

Gambhali, Shri Ishaque  
Sen, Dr Ranen  
Sequeira Shri Erasmo de  
Shastri, Shri Ramavatar  
Sher Singh, Prof.  
Singh, Shri D N.

MR DEPUTY SPEAKER The result of the division is Ayes—183, Noes 38

*The motion was adopted*

SHRI DINEN BHATIACHARYYA  
As a mark of protest, we walk out from the House

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA As a mark of protest, we withdraw from the House

Shri Indrajit Gupta, Shri Dinan Bhat-tacharyya and some other hon Mem-bers then left the House

14 30 hrs

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

THE MINISTER OF WORKS AND HOUSING AND PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI K RAGHU RAMAIAH) Mr Deputy-Speaker a few days ago I mentioned about the possibility of a sitting on the 6th, when we were discussing the question of finding time for discussion on sugar cane price, and I said that if we were to sit on the 6th we shall try to do government work and complete the discussion left over but that there will be no non-official work I stand here to confirm that we do sit on Friday the 6th and that there will be no non-official business that day and that we will do government work and if the discussion on that resolution is not over, complete the discussion also

14 32 hrs

#### ARREST OF MEMBERS

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER I have to inform the House that the Speaker has received the following two telegrams dated the 3rd February, 1976 from the

Additional Inspector General and Commissioner of Police, Madras—

- (1) "Thiru P A Saminathan, MP, son of Thiru Arumuga Mudaliar Coimbatore District, was arrested in front of Anna Samadhi Kamaraj Salai Madras, by sub-Inspector of Police Perummanathur Police Station Coimbatore District, at 11 00 hours today 3-2-1976 and detention order issued by the Collector of Coimbatore in CMP No 10/76 dated 1-2-76 was served on him The detenu is being taken under escort to Coimbatore by Sub-Inspector of Police for being lodged in Central Prison, Coimbatore";
- (2) "I have the honour to inform you that I have found it my duty that in exercise of powers conferred under Section 32/C read with Section 31A(2) of MISA, 1971, that Shri Murasoli Maran MP be detained. Shri Murasoli Maran, MP was accordingly served with detention order at 14 00 hours on 3-2-1976 and lodged in Central Prison Madras at 14 45 hours on 3-2-1976"

14 35 hrs

#### HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE (EXTENSION OF DURATION) BILL

THE MINISTER OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI H. R. GOKHALE) Mr Deputy-Speaker, Sir I beg to move

That the Bill to provide for the extension of the duration of the present House of the People be taken into consideration"

After the General Elections held in 1971, the first meeting of the existing House of the People was held on 19th March, 1971 Therefore, according to clause 2 of article 83 of the Constitution, the duration of the House of the People will expire on 18th March, 1976. In the normal course of things, a general election would have been necessary for the purpose of constituting a new

[Shri H. R. Gokhale]  
House of the People before the afore-  
said date.

Under the proviso to clause 2 of article 83, the duration of the House of the People may, while a Proclamation of emergency is in operation, be extended by Parliament by law for a period not exceeding one year at a time and not exceeding in any case beyond a period of six months after the Proclamation has ceased to operate.

As the House is aware, the country has been passing through a critical period. The Proclamation of Emergency issued on the 3rd December, 1971 on account of external aggression and the Proclamation of Emergency issued on 25th June 1975 on account of internal disturbance are both in operation. The country was faced with a grave crisis at the time of the Proclamation of Emergency in 1975. The determined measures that have since been taken by the government under the leadership of our Prime Minister have taken people out of despondency and restored confidence among them. The 20 point programme announced by the Prime Minister is being implemented vigorously and this and the other economic measures taken by the Government have led to marked improvement in the economic situation of the country. Law and order situation has also improved. There is also considerable improvement in discipline in all spheres of national life. We cannot yet afford to relax in our efforts. The gains achieved by the nation have to be consolidated and preserved. For this purpose, it is necessary to avail of the powers under the proviso to article 83(2) of the Constitution and extend the life of the present House of the People by one year, so that all-round stability and continued progress is ensured. This is what the Bill seeks to do.

I commend the Bill for the consideration of the House.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved.

"That the Bill to provide for the extension of the duration of the present House of the people, be taken into consideration."

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Burdwan): Sir, this is another glaring instance of misuse of constitutional provisions and is nothing but an outrage on the Constitution and also on the people of the country. The statement of objects and reasons is nothing but a joke. The real purpose of the statement of objects and reasons is to indicate the scope and necessity of a Bill. But what has happened here is, the necessity itself is given as the reason for the necessity of the Bill. In his speech, the minister has relied upon the so-called proclamations of emergency, which we say are nothing but hoax and trumped up. The Constitution no doubt provides for extension of the term of the Lok Sabha, but this should be treated as an exceptional provision, like the emergency provisions of the Constitution. But this Government has made the emergency provisions in the Constitution the normal provisions for the governance of the country. This Government cannot function under the ordinary laws of the land. The Constitution which is the organic law of the people, which the people of this country have given unto themselves, is now being treated as a mere plaything by the ruling party. I am sure the framers of the Constitution had never dreamt that there could be such abuses of the Constitution itself. The emergency provisions which should be taken recourse to only in exceptional circumstances are now being used for their political ends.

When this clause in the draft constitution was being discussed in the Constituent Assembly, Dr. Ambedkar moved an amendment to clause 68(2), which corresponds to the present article 83(2). In the draft Constitution, it was left to the President to extend the term of the House. It was substituted by "Parliament by law". But even then Dr. Ambedkar said, this was

nothing but an invasion of the ordinary constitutional provisions, which means this should be taken recourse to only in exceptional and extraordinary circumstances. By this Bill, what Dr. Ambedkar had apprehended has actually happened, namely, there is an invasion of the constitutional provisions of this country. At the same time, the rights of the common people of the country are being invaded by a power hungry executive and a power-hungry ruling party. Their hunger for power is insatiable and its latest manifestations are this Bill and what was done recently in Tamil Nadu, with the consequences which you have just now reported to the House.

It is clear to the people that the whole object of this Bill is nothing but to bare perpetuate the *status quo* because it suits their political interests. Having muffled the voice of the people, having taken away their right of personal liberty, having banned all meetings and processions, having gagged the press, freedom of expression and speech, having kept Members of Parliament in detention for an indefinite duration without telling them the charges they are supposedly guilty of having taken away, with the active support, I shudder to think of Mr. Gokhale also, all the people's fundamental rights, what the ruling party wants is to continue with a rubber-stamp Parliament to suit its own political ends. It is the tragedy of this country, I say, that this is all sought to be done in the name of the people of this country, when the people are the real targets of this attack. I submit that this Bill is an obnoxious attempt and a crude attempt to justify a non-fact, I call it a non-fact because it is the so-called emergency. Just now the hon. Minister said that everything is peaceful in the country, there is no trouble, law and order is restored, production has increased and the sense of dependency has gone away from the minds of the people. But you do not want to face the people. This is the situation in this country.

The people have been made ineffec-

tive in the name of maintaining democracy, and this Government has shown complete antipathy towards all sections of the people which do not belong to their hue, or is not their ally, who do not listen to their voice. They do not want to listen to either constructive criticism or practical suggestions and they do not wish to enter into a dialogue with the people of this country. That is why I say that this Bill is not a *bona fide* measure and is not in the public interest. Will this Government continue to deny and deprive a large number of people of their fundamental and basic rights?

They say that the people are with them, they say that the people are not with the opposition parties; they say that the vast multitude of people in this country are behind one individual who is the leader of the political party which is in power. By mere propaganda they want to create an impression that they alone represent the public views and public sentiments. But how do they ascertain the views of the people in this country? What is the mandate of the people? The mandate given to this House is going to expire shortly. How do the people express their views when all meetings have been banned all meetings except their own? The other day I told this House how meetings in West Bengal, called by the leftist parties have been banned one after another, since the proclamation of the emergency. Even a condolence meeting called in the memory of Mr. Chou En-lai, the Chinese Prime Minister, was stopped by issuing an order under the Defence of India rules. We wanted to take out a procession, a silent procession, in memory of those persons who have been killed in Chas-nala. That was not permitted and that was stopped. Then how do the people express their views? You have banned all meetings, you have banned all the discussions, you have banned all processions and you have banned all publications. You have imposed ruthlessly the censorship regulations and yet you say the people are supposedly with you.

[Shri Somnath Chatterjee]

There is no method of ascertaining what the people really think about you and what the people really want. Now they want to seek to project that the people are with them by officially sponsored demonstrations. Official agencies, like the DTC buses in Delhi, are shamelessly used, you organise the people, you create a hullabaloo and then you say that the people are with you. The mass media are shamelessly used for your own purposes. But you do not want to find out what the people think about you. The public or the people have not been given the right to express their views freely and fairly by means of an election, through the ballot paper.

Have the people of this country been given the right of recall? They have no right to recall their representatives, even if they have proved unworthy of their trust. How do the electorate control their representatives? They have chosen us as representatives for a term of five years and we are now trying to extend it without consulting them. Suppose the 20-point programme requires the continuation of this House, why do you not approach the people and ascertain their views?

I say that though this is being done in the name of exercising constitutional power, this is committing rape on the constitution by flagrant and motivated abuse, reducing the constitutional scheme of this country to a mere mockery. Abuses we have seen. Article 352 of the Constitution has become very handy for the ruling party and article 356 of the Constitution is used to achieve party ends.

The other day the Tamil Nadu was brought under President's rule under article 356. We feel that if the DMK Ministry did not justify the faith reposed in them by the people of the State, then the people of the State should have been given an opportunity within a few weeks to express their views, and if they wanted, they could have thrown out the Ministry and the party into the dust bin of history. Why

should the Centre intervene at this stage and get a convenient report at a convenient time from the Governor and impose President's rule under article 356?

The DMK was the party with which the ruling party co-operated openly only five years ago, in 1971. You gave up the right to contest even a single Assembly seat. You were so much enamoured of them because that suited your political purpose and you wanted some candidates to be returned to Parliament from Tamil Nadu. Now you do not want them because you have got the emergency and the Constitution is being abused and misused for your party purposes. Under the garb of emergency you can do anything in this country. This is what is happening.

I am not holding any brief for the DMK Ministry as such, but see the way this Government behaves and misuses the constitutional provisions. You engineered the charges to be made against the Ministry and then you assume the role of prosecutor and then Judge. On these charges framed by yourself, you issue the order of President's rule. This is the way the people's verdict is being respected by this Government.

The Tamil Nadu people have voted them to power for five years with the greatest majority known there. You cannot wait for another six or ten weeks for the purpose of giving them an opportunity for giving their views again.

The Governors in this country, I am very sorry to say, are behaving as clerks, and they are defiling the Constitution by their abject surrender to the vested interests which are monopolising the Centre.

Even before the so-called emergency in June, 1975, do we not know how many by-elections have been kept pending. For what reasons? Why was not the Parliamentary by-election from Trivandrum held? Why was it cancelled at the last moment? Why are so many seats kept vacant in Bihar, West

Bengal, throughout the country? No explanation has been given. It is because it does not suit them, because they found that the wind was not in their favour. What with Jabalpur and other places, they felt that they could not face the people.

I charge that this Bill has been conceived by this Government, by the ruling party, as a means to avoid facing the people because they want to run away from the people. It is a product of nervousness and cowardice, and that is why it is being given as a lollypop to their party MPs., along with the bonanza of a tax-free allowance, so that they would keep quite. They believe that they have never had it so good in the country in the past, and they want to perpetuate their hegemony by rampant abuse of the Constitution. One should have thought that it was wholly immaterial whether, "A" or "B" remained in Parliament or not. We do not believe in, nor do we preach the indispensability of any body of persons or individuals.

They think they are indispensable; they think their indispensability is because of the indispensability of their leader and that is why they want to perpetuate themselves as the only arbiters of the fate of the people of this country. But they forget thereby they are expressing lack of confidence in themselves.

Today the stark reality is that they want the people to remain enslaved with no manner of freedom, whatsoever. They want a committed and ineffective judiciary and they want a majority in Parliament consisting of their yes-men with their conscience mortgaged and tongue-tied.

The attitude of this Ruling Party is that the people are no longer the masters but they are the masters of the people. It is no longer a democracy of the people by the people or for the people. This democracy in spite of the people, because that only suits them. That is why they do not care to seek the verdict of the people. What

justification they have to continue this Parliament without placing their balance-sheet before the people of this country and getting their sanction for their continuance?

This duplicate emergency is being utilised as a ruse to continue in power. On 3rd December, 1971, an emergency was declared when there were really some dangers to the security of the country by foreign aggression. But our Jawans won a great victory within 13 days and Bangla Desh was liberated. Everybody hailed that. We applauded the victory of the Jawans although the credit was sought to be arrogated by one single individual for that great victory. Even after that, when the country had been threatened with foreign aggression and even the external aggression was continuing, elections were held in so many States, including the border State of West Bengal, which was of course nothing but a farce, as we saw there the fine though sickening example of rigging and manipulation. But even then you did not take recourse to the emergency for the purpose of avoiding the people of this country.

What is the justification for not holding the elections now? They say with the implementation of the 1975 proclamation of emergency, now it is milk and honey that is flowing in this country. Everybody is going to the office in time. Trains are running on time. Every body wants that trains should run in time. Everybody wants that people should work in the offices. Therefore, so long as trains are running on time, there should be no elections; so long as office-goers report to the office at 10 O'clock, there should be no elections! According to them the emergency must continue. If trains are to run on time, emergency must continue. If the country is peaceful, if they are achieving what they wanted by this emergency, if there is no internal disturbance which was sought to be the justification for issuing the second proclamation of emergency, then how can you utilise this emergency for the purpose of not facing the people of this country?

[Shri Somnath Chatterjee]

During the last 26 years of our Republic, we have had to live with emergency for more than ten years. Like poverty, emergency is supposed to remain for ever with the people of this country. Under the Congress Rule, emergency provisions have come to be regarded as part of normal state of affairs in this country, giving rise to what Mr. Setalvad described as "Constitutional dictatorship."

Mr. Gajendragadkar has said:

"The continuous use of such unfettered powers (it happened in 1965-66) may ultimately pose a serious threat to the basic values on which the democratic way of life in this country is founded."

What he had said has proved to be true within a decade from when he said that. 34 eminent persons in this country like Chief Justice Mahajan, Chief Justice S. R. Das, Chief Justice Sinha,—they are not belonging to any political party or the Opposition Party for that matter said on 27th February 1966 as follows:

"A grave emergency lasting over three years and resulting in the exercise of arbitrary powers by the Executive for such a long period has not been known in a democratic country."

But we had another ten years since then.

15.00 hrs.

The situation is this. They are now trying to write a new definition of democracy under the leadership of one individual because they have equated an individual with the country and the country with an individual. Now, democracy is of 'X', for 'X' and by 'X'.

We oppose this Bill.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, four hours were allotted for this Bill. We took up this Bill at 2.40 P.M. If you add four hours to that, we should con-

clude by 6.40 P.M. Let us fix up the time when the Minister should reply.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are we sitting beyond 6 O'clock?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It is up to you.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: The Minister can reply tomorrow.

AN HON. MEMBER: We do not want to sit beyond 6 O'clock.

SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH: I suggest that the Minister may be called at 5.30 P.M. There are other stages of the Bill also, the clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill and the third reading.

SHRI ERASMO DE SEQUEIRA: This is an important Bill.

SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH: The Business Advisory Committee has allotted four hours. This will give you three hours for the first stage.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: If that is agreed, the Minister will be called at 5.30 P.M.

Shri Dinesh Chandra Goswami.

SHRI DINESH CHANDRA GOSWAMI (Gauhati): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, in politics we are accustomed to see strange spectacles. Today, we have seen another such strange spectacle when the party on this side of the House which will have no difficulty in winning the elections at this time of the year is asking for postponement of the elections for one year.....

SHRIMATI T. LAKSHMIKANTHAMMA (Khamman): How do you know?

SHRI DINESH CHANDRA GOSWAMI: ..and Members on the other side of the House who by and large have no chance of coming back or gaining the confidence of the people at this time of the year are asking for

holding elections and they are opposing this Bill. I know, if the Prime Minister would have called for elections in due time, Mr. Somnath Chatterjee would have been the first person to oppose it on the ground that we are trying to reap political advantage of emergency and, if we would have won the elections, he would have said that the elections were rigged and manipulated.

This has been their argument all throughout and, today, I would very humbly appeal to my hon. friends or the opposition who feel that the continuance of this House beyond 18th March will be illegal or unconstitutional to act according to their conscience and resign membership so that to the country at large they can say that they not only advocate that one should follow conscience but act according to it.

Then, my hon. friends opposite have said that we have taken some extra allowance. I would like to know from my hon friends of the Opposition, including Mrs. Lakshmikanthamma, whether they have not taken this extra allowance or not. If they have drawn it, have they got a right to oppose it? (Interruptions) It is not your money; it is not my money.

AN HON MEMBER: It is in a bad taste.

**SHRI DINESH CHANDRA GOSWAMI:** It is not a question of bad taste. When you say that the conscience demands something, you should follow it not only by making speeches but by your actions too. I hope, my hon. friends of the opposition who say that this House has no right to stay beyond 18th March will follow the dictates of conscience and act accordingly.

Again, my hon. friends of the opposition are asking: Have you taken the opinion of the people? If my hon. friends on the opposite have not been able to realise the opinion of the people today which is prevalent in the

country, I would say, they do not have the eyes and the ears. Not only the entire situation today in the country justifies Emergency but even in the panchayat elections in Gujarat and other elections, it has been clearly and conclusively proved that the people have supported Emergency. I do not think we should go back to discuss it because this House has debated it a number of times and this House, by an overwhelming majority has given its credence to the Proclamation of Emergency.

My hon. friend, Shri Somnath Chatterjee, like a devil quoting scriptures, talked about Constitution and democracy. May I remind him, if anybody really put the Constitution into a dustbin, it was his CPI(M) party during the Marxist regime in West Bengal.

15.05 hrs.

[SHRI ISHAQUE SAMBHALI in the Chair.]

Sir, if self-interest had dictated it or if a self-interest would have been the guiding force in giving our own preferences to this Bill today, I myself would have voted against this Bill; because today, if I go to the polls, I have no doubt that, personally speaking, myself and, may be with an exception or two here and there, almost all Members of the House on this side would come back; and I have no doubt that all the Members of the other side, barring a few exceptions, of the House who are opposing this resolution would have been thrown out by the people. But there are moments, when in the interest of a national cause we should subject our self-interest to it—and we should not forget that that is exactly what we did four years back when this Party, in spite of the fact that it had another year's lease, did not for a moment hesitate or our leader did not for a moment hesitate to dissolve this Parliament and seek the mandate of the people. The leader of the country, our Prime Minister, has at least shown one thing to this world. She has shown that she is capable of taking risks and, in moments when the interests of the Party and the interest of

[Shri Dinesh Chandra Goswami]

the country are at conflict, she has always chosen to accept such a decision as would be in the interest of this country.

