

sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Gujarat for the services of the financial year 1974-75."

The motion was adopted

SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHERJEE: I introduce† the Bill as corrected.

I beg to move†:

"That the Bill, as corrected to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Gujarat for the services of the financial year 1974-75, be taken into consideration."

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the Bill, as corrected to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Gujarat for the services of the financial year 1974-75, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted

MR DEPUTY SPEAKER:

We take up clause by clause consideration.

The question is:

"That clause 2 as corrected, clause 3 the Schedule as corrected, clause 1, the Enacting Formula, and the Title stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted

Clause 2 as corrected, clause 3, the Schedule as corrected, clause 1, the Enacting Formula, the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHERJEE: I beg to move:

"That the Bill, as corrected, be passed."

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the Bill, as corrected, be passed".

The motion was adopted

† Introduced/moved with the recommendation of the president.

SHRI SEZHIAN (Kumbakonam): I want to put on record my appreciation for the attitude shown by the Minister. He did not stand on formality of pushing through the Bill. He agreed to our suggestion and made the correction. This has been helpful not only to us but also to the growth of Parliamentary democracy in the country.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR (Ahmedabad): We want to convey our appreciation to the Deputy Speaker for the manner in which he held the points of view of Shri Era Sezhiyan.

SHRI PILLOO MODY: The Speaker is expected to do that.

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I would also like to join and say that this is a happy day to me especially because I think the House to-day has discovered itself. I hope that the administration also will take note of this. It has been a happy thing that there has been a spirit of give and take—reciprocity—and nobody has tried to stand on prestige but all that we have tried to do is to do the duty of this House with all responsibility and to assert the supremacy of this House and also to give notice to establish that nobody in this democracy of ours should take this House or us for granted.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We shall now take up Private Members' Bills. Dr. Lakshminarayan Pandeya is not here. So, his Bill cannot be introduced.

16.34 hrs.

CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL (Amendment of articles 101, 102, etc.) by Shri Priya Ranjan Das Munsri.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The House will now resume further consideration of the following motion moved by Shri Priya Ranjan Das Munsri on the 7th March, 1975:—

"That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India, be taken into consideration."

Shri Priya Ranjan Das Munsri was on his legs on the last occasion. He has

written that he is not well and so he cannot continue with the speech. If he cannot continue, it means that he has concluded his speech and the Bill is now the property of the House.

SHRI M. C. DAGA (Pali) : Am I to take it that Half-an-Hour discussion will be at six O'Clock ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : As far as I am concerned we have to go through the entire business of the day unless the House decides other-wise.

SHRI K. GOPAL (Karur) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, I welcome the spirit of the Bill though not the entire thing, part (ii) of Clause 3.

My friend Mr. Das Muni deserves the appreciation of all of us for bringing forward this measure but what I wonder is whether with regard to Clause 3(i), this is possible at all, because in our democratic country those who enter politics, those who enter the Assembly or any office like Municipalities or Panchayats, have got to fall back upon something for their livelihood. My friend says, Doctors, Lawyers and Teachers should not be allowed to continue with that profession. But he does not say that a man owning large property or doing any business should also be prohibited to carry on such activities. The profession of lawyer and doctor is such that once there is a break, they can't catch up with their work and therefore this is a continuous process. If he is elected to this office, say for 5 years, after that term is over, what is he going to do ? Because, Sir, conditions in our country are such that those who are elected to Assemblies or Parliament are not assured of their future livelihood, however honest a man may be, unless he is something like an agriculturist or a small industrialist and so on. Once the term is over in our country there is no provision to look after ex-Members and in this regard what we find is that even a country like Malaysia has got a system of gratuity and provision for this but in our country this is not there. So

one has got to have some provision. I don't say that they should earn living by dubious means. Not at all. I say, a lawyer should be enabled to continue with his practice, so also a doctor.

In Clause (ii) he says as follows :

'If a member of either House of Parliament, after his election to that House joins a political party or group other than the one on whose ticket he was elected to that House or if he was an independent member at the time of election to that House and joins any political party or group, he shall be disqualified for being a member of that House from the date of his joining the latter political party or group.'

16.37 hrs.

SHRI NAWAL KISHORE SINHA : *in the Chair.*

I am in agreement with this. This question is being looked into by a Parliamentary Committee and I hope that something would be done in this regard. Not only disqualification alone, but once he crosses the floor, he should be disqualified for ever. He should not be allowed to contest any election to any public office. Then in the next clause he says :

'If a Member of either House of Parliament after his nomination or election to any Committee constituted by either House of Parliament does not attend any meeting of that Committee continuously for a period of one year, he shall be disqualified for being a member of that House after the expiry of the said period of one year.'

I do not know why he specifies one year only. There are some committees which do not meet for more than one year. I am a Member of one committee, Dock Passenger Welfare Committee. For one year I have not attended any Committees meeting. There are some Committees which do not meet for two to three years. I am a member of the Committee known as 'Deck Passengers' Welfare Committee'. For the last three years this Committee

met only once. So, it should not be that not attending the Committee for one year will entail a disqualification of a member. It should be only if a member does not attend for two to three days consecutively that a disqualification can be made. Of course, interpretation can be made that I have not attended the meeting of that Committee for no fault of mine. The committee itself has not met. Why should I be disqualified?

So with these few words, I support this Bill.

SHRI S P BHATTACHARYYA (Uttar Pradesh) Sir, I oppose this Bill. There are many things that are yet to be done. This Bill is something which goes against the spirit of the Parliamentary system because this is for important persons like professors, lawyers, doctors etc. who are popular and who get themselves elected and whom the people accept. The purpose of the Bill is that whenever a person is elected to Parliament, he must get out of his profession. That is something impracticable. It is unjust also. If the Parliamentary system has to function in this country what is important is to make it function in an efficient manner. The importance of Parliamentary system is going down and down. What do we find throughout the country? There is disparity of income. We have failed to give our people the fundamental rights to work, to live etc. We have to run this system in a democratic line. We are not running our democracy in the interests of the people and not when according to the Constitution. That is because the poverty level goes on increasing, unemployment is increasing, price rise is going up and up, taxation is also going up. Everything acts against the interests of the people. We must realise that we are not working in the interests of democracy. The purpose of the Constitution is not better served. From that angle if any change is called for in our Constitution that would be welcome to us. It is not the case at all that because Parliament Members are professionals like doctors, professors, engineers and lawyers and that is why the Parliament is not able to function. We should try to think a new

We have got to face the basic problems. In Parliamentary discussions we cannot bring up the problems of growing poverty so as to solve them. For example we are not able to solve the problem of growing unemployment. How to bring about the changes in this regard is the question to be considered. For example, we are not able to bring down the price rise. Only big landowners, profiteers or blackmarketeers are the beneficiaries. That may be because the ruling party gets a lot of money from them. It is an irony of fate that when the people suffer terribly we are remaining silent over that. If Parliament has got something to do with this, it must really try to solve the problems faced by the people. Whatever new amendments are proposed, this constitutional amendment bill is not going to make our Parliament function better.

With these few words I totally oppose this Bill.

श्री मूल बिल द्वारा (पाली) समाप्ति की यह कहना बहुत प्रायान है कि हम लोग क्या करने हैं इस के लिये सविधान म सभाघन पेश कर दिया गया और वह बिल बन कर आ गया। तबिन मैं अभी तक समझ नहीं मचा कि श्री सुधी इस बिल के यहा लाने से क्या चाहत है? अगर मैं उन का भाषण सुन पाता तो समझ सकना कि व क्या चाहत है कि डाक्टरों इन्जीनियरों वकील पालियामेंट बनसक्य न बने। आप इमार साल्वे साहब का उदाहरण लीजिये—य टैक न ब मासले में बहुत एक्सपट है इन का वह दिया जाय कि कल से आप पालियामेंट म मन प्राइय क्याकि आप अपना काम करते हैं। इसी तरह से स्टीफन साहब है, वह वकील है—उन से कह दिया जाय कि आप कल से पालियामेंट मन प्राइय जाकर कोट म लपिघर प्राइय—इम का क्या परिषाम निकसेगा।

मेम्बर चाहे वकील हा, डाक्टर हो इन्जीनियर हा, अगर वह ठीक काम करता है, तो पालियामेंट में भी ठीक काम करेगा। यह कहना की जा वकील है, वह पालियामेंट में अच्छा काम नहीं कर सकेगा यह गलत है, जो बाहर अच्छा काम करता है, जिल की काम करन की श्रावत है वह पालियामेंट

के धरकर भी अच्छा काम करेगा। आप देखिये—इस लोक सभा के लगभग 500 मेम्बर हैं—हम आप की सेवा में लिख-लिख कर भेजते हैं कि हम को बोलने का मौका दीजिये और आप कहते हैं कि टाइम नहीं है। हम में बहुत से ऐसे मेम्बर हैं जो खुप-खुप रहते हैं, लेकिन भीज्जिण्ट पटेशन करते हैं, अपनी कान्ट्रीब्यून्सी में काम करने हैं—ता इम चीज का कान्ट्रीब्यून्सी क्या होगा ? आप किस तरह से जाच करेंगे कि कौन अच्छा काम करना है कौन नहीं करता है। यह साचना गवत है कि जो लाग पार्लियामेंट में बानत है सिर्फ वे ही कान्ट्रीब्यून्सी करने हैं जो लाग कमेटीज में जात है—पार्लियामेंट का ज्यादा काम ता रमेगीज में होता है—वे बड़ा काफी हिस्सा तन है उन ता काफी गान्डीयजन हाता है वे बड़ा पर वग मन्त्रपुण समिका भदा करने हैं। बहुत से लोग अपने निर्वाचन क्षत्रा में बहुत अच्छा काम करने हैं। मैं ता यन् तक कहना चाहता हू कि मसद मदम्या का आप जा टमीन्पु मन्टम दे रह है उम इमीन्पु मन्ट में व दिन गत भी काम करे ता अपने घर का गजाग नग कर सकत है और न अपने निर्वाचन क्षत्र व प्रति -प्राय कर सका है।

