? I can lead a blind man, but I cannot lead a person who can see, but does not want to see. What can I do to them?

And then it was also said by Jagjivanramji that we are working together. It does not mean that all our hearts have come together. Therefore, there are bound to be some differences, differences of opinions and views. That is not healthy in my views, I do agree, but it is not an unusual phenomenon. It is natural. If it did not happen, it

[Shri Morarji Desai]

would have been unnatural. We would not have lasted. It is because of this that it will be cemented.

And I want their factions also to be cemented. I want a strong opposition. I do not want a weak opposition. It is the business of the opposition to show the faults of the Government, and also try to see that they get the mandate of the people to replace the Government in a constitutional manner. It is their right. That is what democracy means. And that is why I want that they should recognise this.

I believe what is happening is natural in the conditions in which we have come together, but that also will settle down. We will not oblige you. Don't think that you are likely to come here soon. But if you behave like this, you will never come here again.

I only want that they should be dignified in what they say, that they must have more regard for facts and truth, rather than only eagerness to attack and make us feel. That way nobody feels anything. I wish they had said something which would have made me think. I do not know what reply to give because there is nothing on which I can say anything to them, there is nothing which requires any telling. But my hon. friends go on saying what they like. Let them do so. After all, it is they who have to pick up wisdom, not I. I am trying to pick up such wisdom from them, as is therein them. Everybody can have wisdom I cannot say that there is anybody without any wisdom whatsoever. I can never say that. I am trying to learn from them. I do not want them to learn from me if they do not want to.

On the one side they give me a compliment that I am a Gandhian. On the other side, they depict me as a fool or a convector. That is not the way.

They bring here cases of oppression, terrorism of oppression of Harijans,

law and order problems, but these are not problems which only relate to us, they relate to all. I do not want to go on with this argument. This has been happening. And we have got to stop it. We are not able to stop it much, I agree, but this is also a legacy that we have got, and it is not created only by those people; these are also inherent in the conditions of the country. I do not want to blame anybody for these things, but these are things which we have got to stop. Formerly these incidents were not published. The Harijans, the tribals and the backward classes had no courage to fight it or speak about it. I am very happy that they are able to fight and speak out today, and that is why when my colleagues here on this side speak very strongly about it, I have patience with them, I appreciate their feelings.

But, do my hon. friends want to spoil the atmosphere further and not make it better? If they are interested in improving the situation and making this country great for the benefit of all of us, this is not the way to go about it. That is all that I can plead with them.

I have nothing to advise them. This is no sermon. It is my business as Leader of the House to advise them if necessary, but I know that advice must not be given to anybody who does not want it. One who does that would be stupid. That I learnt when I was young, not now. If they say many things and I have got to reply to them, they consider it a sermon. God help them again. Do they expect that I must not say anything which I must say to refute what they are saying in a wrong manner? If I say that, how does it become a sermon. If I say that I want the opposition to be strong, would I be giving a sermon? I say that the opposition will be strong only if it becomes dignified and disciplined in the House because it goes out from the House outside and I was simply very unhappy when I was told in one argument that this House does not represent the conditions in the

country. The people out side represent them. Are we not representatives? Is it not derogatory to the Parliament and its authority? This House represents the best in the country, whatever they may be.

**SHRI MOHD. SHAFI QURESHI:**  
Nobody said this.

**SHRI MORARJI DESAI:** It was said here. I will show it from the record. That is not right. It has been said from the front benches opposite. It has not been said from the back benches.

**SHRI MOHD. SHAFI QURESHI:**  
Whom is he referring to?

**SHRI MORARJI DESAI:** I can tell you but I do not want to name people. It is not said by one but by two. If they did not say it and if they say, they did not say it, I accept it. I have no difficulty about it. But let them see afterwards what they have said in a hurry without knowing what they are saying. That also is a malady from which we are suffering here. I hope, we do not suffer from that malady as a result of this no-confidence motion.

I am thankful to the hon. Leader of the Opposition for making an exhibition once again of what weaknesses they are suffering from. If they want to press the no-confidence motion, they are free to do so. But that will not add to the dignity in any way. That is all I have to say. Thank you.

**SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Idukki):**  
Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am really disappointed that in rising to reply, there is nothing in the speech made by the Prime Minister which I have got to reply to. He said only one thing that the people who have eyes do not care to see, cannot see. After listening through two days speeches if the Prime Minister does not see anything that has been said which is to be taken note of, I only repeat what Christ said once: "Those who have eyes to see, let them see; those

who have two ears to hear, let them hear."