We have seen this in the case of Kashmir, for example. We have seen that when our Party was in power and when our Party was asked to go out of power because it was our opinion that the solution of the problem was to hand over power to Sheikh Abdullah and without hesitation we did it. Therefore, to say that we have brought this Bill only for the sake of personal interest and also for political aims is not only a completely misleading proposition but, I think, it is almost ignoring the facts of life as they exist today.

It is not that trains are running on time or that the offices are working properly that is the gain of emergency. The gain of emergency is that a sense of discipline has come into this country today and nobody can ignore it; the gain of emergency is that the productive and distributive forces of this country are working at much better capacity.

(Interruptions)

Nobody can deny that a sense of discipline is coming into this country and nobody can deny that the effort of the Opposition to frustrate or to lead to the collapse of the distributive machinery and the productive machinery was itself frustrated. I know your anger because if the benefits that we are reaping today of emergency continue for long, obviously the people of India will realise that what you were doing in this country so long is something nobody can support, and the continuance of emergency will only confirm that fact. You know in your heart of hearts that the people today have fully realised that the type of politics you are running here—which most of the extreme Rightist and Leftist Parties are running—is not for the good of the country and that is why today, in spite

of the fact that certain essential and basic rights of individuals of this country have been curtailed—nobody denies it and I do not deny that the proclamation of emergency has taken away certain rights of the individuals—yet, the common man has not protested. Why have they not protested? Please try to search your own hearts and you will find the answer. They have not protested because, at no point of time have you been interested in giving the individuals or the common man of this country an opportunity by creating a situation in which they can exercise these rights.

You are talking about the fundamental right of speech. How many people of this country can exercise that right? You are talking about the right to go to courts; how many people of this country can go to courts to exercise this right. You are all along pursuing such a policy of negativism that you don't allow this country to create an atmosphere where the common man can feel that these rights exist for him. Even when these rights are curtailed, the common man has found that an atmosphere has come in which he can express himself much better than in the atmosphere which was prevailing before Emergency. Today if we go for elections, there is no doubt that we will come back to power. But what will happen is that there is the risk of losing the gains of Emergency. We want to consolidate the gains of Emergency. What is more important than elections at the present moment is that the economic programmes, which the Prime Minister has given to this country, must be implemented and translated into action. I know that Government, by postponing the elections for one year, has taken a risk, in the sense that, if we go to the people without translating the economic programmes into action, the people will undoubtedly say that all this was done in order to protect our interests. Government has taken this risk; the Prime Minister has taken this risk, because she has felt that, instead of going for elections and trying to come back to power, what



It is important is to give a new orientation to our way of life and to bring a new economic order, to this country. Emergency has created such conditions in this country, and that is why we have asked for postponement of the elections. I have no doubt that, the choice of the people to the question whether they would like to have elections and along with that take the risk of losing the entire gains of Emergency or to postpone the elections by a year and create an atmosphere whereby we could have a new economic order, is for the latter, and there are visible expressions of it. That is why, even though I know, full well that, if I go for elections now, I would be returned, I support this measure because this measure is for the benefit of this country. That is why, I support this Bill and I have no doubt that the whole House will support this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. H. N. Mukerjee.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore): When such an important Bill which relates to the extension of the life of this House is being discussed, should not the Leader of the House be present?

SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH: The Leader of the House will be present whenever her presence is required.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: This is not an ordinary Bill.

SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH: She will be present whenever her presence is required. She cannot sit here all the 24 hours. Also both the Houses are sitting.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: But that House is not discussing this Bill. Be serious. Show some dignity and respect to this House.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta—North-East): I am very glad, Mr. Chairman, that Shri Indrajit Gupta has raised this point about the habit of Government—which has been growing for

quite some time now—of ignoring the House of the People and of not offering to it the respect that it commands because the Ministers are responsible to this House. And with all respect to the other House, I would say that the Members of this House are hurt; I have no doubt, irrespective of party affiliations, Members of the House of the people are hurt when, on pointing out that neither the Leader of the House nor the eminent Cabinet Ministers responsible to this House are sufficiently respectful, we are told that they have business to do in the other House and business elsewhere also, perhaps, in this very building where Ministers are meeting hordes of supplicants and collecting testimonials about their popularity. It is more than usually depressing. On a day when, a little while earlier, so many of us who wish to be with Government in this hour of trial for the country, we had to go out of the House in order to register our utter dissatisfaction with the way in which Government is proceeding, I certainly expected the Law Minister to make a speech before the House which would have been conveyed to the country. There is no ban, I suppose, on reporting this. Or, is it there? Our speeches would never get known as far as the people are concerned, but the Ministers' pronouncements would be conveyed over the radio and television and every other electronic device. He did not choose to take the House and the country into confidence. He should know that this House represents the country, and if he wishes to say something to the country, he should say it in the House. He did not choose to make anything but a dull re-reading of the Statement of Objects and Reasons which we have had for the last couple of days or so, quoting the Article in the Constitution which was relevant and telling us, well, we are extending the life of the House of the People. Does not Government have the commonsense to understand that the people of the country would like to know more precisely and substantially the reasons why the tenure of those whom they had elected to be Members

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]  
of the Lok Sabha is to be extended. Sir, you, I or anybody on that side might be personally a little pleased that we are now exempted from the trouble and anxiety of fighting an election, but it is neither here nor there. Whatever the personal predilections of X, Y or Z, this country has to take a principled judgement on this kind of issue, and even if we are not unwilling to understand some of the arguments at the back of your mind, Government does not have the guts to come forward and tell the people all about it. Why is it that Government does not say that these are the exact reasons why they wish the life of Lok Sabha to be prolonged. On the face of it, extension of the tenure of Parliament is an extraordinary proposition. You are invoking an extraordinary power invested in you by the Constitution. Normally, nobody would like the idea that the life of the House of the People, which is an elective House—this is the reason why they are proud of it—should be extended. If it is extended, some very special reasons have to be given, there is no doubt about it. Long time ago, Charles the First, who had many reasons to be dissatisfied with his Parliament said: The Parliaments are of the nature of cats; they grow accursed with age; Parliament which lasts too long is a catty customer. Normally, the Parliament should not run longer than the tenure for which it was elected. There might be reasons, extraordinary reasons, which might be here for the moment, which would justify the proposition, but why on earth does Government imagine that they are under no obligation to take the people into confidence and tell them authoritatively the reasons why they wish a certain course of action to be taken.

I do not agree with the point of view basically on which my friend. Shri Chatterjee based his arguments, because I believe that the crisis which led to the Emergency being declared last year, is not yet over. Whether we like it or not, there was a crisis and I am sure, my friend Shri Chatterjee has realised by this time that being

dragooned into a bad company, they burnt their fingers and now they are trying to nurse the injury to their fingers and do not quite know what to do with their political activities. It is a fact that last year, a situation had developed about which some of us might not have had a comprehension for very understandable reasons, but a crisis did develop last year, which required promulgation of an Emergency. But when an Emergency is proclaimed, certain steps are also called for and we are ready and willing to conceive that the Emergency which had to be declared last year is yet not over, and, therefore, we have already agreed to the extension of the period of Emergency, but we want to be satisfied by Government on this score that Emergency notwithstanding the elections should not be held at this particular time; if the elections were held, we were ready to take part with whatever results, we would have left it to our people, but for some reasons, elections cannot be held; I can understand it, but Government does not say that; Government in repeated pronouncement made it clear that the fact of the Emergency being there is no bar to the holding of elections. That is a perfectly warrantable proceeding. In that case, how is it that this Bill comes before us? It can only come and we can justify it only on the hypothesis that Government says that we have to have something like an year which is the period of time for which the life of Lok Sabha is to be extended, to go ahead really and truly with those plans for national reconstruction which have to be accomplished if our people's objectives are to be realised. If the Government could tell us that the 20-point programme or whatever you have, has got to be implemented seriously and earnestly and for that purpose 'we are going in for this kind of programme'. I can understand it. But the government says nothing of that sort because, it cannot say anything of that sort.

Postponement of the elections, therefore, as I said, can be justified by the need to concentrate national energies

on solving the problems which constituted the crisis which has led to the emergency. This is the basic point of view which has not been expounded by the Minister and I do not know—perhaps only one or two Cabinet Ministers are here even to listen to what is being said in the Lok Sabha on a matter of this description.

Now, the implementation of the Government's own programme, the 20-point programme and the task of fighting the reactionary forces seriously has to go on and the government has to come forward to tell us how they are curbing the bureaucracy which is playing such an ugly role today. The bureaucracy stands in the way of actual implementation, essentially, of the 20-point programme of the Prime Minister which is being bellowed to the skies and when the results are infinitesimal. And today, the bonus given to the capitalists and the bonus taken away from the workers was symptomatic of what the Government has always been trying to do. As I speak here, I got the information that in the Chindwara coal mines, 1,000 workers were arrested on account of a dispute over the management's unilateral changing of the shift system. Is this the way of winning over the working class? My friend Shri Chandrajit Yadav is here or perhaps like Shri Paghunatha Reddy he would fling back at us charges of populism and economism? They are becoming experts now

**SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA:** It is not under him. It is under Mr. Pant.

**SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE:** After all, they share the same baby. They have to be answerable to the people. Anyhow, in the coal-mines, one thousand workers were arrested on account of a dispute over the shift system and the management is having its own way. Thousands of peaceful hunger-strikers on the bonus issue have been arrested in various States and in Bhilai we find that the District Collector has started proceedings under DIR against the Press which had printed a simple an-

nouncement where the hunger strike on the issue of bonus has been advertised.

There are so many other instances to which I will not make any reference because, after all it is quite unnecessary, which shows how we find that in the implementation of what is the programme, nothing actually is being done. What exactly is therefore the Government's answer to the people? How exactly are the Government going to justify the House of the People and itself before the people? How are we, as representatives of the people, going to explain the position to our own constituents when they twist us for having added another year to our innings in Parliament? What do we tell them? We must be in a position to say that the Government is seriously trying to pursue this programme of activity, but, we hear, on the contrary, only a reference to the 'illustrious leadership of the Prime Minister'. We do not mind the 'illustrious leadership' I personally do not grudge nor my Party certainly do grudge the Prime Minister the historic role which she has happened to achieve in our country. But, I am sometimes a little sick about this repeated adulation in a manner which goes against the grain of democratic decency. And I recall what happened in the 5th Century B.C. in Athens which was run by direct democracy where there was a very important person called Aristides who had got the reputation of being the 'Justice Man in Greece' and he was described by everybody at every time as 'Aristides the Just' and this ultimately annoyed the citizens of Athens to such an extent that by exercising their right of what they called, ostracism, sent that very good man into exile because they got fed up with this repeated description of the man as 'Aristides the Just'. I do not grudge, my Party certainly do not grudge the Prime Minister the position she has won. We act on principles and we render the assistance that we do only because we consider that at this point of time, she has come forward to fight the menace of neo-fascism. We do not mind at all the

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

tributes that are paid to her, but a little too much of this adulation, a little too much of apologetic explanations to her allergy to Parliament which has infected her Cabinet colleagues. It makes us feel apprehensive that perhaps, things are not being done as they ought to be. If on the Bonus issue Government could take the stand as they did, I find and my party have discovered from the debate that it is difficult to reconcile the position. But position has to be reconciled in the interest of the people because the danger is still there, the dangers which call for the emergency have still to be fought efficiently and for that reason if you want extension of the life of the House of the People after all it is a flea-bite. It is a drop in the ocean, to speak, so far as time is concerned. Our people have inherited the idea of acquiescence in maintaining the status quo. The heavens would not fall. But we have to justify ourselves to the people, tell them specifically and earnestly that we are going to do these things objectively. If you do not, then we shall become the butt of ridicule and that would be bad that would detract from the efficiency of struggle against neo-fascism, the struggle for the achievement of people's objective. Therefore, I would say that it is a great pity that Government does not come forward before the people with explanation of its intentions which would make sense and which would indicate at the same time also that always steps were going to be taken in order to put our people on a different level of living in the dangers which confront our country till to-day, those dangers have got to be fought out efficiently.

सभापति महोदय : मैं यह अर्ज कर दूँ कि साठे पाच बजे मिनिसटर साहब को जवाब देना है। बोलनेवालों की तादाद बहुत ज्यादा है और जैसा मुझ को एडवाइज किया गया है

बी० के० डेब (कालाहांटी) : किस ने एडवाइज किया है.. (अव्यवधान)...

सभापति महोदय : जो इस हाउस के प्रोग्राम को देखते हैं और जिस के मुताबिक इस हाउस के स्पीकर, डिप्टी स्पीकर और चेयरमैन को एडजस्ट करना होता है, उस नजरिये से यह जरूरी है कि उस का निहाय रखा जाय और मैंने जो हिसाब लगाया है उस के मुताबिक मैं समझता हूँ कि कांग्रेस पार्टी को, जिस के बोलनेवालों की लिस्ट सब से बड़ी है, पाच-पाच मिनट में ज्यादा नहीं देना चाहिये। ऑपोजीशन की लिस्ट भी काफी बड़ी है, मैं समझता हूँ उन को भी 10 मिनट में ज्यादा नहीं दिये जा सकने।

इस वक्त पैन्यली साहब का नम्बर है, लेकिन साठे साहब का मेर दाद लेखन पर आता है, हम जिन से आप ने आग्रह चाहा कि सब में पहले साठे साहब को उठाऊँ। श्री साठे।

श्री बसन्त साठे (प्रकोला) : सभापति महोदय, आप ने मुझे इजाजत दी, इस के लिये आप का शुक्र गुजार हूँ। अभी हम बिल की बत्स में हमारे बुजुर्ग छोर माने हुए नेता श्री मुखर्जी साहब बोल रहे थे। उन की तर्जनीर मनने हुए मुझे गंगा लगा कि वे दिल से तो इस बिल का समर्थन करना चाहत थे, लेकिन यह भी साथ-साथ बताना चाहते थे कि हम ने इस का विरोध भी दर्ज करा कर रखा है। उन की दलील क्या थी ? हालांकि बोलने में, जुबान और भाषा में, खास तौर से अंग्रेजी भाषा पर जो उन का प्रभुत्व है, उस में कोई उन का हाथ नहीं पकड़ सकता। लेकिन दलील जो उन्होंने दी वह दलील क्या थी इस की जगह देखा जाय। वह यह कह रहे थे कि यह जो हालात इमरजेन्सी के वक्त इस देश में पैदा हुए थे वह हालात आज भी कायम हैं देश में। उन की शिकायत इतनी ही थी कि आप ने जिस ढंग से, पुर्जोर

सरी ४ से खुलासावार कारण बतलाने चाहिये थे, जैसे कि वह बतला रहे थे, वैसे उन्होंने नहीं बतलाये। यही उन की शिकायत थी। तो कारण हमारे अजीज मोस्त मेरे बाद जो बोलेगी वह भी और उधर बनर्जी साहब जैसे वक्ता भी हैं, तो यह सब लोग कारण जोड़ेंगे। पर सही कारण क्या है? जो हम सब लोग जानते हैं, वह यह की जो हालात उस वक्त थे, आज आप लोगों के पाम यदि जाना चाहते हैं चुनाव मे तो जाहिर है चुनाव का जो माहौल होता है उस चुनाव के माहौल मे जहा तक हमारा ताल्लुक है यह सब से अच्छा मौका हमारे लिये था लोगो के पाम जाने का, हम तो 20 पाइंट प्रोग्राम के ऊपर ही जीत कर आ जाते, कोई दिक्कत नहीं थी। लेकिन सवाल यह था जैसा कि हमारे एक नीजवान लीटर ने कहा कुछ दिन पहले कि

Now we cannot go to the people with promises; we will have to go to the people with performance

तो यह जो परफोरमेंस करने की आवश्यकता है उस परफोरमेंस के लिये बातावरण कौन सा चाहिये? चुनाव मे यदि आप चले जायें तो फिर आप जानते हैं कि वह भाषणबाजिया मीटिंगें, प्रीपेगण्डा, प्रोग्राम, सारा माहौल देश का फिर काम का नहीं खाली बातों का हो जायेगा, और इसलिये यदि परफोरमेंस के लिये हमें काम करना है इस देश मे तो जाहिर है कि देश मे बातावरण भी एक अनुशासन का सारे देश मे होना आवश्यक है और सारे लोग एक दिल से, एक डरादे मे परफोरमेंस के लिये लग जायें। और हम यह नहीं चाहते कि फिर मे वही बातें शुरू हो जायें इडिसिप्लिन की नीजवानों मे, कारखानों मे, बह रेलवे की स्ट्राइक, ट्रांसपोर्ट की स्ट्राइक और भी तमाम इस तरह की चीजें यदि फिदे मे शुरू हो जाती हैं उस देश मे जरा डील / दी जायगी तो सारा परफोरमेंस आप व,

जो लोगो के फायदे के लिये था वह पूरा नहीं हो पायगा। मैंने एक भी जवान से नहीं सुना है कि 20 पाइंट प्रोग्राम किसी तरह से भी गलत है। यदि गलत नहीं है और उस को अमल में लाना है तो देश के हर जिम्मेदार आदमी को काम के लिये जुटना पड़ेगा। और इसीलिये वह बातावरण चाहिये। खाली हम बिल का जो मकसद है वह यह है कि एक साल का पीरियड आप को दिया जा रहा है कि सही बातावरण मे परफोरमेंस के लिये, लोगो की भलाई के लिये आप काम करें। उस ११ बाद यदि आप नहीं काम कर पायें तो आप को तो खुश होना चाहिये। कि अगर हम एक साल १ भीतर यदि काम नहीं कर पायें तो जनता हमारे खिलाफ जायेगी और आप विरोध के लोग ज्यादा तादाद मे चुन कर धायेगे। इसलिये यह बिल बहुत निशान्य जरूरी है। इसलिये मैं दख्खास्त करूंगा अपोजीशन के दास्तो मे कि वह लोख भी दिल में जा अन्दर की बात है, जो खुश है कि एक माल मिल गया, उन मे मे कुछ लोग तो गेमे है जो जानते है कि यदि चुनाव हो जाना तो कोई उम्मीद नहीं थी यहा आने की, इसलिये अन्दर से बहुत खुश है। पर ऊपर यह बताना चाहते है कि हम ने ता विरोध किया। जरा दिल पर हाथ रख कर अपनी ईमानदारी से बात करें और इस बिल का पूरा समर्थन करें, यूनानिमसली सपोर्ट करें जिस से हम जनता की और देश की भलाई के लिये काम कर सकें।

प्रो० शे० सिंह (अज्जर) नवापति महोदय, यह विवेक जो हमारे सामने प्रस्तुत है, इस पर बोलने मे पहले मैं एक बात याद दिलाना चाहूंगा जो पण्डित साहब ने इसी ऐजान मे कही थी। उन्होंने कहा था कि यह मतमानी देश मे चल रही है और उठ मतमानी को दबाने के लिए कुछ कदम सरकार को उठाने पड़ें।

( श्री० श्री सिंह (अध्यक्ष) )