आप जिन गजा का पानिभाषानी कहते हैं जो एकमपट लाग है अगरे वे घाडी दर के लिये भी प्राये व अपने बान कर कर चये जाते हैं लेकिन उन का जितना भी कान्ट्रीब्यून्सी हाता है वह बहुत महत्व का हाता है। इमी तरह मे जो इन्जीनियर हैं—जैसे हमारे डांकंगल राह है जो बहुत बड़ इन्जीनियर हैं उन का जितना भी कान्ट्रीब्यून्सी हाता है वह बड़ महत्व का हाता है। मन्त्र मन्त्रजन साहब है जा मिन्सपल हैं टोचस की माइड से उन का कान्ट्रीब्यून्सी बड़ा महत्वपूर्ण हाता है। साल्चे साहब है जा इन्कम टैक्स क एकमपट है उनका कान्ट्रीब्यून्सी फाइनेन्स की दृष्टि से बड़ा महत्वपूर्ण होसा है। एक तरह से ता इन्ही लाग ने यहाँ पर अपना राज जसा रखा है। मन्त्रपति जी मैं क्षमा चाहता हू—इम पार्लियामेंट में इन्ही बकीलो प्राफेसरो और इन्जीनियरो का गज है अगरे ये लोग यहा न प्राये तो उन मामलो पर

कौन बात करेगा जिन का हम नहीं जानते हैं। कान्ट्रीब्यून्सी का कान्ट्रीब्यून्सी उठाना है कौन उठायेगा। जहा इन्जीनियरिंग की बात करनी है—कौन करेगा।

मै मुझी जी की इम बात को मानता हू कि हम मसद के प्रति बफादार बनें लेकिन हम बिल को मान में पहल उन को साचना चाहिये था कि कौन प्रावमी किस तरह में काम करता है। सब में पत्नी बान ता यह है कि बाई भी प्रावमी प्रावमी स यहा नहीं प्राता है—निर्वाचन क्षेत्र बहुत लम्बा चौड़ा हाता है मतदाना लागो का जाचन है कि कौन बना प्रावमी है। अब जैसे हमारे पाण्डेय जी है यह बड़ माहियकार है बनाकार है, इन क अन्दर मारी बनाय है ये अगरे यहाँ न प्राये ता यह निरमता छा जायगी। हमारे महाजन जी है बड़ इन्फनमीता है इन का अगरे यहा न प्रात दिया जाय और कहा जाय की सुप्रीम काट में आघ्रा ता कैसे काम चनेगा।

इम बिल में दल-बदल की बात बही गई है। दल-बदल का कानन पलन ही यहा पर विचारगधीन है उम क निय जवा-इन्क कमीटी बँठी है सिद्धान्त हम न माना भी है कि हम दलबदल नहीं चाहते हैं। लेकिन आप लागो का यह भी देखना है कि एक पार्टी जो जनता क मामन पसान करती है कि हम ये ये काम करग एक घोषणा-पत्र निवासती है और फिर उम क प्रति अगरे बह पार्टी बफादार नहीं रहती है और इम स्थिति में उम का कोई मदम्य उम पार्टी का छोड़ देता है तो मेरी मसद में नहीं प्राता कि उम का दलबदल कैसे माना जा सकता है ? अगरे कोई पार्टी अपना सिद्धांत ही नहीं निभाती ता उम का छाडना कैसे दलबदल माना जा सकता है ? या मान लीजिये जैसे मधु लिमये जी की पार्टी है इन के पाच मदम्य है इन की पार्टी पूरी की पूरी किसा दूसरी पार्टी में मिल जाय कोई बिगधी मोर्चा मचबूत बनान क लिये जिस की लाग काजिस भी कर रह है तो क्या उम को दलबदल माना जायगा ? या माननीय घोते साहब है वह किसी दूसरी पार्टी

मे जाते हैं तो उसे दलबदल नहीं कहा जा सकता है। इसके भी कुछ सिद्धांत होने चाहिये।

हरियाणा में एक समय में यह हुआ चली आया राम गया राम। लेकिन अब भारत के मतदाता बहुत होशियार हो गये हैं। जो बाकायद में दलबदल होने हैं मतदाना उन को कभी वोट नहीं देगे। लोग अपने आप ऐसे लोगों की परीक्षा करते हैं, जनता अपने आप ऐसे लोगों को सजा देगी और जैसे दूध से मक्खी निकाल कर फेंक देते हैं वैसे ही जनता ऐसे लोगों को भी निकाल फेंकेगी। सिद्धांत के ऊपर बड़े बड़े लोगों ने दल बदल किया है। तो क्या माननीय मंत्री जी चाहते हैं कि ऐसे लोगों को भी दलबदल की सजा दे कर उन्हें पार्लियामेंट से घाने से रोका जाय ? मेरी ऐसी राय है कि सिद्धांत के आधार पर किसी पार्टी को छोड़ना कभी भी दलबदल नहीं माना जाना चाहिये। मेरा ही सिद्धांत है कि हिन्दी को प्राथमिकता दी जाय। अब अगर मैं देखता हूँ कि इस सिद्धांत का पालन नहीं किया जा रहा है तो मेरे लिये क्या चारा है निवाय हम के कि मैं ऐसी पार्टी को छोड़ दूँ। इसलिये मेरे इनकमन्सिलिट बिल पर विवाद करने क्या फायदा ?

दूसरी बात माननीय मंत्री जी के बिल में यह है कि अगर कोई सदस्य किसी कमेटी को बगबर अटेंड नहीं करता है तो उस को डिमक्वालीफाई कर दिया जाय। अब मान लीजिये एक सदस्य कई कमेटीयों का सदस्य है, जाहिर है कि वह सब का अटेंड नहीं कर सकता, या कभी कोई बीमार ही पड़ जाय, तो क्या आप उन को डिमक्वालीफाई कर देगे। मेरी राय में बिल लाने वाले माननीय सदस्य ने इन बातों पर ठीक से नहीं सोचा। मेरा कहना यह है कि संविधान में संशोधन करने का यह तरीका नहीं है कि जब इच्छा आयी किसी भी अमूकके में एक, दो माइन जोड़ दी। इसलिये मैं इस बिल का विरोध कर रहा हूँ। डिफेन्सन्स के बारे में जोइंट कमेटी में विचार विमर्श चल रहा है और वह समिति उस बारे में निर्णय ले रही है। फिर उस बिल के होने हुए यह बिल लाना उचित नहीं है, ऐसा मैं मानता हूँ।

लोगों की यह एक धारणा बन गई है कि जीरो आबर में भी बोलता है उसी का ज्यादा नाम बाहर अखबार वाले निकालते हैं, या कोई ज्यादा जोर-शोर से बोलता है उसके लिये समझा जाता है कि वह सदस्य बड़ा ऐक्टिव है। और समाचार-पत्र वाले भी ऐसी खबर को ज्यादा छापते हैं। जीरो आबर में किसी ने अगर एक सेंटेंस कह दिया या नेता को गरीबी दे दी तो वह नेता बन गया। जब कि बहुत से सदस्य ऐसे हैं जो चुपचाप अपना काम ज्यादा अच्छी तरह से करते हैं, कमेटीयों में उनका बड़ा अच्छा योगदान रहता है। ऐसे लोगों का जाहिर है कि अखबार में कम ही नाम आता है। तो क्या यह मतलब हुआ कि ऐसा सदस्य जो चुपचाप काम करता है, कमेटीयों में योगदान करता है, उस सदन का सदस्य नहीं चुना जाना चाहिये ? मेरी राय में यह धारणा बिल्कुल गलत है और इस पर अमल नहीं करना चाहिये। मन्नापति जी, यह भी देखा जाता है लोक समझ कर क्वेश्चन ही नहीं करते हैं, एक ही मवाल पर पौन घटा लग जाता है, लेकिन अखबार में नाम निकल जाता है। पर वास्तव में उन का देश के लिये क्या कट्टीभूषण है ? जीरो। नाइनेम स्केडल पर काफी खर्चा हुआ, मार देग में आवाज आयी कि तुमसोहन राग के केम में मदन ने माखी म्प्या खर्च कर दिया। लेकिन नतीजा क्या निबना ? केम कोर्ट में भालरेडी चल रहा है।

इसलिये मेरी निश्चिन धारणा है कि इस बिल से यह पना लगाना मुश्किल है कि कौन सा प्रादमी ठीक में काम करता है और कौन सा नहीं। कई ऐसे व्यक्ति हैं जो कम बोलते हैं लेकिन बड़ इतना काम करते हैं कमेटीयों में, इनकी ठाम और अच्छी बात कहने के कि उन का कट्टीभूषण बहुत उपयोगी साबिन होता है।

इस बिल के अनुसार संविधान में संशोधन करने के पहले प्रस्तावक महोदय के विभाग में एक गुबार प्राया और लिख दिया कि यह लोग डिमक्वालीफाई समझे जायें। लेकिन यह नहीं बताया कि क्या तरीका रहेगा, कैसे जज करेगे। डी०एम०के० वाले राज बोलते हैं तो यह अच्छे-