The Prime Minister, unfortunately, does not have the ears to hear what was being said here.

A question was repeatedly asked why this no-confidence motion was brought forward. Many of the no-confidence motions were discussed in the past. Many Members in this House are witness to that. There is one thing absolutely distinct as far as this motion and the speeches on this motion are concerned. With the exception of one or two speeches, it will kindly be noted that the motion sought to rest not on corruption charges and mudslinging but on national issues. Not that there are no corruption allegation to be made; there are quite a number. I do not want to make any allegation but I have got with me a letter from Shri Shibban Lal Saksena who sent this to me where he said:

"I have been deeply distressed and pained at the corruption of some of the Ministers in the Central Cabinet. I have already given you a chargesheet containing hundred-and-one specific charges against..." (I do not want to mention name; it is here.) "And another chargesheet against another Minister..." (I do not want to mention. That is there in the letter.)

I have got the corruption charges with me. I could just read out those charges and could have started mudslinging process. But, I believe, the Parliament of India, if one can avoid it, must not be used for that purpose. National issues must be raised; national issues must be projected. National issues were projected here.

In the course of the budget discussion, every demand was discussed and a sum-total of impression has been formed and a sum-total of impression has been reflected in this House.

What is it that you heard from here? Congress (I), Congress,

[Shri C. M. Stephen]

P.W.P., Communist Party of India A.I.A.D.M.K., C.P.M., Muslim League, everyone of the parties which spoke from here said, performance is miserable; take warning; you are failing the country. Many members from your Benches said, this is a warning, take the warning. Prof. Mavalankar who so verily spoke, partly for you and partly for this side, while defending you, said, take care, the going are not good. This is the consensus that has developed.

There are two grounds on which I put through my No-Confidence motion. Generally, the No-Confidence motion comes up for three purposes. One is, there is a possibility of capturing power and the No-Confidence motion comes to unseat the Ministry. It is not for that purpose. Second is, when there is a specific issue, that has got to be projected and, sometimes, the No-Confidence motion comes—this happened when the Railway strike was there. It is not for that purpose. There are many issues which have got to be projected. The third is, when the opposition feels that the Government are failing the country miserably and, therefore, in the interest of the country it is time that the Government think of either performing or quitting, the Opposition is bound to give this warning. And it is for that purpose that I put through the No-Confidence motion.

Analysing the grounds on which I put the No-Confidence motion, with respect to the first one, that you are failing the country, there is a consensus. Then, what should follow? There is a difference of opinion there. According to me, I find that no mending is possible and, therefore, I say, it is time that you quit. The C.P.M. differs from me. They made a most blistering attack on you. Mr. Samar Mukherjee said, "Mend. We give you more time. Otherwise, you will be thrown out." These are the two positions taken. Even Mr. Biju Patnaik took up the position about the election, saying that it was the

token cut—an erosion of credibility; we accept that. That he conceded. As far as we are concerned, some friends believe that you should mend and, therefore, allow you to carry on or get thrown out and, I believe, it is impossible for you to mend and, therefore, get out before you are thrown out. Excepting for this, there is no difference of opinion.

As far as the basic issues are concerned, there is absolutely no difference of opinion at all. They say, they will mend and there can be a difference of opinion and all that. Difference of opinion there must be in every party.

Let us look at the Congress. We were told, "How was your Congress?" Many of my leaders who spoke, who got me in the Congress, tell me, "How was your Congress?" It is they who brought me up to the Congress. I sat at their feet and learnt what the Congress message was. It is very strange that they tell me, "What about your Congress?" It is your Congress, Babu Ji; it is not my Congress. Let us not think the other way. What was this Congress? This Congress before Independence was a mass movement. There were different ideas, different ideologies. When it came to the question of implementation, how programmes must be taken up. Sharp differences developed. From out of the womb of the Congress, the Swatantra Party emerged; from out of the womb of the Communist Party the Socialist Party emerged; from out of its womb, the B.L.D. emerged and I do not know whether it will be correct to say, to a certain extent, from its womb the Jana Sangh also emerged. (Interruptions) I stand corrected. That is why I do not know. Out of these wombs, different parties emerged. They emerged, consolidated and crystallised on different specific ideas and ideologies. Now they say merely because these crystallised organisations came together and they put a khadi shawl around that and said: this is a single party. Therefore,

cohesion there can be. You are assuming a position which is absolutely not possible or practicable.