आज इस बिल को जब कोई निष्पक्ष हो कर देखेगा, तो समझेगा कि जनमानों को भुलाकर यह मनमानी की जा रही है। पिछले दिनों यह बात बहुत कही गई थी कि जो लोग पांच साल के लिए चुन कर आए हैं, उन लोगों को बीच में हटा देना एक नाजायज बात है एक मूल्य बात है और ऐसा नहीं करना चाहिए। मैं मानता हूँ कि यह बात ठीक है कि पांच साल के लिए जनता ने अपने प्रतिनिधि बना कर भेजे हैं और अगर उन पांच सालों के बीच में वे कोई गड़बड़ करते हैं, अपने कर्ज का उन को अहसास नहीं है, सलन तरीके से वे काम करते हैं और व्यवहार उन के जीवन में है और जनता के हितों की बात नहीं होती है, तो भी जनता को पांच साल उस को बदलन करना चाहिए। पांच साल के बाद जनता को हक है कि वह उन को बदल सकती है, लेकिन मैं यह जानना चाहूंगा कि ये पांच साल जब बीत जाए, तो जनता क्या करे? मैं मंत्री जी से यह प्रश्न पूछता हूँ और इस का उत्तर चाहता हूँ क्योंकि यह कहा जाता है कि पांच साल तक किसी को अपना जवान नहीं खालनी चाहिए और पूरा मोटा देना चाहिए कि पांच साल तक वे अपना काम करे और कर्ज का अहसास कर के पूरी तरह से अपना काम करे।

अब जा यह परफोर्मेंस की बात कहने है, तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि पांच साल तो आप को परफोर्मेंस दिखाने के लिए मिले थे लेकिन अब पांच साल के बाद आप को परफोर्मेंस की बात याद आई। पांच साल तक बो आप ने कुछ नहीं किया और अब एक साल और चाहते हैं परफोर्मेंस दिखाने के लिए और उसके बाद भी अगर परफोर्मेंस नहीं दिखलाई, तो फिर आप निबाल देंगे कि एक साल के लिए और इस को अवधि बढ़ा दो।

बिधि, न्याय और कानून ताना गाना (श्री एच० आर० गोखले) आप भा हमारे साथ थे।

श्री० श्री सिंह : मैं भी आप के साथ हूँ, लेकिन आप लोगों की ही बातों से आप जाहिर होता है कि पांच साल तक आप से कोई परफोर्मेंस नहीं दिखलाई और अपने वाचनों को पूरा नहीं किया लेकिन अब आप कहते हैं कि इस एक साल में परफोर्मेंस कर के दिखलाएंगे। अब तो यह बात भी चख रही है कि एक साल के बाद भी बढ़ावे का अधिकार हमें है और एक साल के लिए आप भी बढ़ा सकते हैं। सेन्ट्रल हाउस में यह बात होती है और हमारे मित्र कहते हैं कि अब भूल जाइए चुनावों को। यह एक झल के लिए है और हमसे माल फिर बढ़ाने का हमारे पास अधिकार है। इन्हें लिए हमसे माल फिर आप एक साल के लिए बढ़ा देंगे क्योंकि जनता के पास इस के लिए जाने को आप को जरूरत नहीं है। आप यही बैठ कर इस का बढ़ा देंगे। जनता के पास जाने में कोई हिम्मत चाहिए क्योंकि जनता उल्टी बात भी कर सकती है। इसलिए मैं रोखले साहब से यह निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि वे अपने उत्तर में इस बात का भी जबाब दें। पांच साल के लिए जनता से आप पावर लेते हैं प्रायः कहते हैं कि किसी को इस बीच कुछ नहीं करना चाहिए और इस बीच जनता को कोई अधिकार नहीं है कि वह आप से कुछ मत ले लेकिन पांच साल के बाद जनता का केवल इतना अधिकार है कि वह वोट दे दे और जिस का चाहे चुन कर भेज दें। बीच में जनता का कोई दबाव नहीं है और अगर कोई दबाव है तो वही पांच साल के बाद ही है कि वह जिस चाहे उसे चुने। यही उंग के हाथ में एक हथियार है कि पांच साल के बाद आप उस के सामने जाए और अगर आप पांच साल के बाद चुनाव नहीं कराते हैं, तो यह जनता के अधिकार पर एक छापा है। क्योंकि जनता को एक ही अधिकार है कि 5 साल के बाद वह आपका जबाबतसब कर ले और आपसे पूछ ले कि आपने ठीक

कर से और हमपसे पूछ ले कि आपने ठीक नहीं किया है और यहां से हटा दें। इसलिये वह जनता का अधिकार आप छीनने लगे हैं।

यह कहा गया है कि इस समय एमरजेंसी है, इस समय चुनाव कराने से काम करने में सकारात्मक पड़ेगी, देश बिखर जायेगा, उसके टुकड़े हो जायेगे, देश की यूनिटी और मजबूती खतरे से है। मैं नहीं समझ पाया कि देश की मजबूती और यूनिटी कहा खतरे से पड़ जाती है चुनाव कराने से। अगर आज खतरे में है तो अगले साल फिर वह यूनिटी खतरे में पड़ सकती है। यह बात मैं नहीं मानता हूँ। जब देश को यूनिटी की जरूरत पड़ी है, तो यह इस देश की शान है कि उस समय उस यूनिटी को कायम रखा गया। 1965 में देश पर हमला हुआ, उस समय सारा देश एक था। फिर 1971 में हमला हुआ और सन्ध्या का सन्त आया, तो भी सारा देश एक था और मैं समझता हूँ कि आज भी लोगों में राष्ट्रीयता और राष्ट्र-प्रेम की बम्बी नहीं है। हम अगर एक दूसरे पर आरोप लगाये, तो लगा सकते हैं। मैं कहूँ कि आप में भी देशभक्ति नहीं है, तो आप मुझे कह सकते हैं कि मुझ में देशभक्ति नहीं है। लेकिन मैं कहता हूँ कि हम सब में और इस देश के लोगों में देशभक्ति है। जब देश पर सकट आता है, तो देश के लोग बिखरते नहीं हैं, एक हो जाते हैं और एक होकर एकजुट खड़े हो जाते हैं। उन्होंने ऐसा कर के दिखाया भी है। इसलिये इस देश की यूनिटी को चुनाव से खतरा हो जायेगा, और वह तहम-नहस हो जायेगा, वह खतरा बिल्कुल झूठा है, फर्जी है। ऐसा कोई खतरा नहीं है।

अभी-अभी गुजरात के चुनाव का जिक्र किया गया है। गुजरात में प्रदेश भर में, गांव-गांव में पचायतो के और म्युनिसिपैलिटी के चुनाव हुए। वहाँ कौन-सा तबका बच गया? आपकी एमरजेंसी भी लागू थी, बोस-सूरी कार्यक्रम भी चल रहा था। तो

जब सब कुछ होते हुए गुजरात में चुनाव हो सकता है तो सारे देश में क्यों नहीं हो सकता है? इसका जवाब अगर श्री मोहंसे साहब के पास है, तो उनको देना चाहिये।

गुजरात में चुनाव हुए अभी दो महीने भी नहीं हुए हैं। जब गुजरात में चुनाव हो गये और देश की यूनिटी को कोई खतरा नहीं हुआ तो अब यह खतरा कहा से आ गया?

अनुशासन पर्व की बात बहुत कही जा रही है। यह कहा जा रहा है कि हमें समय और अनुशासन में काम करना चाहिये। फिजूलखर्ची, डाउरो आदि सामाजिक कुटी-तियों को बन्द करना चाहिये। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि अगर अच्छे ढंग से चुनाव करवाये जाये, जिसमें शराब न देनी पड़े, कारो का काफिला न चले और बेतहाशा खर्चा न हो, सादे ढंग से चुनाव हो, जिसकी बात मैंने हमेशा कही है, तो उससे क्या फर्क पड़ने वाला है?

एक माननीय सदस्य क्या चुनाव में शराब भी देनी पड़ती है?

प्रो० शेर सिंह बहुत लोग देते हैं, आप भी जानते हैं। शराब के बैरल खोले जाते हैं। मैंने कभी शराब नहीं दी हमेशा सादे चुनाव लड़े हैं। अगर कोई करोड़ों खर्चा खर्च करे तो भी मैं सादा चुनाव लड़ता हूँ।

अगर हम अनुशासन की बात करते हैं, तो अनुशासन और समय में रहते हुए, इन्वैशन का जो हमारा कानून है, उस पर ईमानदारी से अमल करते हुए अगर हम चुनाव करवाये तो यह एमरजेंसी की एक देन हो सकती है। हम लोग क्या अनुशासन में नहीं रह सकते हैं, क्या हमको नहीं रहना चाहिये? क्या दूसरों के लिये यह उपदेश है? हम मेम्बरों को भी, जो चुनाव लड़ते

[श्री० शेर सिंह]

हैं, अनुशासन में रहना चाहिये। इसलिए मैं समझता हूँ कि यह बहानेबाजी है कि हम चुनाव नहीं करवा सकते हैं, इससे देश को खतरा है, एकना को खतरा है, 20-सूची कार्यक्रम रुक जायेगा। अभी मेरे मित्र कह रहे थे कि हम तो चुनकर आ जायेंगे। जब आप फिर चुनकर आ ही जायेंगे तो फिर 2 महीने के बाद इस कार्यक्रम को चला सकते हैं, दो महीने बाद आपको चलाने से कुछ बिगड़ नहीं जायेगा।

जहाँ तक देश में अनुशासन लाने और गड़बड़ी करने वालों को रोकने का प्रश्न है, देश की सब पार्टियों को यह कहना चाहिये कि देश में अनुशासन चले, सब लोग अपना काम ठीक करें, रेल समय पर चले, दफ्तरो में ठीक ढग में काम हो। अनुशासित ढग से चुनाव कराने में मुझे कोई दिक्कत नजर नहीं आती है।

श्री शशि भूषण : (दक्षिण दिल्ली)  
आप रिज़ाइन कर दीजिये, आपका चुनाव करा दिया जायेगा।

श्री० शेर सिंह : आप प्रधान मंत्री से एलान करवा दीजिए कि वह एक महीने में चुनाव करवा देगी, तो मैं रिज़ाइन कर दूंगा।

श्री शशि भूषण : वह रिज़ाइन कर दें, मैं उनके साथ चुनाव लड़ने के लिये तैयार हूँ।

श्री० शेर सिंह : मुझ से चुनाव लड़ने के लिये पता नहीं कहा-कहा से लोगों को ढूँढ रहे हैं और पकड़कर ला रहे हैं। मुझे चेलेंज न दीजिये, आपको एक वोट भी नहीं मिलेगा। आपको वहाँ कोई जानता नहीं है।

श्री शशि भूषण : जब ये जाट कालेज में नीकरी कर रहे थे, तब मैं जेल काट रहा था, रोहतक में था। मुझे वहाँ बहुत लोग जानते हैं, आप खुद भी जानते हैं।

श्री० शेर सिंह : आप दिल्ली से चुनाव लड़ लेना, जो आपका हलका है।

उद्योग और नागरिक प्रति मंत्रालय न राज्य मंत्री (श्री बी० पी० मोर्य) : माननीय सदस्य अपने आप को प्रोफेसर मानते हैं और बड़े सिद्धान्त की बात करते हैं। जिस पार्टी से वे चुनाव लड़कर आये थे, जब उससे उनका सम्बन्ध टूट गया है तो उनको लोक-सभा से इस्तीफा दे देना चाहिये। यू मस्ट रिज़ाइन, यू हैव नो राइट टु स्पीक आन दी फ्लोर आफ दी हाउस।

श्री० शेर सिंह : मैं इस का जवाब देना चाहता हूँ। (ध्वजवाज) मैंने कांग्रेस का कोई सिद्धान्त नहीं तोड़ा है। (ध्वजवाज) मैंने कांग्रेस के अपने साथियों से केवल एक ही बात कही थी, और उसी की वजह से मैं कांग्रेस से निकला हूँ। मैं ने उन को पत्र लिखा कि हम जनता का वोट ले कर आये हैं और हम ने लोगों ने कुछ सिद्धान्तों की बात कही थी। मैंने कहा कि जो बात हम आज करना चाहते हैं, वह हम चार साल पहले भी कर सकते थे, और अब उस के नाम पर इमर्जेंसी को लागू करना और लोगों की आजादी का गला घोटना सही नहीं है। मैंने कहा कि वे जो काम कर रहे हैं, वह गलत है। मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इस से कांग्रेस का कौन सा सिद्धान्त टूटना है और मैंने कांग्रेस की कौन सी नीति का विरोध किया है। मैंने कांग्रेस की किसी नीति का विरोध नहीं किया है। लेकिन कांग्रेस ने अपने जम्हूरियत के रान्ते को छोड़ दिया और मनमानी के रास्ते को पकड़ लिया। कांग्रेस में अध्याधुनिक हाथ उठाने की प्रथा चल पड़ी है। यह कांग्रेस को खत्म करने वाली है, इस से कांग्रेस का नुक्सान होने वाला है? (ध्वजवाज)।



अगर मैं सिद्धान्तों के भेद के कारण कांग्रेस को छोड़ कर जाता, तो मैं अवश्य चुनाव लड़ता। लेकिन मैंने कांग्रेस के सिद्धान्तों में भ्रमण होने की कोई बात नहीं की। मैंने तो कांग्रेस को अमरियत की याद दिलाई (अवबधान)

श्री बसंत साठे (अकोला) : क्या टोटल रेबोल्यूशन के नाम पर देश को भ्रम में झोंकने की बात कांग्रेस के सिद्धान्तों में बैठती है ?

प्रो० शेर सिंह . बिल्कुल बैठती है। 20 सूत्री कार्यक्रम में और क्या बात है ? उस में वही कार्यक्रम है। (अवबधान) लेकिन यह बात नहीं है कि मैं उन सब बातों का समर्थक था, जो दूसरे लोग कह रहे थे। (अवबधान) अनुशासन की बात कही जाती है, और यह है आत्मानुशासन का प्रदर्शन, जो मानवीय सदस्य कर रहे हैं।

मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि मैं ने जो तीन प्रश्न किये हैं, श्री गोखले उन का उत्तर दें। अगर सरकार लोक सभा के कार्य-काल को पांच साल के बाद बढ़ा दे, तो फिर जनता क्या करे, क्योंकि उस का अधिकार छीन लिया गया है। जब सरकार मुजर्रात में चुनाव करा सकती है, तो फिर वह लोक सभा के लिए चुनाव क्यों नहीं करवा सकती है ? सरकार अनुशासन और संयम से और थोड़े खर्च से सस्ते चुनाव क्यों नहीं करवा सकती है ? मंत्री महोदय इन बातों का जरूर जवाब दें।

श्री परिपूर्णबन्ध पैन्थूली (टिहरी-गढ़वाल) : सभापति महोदय, मैं इस विल का समर्थन करता हूँ। मैं प्रो० हीरेन मुर्जी की इस बात से पूर्णतः सहमत हूँ कि हमारे देश में फ्रांशिस्ट ताकतें छद्म वेश में आज भी विद्यमान हैं। वे आरसाईन को। इस कारण इमर्जेंसी को कायम रखना जरूरी है।

और जब तक इमर्जेंसी है, तब तक चुनाव होना सम्भव नहीं है।

मुझे प्रो० जेर सिंह की दलील पर आश्चर्य होता है। वह श्री गोखले से पूछते हैं कि लोक सभा का कार्य-काल पांच साल से आगे बढ़ाने का क्या कारण है। क्या उन को मालूम नहीं है कि इंग्लैंड में 1914—1918 तथा 1939—1945 के विश्व-युद्धों के दौरान कोई चुनाव नहीं हुआ और उस समय विद्यमान पार्लियामेंट काम करती रहीं ? यही नहीं, फ्रांस में 1892, 1918, 1923 और 1939 में चार बार, पार्लियामेंट का समय बढ़ाया गया। और 1939 का समय तब बढ़ाया गया जब कि देश की आंतरिक स्थिति ठीक नहीं थी। मैंने इस पर विस्तार में जाने की आवश्यकता नहीं है कि हमारे यहां किन परिस्थितियों में एमर्जेंसी कायम की गई। टोटल रेबोल्यूशन वालों ने देश को फासिस्ट ताकतों के हाथ में बेच दिया था। उन सब बातों का यहां सदन में उल्लेख हो चुका है जब एमर्जेंसी पर चर्चा थी कि क्या क्या तत्व सश्रिय थे और किस प्रकार उन्होंने देश को विघटन के कगार पर डाल दिया था। इसलिए जब तक एमर्जेंसी है तब तक मैं समझता हूँ चुनाव किसी प्रकार होना संभव नहीं है।

श्री सोम नाथ चटर्जी ने अभी डा० अम्बेडकर को उद्धरित किया है। मैं इस सन्दर्भ में 18 मई 1949 को कांस्टिट्यूट प्रसेम्बली में जो श्री के० टी० शाह ने कहा था उसे उद्धृत करना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने कहा था :

"... a Parliament elected under the stress of a grave emergency, influenced by the effect of that emergency, sufficient to cause a proclamation or even a suspension of the Constitution, would not be reflecting the normal sentiment of the people."

[श्री सोमनाथ परिपूर्णनन्ध वैष्णवी]

और उसी अवसर पर डा० अन्वेडकर ने भी कहा था :

"I think it must be realised that war is not the only cause of circumstance which leads to the unhinging so to say, of the minds of the people from their normal moutings. There are many other circumstances many incidents, which are not actually wars, but which may cause similar unbalancing of the mind of the people."

आप इतिहास को भूल गए। ऐसी परिस्थिति में देश को डाल दिया गया हो उस में आप चुनाव की बात करते हैं? प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कांग्रेस के चडीगढ़ अधिवेशन में घोषणा की थी कि हमारे समक्ष सदस्य बड़े खुश हैं इस बात से कि चुनाव हो रहे हैं, किन्तु उन्होंने कहा था कि कांग्रेस सत्ता में आए या न आए हमें देश को बचाना है, और अगर देश को बचाना है तो हमें उस के लिए बड़ी में बड़ी कर्बानी करनी पड़ेगी। मैं प्रोफेसर साहब से निवेदन करना चाहूंगा और श्री सोमनाथ चटर्जी से भी कि आप का सौभाग्य है कि एक साल की प्रवृत्ति आप की ओर बढ़ गई वरना अगले साल आप मालूम नहीं वहां कहा होते और क्या करते।

इसलिए मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि इस समय एमजेंसी हटाने की स्थिति नहीं है और इसीलिए चुनाव भी होना संभव नहीं है। एमजेंसी का जो इम्पैक्ट हुआ है वह सराहनीय है इस में कोई शक नहीं है। होटिंग कम हुई है स्मॉलिंग पर भी काफी हद तक काबू पाया गया है। लेकिन जिस तरह से ऐंटी सोशल एनीमेन्ट्स आज भी छिपे हुए और बढ़े हुए बैठे हैं उसी तरह ये फासिस्ट तत्व भी अभी तक छिपे हुए बैठे हैं। हरिजनो और आदिवासियों के साथ कहीं कहीं छुट-पुट

कटाए अत्याचार की हथें चुनके को मिलती हैं। एमजेंसी का मतलब क्या आप समझ लें कि इतने थोड़े से समय में एमजेंसी के कारण ये सब जात हो गए हैं या समाप्त हो गए हैं?