कि वह भ्रष्टा दो कार्यदे की बात बोलता है ? माननीय चन्द्रापन जी साइलेंट बर्कर हैं, जरा कम बोलते हैं लेकिन इन की ही पार्टी के माननीय एम० एम० बनर्जी हैं उन का नाम ज्यादा प्रता है । तो कैसे प्राय जत्र करेगे कि बिम का कट्टीब्यूहन ज्यादा है ? इनलिये मेरी राय में जत्र करना बड़ा मुश्किल है । मेरी मांग है कि जो बिल माननीय सदस्य लाय है वह बापस ल लग इस बिल को इन्मोर करना चाहिये । हम न चाहता है कि वह बड़ इजीनियस, डाक्टर बकाल और प्राफेसर प्राय । और अगर माननीय मशी जी का बिल स्वीकार कर लिया जाय तो प्रा० महाजन प्रा० पाराशर प्रा० समर गूढ़ जैसे नाम्य व्यक्ति सब डिमक्वालीफाई हो जायग । अगर यह बिल पास हो गया तो माननाय गस्वामी से चल जायेग । ॥

इसलिये मेरी प्रार्थना है कि प्रस्तावक महादय अपना बिल बापस ल ल ।

*SHRI J MEHTA GOWDER (Nilgiris) Mr Chairman, Sir, I like to say a few words on the Constitution (Amendment) Bill of Shri Pitya Ranyan Das Munshi a member of the ruling Congress Party I think he is also the leader of the Youth Congress I am surprised that he should have brought forward a Bill of this nature before the House

The three features of this Bill are (i) the professionals like Lawyer Teachers Doctors Engineers etc should not seek the membership of this House (ii) the defectors meaning those Members who defect from one Party to the other after having been elected to the House on the ideology of a particular Party should be disqualified for the membership of this House (iii) those who do not take genuine interest in their parliamentary work should be also disqualified

I would like to remind Shri Munshi of the saying that sitting in the Glass House one should not throw stones at the others

*The original speech was delivered in Tamil

outside. If his theory of composition of this House is accepted, then there will be only 92 political and social workers who would be the MPs on the side of the ruling Congress Party The ruling Congress Party will lose its majority, it will be out of power. soon

Sn, this House consist of 520 Members I have with me details of 497 Members I would like to give to the House the information about the composition of these 497 Members There are 93 lawyers, 92 political and social workers 36 Teachers and Lecturers 176 Cultivators and Landholders 39 Traders and Industrialists, 30 Journalists and Writers 12 from Civil and Military Service 11 Medical practitioners 5 Engineers 2 Religious Missionaries and a few former Maharajas If all the professionals cannot become the Members of this House, as is being suggested by Shri Munshi, then there will be only 92 political and social workers as Members of this House I would like to know whether it is possible and feasible that in a democracy there should be no representation to any other section of our society except political and social workers ?

17 hrs

Here I would like to refer to the representation being given to Local Bodies in the State Legislative Assemblies Similarly, there are teachers' constituencies also in the States The Founding Fathers of our Constitution thought it wise to give representation in the democratically elected legislative bodies to all sections of the society like Local Bodies Teachers etc Is it conceivable that they should be denied representation in this House or in the Legislative Assemblies ? Shri Munshi has not done any service to democracy in this country by bringing forward this Bill

I agree with his contention that the defectors should be debarred from seeking membership of this House But, I would like to know why the Government have not brought forward the Anti-Defection Bill which is being talked for years now I demand that the Member who has been

elected on the plank of the political philosophy of a particular party defects to some other political party should be immediately disqualified. They should not be permitted to continue as Members. But the ruling Congress Party, to which the mover of this Bill belongs, has not shown the courage of conviction in bringing before this House the Anti-Defection Bill.

In conclusion, I would like to know what Shri Munshi has to say about those who change their faith in the political programmes and ideologies of the Party to which they belong. Should they be allowed to continue as Members of this House belonging to that political party or should they also go out? For example, after his resignation from the Council of Ministers, Shri Mohan Dharia, made a serious allegation on the floor of this House that the solemn assurances given by the ruling Party at the time of last General Elections to the people of the country have not been fulfilled. He also alleged that the party to which he has the honour to belong deviated from its chartered course of action. After hearing his statement, I felt that Shri Dharia alone should not have resigned, but the entire Central Ministry should have resigned because of its failure to honour the commitment pledged to the people of the country.

I would like to know what Shri Priya Ranjan Das Munshi has to say about the failure of his own Party in fulfilling the assurances given to the people of the country.

I would extend my support to the limited concept of debarring the membership to the defectors as adumbrated in the Bill Shri Munshi. I am opposed to the rest of the provisions in his Bill.

SHRI Y. S. MAHAJAN (Buldana): At first I took the Bill rather seriously and tried to study its Clauses and its implications, but after going through it I thought it was framed in a very haphazard slipshod manner and I came to the conclusion that it must be opposed.

I oppose it on three grounds. Firstly it is unnecessary. Secondly, it is highly restrictive of the individual's freedom. Thirdly I may say it will deprive Parliament of much of the rich experience that is contributed to its legislative work by experts in different fields and different professions.

I appreciate the object of the Mover of the Bill. He wants the Members to pay as much attention to their Parliamentary work as possible. And Parliamentary work means not only speaking here, but explaining the programme of your party to the people or if you belong to the opposition, explaining the defects of the Government's programme and perhaps leading agitations, carrying on public education etc. This is part of the work of a Parliamentarian and perhaps Shri Munshi wishes that people should devote as much time as possible to this public work. To that extent we can appreciate his objective, but the proposals which he has brought forward cannot possibly be accepted because of the reasons which I have just given.

As regards the first amendment which he proposes, if a person practises any profession like teaching in a College or a School, he will become disqualified. But Shri Munshi does not know that teachers have a right to stand for election to the Legislature. If they are employed in private institutions, the University Grants Commission has suggested a solution to the difficulty, namely that during the period of their membership of the Legislature they should be given leave without pay by the institution in which they were working.

So far as members of other professions such as lawyers, doctors, engineers etc., are concerned, I think their presence is necessary if our legislation is to be realistic, if realistic and satisfactory solutions are to be found for the problems of the community. They must practise outside as it enriches their experience and enables them to participate more effectively and more fruitfully in the legislative process which goes on in the House. As rightly pointed out by another hon. Member, if

you come here for five years and give up for good your profession as an engineer, doctor or income-tax practitioner, what are you to do afterwards? You cannot pick up the thread and start your practice again. Nobody will consider you seriously. Therefore, the first proposal cannot be accepted.

Secondly, as regards defections, this is a very complicated problem. Of course, we do not favour defections, but it is possible that a person may regard it as a matter of conscience to leave the party.

If he thinks that his party has changed its policy in such a way that his conscience cannot possibly approve of it, he has the right to change his party. There is another complication. Suppose your party itself is liquidated. Members of the Socialist Party are not here. It has gone through various transformations during the last ten years. What can the Members of such a party do? There were the PSP, the SSP and other parties, as a result. They have accepted half a dozen names in the last ten years. Then what will the Members do under such a clause which Mr. Munshi wants to incorporate in the Constitution? Therefore, the problem of defection cannot be summarily solved in the manner proposed by him. We have a parliamentary Committee considering this problem. Even after two years, they are not able to come to certain conclusions. Finally, he says :

"If a member of either House of Parliament, after his nomination or election to any Committee constituted by either House of Parliament, does not attend any meeting of that Committee continuously for a period of one year, he shall be disqualified for being a member of that House after the expiry of the said period of one year."

How can you reduce the whole thing to such a ridiculous position? One Member has said that he has been a Member of a Committee which did not even meet once in three years. We cannot judge a person's contribution to Parliament by the number

of times he attends the committee's meetings. I believe the proposals have not been framed after due consideration. They should be summarily rejected by this House

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE (Betul) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, unless this Bill was motivated by considerations of sheer humour or to create some sort of a practical joke, I could only otherwise in the alternative attribute it to either the immaturity or the imbecility of the mover. It cannot be any thing else. He is not here; the youngest is not here. When I come out, it must have been either a joke or an absolute joke. If it is not absolute joke, then a sheer immaturity or purlity. I am not able to understand what it is that he is seeking to achieve. Does he mean to convey that people who are practising certain professions

MR CHAIRMAN : I don't think imbecility is a good word. If it is unparliamentary you should be ready to withdraw it.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE : I withdraw it

MR CHAIRMAN : That is all right.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE : It may be substituted by purlity. My submission is that if he is serious about it that he is trying to deal with by amending Article 102 which deals with the disqualification of a Member of Parliament, I am sure in my mind, he could never be serious, that a set of professionals or a set of nincompoops and idiots, if they become Members of Parliament, they are no good as Members; they are no good towards their constituencies; and only, if they become professional leaders and professional *netas*, then alone they will serve the Parliament and their constituencies.

Today, you want this sort of thing to come up. In fact, it should be the other come up. In fact, it should be the other of Parliament must disclose what is his source of livelihood outside his political earnings, outside membership of Parliament. A large number of people who come

here have no other source of livelihood. That does not matter any way. It is up to them to manage their own affairs. But I submit, in all humility, that I am not saying for myself. Whatever little I know of a profession and professionals, I submit that it is the professionals specially the legal profession which is the second oldest profession in the world. (*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN : He wants to know which is the first oldest profession.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE : The senior profession, the legal profession, not only in our country, but all over the world has produced champions and captains whose contribution to politics has been the greatest. The people who are remembered for their tremendous parliamentary contributions are not those who came as whole-time leaders, nor people who tried to distinguish themselves at zero hours, but lawyers who made very serious contributions right from the days of Motilal Nehru and Bhalabhai Desai etc. Our debates are replete with instances regarding the contributions made by lawyers.