If the Indian National Congress completely cohesive, completely strong, could not, at the stage of implementation of a programme, carry on as one party but had to be split up, then the different organisations crystallised as iron clad organisations coming together at the moment of implementing a programme will necessarily have to fall out. Otherwise, every one of you is a hypocrite; you are not sincere people standing firm with the faith you have, with the political conviction you have. It is just my reading. Therefore, I feel it is a vain exercise. If you want to carry on that exercise, by all means you carry on that exercise. But, in the interest of the country, I feel a better progress will not be possible. That is the difference I pointed out.

In 1977, when you won the elections and the results were that, you are here today, in 1977, it was a cohesive party, strong and powerful and determined to do something. Within one year, difference have developed. I am not interested in your differences at all. I am not calculating on my future on the disension that may take place among you. I am calculating on my inherent strength and in my capacity to muster people for implementation of my programmes. I will be a political fool if I think that by your disintegration I must fix up my future. Not at all. But I could see that in the nature of things this disintegration is unavoidable and to the extent of its being unavoidable, the country will suffer. That is the position I am taking.

Now, Sir, you are repeatedly saying that we did not mend matters during emergency. Well there are four types of people, as far as emergency is concerned. When you call one another names let us understand those people. There is a set of people who valiantly opposed the emergency from the start. Hats off to them. I salute them. There

is a set of people who put the cause of emergency as necessary for the nation, who argued in this House and remained arguing until the elections were declared. Then there is a third class of people who protested against emergency, went to jails made an escape out of it and started negotiations and scuttled the whole movement. I knew this class of people. They are the persons on whom the cap will fit. He understands what I mean. Then there is a fourth class of people who even after the elections—during the elections, they were defending the emergency—finding out that the power had passed on to somebody jumped to the other wagon and came back saying: down with the emergency and you are accepting those people. Then there is a fifth class of people whom I represent who believed and continue to believe that emergency was rightly declared. (*Interruptions*) You may say thousand times shames. Here in my hand is the first speech I made in this House, after the elections when the President's Address was discussed. I said, "I for one fought for the elections on the question of emergency. I wanted a verdict of the people on the basis of emergency. All of us in Kerala campaigned on the basis of emergency" and so on and finally said: "this was the issue which we had honestly put forward in my constituency. In our pamphlets and speeches, we said: do you approve of the emergency as you know it or not and they have upheld the proposition and they approved the emergency." This is the position I took in my very first speech after the elections. You may accept or you may not accept it. What I am saying is that there are four or five types of people. Who is more honourable? I say those persons who opposed emergency from the very start, I differ from them. But I acclaim them as honourable man and accept them as honourable men. We pleaded for the Emergency believing that it was correct and were holding on to that position and are still saying that it was rightly declared. Would you condemn me for the reason that I did not change my

[Shri C. M. Stephen]

opinion? And would you prefer the person who argued for Emergency till the elections and who remained in my party upto the elections, who were the high priests of Emergency in the Ministry, who wanted to command you and whom you hugged and kissed in order that you may get some election results somewhere? Who is honourable? The person who said, 'I have got the right to believe' and who believed that the Emergency was rightly declared, who held on to it whatever be the attacks and criticisms who said not once but twice, who is saying even now for the third time that Emergency was rightly declared, or the other person? Would you condemn me as a dishonourable man and would you prefer to call the other man as an honourable man? Would you say that anybody who came here and argued for Emergency held on to it, goaded us to the impression and also told us that the Emergency was good, played our leader and made us accept the Resolution and then when the crucial time came, jumped off

SHRI KRISHAN KANT (Chandigarh): I want to know from him whether in the same situation develops today, he would like Emergency to be promulgated in this country.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: I am only saying this. Let nobody say anything against anybody at all.

Mr. Biju Patnaik made a valiant speech. All I have to say is that those who are in the glasshouses should not throw stones at others. There are many people there who can come out, hold their heads high and attack, but not Mr. Biju Patnaik; Mr. Biju Patnaik is not among them, because we know his antecedents. He speaks about sycophancy. We says he knows intimately how Nehru functioned, how Indiraji functioned. We know. I saw how, in Bhubaneswar session of the Congress, the sycophancy was functioning, I saw the sycophancy the maximum, how the sycophancy fruited in an unparalleled manner when

without being a Minister, he was given a room in the South Block to run this country, to carry on the defence of this country.