अभी श्री सोमनाथ चटर्जी ने तामिलनाडु की बात की। बड़ी पुर्नर्दी दी है। किस वजह से तामिलनाडु की सरकार को बरखास्त किया गया अत्याचार के कारण और जिस के लिए सुप्रीम कोर्ट के एक जज को नियुक्त किया गया है एन्क्वायरी करने के लिए तथा जो चार्जशीट लगाई गई है आप ने तो उस का भी विरोध किया। मैं आप से निवेदन करूंगा कि मद्रास और तामिलनाडु में जो सरकार थी और जो गुजरात की सरकार है उन्होंने एमजेंसी को ठीक तरह में लागू नहीं होने दिया है। न केवल उन्होंने ऐंटी सोशल एनीमेन्ट्स को पनाह दी है बल्कि एमजेंसी की भाव में अत्याचार को और बढ़ाया है। इसलिए मैं समझता हूँ कि जब तक इस प्रकार के तत्वों को समाप्त नहीं किया जाता है तब तक एमजेंसी समाप्त नहीं की जा सकती है और तब तक एलेक्शन भी नहीं हो सकता है।

इस के अलावा 20 सूची कार्यक्रम की बात की गई है। 20 सूची कार्यक्रम के द्वारा हम समाज के सब से गिरे हुए, सब से कामजोर तबकों को लाभ पहुंचाना चाहते हैं। इन को लाभ पहुंचाने में जो रुकावट अभी तक थी वह वही लोग थे जिन का आप समर्थन करते हैं बड़े-बड़े जागीरदार, जमींदार, पूँजीपति जिन का प्रतिनिधित्व जनसब करता है, ये लोग इन के लिए बाधक बने हुए थे। इसलिए 20 सूची कार्यक्रम के लिए उस प्रकार का वातावरण जो आज बना हुआ है वह कुछ समय तक और बना रहना चाहिए और उस 20 सूची कार्यक्रम को लागू करने के

बिना कुछ समय चाहिए। इसलिए हमजैसी  
सांगू रखना जरूरी है और जब तक  
एमर्जेंसी है तब तक चुनाव नहीं हो सकते।  
इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस बिल का समर्थन  
करता हूँ।

\*SHRI E. R. KRISHNAN (Salem):  
Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to express  
my views on the Bill which has been  
introduced for extending the life of this  
Lok Sabha by one year.

In the General Elections held in 1971  
the people of this country elected all  
of us to constitute this House and take  
over the administration of this country  
for a period of five years. Now the  
life of this House is sought to be ex-  
tended by one year through this Bill.  
While introducing the Bill, the hon.  
Minister advanced the argument of  
prevailing Emergency in the country.  
After the proclamation of Emergency,  
in all her meetings and conferences  
held within the country, and also in  
her Press and Television interviews to  
foreign correspondents, the hon. Prime  
Minister has been repeatedly emphasising  
that national emergency has been  
proclaimed to save democracy which  
had been endangered by local militant  
elements. I appreciate and welcome  
the Prime Minister's abiding faith in  
democracy. To protect democracy the  
Emergency was proclaimed; to stabilise  
Emergency the Election is being  
postponed and the life of this House is  
being extended. This is the substance  
of this Bill.

Sir, this Bill seeks to reflect the  
views of the Prime Minister that to  
protect democracy the Emergency  
is proclaimed and to stabilise Emer-  
gency, the life of this House is being  
extended by one year and the General  
Election is also being postponed by  
one year. The hon. Professor who  
preceded me pointed out that it might  
be further extended by one more year.  
I will not refer to the views of the  
people outside this country. If I refer  
to them, the hon. Prime Minister may

get annoyed. But 80 crores of people  
within the country feel that the elec-  
tions to the Parliament will not be  
held hereafter; many think that the  
life of this Parliament will be extend-  
ed by at least five years. This is the  
general feeling of the people within  
the country. Yet I believe and I  
realise that the Prime Minister has  
deep faith in democracy.

To protect democracy the life of this  
Lok Sabha is being extended by one  
year. At the same time, I would like  
to know how far democracy has  
flourished in Tamil Nadu. All of us  
in this House and all the politicians in  
the country knew that the life of the  
Tamil Nadu Legislative Assembly  
would end within six weeks, that is  
by the second week of March. Yet on  
31st January the Tamil Nadu Legisla-  
tive Assembly was dissolved and the  
President's rule was imposed. At  
5.30 P.M. on January 31, the Tamil  
Nadu Government was dismissed. At  
12 in the night the Santries and the  
Security Officers before the houses of  
the Chief Ministers and other Minis-  
ters of the State Government were re-  
moved. The telephone connections of  
the Chief Minister and other Ministers  
were cut. The telephone lines of the  
M.L.As. were disconnected. The tele-  
phone connections of the Members of  
Lok Sabha from Tamil Nadu, the  
D.M.K. M.L.As. and the District Sec-  
retaries of D.M.K. were cut. My tele-  
phone which used to work upto 9 P.M.  
was also cut. Nearly 10,000 persons  
are in prison. Three Members of Par-  
liament are imprisoned. I do not know  
in which prison they are lodged.

Sir, the faith of D.M.K. movement  
in non-violence can easily be compared  
to the faith of Mahatma Gandhi in  
non-violence. To the extent that  
Mahatma Gandhi had faith in non-  
violence the D.M.K. movement has  
faith in non-violence to the same ex-  
tent. For example, in 1952 the Con-  
gress Government was there in Tamil  
Nadu and the D.M.K. had 51 Members  
in the Legislative Assembly. At that

[Shri E. R. Krishnan]

time there was the price-rise agitation in Tamil Nadu for about 10 weeks and during that period 10,000 D.M.K. workers went to prison. For about a year they were in prison. Arignar Anna, the founder of this movement who attracted the attention of all the Indian people, participated in this movement and he was imprisoned in the Vellore jail. He came out of the prison in 1963. The people of Tamil Nadu were in an angry mood. Then the Chinese invaded India. In the Vellore Fort Maldan lakhs of people had assembled and Arignar Anna addressed the meeting. He appealed to them not to get angry. He said: 'I am coming out of the prison. I know you will be wild that 10,000 people were in prison. But India is in danger. China has attacked India. We have to protect the independence of our country; the Indian culture has to be protected. All the people of Tamil Nadu and the D.M.K. workers should strengthen the hands of Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru.' He claimed them. Then peace prevailed.

16 hrs.

Now, what has happened in four days after the dissolution of the Legislative Assembly? Many thousands of people are in prison. 100 M.L.As. and M.L.Cs. are in prison. The Rajya Sabha Members belonging to D.M.K. are in prison. The Lok Sabha Members belonging to D.M.K. are in prison. Yet, in Tamil Nadu there is peace and there is no agitation. The reason for this is that we are followers of Arignar Anna; we are the followers of the policies of Anna. We are not angry. We realise that there should be no destruction of public property because they have been built out of the tax money collected from the people. That is why we are maintaining peace.

On the one side the democracy is destroyed and on the other to save and protect democracy the life of this House is being extended. One hon. Member referred to the allegations against Tamil Nadu Government and the appointment of a judge of the Supreme Court to inquire into them. We ourselves asked for an inquiry. We

do not refute them. If the allegations are proved, we will accept the findings of this Inquiry Commission. But the question is to what extent the democracy would have been destroyed if the Government had waited for two months. Could you not have waited for two months?

Shri Maran who has been a member of this House for 10 years is in prison. Shri Chittibabu, a member of this House for 10 years is in prison. Shri Saminathan, a Member of this House for 10 years, has been arrested. Sir, you will appreciate that we are showing extreme patience. It is a fact that democracy cannot have two definitions. When a mother gives food to her children, she will give it equally to all the children. That is the mind of a mother. I hope that the Prime Minister would have the same motherly instincts. On the one side the life of this House is being extended and on the other side the life of the Assembly had been reduced. I am not angry because of this. I am not saying this in anger or in pitched-up emotion because a Supreme Court judge has been appointed to inquire into the allegations against the Tamil Nadu Government. But I would like to know what kind of judge you are going to appoint for inquiring into the allegations made here. Sir, it is not in our culture to get boiled up in anger. In 1957 General Elections the D.M.K. contested for the first time and won 15 seats. In 1962 Elections the D.M.K. won 51 seats and in 1967 the D.M.K. got 139 seats. In 1971 the D.M.K. won 183 seats. The people of Tamil Nadu gave their massive support to the D.M.K. led by Arignar Anna. The D.M.K. Government was a people's Government. The people extended full support to the D.M.K. and it was their order the D.M.K. obeyed. Now it has been removed. Is it doing justice to democracy, I would like to know. Today I am here and I do not know in what prison I will be tomorrow.

SHRI K. MAYATHEVAR (Dindigul):  
It is not the Government formed by Anna, but it is the Government formed by Karunanidhi.

**SHRI E. R. KRISHNAN:** We will talk it over later.

**SHRI K. MAYATHEVAR:** We are not concerned with Anna; we are concerned with Karunanidhi. You come to Karunanidhi. Do not quote Anna.

**SHRI E. R. KRISHNAN:** I have been repeatedly stated in this House and outside that Shrimati Indira Gandhi alone is capable of protecting democracy. But my speech here will not come in the Press. 4½ crores of Tamil people will not know about this. 60 crores of our people will not know about this. I do not know what is this freedom and what is this democracy. I humbly submit that the D.M.K. Government in Tamil Nadu was implementing 100 per cent the policies of Arignar Anna. Peace prevailed in the State. The Government in the State was showing enormous patience and had firm faith in non-violence. It is not just that this Government should have been dismissed. This Government was formed by Arignar Anna who could teach democratic tenets to the world, and it was implementing his policies.

Sir, many thousands have been arrested. I would appeal through you to the Government that these cruelties should be stopped and peace must be restored. As in Bihar, Gujarat, Maharashtra or any other State, Tamil Nadu will not succumb to violence. Tamil Nadu has its own culture. Tamil Nadu will perpetuate Arignar Anna's cultural legacy. Sir, I submit that Tamil Nadu should not be harmed and the people of Tamil Nadu should be given protection. Only four days back the Prime Minister stated that the people of the country would vote for the Congress because of its faith in democracy. If the people would vote for you, if you have faith in democracy, you can contest the Elections and win and then run this House. If the hon. Minister has faith in democracy, he would and should withdraw this Bill and I hope he will do it because that is the only way to protect and perpetuate democracy in this country.

**SHRI B. R. SHUKLA:** Mr. Chairman, this Bill is unprecedented and is brought under extraordinary circumstances. Therefore, in order to see the justification and the relevance of this Bill, we have necessarily to go to the justification of the imposition of the emergency measures in this country. The House has many a time in the past debated the propriety of emergency and its continuance, and the House has also approved by an overwhelming majority the justification for the emergency.

Now the question is why the extension of the Lok Sabha should be made after the expiry of its period. In order to correctly appreciate the point involved, we have to see as to what were the forces that were operating on the eve of the proclamation of emergency.

16.09 hrs.

[**SHRI VASANT SATHE** in the Chair]

Forces of Fascism, forces of reaction, forces of left adventurist parties and unprincipled and frustrated politicians suddenly ganged up in order to overthrow the parliamentary institutions from this country. They were aided, abetted and goaded by alien elements which were interested in destabilising the Government established by law in this country. Therefore, emergency was imposed.

Emergency has brought in its wake certain undoubted beneficial fruits, on which we are all agreed. Emergency was imposed for a limited purpose, in order to maintain the stability of the democratic institutions. Now we have to see whether those very forces which were responsible for the imposition of the emergency have ceased to operate in this country. If they have not ceased to operate in this country, then emergency has to continue.

Those forces are still at work. Their followers have gone into hybernation. They are stealthily and secretly still operating and their bases, their dens, are located in Tamil Nadu, in Gujarat, and from there they are

[Shri B. R. Shukla]

sending clandestine literature instigating revolt and rebellion throughout the country. Therefore, their attempts have to be cutted and many so-called stalwarts having a long record of past service have to be detained under MISA. If they are to be detained under MISA and if their release is not to be made in the near future, the question is if the elections should be held as stipulated in the Constitution.

Will the opposition not bring this criticism that such an election is nothing but a farce when their leaders are behind the bars, when their comrades are detained under MISA? How can it be said that it is fair election?

Therefore, in order to allay their criticism, to do justice to them, to be fair to the opposition, it is but necessary that the normal period of the Lok Sabha should be extended, so that if they reverse their processes, revise their thinking and pursue normal course of activities, they will come out of jail, MISA will no longer be necessary for their detention, and when they are free, no longer in jail, let there be elections. Let them criticise our actions, our measures, and say that we have not functioned properly.

Therefore, whatever may be the reasons of the other Members and the Government, I personally think that in order to ensure free, fair and democratic elections, it is necessary that the term of Lok Sabha should be extended so long as they do not come out of jail.

Therefore, I fully support this measure though under painful circumstances. We are not happy. If they think that we are afraid of the elections, they are under an illusion. We are not afraid of elections. The country is with us, the people are with us.

SHRI ERASMO DE SEQUEIRA (Marmagao): To me this Bill is nothing less than the naked exercise of unwarranted power camouflaged within a constitutional provision. And

the provision, as we all know, is only an enabling provision, not more than that.

If Prof. Hiren Mukerjee of the CPI could not find in the statement of the Government before the House any reason to justify the extension of the term of the Lok Sabha, I do not think we need go any further than that. No reason exists at all. This Bill is a demonstration of how interested this Government has become contrary to its profession in the House of merely following the form of democracy but eroding inch by inch its substance.

We all know that an emergency was declared. In our view, it was not justified when it was declared, and its continuation is completely unwarranted. One does not have to go very far back to find out that the only effective arrest was the arrest of Mr. Chandra Shekhar and to justify that arrest, this whole emergency is a bogey concocted and you have had to start with Jayaprakash Narayan, because his only problem was the revolt in the Congress Party. It is the case of Government that people have supported this emergency. If this is so, may I ask the hon Minister why two lakhs of them are in jail?

AN HON. MEMBER: How do you know it?

(Interruptions)

SHRI ERASMO DE SEQUEIRA: If you wish to have the list, I am prepared to provide it within a week, if you will appoint a Parliamentary Committee to go and find out whether it is true. You appoint a committee and I will provide the list.

(Interruptions)

I know at the moment. I do not know what will happen tomorrow.

This Government cries itself and is trying to say that it is constitutional. I am sorry to have to remind them

that Hitler came to power within the provisions of the Weimer Constitution but that did not make Nazism legitimate.

Beyond the 18th March, 1976, this Government, this House will lose its legitimacy. I may even concede for the sake of this argument that before that date, there was something perhaps to be said for both sides. Beyond that date, it will be difficult.

(Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER: What will you do?

SHRI ERASMO DE SEQUEIRA: I will do on that day. We shall find out, because we shall know both apparently if this Bill is passed. Till then you find out.

Mr. Goswami, my good friend from the Congress was putting forward here that he was sure that all the Congress men would win and all of us would lose. I am not claiming that if election is held today, I will win, because, as a democrat, I believe that I can do no more than to represent myself to the people and it is for them to decide; because precisely the Congress today has changed its attitude, because this was the attitude which the Congress had adopted before. It is because of this they have changed this attitude and they now take for themselves the right of even judging the people of this country that this has ceased to be a democracy and is being carried into an autocracy. You may think that I am speaking very little of Nazism; I am not. When MISA Amendment Bill was being discussed in this House many months before the emergency, I had warned about this that such provisions would lead precisely to the kind of arrests that have taken place, and already today, we get reports that Sathyagrahis are beaten up in the jails. I had read in this House last week a letter that I received from a detenu in which he has said that not only people were beaten up but in his cell, there was a person whose name I mentioned in this House

on the 26th of December, if I remember the date correctly, was also beaten to death.

Mr. Sathe, from this Floor, has put forward this extraordinary theory, as I understood it, that because we cannot go to the people with promises, we must go with performance and, therefore, the term of the House is to be extended. Judging by past performance, there is going to be no performance in the coming year. Does that mean that the term of the House is to be extended once again next year?

AN HON. MEMBER: May be.

SHRI ERASMO DE SEQUEIRA: This is precisely what I am saying. There are some provisions in our Constitution that must never be operated on the balance of convenience. In a democracy, there must be an article of faith that at the end of the term we must go to the people and that, without their sanction, neither the House nor its membership has any meaning at all. It is for this reason that on behalf of the B.L.D. and our colleague party, the Janta Front in Parliament I oppose this Bill.

There was one thing that was mentioned also by my hon. friend, Mr. Goswami, and that was the danger that Government has taken in extending the term of this House by one year. I hope, the Government is conscious of this danger because, when the door to one's house is shut from inside and there is no other way to get out what the people are supposed to do?

AN HON. MEMBER: Break it.

SHRI ERASMO DE SEQUEIRA: I am glad he has said, break it, because that is precisely the danger that I want to bring to the attention of the Government, that here are recent cases in our neighbourhood where democracy because autocracy and what following we all know. I am sure that there is not even one person in this House who would like that to happen. So, before we play with things that none of us

[Shri Erasmo De Sequeira]

can control, we should know that danger. If only for the sake of ninety years of history that your party has which, it looks to me, this House has forgotten, if we have tried to find somewhere in the Congress a democratic chord, I am sorry to say, we have not been able to find it. We have search for it..

AN HON MEMBER: Join the Congress.

SHRI ERASMO DE SEQUEIRA Because it is that chord that must now come to the surface. It is buried under the weight of all of you. I am sure, every predecessor of yours is turning in his grave. I pray that before the danger that from 18th March will be open in this country, the danger of the Government minus its legitimacy, before that becomes a reality, even after passing this Bill, this Government will lift Emergency which is unwarranted, free the leaders that the Government is holding in jail without trial and go to the people and, on the basis of equality with Opposition, seek a fresh mandate.

SHRI K. SURYANARAYANA (Eluru): Mr. Chairman, Sir I am quite happy that the Government has some forward with this Bill for extending the term of the present Lok Sabha

I am surprised to hear my young friend from Goa. Let us go back to 1970 when the Lok Sabha was dissolved. The same argument was put forth in 1970 before the dissolution of the Lok Sabha. At that time also, they had challenged like this with the slogan: "Let us go to the people." We went to the people and came back.. (Interruptions) About the Andhra movement also, he was questioning our bona fides. What happened in Andhra Pradesh? We were the real representatives of the people there. Now, he has agreed to our points unconditionally.

In the same manner, I pray, let us integrate our country now. The danger is still there for the country's unity. We are not afraid of elections. Let us go back to the history of the Congress. When the Congress was founded, my friend was not born and I was also not born. The Congress has not a great history behind it. I remember the great leaders who developed the Constitution framed by our elders. They have provided for this contingency during Emergency, the necessity of passing such a law. This is not a new thing, nor an unusual thing. The Government has come forward with this Bill in the same usual way when the Lok Sabha was dissolved before its term was over. You say that because we have no hope of coming back if we go in for elections we are doing this. Not at all. Several times in the Congress Party and even in the Congress session at Chandigarh, they had consultations for two to three weeks and only after hearing various other groups of people—other Parties and the public also—they decided to come forward with this measure. This is the usual course. Why should there be opposition for this? We may be here for one more year but in the meanwhile also, as our Prime Minister has said, if conditions are good and continue to be good, we may go in for elections. It is not a contract for the year. It is only a provision for continuing for one year but it can be dissolved even within a month if found necessary.