MR. CHAIRMAN : In which category do you put Mr Stephen ?

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE : He is a distinguished member of the legal profession. On seeing him, my faith is reiterated that there is unparalleled heroism in every profession, if it is practised honestly and boldly. Our debates are replete with instances where the contributions of barristers, doctors and lawyers are unparalleled. At the same time, it has been most unfortunate that people who have otherwise had tremendous knowledge of law, who have been otherwise well-read and men of letters, but who have not had the opportunity of practising anywhere either in the High Courts or tribunals, have not been able to distinguish themselves here as well. If some of the members who are extremely vociferous and take at least 90 per cent of the time of the House and cent per cent space in the newspapers, had been practising in High Courts or tribunals, their training and tradition would

have been entirely different. I submit with great respect that there is hardly anything in this Parliament for anyone to come and learn. If at all there is anything, it is to unlearn many things. It is the traditions and conventions which we learn in the tribunals, High Courts and Supreme Court, it is the professional ethics and conduct, which enable us to make worthwhile contributions here. An artist has to have certain discipline. Otherwise, he will never be able to climb the rungs of the ladder because he lives in a competitive world. He cannot propagate his artistic paintings by merely shouting or taking advantage of the zero hour; He should give it a creative look. It is the professionals, who are sought to be disqualified by this Bill, who have rendered the greatest service in various fields. Instead of coming out with this Bill, it would have been much better if he had said that those who come without proper background and use parliament for their publicity purposes only would be disqualified. Then we would have wholeheartedly supported it and Mr Mohsin also perhaps would have accepted it.

Defection is a political menace which hurts the very root of parliamentary democracy. But defections as we know it a few years ago is on the decline. It is not because of the law but because the electorate today is so much enlightened. They know that the politics of Asa Ram and Gaya Ram is deleterious and detrimental to the very existence of parliamentary democracy. The people of West Bengal have thrown out the CPM lock, stock and barrel not because of any law, but because the electorate have become enlightened and know-whome to elect and whom to reject. As long as the people verdict remains supreme and the electorate remains mature and vigilant, we will never need the sort of amendment sought to be made by Mr. Das Munshi.

श्री महावीरक सिंह झा (कानपूर) : इस बिल को मिले श्री प्रियरंजन दाम मुंशी लाये हैं मैंने बहुत गौर से पढ़ा है । मैंने इस में एक ही बात पाई है । ऐसा लगता है कि उनको कुछ

वर्ग विशेष से घूना है। उस धूणित भावना को इस बिल के रूप में यहाँ पर प्रस्तुत किया है। इस बिल के एक खंड में लिखा है कि—

“परन्तु इस उपखंड के इस उपबन्ध अधिनियम के प्रारम्भ के समय समूह के दोनो सदस्यों के वर्तमान सदस्यों पर लागू नहीं होंगे।”

उन्होंने बमबार्ट तो कर दिया है लेकिन अपने लिये स्थान सुरक्षित कर लिया है। पहले तो यह बिल पाम नहीं होगा, अगर हो गया तो वह अपने लिये पहले जगह सुरक्षित कर लेते हैं, वह उनकी किंगनी स्वार्थ की भावना है? इसको जाने दीजिये, मैं असली बात पर आता हूँ।

उन्होंने चार वर्ग विशेष की बात कही है। उनका तात्पर्य यह है कि जो समूह-सदस्य रैगुलर वर्क नहीं करते हैं, वही फुल टाइम ट्यूटी दे सकते हैं। मेरी समझ में एक बात नहीं आती। उन्होंने यह तो बड़ा धच्छा लिखा है कि इन चार वर्गों के व्यक्ति हममें न आयें। लेकिन अगर वैन प्रैज्यूट आदमी नहीं आयेंगे, तो यह समूह जो हमारे राष्ट्र की सर्वोच्च शक्ति है, जिसके द्वारा हमारे भविष्य का निर्माण होता है और जिसके द्वारा हम राष्ट्र की रक्षा करने हैं। अगर यह समूह अपनी इच्छा से चिन्न जाये तो राष्ट्र का सर्वनाम भी रग सकती है। तो इस शक्ति को बनाये रखने के निम्न दमका किन का यहाँ आना चाहिये?

मैं श्री मूलचन्द डागा की इस बात का समर्थन करता हूँ कि यह बिल निरर्थक है। ये वैन प्रैज्यूट आदमी-इजीनियर, डाक्टर और प्रोफेसर जिनका विवरण माननीय सदस्य ने प्रस्तुत किया है अगर समूह में नहीं आयेंगे तो फिर आखिर कौन आयेंगे? क्या यह मूखों की समूह चलेगी? और जब मूखों की समूह चलेगी तो राष्ट्र विनाश की ओर जायेगा या विकास की तरफ जायेगा? अगर वह ऐसा चाहते हैं तो ठीक हैं लेकिन हम जानते हैं कि देश का हम प्रकार से कल्याण नहीं हो सकता है। हम लिये इन्होंने यह जो धूणित भावना इसमें प्रदर्शित की है, हम समझते हैं, बिल्कुल ही अनुपयुक्त है।

इसमें एक बात और जोड़ी है कि समूह-सदस्यों का जो कार्य करने का समय है, वह उससे अपनी इच्छा नहीं बँते हैं। मेरी समझ में बात नहीं आती है कि वह समूह-सदस्य के कार्य क्षेत्र को किस दृष्टि से देखते हैं। सभापति महोदय, समूह के सभी सदस्यों को पता होगा कि सदस्य-समूह या उससे संबंधित सोलैकट कमेटियों में काम करने के अलावा जिले की विभागीय समितियों से भी संबंधित होने हैं और अगर बोर्ड नीचे स्तर पर जाइये तो ब्लॉक डेवलपमेंट कमेटी का भी वह मेम्बर समझा जाता है और यहाँ पर वह अपनी राय प्रस्तुत करना है। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि समूह-सदस्य का कार्य-क्षेत्र बहुत विकसित है। उन्होंने अत्यन्त सक्षुब्ध दृष्टि से समझा है कि समूह-सदस्य हाउस में बैठे रहकर ही अपनी इच्छा को अंजाम दे सकते हैं। उनका यह दृष्टिकोण सही नहीं है। अगर वह ब्लॉक में नहीं आते हैं तो विकास सम्बन्धी योजनाओं में भाग नहीं ले सकते। अगर जिले की कमेटी में नहीं आते तो जिले सम्बन्धी उद्धार के कार्य में भाग नहीं ले सकते। अगर इसी प्रकार ये समितियों में नहीं आते तो वहाँ भी वह अपने कर्तव्य का पालन नहीं कर पायेंगे। टाइम ना उनके पाम उनका ही है, आप उसे समूह में लगवाइये या बाहर लगवाइये। आखिर वह अपने परमनल वाम से तो जाते नहीं हैं। वे उन्नी इच्छा के लिये जाते हैं जिसके लिये वहाँ से चुनकर आते हैं। समूह-सदस्य का कार्य बहुत विस्तृत है, अगर उन्होंने बड़ी सक्षुब्ध दृष्टि से इसको देखा है। केवल हम यह मान लें कि एक समूह-सदस्य हाउस में रहकर ही काम कर सकता है तो मैं समझना हूँ कि यह ठीक नहीं होगा।

इसलिये मेरी राय में तो इन्होंने व्याख्या की है मैं इसका विरोध करता हूँ और यह व्याख्या उपयुक्त नहीं है।

माननीय सदस्य को इस बिल में यह व्यवस्था भी करनी चाहिये कि किन्हीं प्रकार के व्यक्ति यहाँ आयें। क्या उनका लक्ष्य यह था कि देश में जो बेकार सेना पड़ी है, उसको यहाँ लाया जाये। 1 करोड़ 83 लाख जो बेकार लोग पड़े हैं, उनको

अगर लाने का उद्देश्य था तो वह उन्नी तरह का बिल लाने, इस बिल को यहां लाने की क्या आवश्यकता थी ?

एक बड़े ताज्जुब की बात इन्होंने यह बंदी है कि जब कोई संसद्-सदस्य किसी कमेटी में रहता है और साल भर तक उस कमेटी को अटैंड नहीं करता है तो उसको अपने पद से हटा देना चाहिये यह कितनी अशोभनीय सी बात है। अगर कमेटी की मीटिंग नहीं हुई तो क्या होगा ? बहुत बार ऐसा होता है कि कमेटी की साल भर तक मीटिंग नहीं होती है, तो क्या उनको हटा देंगे ?