Well, Sir, there is a book...

PROF MADHU DANDAVATE: In Indiraji's raj, even those who were Ministers were not given room.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Here is a book by Shri C. G. K. Reddy on Baroda Dynamite Conspiracy; here he says:

"Further discussions between the representatives of the conclave of mid-December and the Government representatives were stalled by Om Mehta. This gave birth to the infamous 'My Dear Om' letter addressed by Biju Patnaik in the New Year of 1977. This letter crowned the shame that the opposition leaders who were outside the jail perpetrated on themselves and caused consternation and demoralization to those who were either in jail and still uncompromising."

श्री राजी लाल लुनन (फिरोजाबाद) : श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी ने श्री बीजू पटनायक को पत्र लिखा था। क्या आप को पता है और जानकारी है कि उनके व्यक्तित्व सम्बन्ध क्या है ?

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: All I am saying is this. Let nobody try to play up the valorous posture. The question was asked....

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK: The record must be set right. He has named me. He was reading from a book, from a newspaper chap, whoever it is, I do not know. He may be very big for him, but I do not know him. He may have done a good job for him, I do not know....

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: You do not know George Fernandes!

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK: Whether he came with George Fernandes or for George Fernandes, I do not know... (Interruptions)

**SHRI C. M. STEPHEN:** I am not yielding.

**MR. SPEAKER:** He is not yielding. I will give you an opportunity later.

17 hrs.

**SHRI C. M. STEPHEN:** Mr. Krishna Kant asked me a question, whether, if such a situation arose today, we would like Emergency to be declared. I put the question back to him, because the Constitution amendment proposals have come up. The question is whether, in the case of an internal emergency, emergency must be declared or not. The present Article says 'internal disturbances' and in place of that you want to put in the new words 'armed rebellion'. That means an internal affair. Supposing the Naxalite people go up in a sort of a rebellion in an area, you can construe it as armed rebellion: if, in a working class area the people take up arms, you can take it as armed rebellion. The question is whether you are prepared to say there will be declaration of Emergency only if there is external aggression and war or fear of external aggression and war or would you still say we should provide for a contingency in which internal Emergency can be declared? The very fact that you want to provide for it shows that in your view there can be a situation in which internal developments can happen which would justify the declaration of emergency. The difference is only this—whether the assessment of the situation as at the time of the declaration of Emergency was correct or not, whether your assessment or our assessment is correct. Different opinions are possible. However, once it is declared, all the other consequences follow. Nobody had anything to say about the period beyond this 19 month period. All that was said was about the 19 month period. There was no allegation that there was no freedom or democracy before the Emergency was declared: there was

absolutely no allegation. The allegation is only in respect of the 19 month period. Therefore, the moment Emergency is withdrawn, automatically *status quo ante* will have to be restored. And the Emergency was withdrawn: the Emergency was withdrawn the moment people's verdict came through the Election. (*Interruptions*). Before the Government was handed over to you, Emergency was withdrawn. (*Interruptions*).

My point is, if you wanted to bring back the conditions which were obtaining during Emergency, you were faced with the necessity of declaring a fresh Emergency. That declaration you did not make. If a new declaration did not come, then *status quo ante* and democracy automatically stood restored. It is nothing of your boon: that is what I am saying. The people declared themselves against Emergency and that verdict was accepted. The Emergency was cancelled and you were ushered into power—which you did not hope for before the Emergency. If you wanted to restore the happenings of the 19 months period, you would have had to declare Emergency again. Therefore, the essence of what you are saying is only this, that you did not declare a fresh Emergency. This is all that you are saying: nothing more than that. In the absence of Emergency, nothing else was possible and your omission to declare a fresh Emergency is something you want to claim credit for. Are the conditions in this country such as would justify the declaration of a new Emergency? That is the simple question I have got to ask you. (*Interruptions*).

I had the most painful moment in my life today when I listened to Babuji. I must confess to an attitude of instinctive reverence on my part towards Babuji more than any other leader. It is the unkindest cut of all that the Janata Party chose to field Babuji in this No Confidence Motion discussion: it was the unkindest cut of all. Babuji talked about the removal of the 92 year-old Congress.