Now, some Members have spoken of two lakhs being in jail. Let us know also their names and their States through the State Governments. Let us know that and we will see. What is the use of repeating that two to three lakhs are in jail? Where is the necessity of appointing a Parliamentary Committee to enquire into it? If they have got the figures, let them give the figures.

Now, this is a simple Bill and there is no necessity of further discussion. Only, let us know what the strength of the Congress Party has been. The



strength of the Party in the Lok Sabha was 364 in the first election in 1952, 371 in the second election in 1957, 358 in the third election in 1962, 282 in the fourth election in 1967 and 350 in the fifth election in 1971.

Even now, we are for democracy. what is the meaning of democracy? Mahatma Gandhi said that democracy means only the majority opinion; if it is a good thing, you can support and if it is not a good thing, you need not support. He said that individual freedom in a democratic society is also limited. Parliament has got control over the Assemblies also and the States also. When they were receiving funds for drought relief, people in other States grumbled that they were favouring the Madras Government and that the Prime Minister was giving them more. In Andhra we also cried like that. But the fact is, the Government is giving funds whenever necessary.

Now, let me read this out. I quote.

I am quoting this from *The Message of Mahatma Gandhi*:

"A born democrat is a born disciplinarian. Democracy comes naturally to him who is habituated normally to yield willing obedience to all laws, human or divine. I claim to be a democrat both by instinct and training. Let those who are ambitious to serve democracy qualify themselves by satisfying first this acid test of democracy. Moreover, a democrat must be utterly selfless. He must think and dream not in terms of self or party but only of democracy. I do not want anybody to give up his convictions or to suppress himself. I do not believe that a healthy and honest difference of opinion will injure our cause. But opportunism, camouflage or patched up compromises certainly will. If you must dissent, you should take care that your opinions voice your innermost convictions and are not intended merely as a convenient party cry.

"I value individual freedom, but you must not forget that man is essentially a social being. He has risen to his present status by learning to adjust his individualism to the requirements of social progress. Unrestricted individualism is the law of the beast of the jungle. We have learnt to strike the mean between individual freedom and social restraint. Willing submission to social restraint for the sake of the well-being of the whole society, enriches both the individual and the society of which one is a member."

This was what I wanted to pointed out.

श्री राज रत्न शर्मा (बांदा) : सभापति जी मैं ने दोनों तरफ के भाषणों को सुना । मैं एक निर्दलीय सदस्य हूँ, जो मेरी भावनायें हैं उनको मैं इस सदन के सामने प्रस्तुत करना चाहता हूँ । दोनों तरफ के सदस्य इस बात पर सहमत हैं कि इस तरह के हालात यहां पर थे कि आपात कालीन स्थिति लागू करने की आवश्यकता आई । एक बार जब दोनों तरफ के सदस्य इस बात पर सहमत हैं तो हमें मविधान को देखना पड़ेगा, क्या संविधान में, जिसकी हम यहां पर शपथ लेते हैं, जिसकी बात बात पर दुहाई देते हैं उसमें कोई प्राविजन है कि इस सदन का कार्यकाल बढ़ाया जा सकता है । संविधान के आर्टिकल 83 का प्राविजो इस प्रकार है:

"Provided that the said period may, while a Proclamation of Emergency is in operation, be extended by Parliament by law for a period not exceeding in any case..." etc., etc

इमर्जेंन्सी है, इससे सभी लोग सहमत हैं और यह प्राविजन संविधान में है सभी लोग इसको जानते हैं । फिर आखिर कौन सी बात है, कौन सा आसमान गिरा पड़

[श्री राम रतन शर्मा]

यह है एक सप्ताह की सीरियस बढाने में जबकि इमर्जेंसी है और यह प्राविजन भी है।

मैंने और भी बहुत सी बातें सुनीं। बहुत सारी बातें यहां पर आईं। जब मैं खड़ा हो रहा था तो पीछे से एक सदस्य ने कहा 'आप किस हिसाब से बील रहे हैं तो पहले मैं जनसंघ से था लेकिन मैंने उससे त्यागपत्र ले लिया है और पूरी ईमानदारी से त्यागपत्र दिया है। मैं आपको कारण भी बतला रहा हूँ क्यों त्याग पत्र दिया। एक आदमी एक रास्ते पर जाना चाहता है, कुछ देर बाद पता चलता है कि वह गलत रास्ते पर था तो क्या उसको अधिकार नहीं है कि अपना रास्ता बदलकर दूसरे रास्ते पर आ जाये? आप मे मे बहुत से लोगों ने दूसरी पार्टियों में काम किया होगा लेकिन जब आपने अन्तरात्मा की आवाज सुनी होगी तो अपना रास्ता बदला होगा (अवबधान) मैं ने भी जो रास्ता बदला है उसके पीछे कुछ कारण हैं और पूरी ईमानदारी है। यह तो इतिहास और अविव्य ही बतलायेगा कि मैं ने कोई गल्ती की थी या अच्छाई की थी—वह बात भी सामने आयेगी। (अवबधान) एक माननीय सदस्य जेल की बात कह रहे हैं। आप लोग जो महा पर राजनीति में आये हैं उनमें दसियों ऐसे होंगे जिन्होंने जेल काटी है। जब भी कोई राजनीति में आता है तो जेल या जेल का डर उसके दिल में नहीं रहता। उसके दिल में परिवार का मोह नहीं रहता। मिर्फ पार्टी के सिद्धान्तों को लेकर काम करने की भावना रहती है। ऐसे बहुत कम लोग राजनीति में आने वाले मिलेंगे जिन्हें जेल का डर हो। महा पर जो जेल की बात कर रहे हैं वे भी जेल के बाहर हैं। वे महा पर जेल की बात कर रहे हैं। मुझे जेल का कोई डर नहीं। मैंने जब सिद्धान्त और नीतियों को अच्छी तरह देखा तो उसके बाद मैंने तय किया कि मुझे इस रास्ते से अलग होना है और मैं

पूरी ईमानदारी से उस रास्ते से अलग हुआ हूँ।

एक बात मैं यहां पर जरूर निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इस इमर्जेंसी में भी, व्यूरोक्रेसी जिन प्रकार से पहले काम करती थी उसी प्रकार से आज भी काम कर रही है। मेरे बाबा जिले में 19 जनवरी को पुलिसवांग नांव से दो हरिजननों को पकड़ कर ले जाया गया और यमुना के किनारे सबणों ने उनकी हत्या कर दी। 13 दिन के बाद लाशों को पोस्ट-मार्टम के लिए भेजा गया। मुझे मन्त्री महोदय बताये किस दिन मामले की रिपोर्ट हुई थी और कितना टाइम लाशों को तलाश करने मिला। आखिर यह क्या बात है? अगर यही दशा रही तो एमरजेंसी का क्या मतलब है, किस लिये हम ये सब कर रहे हैं? मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इस एमरजेंसी में इन सब बातों को देखा जाय, व्यूरोक्रेसी को कसा जाय। जिन तरह से राजनीतिक पार्टियों ठीक हुई है, अगर व्यूरोक्रेसी भी इसी तरह से ठीक हो जाय तो यह बर्दान मित्र होगा। राजनीति, पार्लियामेंट और डेमोक्रेसी 10 आदर्शों के लिये नहीं होते हैं, ये 90 प्रतिशत आदर्शों के लिये होते हैं। अगर 90 प्रतिशत आदर्शों देश में राहत की सास ले रहे हैं, तो यह देश के शासन की सफलता है। इसीलिये मैं इस बिल का स्वागत करता हूँ। यह बिल बिलकुल सही समय पर आया है, इस व लिये आप को धन्यवाद देता हूँ।

सभापति महोदय, मैं आप का भी बहुत आभारी हूँ—आप ने मुझे दस मिनट का समय दिया। मैं एक निर्दलीय सदस्य हूँ, इसलिये मुझे पता नहीं था कि मुझे भी समय मिलेगा या नहीं—लेकिन आप ने मुझे समय दिया।

**SHRI GIRIDHAR GOMANGO**  
(Koraput): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to support this Bill for extending the life of Lok Sabha by one year.

At the moment, what the people of India are interested in are the economic gains, whereas the opposition parties are interested in political gains. It is only the Congress Party which can provide these economic gains to the people. That is why after the Emergency was declared, the Congress Party has adopted this economic programme for the general well-being and uplift of the people.

We got political independence in 1947, at that time the foreign power put all sorts of obstacles and now the fascist forces are there to put all sort of obstacles in the way of economic programme. After the economic programme was launched, the country has gained tremendously within this short period.

Sir, as you know, the Congress Party has always been in power at the Centre and also almost in all the States. In future also, the Congress Party will be ruling this country. In opposing the extension of one year to the life of present Lok Sabha, it was mentioned by some opposition members that because of the fear of losing the elections, the Congress Party is not going to fight the elections now. I am a new Member, but I can say with confidence that the Congress Party will win the elections now or later. It is the Congress Party which represents the masses. The Government by the Congress Party is by the people of the people and for the people.

As I said, what the country needs at the present moment is economic gains. In India we have adopted the democratic socialism. We are well on the road of socialism. We have set this 20-Point Programme as twenty milestones in the socialistic path. We know that there will be difficulties in achieving those objectives but it is only the Congress Party which can face those difficulties.

Sir, I would like to tell this House that if there are elections now, attention of most of the people will be diverted from the economic reforms to the elections. In Orissa we had a number of elections and a number of ministries and we know what happens during elections. All the machinery concerned with developmental work is diverted towards the elections. So, if we lose this one year of working season, we will simply slide back by ten years.

Lastly, I support this Extension Bill because in that period if we will be marching forward again and not be going back. I think the country will progress.

With these few words, I support this Bill.

**श्री जादवन्त घोटे (नागपुर) :** सभापति महोदय, मैं लोक सभा की अवधि बढ़ाने का जो विधेयक पेश किया गया है उस का समर्थन करने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ। प्रजातन्त्री लोकशाही या ससदीय प्रजातन्त्र में जो चुनाव होते हैं उस के दौरान सारे देश में, सारे इलाके में एक वातावरण तैयार होता है जो देश की मारी स्थिति को बिगाड़ देता है, तहस नहस कर देता है। हम ने देखा है कि जब भी चुनाव होते हैं ग्राम पंचायत से लेकर संसद तक, तो उस में संघर्ष होते हैं, संग्राम होता है और चुनाव के दौरान हम ने कई कत्ल होने भी देखे हैं, और कई बातें होती हैं, कैसेज चलते हैं।

आपातकालीन स्थिति 1971 के बाद 1975 में घोषित की गई, जब हमारे देश में ऐंस्टर्नल और इन्टर्नल दोनों ही तरह की आपातकालीन स्थिति है ऐसी हालत में चुनाव कराना मेरे ध्यान से मुनासिब नहीं है। इसलिये मैं इस विधेयक का समर्थन करता हूँ। चुनाव के जरिये और चुनाव के दौरान आप ने देखा होगा कि शक्ति, सम्पत्ति और समय का जो व्यय होता है उस की कीमत हम

[श्री जांबवंत बोटे]

5 साल में भी नहीं चुका सकते। चुनाव के दौरान जो खर्चा होता है, भरबों खपा खर्च होता है, सत्ताधारी दल की ओर से पूरे यन्त्र और पैसों का इस्तेमाल किया जाता है, विरोधी दलों की ओर से भी यही ढंग के दूसरे हथकंडे इस्तेमाल किये जाते हैं और वातावरण में एक ऐसी भयानक स्थिति पैदा होती है कि चलना फिरना भी मुश्किल होता है। जब देश में आपातकालीन स्थिति है उस वक्त यदि हम चुनाव कराने हैं तो इन सारी बातों का हम को मुकाबला करना पड़ेगा और ऐसी अवस्था में जब दो किस्म की आपातकालीन स्थिति है चुनाव कराने का समर्थन नहीं हो सकता। चुनाव लाना चाहिये जब हम कहते हैं, अन्तरात्मा की बातें बहुत आयी हैं, हमारे साथी जो परसों तक जनसंघ में थे उन्होंने अन्तरात्मा की आवाज दे दी और फ्लोर क्रोस कर के कांग्रेस में आ गये।

एक माननीय सदस्य : कांग्रेस में नहीं आये बल्कि इंडिपेंडेंट हैं।

श्री जांबवंत बोटे : अभी इंडिपेंडेंट हैं, कल कांग्रेस में चले जायेंगे।

डा० कैलाश (बम्बई दक्षिण) : आप भी आ जायेंगे।

श्री जांबवंत बोटे : डा० कैलाश मैं आप का दोस्त हूँ, लेकिन वेदमान दोस्त नहीं हूँ। जब हम और आप विधान सभा में थे उस वक्त पहला मेरा केस हुआ जिस में विधान सभा का मेरा सभासत्व खत्म कर दिया गया था, एक्सपैल किया गया था। तो आप और हम एक दूसरे को अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं, वह सबाल छोड़ दीजिए। प्रश्न यह है कि समय, सम्पत्ति और शक्ति की जो फजूलखर्ची होती है चुनाव में, उस को रोकना इस आपातकालीन स्थिति में बहुत ही जरूरी है, निहायत जरूरी है।

जब आपातकालीन स्थिति हमारे देश में जारी है और इस सदन के इधर के और उधर के, पार्टी-इन-पावर के और ओपोजीशन के, दोनों के लोग कारागार के अन्दर बन्द हैं, जब दोनों तरफ के लोग कारागार में बंद हैं, राज्य विधान सभाओं के भी कुछ लोग कारागार के अन्दर बन्द हैं, राज्य सभा के कई सदस्य भी इस समय कारागार के अन्दर बन्द हैं, ऐसी अवस्था में जो प्रचार खुले वातावरण में करने का लोगों को मौका मिलता है, आजाद वातावरण में इलैकशन में हिस्सा लेने का अधिकार जो सारे लोगों को है, उस अधिकार से इस आपातकालीन स्थिति में उन सब लोगों को वंचित होना पड़ता है। और जब आपातकालीन स्थिति है तो एक बात साफ़ है कि आपातकालीन स्थिति का समर्थन करने वाले हमारे देश से काफ़ी लोग हैं। अब जब आपातकालीन स्थिति का समर्थन करने वाले सारे किस्म के लोग हमारे देश में हैं, 20 सूची कार्यक्रम का भी समर्थन करने वाले सारे किस्म के लोग हमारे देश में हैं, तो ऐसी अवस्था में चुनाव कराना कहां तक ठीक है।

प्रजातन्त्र की बात करने वाले बहुत से लोग हैं और सभापति जी, मैं आप को बताना चाहता हूँ कि संसदीय प्रजातन्त्र का समर्थक मैं न पहले कभी था और न आज हूँ। संसदीय प्रजातन्त्र का समर्थक मैं कभी नहीं था और आज भी मैं उसकी मुखालफत करता हूँ और संसदीय प्रजातन्त्र में मेरा विश्वास नहीं है क्योंकि इस में बेस्ट ब्राक़ मनी एण्ड टाइम बुरी तरह से होता है और किसी भी दूसरी शासन व्यवस्था पर इतने बड़े ढंग से पैसा, वक्त और शक्ति खर्च नहीं होती।

प्रजातन्त्र का समर्थन करने वाले लोग, प्रजातन्त्र को टिकाने की जो बात करते हैं, उस के लिए अगर प्रजातन्त्र को रखना है, तो जब इतने सारे लोग कारागार में बन्द हैं, उस वक्त चुनाव कराना कहां तक मुना-

सिद्ध है, यह मैं अपने साधियों से पूछना चाहता हूँ।

मेरी एक सूचना है, संशोधन तो मैं नहीं कहता, कि इनडाइरेक्ट चुनाव आज हमारे देश में हो रहे हैं। राज्य सभा के चुनाव भी होने को हैं। उस वक्त यह बात क्याल में रखनी चाहिए कि देश की राज्य विधान सभाओं के काफी सदस्य आज कारागार में हैं और विधान सभाओं में से राज्य सभा के लिए जिन को हमें भेजना है, उन विधान सभाओं के बहुत से बोटर्स आज जेल में हैं और जेल में होने की वजह से वे बोट नहीं कर सकते हैं। इस तरह राज्य सभा के सदस्य के लिए बोट करने का जो उनका अधिकार है, उस से वे वंचित हो जाएंगे। नागपुर के बारे में बम्बई हाई कोर्ट का अभी एक फैसला हुआ है जिस में उन्होंने कहा है कि बोट करने के लिए जो लोग बन्द हैं उन को छोड़ दिया जाए। ऐसी स्थिति में राज्य सभा में अपने प्रतिनिधि भेजने का जो अधिकार विधान सभा के उन सदस्यों की जोकि जेल में बन्द हैं प्राप्त है, उस से वे वंचित हो जाएंगे। मेरा कहना यह है कि उन्हें भी उस चुनाव में हिस्सा लेना चाहिए और उन का हिस्सा लेना बहुत जरूरी है। इसलिए मेरी यह सूचना है, मैं इसे संशोधन नहीं कहता, कि राज्य सभा के चुनावों को भी एक्स्टेंड करना चाहिए जोकि होने वाले हैं और जिन का टर्म खत्म होने वाला है। सारे किस्म के इनडाइरेक्ट चुनावों को, जोकि देश में होने वाले हैं, आज रोक देना चाहिए, यह मेरी प्रार्थना है।

सभापति महोदय, एक प्रश्न मैं अपने सभी साधियों से पूछना चाहूंगा। मुझे मालूम है कि कई लोग यहां ऐसे बैठे हैं जो कि विधेयक का विरोध कर रहे हैं। विरोध करने की भूमिका हमारी भी हो सकती है। केवल

विरोध के लिये विरोध करना यह बात कहीं तक मुनासिब है, यह भी उन्हें सोचना चाहिये।

मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि उनको सीने पर हाथ रखकर बताना चाहिये कि देश में इस समय चुनाव होना ठीक है या नहीं। मेरा दावा है कि जो लोग इस विधेयक के खिलाफ बात कर रहे हैं, वह भी कहते हैं कि चुनाव नहीं होना चाहिये और यहां अन्दर आकर करते हैं कि चुनाव होना चाहिये। यह भूमिका ठीक नहीं है। अगर लोक-सभा का टर्म बढ़ता है तो हमारा भी टर्म एक साल के लिये बढ़ता है। लेकिन चूंकि अपोजिशन में हैं, इसलिये खिलाफत करनी है कि यह टर्म बढ़ना नहीं चाहिये, यह बात पारखंड है, दोंग है, इसका मैं विरोध करता हूँ।