इन्होंने दल-दल की बात कही है। यह बात सार्थक है। माननीय सदस्य को इस बारे में बिल लाना चाहिये था। रूलिंग पार्टी बहुत दिनों से कहती आ रही है कि हम ऐसा विधेयक ला रहे हैं। चार साल हो गये, अभी तक तो वह कोई बिल लाये नहीं हैं। सरकार इससे क्यों भयभीत है, क्या खतरा है उसको। आखिर "आया राम, गया राम" वाली बात कब तक चलती रहेगी ? अगर उनको कोई बिल लाना था तो ऐसा बिल लाते जिससे उनको सही नीति का उसमें चित्रण होता और उस पर विचार किया जाता।

जहाँ तक संविधान का सवाल है, जो लोग वैतनिक हैं, कहीं पर तनश्वाह पर काम करते हैं, गवर्नमेंट सर्वेंट हैं, उनके बारे में तो चुनाव नियमावली में पहले से ही व्यवस्था है। माननीय सदस्य ने इस बिल में उसका कोई समावेश नहीं किया है। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस बिल की भावना दूषित है और ऐसा लगता है कि माननीय सदस्य किसी वर्ग विशेष से क्रुद्ध होने के कारण इस बिल को लाये हैं।

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Mavathupuzha): Mr. Chairman, Sir, after the very cogent, logical, terse and forceful speech by my hon. friend, Shri Salve, on the implications of the Bill, I do not think there is much left to be spoken. So, I do not want to take much time on that. When I read through the Bill, rather than the merits of the Bill, my mind went to

the thought as to what a sad commentary this Bill is on the superficial sentimentality with which even the leaders of the younger generation are reacting to the national cause and how shallow and how unthinking they are when they approach problems which vitally concern the nation.

Now, what is the implication of this Bill? Article 102 says :

"A person shall be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being a member of either House of Parliament ..."

Then some conditions are given. He wants to add one clause there. He says that not only after your election you should not continue your practice but if at the time of the elections you are a lawyer, teacher, professor, doctor or engineer, that will be treated as a disqualification.

I could have understood, while not agreeing to it, but after you come here, you discontinue your practice, your profession, there is something which can be said about. I do not agree to that also.

Here, the Bill says, if you are any of these, then you shall not be accepted for filing the nomination. I am reducing this logic to a conclusion that, by this process of elimination, what will be left. Then, the only qualification is, if you are a leaf-er, if you are a nincompoop, if you are an ignoramus, then you are eligible for filing the nomination and coming to Parliament. This is what it comes to.

I do not understand exactly what my hon. friend says, by saying "full time attention of Members". I do not understand it. Various propositions come before the House. It is not necessary that everybody must pay his attention or thought to every subject coming before the House. We will be doing disservice. If engineering is discussed here, I should certainly not lend my mind to that because I do not know the ABC of it. You leave it to some other Members who know something about engineering. Of course, I can listen to the speeches and all that and form my opinion and take a

definite stand. But if a legal question comes, if a labour question comes, it is for me to participate in it, and I shall certainly do it.

It is the collection of varied talent, the representatives of the comprehensive texture, that is the nation of India, that this House represents. There must be lawyers; there must be professors; there must be engineers; there must be common men. Every type of people must be here. Then alone it will represent the whole of the nation and its variegated feature and atmosphere. Therefore, this is against the very concept of democracy that we are practising. We will be reducing democracy to a mockery. It is a commentary, very complimentary commentary, to the whole sense of the House and the basic sanity of the House that in spite of certain streaks of superficial insanity, the whole House is reacting violently against it and upholding the principles that permeated the Constitution.

I do not want to say anything more than that. It is so very clear about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN : You have said enough.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN : Then, I come to the second subject about defections.

There are two types of defections. I do not know what he means by defection. May I put a question? A political party goes to the people on a platform with a programme, and that political party completely proves a betrayal to that programme. Is that political party not a defector? Going further on the same logic, on the same argument, can you not say that the political party must get itself unseated from the Parliament altogether? It is certainly logical to go to that extent.

There are two concepts. The general of the party and the conscience of a member of the party. I go to my constituency not only as a member of the party but on the basis of a platform and on the basis of a programme. If I in my conscience

feel that my party has fallen unfaithful to the programme that it put forth and, if I stand out and conscientiously say, "I cannot be a party to this betrayal", who should go out of the party? I feel, I should not be asked to get out of the party. It may be a question of resigning; it may be a question of my being sent out. If I am sent out, what happens? I continue there; I continue to fight in my party. But I am sent out. Am I to get out of Parliament?

In the United States, you are elected on the basis of a party. But you are given freedom to take your position on different propositions that come before the House. In England, the same freedom is protected to a certain extent although not to the extent that is practised in America. Certain freedom is given there. Now, if I am elected as a Member from a constituency of 10 lakhs of people, they have put their faith in me. The party has, in the first place, taken me as a presentable person of an acceptable character. On the recommendation of that, the people have accepted me. Therefore, certain things are considered that I am a man of integrity, a man of character, a man of conscience, a man of ability, a man who is worthy of representing a huge constituency of 10 lakh people. Therefore if, at any particular time, consulting my conscience, I feel that I should not remain in the party for the reason that the party has betrayed the platform, then to say, "It is you who should get out" is to argue against the entire premises on the basis of which I was put before the people and I was elected to the House.

I submit, Sir, that a certain measure of individual freedom has got to be given and the party whip system deserves a deeper look. You can ask me that I should support the Government so long as I feel that the stability of the Government is an absolute necessity for the nation, but should you ask me to support every non-sensical measure that is brought here? Should I not have the freedom to think

about it? Should I be bound by the whip, if a measure which is against the workers is brought here? Should you have the whip to whip me down to support something which revolts against my conscience? Should I not have the freedom? Unless that freedom is given, how can democratic despotism be prevented? Therefore, the system of whip arrangement deserves to have a greater look and deeper scrutiny. A certain measure of flexibility and freedom, subject of course, the periphery of the fundamental responsibility of sustaining a Government, has got to be given, if democracy is to be sustained as a vital, dynamic and a sort of thinking democracy, otherwise it will become completely mechanical.

Therefore, for the question of detection, the answer is not unseating anybody from Parliament. This goes against the whole thing. That is why, the founding fathers of the Constitution, when they framed the Constitution, never spoke a word about the political parties. They took into account only the man and the individual. It may be with the backing of a party, it may be with the backing of an organization it may be with the backing of the reputation he has built up or it may be with the backing of the platform on which he is standing, but it is the individual on which the entire structure of the Constitution is built up. To inject the concept of the artificial combination which is known as political party into this structure will be distorting the entire pattern of democracy that the fathers of the Constitution wanted us to nurture. Therefore, this proposition is against the very spirit of the Constitution and I oppose it very strongly. It must be looked into very deeply. I oppose this amendment Bill from A to Z and I request that it must be thrown out lock, stock and barrel.

SHRI B. R. SHUKLA (Babraich) : I oppose the Bill so far as it seeks to disqualify the members of legal profession, medical profession and teaching profession engaged in their respective business, but I have my own reservations so far as disqualification as a result of

defection is concerned. Perhaps the young distinguished Member is of the view that because these professional persons are so much pre-occupied with their respective business and are earning fabulous fees, they do not find time enough to devote to parliamentary work. He is a zealous worker, busy in organising rallies, and campaigning from one part of the country to the other. Certainly, the members of learned professions to which I have the honour to belong cannot undertake that arduous task, nor the leadership of my party would think me fit to organise such rallies, but one thing is very patent. Persons who have got no economic status, persons who have nothing to fall back on except the permits, the licences, donations and other corrupt practices, pollute the parliamentary democracy in this country. Yet, a class of politicians unfortunately is growing in this country, whose only profession is politics, and therefore, such type of politicians acquire a vested interest. They do not approach any question before the Parliament on its merits or demerits, but in order to continue their own existence, they are interested in following a particular line in this House. Supposing, Shri A. K. attends the Parliament session daily, or Shri Frank Anthony attends the Parliament session daily, would they be allowed to say a word? They would be howled down like anything. I am a back-bencher. But I am a lawyer, very busy throughout the year. Yet, I find time to attend the Sessions in the hope and expectation that sometimes I shall be able to catch the eye of the presiding officer. But, Sir, as bad coins drive out the good coins, persons who know something of the law, something of the legislative business, are relegated to the background and only those who are quite ignorant have the voice here and also the publicity at the platform, in the press and in the radio. If the Criminal Procedure Code is debated and I give a speech covering six pages, my name would only be cryptically referred while those who know nothing about it get wide publicity. Such is the state of affairs. Therefore, my submission is that a lawyer by his training, by his temperament, by his

contact with persons in every walk of life, is best suited to participate in the democratic process and contribute to its success. My submission is that this Bill is wholly misconceived as an act of immaturity.

I partly agree with Mr. Stephen that defection should be permitted as a matter of conscience. There are good reasons to support his line of thinking. But, unfortunately, *As a Ramr* and *Gava Rams* have become the common feature of our public life. How to prevent it?

If a lawyer, after having accepted brief for one party, accepts the brief for, or even helps, the other party, he would be liable for professional misconduct. If a witness who has deposed in favour of one party turns hostile and supports another party, he would run the risk of being prosecuted for perjury. But here are persons elected by lakhs of people who, for sheer lust of power, defect from one party to another with impunity.

SHRI R. S. PANDEY (Rajnandgaon) : He seems to be glorifying the lawyers. I agree with him there. There is no dispute. But democracy starts from the village. Who are those people who sit in the Panchayats? They are not lawyers. (Interruptions)

SHRI B. R. SHUKLA : He is saying this because he is not a lawyer. Had he been a lawyer, he would have kept quiet.