[Shri C. M. Stephen]

Babuji was my President. The whole period, Babuji was in power; the whole period, he was in the Parliamentary Board; he was in the political affairs Committee; he was in the Cabinet; he was in the Election Committee, there was no superior organisation of the Party in which he was not involved. He guided us; he advised us; his opinion was orders for us. But now, what does he say? We are not prepared to unlearn the moment he is prepared to unlearn. You taught us certain lessons which have become a part of us. We remain firm there. We cannot unlearn the moment you decide to unlearn. Then, Babuji, you moved the motion for approval of emergency. That speech is before me. Would you withdraw a single sentence of the speech you made. You stand by it or not? You justified the emergency. Babuji says that he stands by everything he said while he put forward the resolution for approval of emergency. Then, what is the difference between you and me? The only difference is that we stand where we did whereas somebody else chose to leave from where he did. This is the only difference.

Now, Sir, when he speaks of the Indian National Congress as an organisation of 92 years, an organisation which brought him up and which he brought up and under whose banner he moulded many a political leader and worker in this country—they are in thousands who look to him...

SHRI NATHU SINGH (Dausa): Mr. Speaker, Sir...

(Interruptions)

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: I know what had happened since the Allahabad judgement. I know what had happened before the resolution by the Party was passed. I remember what happened between Babuji and me when the resolution was drafted. I know the position, from time to time. These things cannot be rubbed off in a single stroke. Therefore, inner

party discussions were there, not with Indira Gandhi only but all of us and many of us were involved. Babuji was involved, Shri Chavan was involved, I was involved and many of us were involved. ...

AN HON. MEMBER: Even Mr. Bahuguna.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: We sat together and drew up a resolution and it was that resolution which was passed by the parliamentary party. Subsequently, step by step Babuji advised us and I, more than to any other leader, went to Babuji for his advice and guidance—this is a secret which I want to make public....

AN HON. MEMBER: What about Hemvati Nandan Bahuguna?

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: And here, Babuji comes and accuses me for bringing forward a no-confidence motion. Babuji, did I say anything disparaging about you in my speech? I raised only national issues when I put my points across. Those national issues have echoes everywhere. Well, it was said somewhere—he too serves a purpose who only stands up and cheers. There are people who can do that. It is his good fortune that he is always on that side and never on this side whichever Party may come and whichever Party may go. It is out of conviction that he is always on that side and he can always reply to a no-confidence motion.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very sorry, after such a long period of time I have got to impart this tone in my speech with regard to my most revered Babuji. A situation for that should not have been created. We can understand the compulsions of the situation but, please, for heaven's sake, don't rub on the wrong side of our heart. Don't wound us by declarations which are all right against your foes but not against us. This is all I have to say as far as Babuji's speech is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is a moment for introspection in the country. The Fathers of the Constitution contemplated that an emergency may become necessary. May be there may be difference of opinion and in judgement. I have got before me Mr. Justice Mathew's report where he says:

"Be that as it may, there can be no gainsaying the fact that violence threatened the democratic set up in Bihar. Violence was very much in the air at all levels—individual, social and political.

It is axiomatic that civilised life becomes impossible if political violence were to take the place of legal, parliamentary and constitutional processes. ...No democratic system can accept the use of physical violence as an instrument of politics.

The incidents of violence in Bihar including the incidents of explosion at Samastipur were a grave warning to the nation and all people had to give very serious thought as to what action should be taken at the national and political levels to put an end to violence to safeguard democracy and ensure national security."

This is the finding of the Commission. May be you withheld this Commission's report. May be you have a soft corner for a Commission's report coming from somebody else. But this is a Commission's report from a sitting Judge of the Supreme Court whose integrity nobody has so far questioned. This is the impression he has gathered as a result of evidence.

The question is: whether under such circumstances an emergency could have been declared justifiably. Misuse there was. Nobody denies it. In the implementation of emergency there was a misuse. Behind the

curtain of emergency certain crimes were committed, which must be condemned. There is no doubt about it. But, on the question as to whether there could be emergency, the test is, what is your attitude? If you want still to provide for internal emergency, then, the cat is out of the bag. Faced with a similar situation you will also declare an emergency. If that is your attitude, then, what right have you to criticise somebody who, in his best judgment, thought that emergency was called for and emergency was declared?

Therefore, the sum total of the entire debate is this. This debate is not without purpose. As was pointed out by me at the very start, this debate was for the purpose of projecting what people in the country have started feeling. There is an erosion of faith. I am repeatedly saying this. Take note of it. And mend it if you can. But I don't believe you can. Therefore I say: Get out before you are thrown out.