चुनाव के लिये जो तैयारियां होनी चाहियें, महाराष्ट्र और विदर्भ में हमारी वह तैयारियां ऐसी हैं कि अगर आज भी चुनाव होता है, तो हम उतने ही अच्छे ढंग से लड़ सकते हैं जितना कि वे लोग लड़ सकते हैं, जो आज इस विधेयक का विरोध कर रहे हैं। चुनाव में आना या न आना, कोई प्रश्न नहीं है। प्रश्न है कि अर्पात-कालीन स्थिति में यह विधेयक प्रजातंत्रीय है या नहीं। मेरे क्याल से यह विधेयक बहुत ज्यादा प्रजातंत्रीय है, सही मानों में प्रजातंत्रीय है। हमारे देश में संसदीय प्रजातंत्र चल रहा है, जिसका कि मैं हिमायती नहीं हूँ। उस संसदीय प्रजातंत्र के हिसाब में भी यह विधेयक बहुत प्रजातंत्रीय है।

यहां पर संसदीय प्रजातंत्र का जिस ढंग से समर्थन हो रहा है, अगर उसको बाजू में रखा जाये तो भी मैं खुले दिल से, खुले अन्तःकरण से इस बिल का समर्थन करता हूँ। मैं अपने साधियों से भी दरवास्त करता हूँ कि वे इसका समर्थन करें।

[बी जायवंत बोटे]

मेरा दल नेताजी सुभाषचन्द्र बोस का संगठन है, फार्बर्ड ब्लॉक और महाविदर्भ राज्य संघर्ष समिति भी इस विधेयक का तहेदिल से समर्थन करते हैं।

बी बूलचन्द डाया (वाली) : सभापति महोदय, जब से हिन्दुस्तान आजाद हुआ है, तब से यहाँ पर कांग्रेस का शासन रहा है। 1947 के बाद आज तक देश ने जो प्रगति की है, वह कांग्रेस के प्रयत्नों के कारण हुई है। अगर हम, देश को सम्पूर्ण क्रांति का नारा लगाने वालों के भरोसे पर छोड़ देंगे, जो सम्पूर्ण क्रांति के नाम पर देश को भराज-कना, उच्छृङ्खलता और अनुशासनहीनता में डोकना चाहते थे, तो आज देश की क्या स्थिति होती, इसकी कल्पना सहज ही की जा सकती है।

26 जून को इस देश में एक बड़ा भूज्वल कदम उठाया गया, जिसकी वजह से मुल्क को टुकड़े-टुकड़े होने में बचा लिया गया। उस कदम की हिन्दुरतान की 58 करोड़ जनता ने सराहना की है, उसने इसका विरोध नहीं किया। जनता ने यह अनुभव किया है कि कांग्रेस पार्टी ने यह जो भूज्वल कदम उठाया है, उससे देश ठीक मार्ग पर चलने लगा, और उसकी विकास की गति तेज हो गई।

यह 20-सूत्री कार्यक्रम जनता का कार्यक्रम है। यह किसी पार्टी का कार्यक्रम नहीं है। देश बड़ा है, पार्टी छोटी है। कांग्रेस कभी भी यह नहीं कहती कि वह पावर में रहना चाहती है। देश को बचाने के लिये यह कदम उठाया गया और हम लोगों को बड़े दुख के साथ यह कदम उठाना पड़ा। जो लोग सम्पूर्ण क्रांति का नारा लगाते थे, उन्होंने गुजरात की असेम्बली को खत्म कर दिया और वे बिहार की असेम्बली को भी खत्म करना चाहते थे। उन्होंने देश के हर

क्षेत्र में अनुशासनहीनता को बढ़ावा दिया था। जब प्राइम मिनिस्टर के केस में इलाहाबाद हाई कोर्ट की जजमेंट के फ़िलाफ़ अपील की गई तो उन लोगों ने राष्ट्रपति भवन पर धरना दिया। उन्होंने पुलिस वालों और मिलेटरी वालों को विद्रोह करने के लिये भड़काया। देश को बचाने के लिये यह कदम उठाया गया और जब विकास की ओर कदम बढ़ते हैं तो उनको नहीं रोकना चाहिये। यह बीस-सूत्री कार्यक्रम जनता का प्रोग्राम है और सारी आम जनता ने उसकी सराहना की है। देश के गरीब लोग यह समझने लगे हैं कि मुल्क आगे बढ़ रहा है।

सवाल यह है कि क्या चुनाव जरूरी है या मुल्क की प्रगति का काम, अगर इस समय चुनाव होते, तो हम अवश्य जीत जाते। देश में यह हवा बन गई है कि कांग्रेस चुनाव में जीत जायेगी, लेकिन श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी ने सोचा कि इस समय पार्टी का सवाल नहीं है, देश को बचाने का सवाल है उन लोगों के हाथों से जो देश को बर्बाद करना चाहते हैं। वे लोग 1947 के बाद आज तक पावर में नहीं आये हैं। तो उन्होंने एक तरीका सोचा कि कांग्रेस के सदस्यों को गाली दो, उन पर कीचड़ उछालो और गन्दगी फेंको। देश ने यह महसूस किया कि उन परिस्थितियों में कड़े कदम उठाने की आवश्यकता है और इस दृष्टि से प्रधान मंत्री ने आपतकालीन स्थिति की घोषणा की।

सरकार के अलग-अलग विभागों में हजारों अफसरों को भ्रष्टाचार के आरोप में नौकरी से निकाल दिया गया है। गाड़िया ठीक समय पर चलने लगी हैं, कारखानों में उत्पादन बढ़ने लगा है और खेतों में धान की उपज में वृद्धि हुई है। देश के गांव में रहने वाले छोटे-छोटे लोगों को लाखों रुपये के कर्ज से मुक्त कर दिया

क्या है। अगर इस बढ़ते हुए कदम को रोक दिया गया, तो देश का बड़ा भारी अहित होगा।

श्री गोखले ने जो बिल पेश किया है वह कानून और संविधान के अन्तर्गत है। बाहरी खतरे और आन्तरिक अव्यवस्था के कारण ही एमरजेंसी लगाई गई है। कल हमने देखा कि श्री दीनेन भट्टाचार्य ने पेमेंट आफ बेजिज एक्ट का विरोध किया; उन्होंने कानून को नहीं पढ़ा और केवल विरोध के लिये विरोध करने लगे।

जहाँ तक चुनाव का सम्बन्ध है, क्या इसको एक साल तक स्थगित रखने से आसमान गिर जायेगा? अभी माननीय सदस्य श्री बोटे ने कहा है कि इल्लूशन के वातावरण में लोग प्रगति नहीं कर सकते हैं, क्योंकि उस समय आपस में तनाव पैदा हो जाता है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि देश का बाहरी और आन्तरिक खतरे से बचाने के लिए, अनुशासन लाने के लिये और उच्छृंखलता से बचाने के लिये यह एक सही और माकूल कदम है। इस बढ़ते हुए कदम को रोकना नहीं चाहिये।

नया सफर है, नयी सुबह है, नयी

सुबह को सलाम करो,

चलो, चलो, न कहीं राह में कियाम करो

अगर बढ़ते हुए कदम को रोक दिया, गया, तो देश पीछे चला जायेगा। इस समय आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि हम सब लोग विरोधी दल के लोग भी बीस सूत्री कार्यक्रम को पूरा करने में मदद करें। हम पहले जनता के इस कार्यक्रम को पूरा करें और उसके बाद जनता के सामने चुनाव के लिये जायें।

SHRIMATI T. LAKSHMIKAN-THAMMA (Khammam): Mr. Chairman, Sir, about the Revolution this was what Mahatma Ghandhi had said. I quote:

"Revolution will sweep India if Congressmen fail."

"The Congress has gained the trust of the people on account of its many sacrifices and penances; but if at this moment it were to let the people down by becoming their overlord instead of their servant and arrogate to itself a position of master. I venture to prophesy, on the strength of my experience of long years that, though I may be alive or not, a revolution will sweep over the country and that the people will pick out the white capped ones individually and finish them and a third power will stand to gain by this."

Sir, I consider you, Sir, as an associate of Vinoba Ji. I had quoted the above from the publication of the Indian National Congress.

Sir, Vinoba Ji is a great living saint next to Gandhi Ji. This was what the great saint said whom we respect so much. This was what he said at the Acharya Sammelan. What does the Acharya Sammelan say?

The Acharyas' Sammelan felt that detention of large numbers of social and political workers, curtailment of civil liberties and press censorship, including the coverage of parliamentary proceedings, were not good for the health of the nation; it is desirable to bring about normalcy through a series of steps to hold the elections as early as possible. They also expressed concern over the effects of the continuance of the present situation on the minds of the younger generation and said this will ultimately worsen the situation.

17 hrs.

This is what the Acharyas said. I hope all of us have respect for the decisions of Vinoba and his Sammelan. Shri Sriman Narayan said that he was coming to Delhi and would meet the Prime Minister on the 23rd or 24th. What happened? Why did Shri Sriman Narayan not get an interview? I

[Shrimati T. Lakshmi Kanthamma]

do not know. Bechara, he must have left. I do not know whether he has left or not....

AN HON. MEMBER: Is all this relevant?

SHRIMATI T. LAKSHMI KANTHA-  
MMA: It is very much relevant, because Vinobha and others feel that early elections should be held and the present emergency and the evil effects of it should be removed (Interruptions).

Whatever may be the position, the papers may not publish it. We may be in darkness, I agree the people may be in darkness. But the leader is not in darkness, because her intelligence works in every part of the country and they have their own reports of how many people are arrested, how many are in jail, how much restlessness there is. So how can you risk it?

This is the main situation and reason why we are not prepared to face an election. What happened? Women in long queues had voted. They have been your supporters. But the theory is—anybody who supports you 'cut him'. Women had stood in long queues and voted saying 'our woman is the Prime Minister'. But what happened? Their rights are taken away; even the little rights that her father had given are taken away. Of course, thanks for a small measure brought in. But I do not know how much practical implementation of it there will be. I wish them all success as far as the Equal Remuneration legislation is concerned.

As regards labour, only today you passed that Bill. About the DMK, it was once a great friend. We did not even set up one candidate, even for the pleasure of it because the wave was there. At least we wanted to be satisfied that we had some MLAs in the Assembly. At that time, for 10 petty parliamentary seats, we bargained with them. Today they are all

criminals to face trial. May be it is true. If a trial is to be faced, let us all face it.

So, also about Charas Singh who is in Jail, then Chandras'ekhar....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your time is up.

SHRIMATI T. LAKSHMI KANTHA-  
MMA: Please give me some more time.

About Kamraj, he was given 'Bharat Ratna' after his death. At least we recognised him after his death. There is a saying in Telugu: 'While living, you do not give a cup of milk, but on the graveyard you tie a cow..

What has happened? One wrong decision led to further wrong decisions. Emergency was first proclaimed. Then to overcome the displeasure of the people over this action, you have to continue other measures, one measure after another; once the fall starts... (Interruptions).

I call this measure the outcome of a guilty conscience and fear complex. These are the two things that have resulted in this Bill. You have put thousands in. I know some instances. There were meetings at Hyderabad and Vizag. What happened? 500 students were arrested. Find out. We may not know it through the press. Is it a fact or not that 500 students were arrested.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. K. Lakkappa

SHRIMATI T. LAKSHMI KANTHA-  
MMA: Please give me two minutes.

SRI K. LAKKAPPA (Tumkur):  
Mr. Chairman, I heard with rapt attention ...

SHRIMATI T. LAKSHMI KANTHA-  
MMA: Only one word more.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.



**SHRIMATI T. LAKSHMI-KANTHAMMA:** Fear is a base instinct of mind. If we all become cowards how will we face foreign invasion? That should be removed from your mind, from the minds of people to make the nation strong so that they can decide things for themselves and you should not arrogate to yourself, to your ego the feeling that you are the deciding authority.

**SHRI K. LAKKAPPA (Tumkur):** I wholeheartedly support this Bill and I want to repudiate the thinking of some Members on the other side like Shrimati Lakshmikanthamma. She is such a good lady but she has associated herself with those people and landed herself in trouble. I do not know what has happened to her social reform and social thinking. Because, we also do respect their sayings. At the same time we must see that the country, the people and the Constitution march forward.

We have seen enough elections. In fact I have fought a number of battles since 1957 and I have also won many battles in elections. That process has been taking the country towards a certain direction and the political thinkers and the people at large should give serious thought to it. Ultimately the will of the people will prevail; people will desire that they should get results immediately after the elections. After many elections, a state of emergency has been proclaimed and the whole country is under discipline. The Prime Minister of our country is taking our country towards economic freedom and that is the will of the people. That is a right decision that the Prime Minister has taken. The question is whether we need any reforms in the election process; that is why there is need for extension of the Lok Sabha's term by one year. It is not a political action; we do not want to take any political advantage. It is the desire of the people that election reforms are necessary and in order to reflect the will of the people certain changes should be made. Economic freedom should be given to the

people. The process of election should be such as to reflect the true will of the people. This is not the thinking of the other side and we have been observing that for many years. They have abused the freedom that has been given under our Constitution. Freedom is only for the black marketeers, for hatching conspiracies and for exploiting the dumb millions and perpetuate what is called election stunts and manoeuvres and thus create an impossible situation. The country needs drastic action. That is the outcome of this emergency. This emergency would help us. Hon. Minister Mr. Gokhale has to take into account the dimensions of this country. I suggest that the term of the Lok Sabha should be more than five years. When there is election we spend a lot of money and the country cannot afford it.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I want to call the next hon. Member. I want to give the maximum opportunity to as many Members as possible because I have to call the hon. Minister at 5-30.

**SHRI K. LAKKAPPA:** I shall conclude.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** You have concluded. Shri Venkatasubbaiah. Hon. Members may be as brief as possible. I shall give time to as many Members as I possibly can.

**SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH (Nandyal):** Mr. Chairman, Sir, while introducing the Bill, the Minister has said that the country is passing through critical times and it is necessary that the present life of the Lok Sabha should be extended by a year and it is also necessary since the Emergency was declared in the country and the internal security was in danger. Sir, nobody disputes the fact that the election is an essential ingredient of parliamentary democracy and elections had been held in this country in the past from time to time after the enactment of our Constitution or even before that under a modified system under the Govt. of India.

[Shri P. Venkatasubbah]

Act, 1937. I humbly submit to those people who are opposing this bill not to be hypocritical of their own conscious because the Congress Party never in the past had hesitated to take the verdict of the people and never in the history of the Congress Organisation it hesitated to quit office when it was necessary. In 1937, the Congress Party went into voluntary wilderness when they opposed the British Government with their imperialist policy.

Sir, I may recall in this connection the speech made by the hon. Prime Minister while addressing the delegates of the All India Congress Committee at Chandigarh when she said: "When I am to choose between the national interests and the party interests. I am prepared to subordinate the party's interests to national interests. It is evident and it is beyond doubt that even if the Congress Party goes to poll after the expiry of the present term of Lok Sabha, it will be returned with a greater majority than it is having now. And it may not be surprising that many of these parties or small groups who are opposing the policies and programmes laid down by the Prime Minister and the Indian National Congress will be wiped out of their existence, since the socio-political-economic programme that has been enunciated and put forward before the masses has won the widest support, ever possible, in this country. India is the biggest parliamentary democracy with nearly six hundred millions of people and nearly half of them are the voters. They are convinced more than ever that unless there is a firm socio-political-economic infrastructure, parliamentary democracy cannot survive in this country. For years to come, parliamentary democracy and the judiciary have been exploited by some few influential sections of the population to buttress their prosperity at the cost of the millions of our people. The people have been told time and again that parliamentary democracy does not mean an empty democracy. It is a

democracy that will be supported by a strong base of economic prosperity to the weaker sections and vulnerable sections of the people. It is extremely necessary that the 20-point economic programme and other programmes should be given a fair trial, should be implemented in toto and should be given a sufficient time to have the real benefit from the policies and programmes of the Government. I say to our friends opposite that they should not be in that blissful ignorance or in the day-dreaming that the Congress Party is hesitant to go to polls because it is afraid of the people and it will not win the elections. It is the other way round to my friends opposite.

So, Sir, in the interest of our stability and also internal security and unity and also to save this country from the external aggression as well as internal disunity, it is necessary that we should go forward and pursue the policies and programmes of the Congress Party under the dynamic leadership of the Prime Minister. For this reason, we all wish that even our friends in the opposition should support this measure that has been brought forward by the Law Minister.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR (Ahmedabad): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I must confess that I am most unhappy today. I feel very uncomfortable because we are about to do something which is totally immoral and unconstitutional. I feel we have no right, no authority, no sanction to extend our own term here by deciding it ourselves. Surely, there is a higher appeal, appeal to the people. That can be stopped only if the situation is so extraordinary and grave like a direct war etc. In the past, we have had such unfortunate grave exigencies and aggressions which we have faced courageously. If such exigencies are there and we cannot appeal to the people, I can understand it. But there is no such grave emergency of that type to compel us to postpone elections by one year. This is a something totally unwarranted and unconstitutional and immoral.

In the statement of objects and reasons, the Law Minister says "It is considered necessary to extend the duration...." and stops there. He does not give any valid reasons to persuade the House and the country that the elections cannot be held now and that the elections should be postponed in the interests of the people and of the whole nation. I hope, in his concluding remarks, he will answer this question.

This decision to postpone the elections has been taken by the government out of its mentality of weakness. It is a diffident government, panic-stricken government, not a confident government which has taken this decision. It is universally accepted in a democracy that an appeal from the legal sovereign has to be periodically made and converted into an appeal to the political sovereign. This Parliament is the legal sovereign body upto a point; but surely the people are more sovereign than Parliament. So why stifle and stop this appeal to the popular will and to the political sovereign?

And may I know where is the emergency? My contention in fact, is that this emergency both external and internal, is artificial, false, totally fabricated. I have never seen a more dishonest, more immoral and more unprincipled piece of legislation! Where is the principle, except that we want to extend our term by one year? This is the product of utter selfishness and of sheer short-sightedness. Such a cold, clever, cunning, calculated and cavalier use of our Constitution was unthinkable and unimaginable for the founding fathers of our Constitution. I am sure, it is equally unthinkable and unimaginable for those of us who believe in democracy and constitutionalism.

I have listened to all the speeches made during this debate. It is said that the extension is sought to consolidate the gains of the emergency, whatever they are. I may not accept those so-called gains. I may have my strong reservations about them; but if

the gains are there, then why not make the claim of such gains of the emergency itself on election issue and go to the people? Sir, my fear is that after one year, Government will again say that they require extension for one more year and then for another year and so, they will go on like this indefinitely. Sir, the real point is that the gains of emergency are not for the people but the gains of emergency are for their own power and perpetuation. Secondly, I want to suggest that even if the gains of emergency are there for the people, they are yet to be seen. But certainly people will say that the gains of emergency have accrued to Members of Parliament!

श्री विष्णुति मिश्र (मोतिहारी) :

मेरा प्वाइंट ऑफ ऑर्डर है। पिछली बार जब चार वर्ष में पार्लियामेंट भंग कर दी गई थी, तो ये लोग कहते थे कि पार्लियामेंट को क्यों भंग कर दिया गया, और अब अगर इस को एक साल बढ़ाने के लिए यह विधेयक लाए है तो कहते हैं कि क्यों इस की अवधि बढ़ाई जा रही है। दोनों बातें ये कैसे कह सकते हैं?