As far as curtailing the menace of defection is concerned, I support the Bill, but not in the wordings and phraseology which the hon. Mover has used in his Bill. I think, the Bill which has been sponsored on behalf of the Treasury Benches and which has gone to the Joint Committee would take care of this; that should be passed in time so that such menace does not pollute our public life.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR (Ahmedabad) : I do not know how to describe this Bill. In the absence of a good or an apt adjective, I would only say that this is a very interesting Bill. I am simply amused over the manner in which, and the thought

with which, my hon. friend, Shri Priya Ranjan Das Munsri, has brought forward this Bill for discussion. I am very sorry, in one sense, that Shri P. R. Das Munsri is absent today because he is not able to hear the various points of criticism and points of compliments, as my friend, Prof. Dandavate, says, on his own Bill. Interestingly enough, by his own logic, he (Mr. Das Munsri) should now be disqualified from the membership of this House because he is not present when his own Bill is being discussed. He wants the other members to be disqualified if they do not go on doing their own jobs. But it is a very curious coincidence that he is absent today. I do not know why he is absent today; I do not want to be uncharitable to him.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI F. H. MOHSIN) : He has sent a letter to the Chair.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR : I do not want to be uncharitable.

MR. CHAIRMAN : He is unwell.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR : It so happens unfortunately that he is unwell; this can be the reason for many members for not attending the committee meetings. Therefore, this is the first point.

If you take this whole Bill, it is so interestingly drafted, because it is so interestingly conceived. It thus simplifies my work. I must say that it is very very refreshing to hear many hon. Members from the Congress Benches and I am particularly charmed by the very refreshing speech which my good friend, Shri Stephen made today. If this Parliament, and, for that matter, any Parliament in any democracy, were to become a collection of full-time and whole-time professionals and politicians, it would be the end of democracy. It would be the end of free debate because it would be a Parliament where people's different interests, people's different professions are not reflected through the debates, but it would be a place wherein a coterie of people, full-time politicians, as Shri Shukla rightly said, interested in the

loaves and fishes that power may bring, will be active all the time, which in the end will make a mockery of the representative institutions that we have created in our parliamentary and constitutional set-up. Therefore, to think of full-time professional politicians as Members of Parliament is to say like writing an essay in ignorance on parliamentary democracy and all that it stands for. Well, we want people to take interest in politics but not take too much interest in politics, just as apathy in politics and apathy in public affairs is something which cannot be tolerated in a democracy. Similarly, on the other hand, it is equally true and I will say perhaps more true, to say that a set of a few people taking too much interest and thereby not allowing others to take even legitimate interest in political and public affairs will also be an end of democracy and certainly, an end of parliamentary democracy. Therefore, we want people who come from different walks of life because when they come from different walks of life, they bring to this hon. and august House their different experiences, their different ideas, ideas which are not merely the results of their independent thinking—*independent thinking* does not mean thinking by an independent only, it can also mean thinking by members of various political parties and Mr Stephen's speech today is an instance to show that even a member belonging to the ruling party can think independently, that he can have certain postures and that on matters of principle and conscience he can take a certain definite attitude. If people come to have an independent thinking and if their independent thinking is supported by seasoned experience of different walks of life and different professions to which these hon. Members belong like teachers, lawyers, engineers, journalists, artists, and I will even say, players, poets, sportsmen, novelists, social workers and what not, and you may have a whole series of professionals and social vocations . . .

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Chirayinkil) : Swamiji also.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR : Yes, the whole series of professions and social

vocations should be represented and reflected in the House. Then, because it is not enough that our debates remain intelligent, free and open, but side by side, with a free debate, it should become an intelligent debate and side by side with a free and intelligent debate, it should become an intelligible debate to a large number of people in the country who are following the proceedings in Parliament and the various speeches in the Parliament. Therefore, if these Members come from different walks of life, they will bring to this House experience, their view-points, their attitudes, their special problems, their special ideas and even original suggestions and various solutions to the problems with which we are confronted in this country and this democratic polity.

So far as professional politicians are concerned, I will end by referring to one or two points before I sit down. About the problem of defections, there is already before this Parliament a Bill which the Government themselves have brought. The Minister may therefore kindly take note of the various speeches made on both sides of the House, particularly, with regard to this problem of political defections. The Bill is before a Joint Select Committee of both Houses and it will not be right for me to express any comments in so many words at this stage on the provisions of that Bill. If in the name of curbing political and party defections it is sought to curb the basic right of free speech by every Member of Parliament, then, I dare say it is not curbing defections. It is destroying the very roots of parliamentary democracy. But, of course, Shri Munsri, I must say, has a suggestion in his Constitutional Amendment Bill which the Bill before the Select Committee does not mention. He has said that even an Independent Member, if he is elected at the time of elections as an Independent should not join any Party whereas the Bill before the Select Committee says that an Independent Member be allowed to join any Party. I, as an independent Member, feel that is not good or logical. A person is elected on a particular programme. The Constitution does not mention the Word 'political party' at all. It only says that a

person can become a candidate if he fulfils certain conditions of age, etc. If a person is elected on a particular party ticket or if he is elected as an independent, the important thing is that he brings to this House the entire constituency. And, further, although he is elected from one particular constituency, he becomes a Member of the whole House. Edmund Burke, when he was addressing the persons of his constituency said, "Hon. Gentlemen of Bristol, you have elected me from Bristol. But now when I am elected, I am a Member of Parliament and not a Member of Bristol only."

In conclusion, I would say that the whole problem is really the problem of how to ensure a greater degree and climate of integrity and character in our public life, how to see that men of quality enter the reputed institution. I would like to tell the hon. Members that it is not the professional full time politicians who will make the House honourable, but the Members belonging to various professions, having integrity, sincerity, earnestness of purpose who will do so and bring credit to Parliament.

May I say, in conclusion, therefore, instead of talking out this Bill, which I am sure we will do, let us also laugh it out!

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN (Telli-cherry): My friend Shri Priya Ranjan Das Munsri has introduced the Constitution Amendment Bill. I am not supporting this Bill. But I do not also agree with many points expressed by many Members here. The whole thing has been reduced to controversy on professional politicians versus Members of Parliament who are having it as a profession. Some people even said that one may have some other profession and then become a Member of Parliament. Then in that case their contribution will be greater. There will be no professional Members of Parliament and their contribution to the growth of democracy will be greater. I do not agree with that.

Firstly let me say about the object of the bill, though not very articulate in its formulations in clauses Mr. Das Munsri felt, as many in this country to-day feel, that there are certain serious defects in the electoral system and the way in which we practice democracy in our country. What he wants actually or what he is aiming at is to make the Parliament effective, make the Members of Parliament responsible to its people—accountability of Members of Parliament is a thing which he wants to establish. Today, Sir, when we speak of democracy, it should be said, what we are lacking today is accountability of Members of Parliament to the Electorate. We only think in terms of meeting the electorate once in 5 years when the next election is coming. Mr. Priya Ranjan Das Munsri tried to find out a short cut, in finding a solution to this. I don't say professional people coming to Parliament is a bad thing. I don't believe in that. My point is this. Once you are elected to Parliament, by your action inside the Parliament, by your action outside the Parliament, you should be worthy to represent the constituency which has elected you and sent you to Parliament.

SHRI K. GOPAL: Please excuse me for one interruption. As Mr. Stephen has pointed out, Article 102 says, a person shall be disqualified from being chosen as, and for being a Member of either House of Parliament, for which the present amendment is proposed. This means, the very fact that one is a lawyer, doctor or teacher, will entail disqualification—not after becoming a Member. That is what it means. It is not properly worded; but the spirit is this.

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: I am not supporting the Bill; please don't be under that impression. I am trying to tell you that the problem here is basically different.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You may continue on the next day. Now we have to take up...

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: We have to continue for another year! (*Interruption*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: That means, we are not taking up the Half-an-hour discussion. We will be going right upto 7 O'clock. I do not think...

SHRI M. C. DAGA: Please look to the programme. It should be taken up as soon as it is 6 O'clock. How can you deny this?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have seen the Agenda. The hon. Speaker has announced that 2-1/2 hours will be allotted to Private Members' Business. That will bring us to 7 O'clock.

SHRI M. C. DAGA: The Order Paper says, this should be taken up at 6 P.M. or as soon as the preceding items of business are disposed of, whichever is earlier. It say so.

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: That was changed by the House.

SHRI M. C. DAGA: I beg to point out to you that this should be taken up at 6 O'clock or as soon as the preceding items of business are disposed of, whichever is earlier.

18 hrs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Daga, the order is changed under the Rules as and when necessary, by the Speaker, with the consent of the House or even, sometimes, without the consent of the House.

Let Mr. Chandrappan continue his speech.

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: Sir, I want to remind those who have participated in this discussion including my friend, Shri Stephen, that democracy definitely is, for younger people and the problem is how to orient them democratically.

I remember that once we introduced a Bill in this House regarding the right of recall. Perhaps the right to recall would have been a remedy for all those which are now suggested by Shri Munsi in this Bill. There is a difference in that. I should like to clarify that position also. It is not that we are asking anybody in

the street to recall a Member in time. For example, I am elected from a constituency and a definite number of the electorate have elected me. Suppose Shri Jayaprakash Narayan asks some people to go to South Avenue and gather Shri Jayaprakash Narayan has nothing to do with that. If it all it is to be done, that should be done by the people of Telli-cherry who elected me. I am accountable to the definite number of people who have elected me to Parliament.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Who among those people who voted against you?

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: Those who voted against me have also got the right to recall me. Party or no party, the problem is that there is solution to this. That solution is only the right to recall. That right of recall will ensure accountability of Members to Parliament and to the electorate. So, electorate is the Supreme. Mr. Stephen mentioned certain other system obtaining in England—the Great Britain. There are other countries too where the right to recall has been successfully practised. A big country with a big population has nothing to do with this. Let us not go into it now. Let us only talk about the possibility of working the democracy and making it strong and more purposeful in our country.