This is all that I have got to say. Try as much as you can to mend it by all means but not by the mimicry such as Mr. Biju Patnaik performed here. That is not the answer.

Sir, I am concluding. The sum total of my charge against this Government is this. Through this discussion a picture has emerged. The interests of the country are at stake. You may take some money somewhere, there may be some corruption somewhere, I am not bothered about it. But, if the fabric of the country is threatened, if the basic...

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Balia): Excuse me for interrupting you. Mr. Stephen, you were never bothered about corruption. You were never bothered about civil rights and democracy. You know about it. But I would like to know one thing from you. Can there be anything more despicable than your performance this evening that you are justifying

[Shri Chandra Shekar]

all the evils of the emergency? Can there be anything more serious than that? I know, you and your colleagues have no consideration for any values. I have been saying this for the last 10 years. I am not surprised at your behaviour and your performance this evening. But I am surprised at the behaviour and performance of some sober people in that side. When their leader is speaking in terms of all praise for emergency, they think that he is doing something very great and doing very great service to the nation. Well, do it if it serves you any purpose..

**SHRI C. M. STEPHEN:** I will repeat it again. I say, Number one: First the question is whether one can held that the declaration of emergency was justified, as per the provisions of the Constitution. My answer is yes.

Second, the question is, whether in the implementation of emergency there were excesses. My answer is, yes, and they deserve to be condemned.

Number three. The question is whether in the conditions obtaining in emergency certain persons committed crimes which cannot be pardoned. I say, yes. They deserve to be punished.

These are the three propositions which I have put forth.

Number four. The question is whether under this emergency positive gains were achieved in the country or not. I say, yes.

So, this is the definite position that I am taking. And I am taking this position, representing the people. This was the proposition I put forth in my election and I won. This was the only issue that was put forth. Anybody who comes from Kerala and other areas will say that this was the issue that was put forth. True, Sir, the North did not accept it. But the

South did. And now what? 'All the by-elections have been fought on the misdeeds of Mrs. Indira Gandhi. The people have rejected that. Therefore a new thinking is coming. That is all I have got to say.

If you say that the acceptance of emergency is bad morally, what justification have you to take in your fold persons who were the high priests of emergency, who justified the emergency and won the election on that basis? What moral sense have you? You have accepted those people. After having done that, what moral right have you to point the finger of accusation at us? Look to your people among you, they are the villains and not I.

I have the honesty to say, the declaration of emergency was justified. I said it. I say it. I will continue to say it. There is no doubt about that. One sentence more and I have done.

The totality of the opinion in this House emerging as a result of the discussion is that the performance of this Government has been unsatisfactory. Faith of the people has been eroded. The people are giving a warning. A large number of Members in this House feel that your performance is miserable. If you accept it as a matter of fact, accept this impeachment and get out. If not, to that extent, you will not be respecting the views of the people.

With these words, Sir, I press this motion for acceptance of the House.

**SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Chirayinkil):** Sir, I am on a point of clarification. One minute, Sir, We are also a party to the no-confidence motion. We have taken part in the debate. But a situation has now come when Mr. Stephen replied to an important question put to him by Shri Chandra Sekhar and now we come to a point of saying whether this motion justifies emergency or not.

AN HON. MEMBER: That was not the question. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai): That is the main question. All their speeches have been directed in justification of emergency. Those who have suffered—1,36,000 under MISA and DIR. (*Interruptions*)...suffered in 19 months of internal emergency. The whole country was made captive; the whole country was made prisoner. And this man is justifying the emergency; if you have got the courage, then throw out the empress of emergency; throw out the crown prince of emergency. (*Interruptions*). It is good that the cat is now out of the bag. This is what you are intending to do. You are trying to bring about a totalitarian regime in this country. You are preparing the ground for that. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: We were a party to the emergency and the

rule at that time; we are not denying that fact. But, we are not taking any position to justify the emergency. It is not the purpose of this motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Now I shall put the motion to the vote of the House. The question is:

"That this House expresses its want of confidence in the Council of Ministers".

*The motion was negatived.*

MR. SPEAKER: Now, the House stands adjourned to meet at 11 A.M. tomorrow.

17.19 hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, May 12, 1978/Vaisakha 22, 1900 (Saka).*