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: Sir, I do not mean personally to anybody but some Congress friends—including you when you were speaking earlier and not from this Chair—asked those of us who oppose this extension to resign. I hope the Congress friends or anybody else in this House will not be uncharitable to those who honestly believe that this measure is wrong. Some Congress members are chiding and arguing that we are honest enough and believe that this measure is wrong then we must get out of this Parliament. Some others say that the Opposition in their heart of their hearts are happy about this extension. These are very cruel and uncharitable remarks, Sir. I can only speak for myself, independent as I am, and not on behalf of any party or group. I am quite unhappy about this Bill. As for

[Shri P. G. Mavalankar]  
the challenge to resign, I can only say that one can accept it provided that the challenge accompanies simultaneously an assurance of holding bye-elections promptly in such areas where the Members resign. Therefore, what is the use of throwing empty words of a challenge? So, then I feel very unhappy today because of this unprincipled legislation for extending our own life and term here, for which we have neither the right nor the authority.

SHRI NATWARLAL PATEL (Mehsana): My friend Mr. Mavalankar is very unhappy. I am sorry to tell the House that I did not find him happy when he came in the Lok Sabha.

So far as this Bill is concerned, Mr. Mavalankar is opposing it. I think, this is not a good tradition on his part. Therefore, I advise him that whatever good he finds on this side, he should support that.

I have heard Mr. Chatterjee. I am much worried about him. He was teaching us some lessons of democracy. These people have no right, to teach lessons of democracy to Congress MPs. These people do not believe in democratic set up and now they have come forward to preach lessons of democracy, it is really very strange. The entire world knows what they have done in West Bengal. They struck terror in West Bengal during their regime.

I understand, Mr. Mavalankar comes from Gujarat. So, he knows everything what is happening there. So far as Congress Members are concerned, we are not after power but we are here just to serve the people. So far as Gujarat State is concerned, today we are not in power there but when Panchayat elections were held, we got a brilliant majority. We have been supported by the people of Gujarat—80 per cent of them. We have got a brilliant majority. Mr. Mavalankar and other Opposition Members should not say that we are afraid of elections. I understand that so far as democracy is concerned, elections are essential; but

I think elections are not everything for us. There is something more important than elections. We are trying to implement the 20-Point Programme. We understand what had happened in the past. There were forces which wanted chaos. They wanted to break the Parliament. I do not know whether Mr. Mavalankar was a party to it. There was a struggle against the duly-elected Assembly in Gujarat. Mr. Mavalankar did not utter a word at that time. (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mayathevar.

SHRI NATWARLAL PATEL: So far as Gujarat is concerned, law and order has broken down absolutely. During the elections there, 4 Congressmen had been killed. Not only that. A number of Congress workers were beaten up. I understand that there is contamination by Jana Sangh and RSS in Gujarat.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand that the time at the disposal of the House is limited. Mr. Patel, will you please resume your seat? Please be seated. Now Mr. Mayathevar.

SHRI K. MAYATHEVAR (Dindigul): I rise to support this Bill without any reservation or any condition. I support this bill in toto because I am fully aware that this bill, extending the life of the House, has been introduced not in the interests of the Members of Parliament. This bill has been introduced, mainly and to the extent of 99.9 per cent, for the welfare of the 60 crores of people of India. It has been introduced by the hon. Minister Shri Gokhale to safeguard the safety and the security of the nation. It has been introduced to give bread to the people. If you put a question to the down-trodden masses of India, whether they would select vote or bread, they would say: "We want bread." The Prime Minister Shri Indira Gandhi had declared Emergency and announced the 20-Point Programme to safeguard India against foreign aggression, aggression from the United States and I do not want to name any other country. What happened in

Bangladesh? The Emergency was declared to safeguard democracy in India. This should be understood by the Opposition. When there is a dispute or clash between the individual's policy and the policy of the political party, the interests of the political party should be safeguarded. When there is a clash between the interests of the political party and those of the country the country's interests should be given the first and the top-most priority. We are now extending the life of this House, not for the interests of the Prime Minister, of the Law Minister or of the members of different parties. It is purely intended to bring bread to the people, down-trodden people. We welcome the 20-Point Programme. We welcome the Emergency. On behalf of the ADMK, I praise the hon. Prime Minister and the President of India and congratulate them for introducing President's rule in Tamil Nadu, in order to put down corruption. By introducing President's rule in Tamil Nadu, they are teaching a lesson to the corrupt ministers in Tamil Nadu. The future ministers and politicians in Tamil Nadu and the future statesmen not only in Tamil Nadu but throughout India, must learn a lesson from the appointment of an enquiry commission by the Government of India, to enquire into the misuse of power by the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu and his ministers. Therefore, I welcome the President's Rule. In fact, I came only yesterday from Madras. I have seen that hundred per cent of the people of Madras are smiling and they are welcome President's Rule. But, while we welcome this under the present situation, when normalcy is brought about in the Indian soil, when rebellions are put down, the people who are behind the bars should be released and we should have free and fair elections. Therefore, on behalf of the ADMK I support the Bill.

**THE MINISTER OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI H. R. GOKHALE):** Mr. Chairman, I have heard the speeches of the hon. Members with very great attention and care. I am thankful that the Bill has

been supported, not only by members of the Congress Party but by a good many of the members of the opposition parties, as well as by the independents. Even those opposition members who opposed the Bill, when I heard their speeches, I somehow or other got the impression that they were speaking with their tongues in their cheeks. Because, I felt that they were opposing as they knew whether they oppose it or not, the Bill is going to be passed, and they really whole heartedly wanted this measure to be passed.

**SHRI ERASMO DE SEQUEIRA:** He is misleading himself.

**SHRI H. R. GOKHALE:** I do not wish to be legalistic. Some members have referred to the argument that this is unconstitutional, apart from the argument of Shri Mavalankar that it was immoral also. I do not know how it is unconstitutional. Nobody has explained it, not even Shri Mavalankar.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** They themselves do not know it.

**SHRI H. R. GOKHALE:** One thing is quite clear, namely, that the very Constitution which, in the normal circumstances, dictated that an election should come after a period of five years is over, also laid down that if there is an emergency in operation, this House by law can extend the period for not more than one year at a time. Therefore, I do not have to answer this, because nobody has said how it is unconstitutional. Therefore, as I said, I do not want to be legalistic.

Coming to the first speaker, Shri Somnath Chatterjee, who spoke very eloquently, as he usually does, so far as today's speech is concerned, apart from his eloquence, unfortunately, I found little substance in it. He said that the emergency was brought on the 25th June on account of internal disturbances and the earlier emergency of 1971 on account of external aggression. According to him there is no emergency now and, therefore, this measure, as he put it, was only with a view to perpetuate the status quo.

[Shri H. R. Gokhale]

New it is understandable how any person, who has observed the developments in this country in the last one year or so, particularly before the 25th of June, can say that the situation which was prevailing in this country was not an emergency situation. Have we forgotten how these very exponents of democracy and liberty, who are very loud about these terms today, had been doing everything in their power to subvert and to destroy democracy in this country? They are now talking in terms of liberty, democracy and freedom of speech. But I believe that even the maximum of idealistic concept of democracy cannot envisage that there can be liberty or democracy to destroy democracy itself.

We have seen how these very people and these very parties acted a few months before the emergency. Have we forgotten that when the Gujarat situation arose, a popularly elected legislature was forced to step down by force and coercion? But when it did not fit in with their concept of democracy .....

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA (Serampore): All stale arguments.

SHRI H. R. GOKHALE: May be stale arguments, but these are all facts. They have become stale to my hon. friend, because they are inconvenient to him. My hon. friend does not want to be reminded of these things, because these are arguments which are inconvenient to him.

The point is that an atmosphere had grown, a deliberate attempt was made to develop that atmosphere, where democracy in this country could not function. I have no hesitation in saying that in the building up of this atmosphere some of these political parties had taken a major share. I would even go to the extent of saying that they were backed up by forces which were not favourable or friendly to India.

Don't we remember how Parliament itself functioned? Was that the concept of democracy in the minds of

these people at that time? No measure could be undertaken, canvassed, argued or placed before the House without unseemly scenes of interruptions and at times even unseemly behaviour. All this is democracy!

Some of them were saying that we should restore normalcy. Is it the suggestion that all that was happening before 25th June was normalcy and that it should be restored? But what was happening before 25th June was not normalcy. In fact, conditions which were in the nature of abnormality had been created in this country for a length of time, so that to say that we should now restore those conditions is the very negation of democracy.

Therefore, I can only say that all these loud phrases about liberty, democracy and so on and so forth are only used for the sake of opposing this measure, but they all know that they themselves have been party to the scheme for destroying and subverting democracy in this country.

It is in these circumstances that the emergency of June, 1975, was imposed. It was in a sense an unprecedented step because after independence while emergency on account of external aggression had been proclaimed, emergency on account of internal disturbances had not been proclaimed.

Why was this extraordinary step taken unless it was a fact that the very existence and maintenance of the democratic fabric of the country was in danger at that time? And it was in danger.

It is said that those conditions have changed over-night. Of course, one thing is true that some of the people who had been instrumental in creating this atmosphere of subversion are not in a position to operate so effectively now and conditions have been quiet. This, in fact, is proof of the fact that they were responsible for creating those conditions. But this is not to say that conditions have come back to normal.

The forces which wanted to create instability, the forces which wanted to create subversion and destruction of democracy in this country are still at work. It may be that because of the steps taken in right time by the Government and the Prime Minister, they are lying low, but it does not mean that those forces are dead. Therefore, it is necessary that before it is too late we must take care to see that these forces of reaction do not raise their heads again to create the conditions of abnormality which were prevailing before the declaration of emergency on 25th June, 1975.

Something was said about the Statement of Objects and Reasons. What is wrong with the Statement of Objects and Reasons? Anyone who knows the purpose of the Statement of Objects and Reasons will also know that it is intended to indicate the purpose in law of the particular legislation. That is precisely explained in the Statement of Objects and Reasons. The political basis and the economic basis of a step which is being taken are matters for this House to discuss and consider and for the Government to explain at the appropriate time. I tried to do that in my opening speech and I am trying to do it now.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee very cursorily referred to the right of recall. I am sure that if that right were there, he and some of his colleagues would be the first to be recalled by the electorate. It is now said that people are being suppressed, people are not supporting this emergency. To say this is not to appreciate or understand or to deliberately distort the exact position which is there in this country. The fact is that an overwhelming majority of the people in this country, from the rural as well as urban areas, have very stoutly and strongly welcomed the proclamation of emergency in this country. They have welcomed the sense of discipline which it has brought in; they have welcomed the implementation of the economic plans; they have welcomed the removal of hurdles in the implementation of these plans; they

have welcomed coming into force a political atmosphere which is really in consonance with this atmosphere. And I stoutly refute that the people are not behind the proclamation of emergency. On the contrary. I vouchsafe to say that very widely all over the country, the people have said and have been saying that the emergency was just the thing which it was necessary at that time and it has been done by the Prime Minister.

One of my friends has talked about democracy. I wonder since when he began to believe in democracy. The point is this. It is only when you use that particular slogan with arguments.....

(Interruptions)

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA:  
I am also a believer in democracy. My political career.....

(Interruptions)

SHRI H. R. GOKHALE: I have also been in the political movement from early 1938. Do not remind me of that.

(Interruptions)

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA:  
I have been since 1930. I am a believer in democracy but not undemocracy.

(Interruptions)

SHRI H. R. GOKHALE: I am glad to hear that from you.

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM (Srinagar):  
Both of them are old enough to leave politics now.

(Interruptions)

SHRI H. R. GOKHALE: Therefore the debate went on which was a distortion of the correct facts of the situation today. One thing is clear that a general election in a vast country like India with an electorate of about 300 million people does create an atmosphere apart from the economic consequences which might tend to give rise to something or strengthen the inflationary situation and so on, of disturbance in a situation like this.

[Shri H. R. Gokhale]

(*Interruptions*)

You will get a chance to have an election and at that time we will see.

(*Interruptions*)

I am only saying that. Somebody has said—I do not remember who—that the Government is acting as if it has no confidence in itself. In other words, it was suggested that the Government is not going in for an election because they are afraid that they will not win the election. I want to be very categorical on this that if at all there was any time, if we looked at it from the point of view only of winning an election, which was favourable to the Congress Party, it was this time. I am quite sure that if elections were held, the Congress Party will come back with a majority, far more than the majority it has today. But as the Prime Minister has said—of course, it cannot apply to all of them—most of them may not be here. That is a different matter.

(*Interruptions*)

In a situation like this, you do not consider merely from the point of view of winning or losing an election. Every political party, no doubt, wants to win an election. So does the Congress Party. But the objective in a country like this in a situation like this is not only to win an election. That is why she has said that while she is quite sure that the present situation is right for the Congress Party to come back, the needs and the demands of the situation are such that the present time is not the right time for election because of the various factors which have been mentioned before this House just now. Therefore, there is no point in going into all these arguments. I know the motivations of some of the Opposition parties behind this. I also know that most of the Opposition parties and Independents have supported this measure and (M) is an indication of the fact that an

overwhelming majority in this House is in favour of this measure.

I recommend this Bill for the consideration of this House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill to provide for the extension of the duration of the present House of the People, be taken into consideration."

*The Lok Sabha divided.*

Division No. 24]

[17.45 hrs.

AYES

Agrawal, Shri Shrikrishna  
Ahrwar, Shri Nathu Ram  
Ambesh, Shri  
Ankineedu, Shri Maganti  
Ansari, Shri Ziaur Rahman  
Appalanaidu, Shri  
Arvind Netam, Shri  
Austin, Dr. Henry  
Awdhesh Chandra Singh, Shri  
Aziz Imam, Shri  
Babunath Singh, Shri  
Balakrishnaiah, Shri T.  
Banamali Babu, Shri  
Banera, Shri Hamendra Singh  
Banerjee, Shrimati Mukul  
Barua, Shri Bedabrata  
Basappa, Shri K.  
\*Basumatari, Shri D.  
Bawa, Shri S. C.  
Bhagat, Shri H. K. L.  
Bhargava, Shri Basheshwar Nath  
Bhatia, Shri Raghunandan Lal  
Bhattacharyya, Shri Chopalendu  
Bheeshmadev, Shri M.  
Bisr, Shri Narendra Singh  
Brahmanandji, Shri Swami  
Brij Raj Singh-Rota, Shri  
Bute Singh, Shri

\*By mistake voted for NOES Corrected to AYES.



181 *House of the People* MAGHA 15, 1997 (SAKA) *House of the People* 182  
(Extn. of Duration) Bill (Extn. of Duration) Bill

Chakravarthi Singh, Shri  
Chandrasekar, Shri Chandulal  
Chandrashekharaappa Veerabasaappa,  
Shri T. V.  
Chaudhary, Shri Nitiraj Singh  
Chavan, Shrimati Premalabai  
Chhotey Lal, Shri  
Chhuttan Lal, Shri  
Chikkalingaiah, Shri K.  
Daga, Shri M. C.  
Das, Shri Anadi Charan  
Das, Shri Dharnidhar  
Dasappa, Shri Tulsidas  
Daschowdhury, Shri B. K.  
Deo, Shri S. N. Singh.  
Desai, Shri D. D.  
Dhamankar, Shri  
Dhillon, Dr. G. S.  
Dhote, Shri Jambuwant  
Dhusia, Shri Anant Prasad  
Dixit, Shri G.-C.  
Dixit, Shri Jagdish Chandra  
Doda, Shri Hiralal  
Dube, Shri J. P.  
Dwivedi, Shri Nageshwar  
Engti, Shri Biren  
Ganga Devi, Shrimati  
Gangadeb, Shri P.  
Gavit, Shri T. H.  
Giri, Shri S. B.  
Gokhale, Shri H. R.  
Gomango, Shri Giridhar  
Gopal, Shri K.  
Goswami, Shri Dinesh Chandra  
Gotkhinde, Shri Annasaheb  
Gowda, Shri Pampan  
Hanumanthaiya, Shri K.  
Hari Singh, Shri  
Jaffer Sharief, Shri C. K.  
Jagjivan Ram, Shri  
Jamilurrahman, Shri Md.  
Jeyalakshmi, Shrimati V.  
Jha, Shri Chiranjib

Jitendra Prasad, Shri  
Kadam, Shri J.-G.  
Kadannappalli, Shri Ramachandran  
Kader, Shri S. A.  
Kailas, Dr.  
Kakodkar, Shri Purushottam  
Kale, Shri  
Kamakshiah, Shri D.  
Kamala Prasad, Shri  
Kamble, Shri T. D.  
Kapur, Shri Sat Pal  
Karan Singh, Dr.  
Kinder Lal, Shri  
Kisku, Shri A. K.  
Kotoki, Shri Liladhar  
Kotrashetti, Shri A. K.  
Krishnan, Shri G. Y.  
Kureel, Shri B. N.  
Kushok Bakula, Shri  
Lakkappa, Shri K.  
Mahajan, Shri Vikram  
Majhi, Shri Gajadhar  
Majhi, Shri Kumar  
Malhotra, Shri Inder J.  
Mallanna, Shri K.  
Mandal, Shri Jagdish Narain  
Manhar, Shri Bhagatram  
Maurya, Shri B. P.  
Mayathevar, Shri K.  
Mirdha, Shri Nathu Ram  
Mishra, Shri Bibhut  
Mishra, Shri G. S.  
Mishra, Shri Jagannath  
Mohapatra, Shri Shyam Sunder  
Mohsin, Shri F. H.  
Murmu, Shri Yogesh Chandra  
Naik, Shri B. V.  
Negi, Shri Pratap Singh  
Oraon, Shri Tuna  
Pahadia, Shri Jagannath  
Painuli, Shri Paripatnam  
Pelodkar, Shri Manikrao  
Pandey, Shri Damodar

Pandey, Shri Narsingh Narain

Pandit, Shri S. T.

Pant, Shri K. C.

Paokai Haokip, Shri

Parashar, Prof. Narain Chand

Patel, Shri Arvind M.

Patel, Shri Natwarlal

Patil, Shri E. V. Vikhe

Patil, Shri Krishnarao

Patnaik, Shri J. B.

Peje, Shri S. L.

Raghu Ramaiah, Shri K.

Rai, Shri S. K.

Raju, Shri P. V. G.

Ram Hedao, Shri

Ram Surat Prasad, Shri

Ram Swarup, Shri

Ramji Ram, Shri

Rao, Shrimati B. Radhabai A.

Rao, Shri K. Narayana

Rao, Shri M. S. Sanjeevi

Rao, Shri M. Satyanarayan

Rao, Shri Nageswara

Rao, Shri P. Ankineedu Prasada

Rao, Shri Pattabhi Rama

Raut, Shri Bhola

Ravi, Shri Vayalar

Roy, Shri Bishwanath

Saini, Shri Mulki Raj

Samanta, Shri S. C.

Sangliana, Shri

Sankata Prasad, Dr.

Satish Chandra, Shri

Satpathy, Shri Devendra

Sayeed, Shri P. M.

Sethi, Shri Arjun

Shafee, Shri A.

Shahnawaz Khan, Shri

Shailani, Shri Chandra

Shambhu Nath, Shri

Shankaranand, Shri B.