Coming to defection, when my friend from the D.M.K. was speaking about it, he was rather vehement. He said that this cannot be allowed. I can understand the pain under which he was speaking. A party which has undergone that pain of split can only speak about it. Our party has undergone that split. We know how painful it is. Your party has also undergone a split and your party knows that pain of that split. When a party is split one need not consider that as defection. It is all a question of upholding certain principles and convictions. You have said that. But, the question of defection will come only when a Member, due to personal motives, irrespective of the will of the people who have elected him, crosses over to that side or this side, then it be-

comes a problem. This is not the solution that is suggested here, namely, to disqualify him from the membership again.

So, I appeal with all earnestness that whatever inaccuracies are there in this Bill and however inarticulate the Bill is formulated, let us not go into this. But let us take the cudgels in our hands and discuss the problem of electoral reforms with more seriousness and thoroughly specially when an opportunity is given to us by the mover of the Bill, Shri Munsri, and discuss about those professional people who are wonderful professionals. Let me say that with all humility that I do not feel in any way inferior because I do not have a profession but I am now a Member of Parliament. I may tell you that I am not corrupt I am not a connoisseur. Let me cite some examples. What sort of profession does Smt. Indira Gandhi practise? Is she a professional? What about Shri Mahatma Gandhi? About him, there are no two opinions. What was the profession of Pandit Nehru? Nobody will remember Panditji as a practising lawyer. The whole world will remember about Mahatma Gandhi, Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru, Smt. Indira Gandhi and others as leading political personalities in Indian life. What about Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia? Was he not a good Parliamentarian?

I would also like to mention that professional politicians need not be a menace to this country. Their contribution to social development and political thought will be greater and meaningful.

Sir, when we think of Parliament another problem is, whatever might be the profession of a particular person, there is a pre-supposition, that when he comes to this House he should represent the will of the people of the constituency from where he is elected. There is provision for nomination in the other House of people who have proved their excellence in various fields but it is not so in this House. The will of the people is the supreme factor in deciding the destiny of the Members of Parliament and the destiny of the country. We should think today how best we can ensure that 'people'

can be made supreme in the working of the Indian democracy.

I do not agree with the propositions made by Shri Das Munsri in the Bill. Therefore, I oppose the Bill. But I do not ridicule Shri Das Munsri for having brought this Bill. However inarticulate and inaccurate the formulations of this Bill, Shri Das Munsri has given us an opportunity—by bringing this Bill—to discuss the future working of the Indian democracy. It is important that everyone should realise that a young man has seriously thought about the future of the country. I would say that the future of the country is not unsafe in the hands of the youngsters.

श्री राम लहारा बाबू (राजनन्दनबाबू) सभापति जी, हम बिना के पीछे इगदा बाटे बूढ़ भी रहा हो, ये समझता हूँ कि नारदनब ने जरा सीविन अधिकार नब दर्शन का हम नबर्षन देवे हैं बरा किमी प्रोफेशन बाबे को मना नहीं कर सकेंगे यह बड़ बर कि बड़ पूरा टाइम नहीं दे सकना । जेवे बकीन हैं, इस्टमैंट हैं, टीचमेंट हैं । ये एक बान घाप मे पछना चाइता हूँ कि बकीन, कानून के पढिनी का बड़ा भारी बर्षन भिन, यहा पर कि जेमे अगर बड़ यहा न हो तो कानून ना बना सकने । ना मेरे मन मे यः बान बीः दुई कि कानून का बनाना एक बान है, उमेने लिये बडिमना की आवश्यकता है, यह बीक है, अच्छी भाषा मे बोल सकने है, किनाबो को कोड कर सकने है । लेकिन बिम प्रयोग इन प्रोफेशन का र्नागेकाई किया गया बड़ मुझे कोड पमनर नहीं आया । इसलिये कि जब बनावन मे बकाना नहीं चलनी है नहीं बर पीनिटिबष मे शामिल हुंता है और इस पालिवामेंट के माध्यम मे अपने प्रोफेशन को बाबे चलाता है और इम्पोर्टेंट बन जाता है । बरना कोई भी हम प्रोफेशन का आदमी जो मजहूर हो वह थोड मना मे क्यों आयेगा ? 1,600 २० उसकी कीव ह ।

ऐसी बान नहीं है कि मैं उसे जनरेलाइज कर रहा हूँ लेकिन उन प्रोफेशन को बनना खोरीकाई करने की कोई जरूरत नहीं है । मैं बारा

से कहना चाहता है कि जैसे कोई अच्छा डाक्टर है अच्छा कार्टोलाजिस्ट है उस से धाप यह कैसे बनेगा कर सकते हैं कि वह समय का सदस्य हो कर अपने दायित्व का, धन कर्तव्य का अच्छी तरह से निभावेगा। इसी तरह से धनर कार्ड प्रोफेशनल एंगल बचने की न तो वह प्रोफेशनल छोड़ देगा है या एक टीचर है वह लोक सेवा में धा कर या एंबेबली में जा कर अपने प्रोफेशन में लिये अस्विय कौसे कर सकता है। मेरा कहना यह है कि इन के लिये कास्टीरिया देना मेरा, होना चाहिये और इन मन्त्रों का माध्यम से ही बहुत लाभ उठे हैं और मैं तो यह कहना है कि पत्रिका मानी मान्य नहर इनन बः पालियामेटीरियन नहो बन पाते धनर से धनर प्रोफेशन का न छोड़न और गांधी जी हम दश की कर्मभूमि पर धा कर महारत्ना नहीं बन पाते धनर से कार्ट क भाषन छेदे रहते। जब उन्कान उन का छोडा और न्याय किया नो वे इनन बन बने। धाप यह दखिये कि श्री मन्त्र नियम बकील नहीं हैं नेबिन कौन बः सकता है कि ये अच्छे पालियामेटीरियन नहीं हैं। इसलिये मैं कहना है कि प्रोफेशन की बात धाप छोड दीजिय और यह बात नहीं है कि मौलिक अधिकारों में सबका हक है कि बः राजनीति में हिस्सा न सकता है लेकिन राजनीति में धान के लिये सेवा का माध्यम स्वीकार कर नना चाहिये और जो एक सामाजिक कर्तव्यता है उसको भी बोधा मा म्सागी कार्ट करना चाहिये। धाप एक गांव का कार्यकर्ता है वह लोकसेवा में नहीं जा सकता है और एक तपस्विसा कायकर्ता भी लोक सेवा में नहीं जा सकता है। हम को कश्चित् का टिकर मिला और कश्चित् की अच्छी हवा भी और हम धा गये। यह तो एक तबनीक है। धप किस का तराजू में ताला जा सकता है कि उनमें कितनी सेवा की है। हमारा जीवन जनता की सेवा में खीता है। मैं तीन मनवा जन भी गया है और लोक सेवा में मैं बन कर धाया और कार्परेशन में भी मैं सदस्य था लेकिन कार्ड बने कि मरा प्रोफेशन क्या है तो मैं यही कःगा कि मेरा प्रोफेशन कुछ भी नहीं है। मेरे बच्चे और कार्ड

कमाते हैं और उनकी धावदनी में से मैं जाना और कुछ गः से भी कुछे लिये खाता है। इसलिये मेरा कहना यह है कि इन को प्रोफेशन से नहीं जाडना चाहिये इलिक इन को सेवा में जोडना चाहिये। सदस्यता की किसी व्यक्ति के कर्म से जाडना चाहिये, ईमानदारी से जाडना चाहिये उस की इटेक्टिटी उन की प्रतिभा में जोडना चाहिये। चुनाव में बहुत से लाभ प्राते हैं और बने जान है। एक धाधी सी जाती है और उन में बहुत से धा जाने हैं और बहुत से बने जान हैं। यह कोई बात नहीं है। कार्ड मुसा है या कार्ड तराजू है किसी कायकर्ता को पःखने की या ममलने की। यह कहां की बात है कि धनर बकील नहीं हुआ तो लोक सेवा नहीं चलनी धनर डाक्टर नहीं हुआ तो लोक सेवा नहीं चलनी और धनर प्रोफेशनल नहीं होगा तो लोक सेवा नहीं चलनी। धनर प्रोफेशनल एंगल इसलिये उनमें प्रतिभा होगी बन बडा धाय है बडा विद्वान है बडा प्रतिभा-मानी है और वह बानना जानना है। वह बिनाबा म से कार्ट करना जानना है। मैं जा सेवा के कास्टीरिया का बात बार-बार कहना है वह इसलिये कहता है कि एक सदस्य अपनी कान्स्टीटेयन्सी के 10 लाख लाभ का प्रति निधिध करना है। मैं पूछे हैं और उनको धान धान को नहीं है और उनको धनाज नहीं मिलना है। उन्की की बात यह कह सकता है। इनमें बकानन की बात कहा से धा जाती है। उनके धान जमीन नहीं है और उन को धरती मिलनी चाहिये। इनमें पारित्य की क्या धावश्यकता है। सदस्य को अपने धलाके से लोगों की चिन्कतों को मानन रखना है और धाधिक विकास के माध्यम से वेत या निर्माण करना चाहिये और नारे श्रोतों को बढाना चाहिये। इन बातों का करन क लिये कौन सी बुद्धिमत्ता की जरूरत है। इन में कौन सी प्रतिभा और विद्वान की जरूरत है और इनके लिये मोठी माल नेहक की जरूरत लेना बःगा एक ठीक है। मैं तो यह कहता है कि माती लाल नेहक इतने बने नहीं बन सकते व धनर से अपने प्रोफेशन को

को न छोड़ते। प्रोफेशन बंधवते ने अगर अपनी प्रोफेशनली न छोड़ी होती तो वे इतने महत्वपूर्ण बनते। हमलिये मेरा कहना यह है कि प्रोफेशन को छोड़ कर मैजिस्ट्रेट के, सेवा के परिप्रेक्ष्य के अन्दर आना पड़ेगा और अपने पेशेवासी की स्थापना करनी पड़ेगी। जब लोग चुने जाते हैं।

श्री जगु बंडवते (राजापुर) प्रोफेशन में रह कर भी मैं मास मूवेमेंट में रहा हूँ।

श्री राम लहाव बांडे : मैं आप की प्रशंसा करता हूँ। मैं प्रोफेशन के खिलाफ हूँ और मुझे जो विश्व लगती है, वह कानून के पक्षितों में लगती है लेकिन टीचर को देख कर मेरा मस्तिष्क अज्ञान से झुक जाता है क्योंकि वही सब से प्राचीन है। बंधवते जी, यह टीचिंग का प्रोफेशन, प्रख्यापन का प्रोफेशन सब से प्राचीन है और सब से बड़ा पेशे का काम है। विद्या ज्ञान सब में बड़ा दान है और प्रख्यापक के मामले में झुक जाना अपेक्षित है लेकिन बकील का क्या है। भगवान बहाय इन बकीलों में। जो पजे में पड़ जाते हैं वह पिस जाना है और मच्छाई भी पिस जानी है और मैं नहीं समझता कि बकील का कान्ट्रीब्यूशन लोक निर्माण में और समस्त के पचापन में बड़ा भारी है। सामाजिक कार्यकर्ता और गांव के कार्यकर्ता की बात मैं कहना हूँ। आप यहाँ पर प्वाइन्ट ऑफ ऑर्डर रोज करते हैं और बड़ी बड़ी किताबों से कोट करते हैं लेकिन आप पचायतों में जा कर देखिये। वहाँ पर कौन प्वाइन्ट ऑफ ऑर्डर रोज करता है, पांच माल धारणी बैठ गये और पचायत का निर्णय हो गया और वह सर्वमान्य होता है। मैं तो कहता हूँ कि आप लोक सभा में भी ग्राम पचायत जैसी व्यवस्था को स्वीकार करे। वहाँ पर आप के कानून के पक्षित नहीं है और अगर वे होते तो निकटतम हो गई होती। वे गांव वालों को सड़वाने और मुकदमें चलवाते। वे सीधे साधे लोग हैं और पचायतों से अपनी समस्याओं का समाधान करने हैं। अगर हम लोक सभा में भी इस तरह से काम चलाये जो सेवा से महित हो, जो धारणी के विकास से महित हो और जो हम ने सकल्प

किया है, उन सकल्प को सेवा की भावना में पूरा करें तो बहुत प्रगच्छी बात है। मैंने मैं मसजाना हूँ कि इन बिग में कुछ भी नहीं है।

श्री शक्ति लूचण (दलिय दिल्ली) : सभापति जी, हम बिल से कम से कम एक चीज जरूर चाहिए होती है। एक माननीय सदस्य का पता लगा कि किसी ब्लैक-मार्केटियर का केस लट रहा है सुप्रीम कोर्ट में। गरीब जनता का प्रतिनिधि हो कर आना है और सभापति का केस सुप्रीम कोर्ट में लड़ना है, यह कहा तक उचित है।

SHRI R. S. PANDEY : He is a Member of Parliament and he is fighting on behalf of the smugglers in Bombay High Court.

श्री शक्ति लूचण यहाँ बहुत से मेम्बर हैं या कि सुप्रीम कोर्ट में केस लड़ने हैं बड़े-बड़े म्मगलमें के। मैं सुप्रीम कोर्ट की मान्यता को कम नहीं करना लेकिन एक गरीब धारणी सुप्रीम कोर्ट की डयोटी पर नहीं चढ़ सकता, यह सब लोग जानते हैं। किम किस्म के केस जाते हैं, किम किस्म के बकील जाते हैं और किम किस्म के जज बहा गते हैं ये सभी जानते हैं जो बुनियादी चीज हानी चाहिए वह पता नहीं कब होनी लेकिन वास्तव में जो पार्लियामेंट के मेम्बर हैं वे जो धोर कम्प्लेक्स लोग हैं उन के केस लड़ने हैं। पता लगा कि कोई माधु मग स्मगलिंग में पकड़े गये, तो उन की बकालन करने चले जा रहें हैं। यह बड़े काम की बात है। मेम्बर ऑफ पार्लियामेंट ऐसे लोगों की बकालन बहा जा कर करते हैं और सरकारी दफ्तरो में करते हैं और सवालतो में जा कर करते हैं, यह गलत चीज है और इस को खाल तीर से रोकना ही चाहिए। जब तक वह पार्लियामेंट का मेम्बर है और 10 लाख धारणियों को रेप्रेजेंट करता है, तो जो पार्लियामेंट का काम है वह उस को करना चाहिए और दूसरा काम उस को नहीं करना चाहिए। जब वह पार्लियामेंट का मेम्बर बन गया, तो प्रान्सेटली उस को वह काम करना चाहिए, लेकिन होना क्या है कि पार्लियामेंट का मेम्बर चुन कर आने के बाद वह प्राधा पटा या एक पटा यहाँ आ कर

बैठ गया और बाकी समय सुप्रीम कोर्ट में जा कर बैठता है और अद्यतनता में अडका जाता है। इन में सेम्बर आफ पार्लियामेंट की प्रतिक्रिया कम होती है। इसलिए सेम्बर आफ पार्लियामेंट की जाग्यता बढ़ाने के लिए यह आवश्यक है कि वह ऐसा कार्य न करे।

श्री मूल अड डाया माफ कीविए यह बकालन क प्राफेजन पर हमला है। यहां पर बिजनेसमैन आता है एग्जीक्यूटिवरियन आता है और आप यह कह कर बकालन के प्राफेजन पर हमला कर रहे हैं। यह एक मोबन प्रोफेजन है और आप उन पर हमला कर रहे हैं।

श्री शशि भूषण आप हम का नाबल प्राफेजन मानते होंगे।

श्री मूल अड डाया आप न मान लकिन आप एम्मा बात कह कर हम प्राफेजन पर हमला कर रहे हैं।

सक्षमता महोदय नागेक भी इस का बाकी हुई है बाकी बुगर्ड भी मुन सीजिए।

श्री मूल अड डाया नागाव की बात नहीं है। मैं यह कह रहा हूँ कि यहां पर सभी प्राफेजन ब न लाग है। यहां पर बिजनेसमैन है और एग्जी बलरियरियन है और कुलम भी हैं। हरेक आदमी का अपना धंधा है लेकिन बाई आदमी निकम्मा नहीं है। (अव्यवसाय)

श्री शशि भूषण दागा जी मैं यह समझता हूँ कि हज़ारा नौजवान हैं जो बिअर हा मकन हैं या दूसरे काम कर सकते हैं और माओ की तादाद में लाग कामा बाट पढ़ने हुए बैठे हैं। उन से दस का और भी काम लिया जा सकता है सना में काम लिया जा सकता है लेकिन वे बैठ रहते हैं। मुझे उन से एनगाड नहीं है लेकिन अब सेम्बर आफ पार्लियामेंट हो गये जो जैसे बकलमेट काटेक्टर सेम्बर आफ पार्लियामेंट नहीं हा सकता, जो बकलमेट के कैसेज पार्लियामेंट के सेम्बर कैस ले सकते हैं। बहुत से सेम्बर आफ पार्लियामेंट बकलमेट के कैसेज लेते हैं बल्कि

बकलमेट के लाइवर्स हैं। मेरे समझ में नहीं आता कि यह कैसी चीज है और इस को देखना ही होता कि चीन से मुनासिब ट्रेड मुनियन के कैसेज हैं। उन का अमर बकील लाय लेते हैं ता बड़ी मुनासिब बात है।

अगर ट्रेड मुनियन के हिला के खिलाफ बकील लाग केम लेते हैं और वे सेम्बर पार्लियामेंट हैं ता बहा गलन है। कोई मायना अगर स्पष्ट हार्नी आहिय पार्लियामेंट की तरफ से कि जी पार्लियामेंट व सेम्बर हा जिस तरफ से कोई पार्लियामेंट का सेम्बर वाण्डेक्टर नहीं हा सकता है, दूसरा काम नहीं कर सकता है, वह बकालन का भी काम न करे उस बकलन तब न करे जब नव व सेम्बर पार्लियामेंट रहता है। जब न रहे उनके बाद कर सकता है। ये बानी काम साथ साथ नहीं चम सकते हैं। लाखा आदमिया का रिप्रिजेंट करना और पार्लियामेंट का काम भी करना और वह काम भी करना सब संभव नहीं है। इसके रिय बाई कांड जरूर बनना चाहिये। इसमें बिचा का एनगाड नहीं जाना चाहिये। बकीला की महला का मैं बम नहीं करता हूँ। अडर पार्लियामेंट का जा मान्यता है उनका मैं ऊपर रखना चाहता हूँ। इतना ही मेरा निबबन है।

THE MINISTER OF WORKS AND HOUSING AND PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI K. RAGHURAMANIAH) : Sir, I had taken the consensus of the hon. Members both opposite and here in view of that I move

That further consideration of this Bill be adjourned."

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is

'That further consideration of this Bill be adjourned.'

The Motion was adopted