Sharma, Shri A. P.

Sharma, Dr. H. P.

Sharma, Shri Nawal Kishore

Sharma, Dr. Shanker Dayal

Shastri, Shri Biswanarayan

Shastri, Shri Sheopujan

Shenoy, Shri P. R.

Shetty, Shri K. K.

Shinde, Shri Annasaheb P.

Shivappa, Shri N.

Shivnath Singh, Shri

Shukla, Shri Vidya Charan

Siddayya, Shri S. M.

Siddheshwar Prasad, Prof.

Singh, Shri Vishwanath Pratap

Sinha, Shri Dharam Bir

Sinha, Shri Nawal Kishore

Sohan Lal, Shri T.

Sokhi, Sardar Swaran Singh

Stephen, Shri C. M.

Sudarsanam, Shri M.

Sunder Lal, Shri

Suryanarayana, Shri K.

Swamy, Shri Sidrameshwar

Swaran Singh, Shri

Tayyab Hussain, Shri

Thakre, Shri S. B.

Thakur, Shri Krishnarao

Tulsiram, Shri V.

Uikey, Shri M. G.

Unnikrishnan, Shri K. P.

Vekaria, Shri

Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.

Venkatswamy, Shri G.

Vikal, Shri Ram Chandra

Yadav, Shri Chandrajit

Yadav, Shri Karan Singh

Yadav, Shri R. P. 192

NOES

\*Basumatari, Shri D.

Bhattacharyya, Shri Dinep

Bhattacharyya, Shri S. P.

\*By mistake voted for 'NOES'. Corrected to AYES.

Chowhan, Shri Bharat Singh  
Deb, Shri Dasaratha  
Deo, Shri P. K.  
Halder, Shri Krishna Chandra  
Hazra, Shri Manoranjan  
Horo, Shri N. E.  
Kiruttinan, Shri Tha  
Lakshmikanthamma, Shrimati T.  
Mavalankar, Shri P. G.  
Modak, Shri Bijoy  
Mohanty, Shri Surendra  
Mukherjee, Shri Samar  
Mukherjee, Shri Saroj  
Parmar, Shri Bhaljibhai  
Ram Deo Singh, Shri  
Ramkanwar, Shri  
Roy, Dr. Saradish  
Saha, Shri Gadadhar  
Sequeira, Shri Erasmo de  
Shamim, Shri S. A.  
Sher Singh, Prof.  
Singh, Shri D. N.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The result of the division is:

Ayes—101; Noes—25.

*The motion was adopted.*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now we take up clause-by-clause consideration.

Clause 2—(*Extension of duration of the present House of the people*)

SHRI ERASMO DE SEQUEIRA: I beg to move:

Page 1,—

for lines 11 to 16, substitute—

“Provided that if both or either of the said Proclamations cease or ceases to operate before the said, period of one year, the present House of the People may continue until six month after the cesser of the said Proclamation or Proclamations, unless it is after such cesser,

dissolved under clause (2) of article 83 of the Constitution.” (1)

Mr. Chairman, Sir, when I saw the Bill circulated, I was wondering why the proviso to clause 2 had been drafted in the manner in which it was drafted. After the discussion today in this House, I am beginning to understand the reason because there was a demand here by Prof. H. N. Mukerjee that Government should hold the elections with the emergency on and the censorship on and all the political leaders in jail. Now I am beginning to understand, why the proviso is drafted as it has been. I am suggesting an alternative proviso to the proviso as it exists in the Bill.

I have two submissions to make in respect of the amendment. My first submission is, whether Government having come to the House and said that conditions in this country justify—even though they say this against the facts according to us—the extension of the term of this House, can still retain for themselves the right to dissolve the House without lifting the Emergency, without getting out of the proviso under which they are now operating and getting into the main clause. You cannot have it both ways. If Government say that the conditions in this country justify the extension of the term, then it must also say, to be consistent, that as long as those conditions exist, the House cannot be dissolved, because this country cannot remain without a Parliament. I think, at least on that much we agree.

My second submission is that if the plan is to hold an election, or the process of election—because substance they now forget—with the country as closely contained, as it is today, with the leaders in Jail, with censorship with extension of MISA and all these Draconian laws, that is no election at all. And, therefore, I have moved an amendment to the effect that this Government should only be able to dissolve this House if it comes forward and says that conditions for a free and fair elections are already there, which means

[Shri Erasmo de Sequeira]

after either of the emergencies is lifted. This is the scope of my amendment.

SHRI H. R. GOKHALE: If there is anything unconstitutional, it is this amendment. The amendment reads like this:

"Provided that if both or either of the said Proclamations cease or ceases to operate before the said period of one year, the present House of the People may continue until six months after the cesser of the said Proclamation or Proclamations, unless it is, after such cesser, dissolved under clause (2) of Article 83 of the Constitution."

Now the extension of the House is till 18th March next year. If the Emergency is lifted say in January, according to this amendment, the House should continue for six months after that. It is just what Article 83 does not permit.

SHRI ERASMO DE SEQUEIRA: Article 83 says exactly that.

18 hrs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will now put amendment No. 1 of Shri Erasmo de Sequeira to clause 2 to vote.

*Amendment No. 1 was put and negatived.*

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clause 2 was added to the Bill.*

*Clause 1, Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.*

SHRI H. R. GOKHALE: I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

MR. CHAIRMAN: There have been no names sent to me—Shri Ram Deo Singh's name has come to me just a

second back. Even so, I will be fair and I will give him time...

SHRI ERASMO DE SEQUEIRA: We will not sit beyond 6 p.m.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will take the pleasure of the House. I will take the reality stage when in five minutes we can have the Bill passed, why to postpone it for tomorrow?

Therefore, I will be fair and give opportunity to the hon. Member who wants to speak. I hope you will co-operate and let us have the Bill then put to vote.

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM: Let us go home and celebrate it.

SHRI ERASMO DE SEQUEIRA: There will be Division on this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Ramdeo Singh.

श्री रामदेव सिंह (महाराजगंज) : सभापति महोदय, इस बिल से हमको कोई आश्चर्य नहीं हुआ है। यह सरकार जिस राह पर जा रही है, उससे लगता है कि प्रता नहीं ऐसे-ऐसे बिल इस हाउस में कितनी बार उसको लाने पड़ेगे। यह कहना कठिन है। श्री गोखले ने कहा कि हम चुनाव से नहीं घबराते हैं, चुनाव तो हमारे पक्ष में होगा। अगर ऐसी बात है तो आप चुनाव में जाते क्यों नहीं हैं? यह तो आप पर निर्भर है कि जब तक चाहे एमरजेंसी को लागू रखे।

आज देश में सब तरफ शांति है, उसके बावजूद भी आप एमरजेंसी रखे हुए हैं। आप अपनी शक्ति का कितना दुरुपयोग कर रहे हैं? यह आप पर निर्भर है। तमिलनाडु में सरकार को आपने तोड़ दिया, बिधान-सभा को तोड़ दिया तो भी आप ईमोर्केट है और अगर कोई बर्कर, बर्करों की एसोसियेशन या जनता किसी तरह इनको बंग करने की मांग करती है तो वह फासिस्ट हो जाती है। आप इस

देश के लोकतंत्र की कोई परिभाषा बता रहे हैं। भाजपा सारी दुनिया के लोकतंत्र की भाषणी इस कमी पर आधारित है। हमारे लिए यह कोई नई बात नहीं हो रही है। हमें यह विचार था कि जब 1942 में आन्दोलन के समय गांधी जी के नेतृत्व में हम लोग संघर्ष कर रहे थे तो अंग्रेजों ने कहा था कि वे फासिस्ट लोग हैं, खोफर हैं, ये जनता के दुश्मन हैं। भाजपा जिन शब्दों का भाष प्रयोग करते हैं, वे शब्द हमें इस देश के विचार स्वतंत्रता रखने वालों के लिये, जनता के अधिकारों के लिये अंग्रेजों ने प्रयोग किये हैं।

लोकतंत्र की ये विषयवस्तु हैं, देश में पूर्ण शांति होते हुए भी हिंसा की सरकार को यह तोड़ते हैं। उन्होंने उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार को सर्वोच्च कर दिया और भी बहुगुणा को हटा दिया, तो भी ये इमोकेट हो गये, लेकिन अगर जवाब कहती है कि बिहार और गुजरात की विधान-सभा को भंग करो तो जनता फासिस्ट हो जाती है। यह जबर्दस्ती की बात है। हम लोकतंत्र और अहिंसा में विश्वास करते हैं। हम उन लोगों में से हैं, जो संसदीय प्रणाली में विश्वास करते हैं। हम तलवार, बम और पिस्तौल की राजनीति में विश्वास नहीं करते हैं। लेकिन लोकतंत्र में जनता को विचारों की स्वतंत्रता होती है। जिस सरकार ने जनता के अधिकारों की स्वतंत्रता का हनन कर दिया है, उस को इमोकेसी का नाम देने का कोई नैतिक हक नहीं है।

इस सरकार ने विचार-स्वतंत्रता का हनन किया है। लोक सभा में हुए हमारे भाषणों की भी भाजपा अखबारों में नहीं छापा जा सकता है। क्या यह डिक्टेटर और फासिस्ट का चरित्र नहीं है? यह सरकार पूरे दल-बल के साथ फासिस्ट राह पर चल

रही है। अगर मैं यह कहूँ कि भाजपा केंद्रीय सरकार फासिस्टों की सरकार है, तो यह कोई अत्युक्ति नहीं होगी।

इस सरकार ने लोगों को मिलने-जुलने से रोक दिया है और इस उस ने चुनावों को स्थगित कर दिया है। उस ने अपने विरोधियों को जेल में बन्द कर दिया है। भाजपा की कठोरता प्रत्यक्ष कर रहे हैं। भाजपा लोगों में रखे गये लोगों की दुर्दशा हो रही है। हम ने केवल आन्दोलन ही नहीं किया, बल्कि लाहौर को जवाहरा, भाजपा को जवाहरा, और बिहार के लोगों को याद होगा कि सात गोरों मार दिये गये हैं, लेकिन फिर भी अंग्रेजी सरकार ने गिरफ्तार लोगों के साथ जेल में प्रत्यूत्ता और इन्साफियत का व्यवहार किया था। भाजपा लोगों के साथ इन्सानियत का व्यवहार नहीं हो रहा है।

मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि श्री गोखले को कम से कम संविधान के साथ इस तरह मजाक नहीं करना चाहिए और अपनी शक्ति का दुरुपयोग नहीं करना चाहिए। सदन के जो सदस्य भाजपा जेल में हैं, कम से कम उन को बारे में सूचना समय-समय पर सदन को दी जाये कि वे किस जेल में रखे गये हैं, वे किस हालत में हैं और उन का स्वास्थ्य कैसा है।

अन्त में मैं केवल यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि न रानी रहेगी, न राजा रहेगा, यह सदन सभी की कहानी कहेंगा।

SHRI ERASMO de SEQUEIRA: Mr. Chairman, the only thing I have been happy about while listening to the debate on this Bill is that nobody has said that we are postponing the elections to save democracy, because if that has been said, this Government would have climbed to the commanding height to which they have not been before. The Minister rightly said that liberty does not contain the liberty to

[Shri Erasmo De Sequeira]

destroy democracy itself. Perhaps, he would say that to himself today, because as usual it is what is said to the other side, that is practised by the governing side that saves it. Even the concept of two emergencies is to us a new concept which was created when the second emergency was proclaimed and when Government, through the Minister in his reply to the first debate gave as one of its reasons for postponing the elections that election might contribute to inflation. It is scraping the bottom of the barrel and it is no argument to justify this unwarranted speech.

SHRI H. R. GOKHALE: This is the same tune, same refrain and everything is the same. There is nothing to reply to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

Let the lobby be cleared.

*The Lok Sabha divided:*

Division No. 25]

[18.10 hrs.

# AYES

Agrawal, Shri Shrikrishna  
Ahirwar, Shri Nathu Ram  
Ambesh, Shri  
Appalanaidu, Shri  
Arvind Netam, Shri  
Awdhesh Chandra Singh, Shri  
Babunath Singh, Shri  
Bajpai, Shri Vidya Dhar  
Balakrishniah, Shri T.  
Banamali Babu, Shri  
Banerjee, Shrimati Mukul  
Barua, Shri Bedabrata  
Basappa, Shri K.  
Basumatari, Shri D.  
Besra, Shri S. C.

Bhargava, Shri Basbeshwar Nath  
Bhatia, Shri Raghunandan Lal  
Bhattacharyya, Shri Chapalendu  
Bheeshmadev, Shri M.  
Bisr, Shri Narendra Singh  
Brahmanandji, Shri Swami  
Brij Raj Singh-Kotah, Shri  
Buta Singh, Shri  
Chakleshwar Singh, Shri  
Chandrashekharaappa Veerabasappa,  
Shri T. V.  
Chaudhary, Shri Nitiraj Singh  
Chavan, Shrimati Premalabai  
Chhotey Lal, Shri  
Chhuttan Lal, Shri  
Chikkalingaiah, Shri K.  
Daga, Shri M. C.  
Das, Shri Anadi Charan  
Das, Shri Dharnidhar  
Dasappa, Shri Tulsidas  
Daschowdhury, Shri B. K.  
Deo, Shri S. N. Singh  
Desai, Shri D. D.  
Dhamankar, Shri  
Dhillon, Dr. G. S.  
Dhusia, Shri Anant Prasad  
Dixit, Shri G. C.  
Dixit, Shri Jagdish Chandra  
Doda, Shri Hiralal  
Dube, Shri J. P.  
Dwivedi, Shri Nageshwar  
Engti, Shri Biren  
Ganga Devi, Shrimati  
Gangadeb, Shri P.  
Gavit, Shri T. H.  
Giri, Shri S. B.  
Gokhale, Shri H. R.  
Gomango, Shri Giridhar  
Gopal, Shri K.  
Gotkhinde, Shri Anmasaheb  
Gowda, Shri Pampan  
Jamilurrahman, Shri Md.  
Jeyalakshmi, Shrimati V.

Jha, Shri Chiranjib  
Jitendra Prasad, Shri  
Kadam, Shri J. G.  
Kadannappalli, Shri Ramachandran  
Kader, Shri S. A.  
Kailas, Dr.  
Kakodkar, Shri Purushottam  
Kale, Shri  
Kamakshaiiah, Shri D.  
Kamala Prasad, Shri  
Kamble, Shri T. D.  
Kapur, Shri Sat Pal  
Karan Singh, Dr.  
Kinder Lal, Shri  
Kisku, Shri A. K.  
Kotoki, Shri Liladhar  
Kotrashetti, Shri A. K.  
Krishnan, Shri G. Y.  
Kureel, Shri B. N.  
\*Kushok Bakula, Shri  
Lakkappa, Shri K.  
Mahajan, Shri Vikram  
Majhi, Shri Kumar  
Mandal, Shri Jagdish Narain  
Manhar, Shri Bhagatram  
Maurya, Shri B. P.  
Mayathevar, Shri K.  
Mirdha, Shri Nathu Ram  
Mishra, Shri Bibhuti  
Mishra, Shri G. S.  
Mishra, Shri Jagannath  
Mohapatra, Shri Shyam Sunder  
Murmu, Shri Yogesh Chandra  
Naik, Shri B. V.  
Negi, Shri Pratap Singh  
Oraon, Shri Tuna  
Pahadia, Shri Jagannath  
Painuli, Shri Paripoornanand  
Palodkar, Shri Manikrao  
Pandey, Shri Damodar

Pandey, Shri Narsingh Narain  
Pandit, Shri S. T.  
Pant, Shri K. C.  
Paokai Haokip, Shri  
Parashar, Prof. Narain Chahd  
Patel, Shri Natwarlal  
Patil, Shri E. V. Vikhe  
Patil, Shri Krishnarao  
Patnaik, Shri J. B.  
Peje, Shri S. L.  
Rai, Shri S. K.  
Raju, Shri P. V. G.  
Ram Surat Prasad, Shri  
Ram Swarup, Shri  
Ramji Ram, Shri  
Rao, Shrimati B. Radhabai A.  
Rao, Shri K. Narayana  
Rao, Shri M. S. Sanjeevi  
Rao, Shri M. Satyanarayan  
Rao, Shri Nageswara  
Rao, Shri P. Ankineedu Prasada  
Raut, Shri Bhola  
Roy, Shri Bishwanath  
Saini, Shri Mulki Raj  
Samanta, Shri S. C.  
Sangliana, Shri  
Sankata Prasad, Dr.  
Satish Chandra, Shri  
Satpathy, Shri Devendra  
Sayeed, Shri P. M.  
Sethi, Shri Arjun  
Shafee, Shri A.  
Shahnawaz Khan, Shri  
Shailani, Shri Chandra  
Shambhu Nath, Shri  
Shankaranand, Shri B.  
Sharma, Shri A. P.  
Sharma, Dr. H. P.  
Sharma, Dr. Shanker Dayal  
Shashi Bhushan, Shri  
Shastri, Shri Biswanarayan

\*By mistake voted for NOES. corrected to AYES.

Shastri, Shri Sheopujan  
Shenoy, Shri P. R.  
Shinde, Shri Annasaheb P.  
Shivappa, Shri N.  
Shivnath Singh, Shri  
Siddayya, Shri S. M.  
Sinha, Shri Dharam Bir  
Sinha, Shri Nawal Kishore  
Sohan Lal, Shri T.  
Sokhi, Sardar Swaran Singh  
Sudarsanam, Shri M.  
Sunder Lal, Shri  
Suryanarayana, Shri K.  
Swamy, Shri Sidrameshwar  
Swaran Singh, Shri  
Tayyab Hussain, Shri  
Thakre, Shri S. B.  
Thakur, Shri Krishnarao  
Tulsiram, Shri V.  
Ulkey, Shri M. G.  
Unnikrishnan, Shri K. P.  
Vekaria, Shri  
Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.  
Venkatswamy, Shri G.  
Vikal, Shri Ram Chandra  
Yadav, Shri Chandrajit  
Yadav, Shri Karan Singh  
Yadav, Shri R. P.

NOES

Bhattacharyya, Shri Dinak  
Bhattacharyya, Shri S. F.  
Chowhan, Shri Bharat Singh  
Dev, Shri Dasaratha  
Halder, Shri Krishna Chandra  
Hazra, Shri Manoranjan  
Horo, Shri N. E.  
\*Kushok Bakula, Shri  
Lakshmikanthamma, Shrimati T.  
Mavalankar, Shri P. G.  
Modak, Shri Bajoy  
Mukherjee, Shri Samar  
Mukherjee, Shri Saroj  
Ram Deo Singh, Shri  
Ramkanwar, Shri  
Roy, Dr Saradish  
Saha, Shri Gadadhar  
Sequeira, Shri Erasmo De  
Sher Singh, Prof.  
Singh, Shri D. N.

MR. CHAIRMAN : The result of the  
division is: Ayes—165; Noes—20.

*The motion was adopted.*

18 18 hrs

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till  
Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, Feb-  
ruary 5, 1976/Magha 16, 1897 (Saka)

\*By mistake voted for 'NOES' Corrected to 'AYES'