

SUPPLEMENTARY DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (RAILWAYS), 1976-77

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (SHRI KAMALAPATI TRIPATHI): I beg to present a statement showing Supplementary Demands for Grants in respect of the Budget (Railways) for 1976-77.

DEMANDS FOR EXCESS GRANTS (RAILWAYS), 1974-75

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (SHRI KAMALAPATI TRIPATHI): I beg to present a statement showing Demands for Excess Grants in respect of the Budget (Railways) for 1974-75.

SUPPLEMENTARY DEMANDS FOR GRANT (GENERAL), 1976-77

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI-MATI SUSHILA ROHATGI): I beg to present a statement showing Supplementary Demands for Grants in respect of the Budget (General) for 1976-77.

SUPPLEMENTARY DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (GUJARAT), 1976-77

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI-MATI SUSHILA ROHATGI): I beg to present a statement showing Supplementary Demands for Grants in respect of the State of Gujarat for the year 1976-77.

SUPPLEMENTARY DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (PONDICHERRY), 1976-77

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI-MATI SUSHILA ROHATGI): I beg to present a statement showing Supplementary Demands for Grants in respect of the Union territory of Pondicherry for the year 1976-77.

11.10 hrs.

MOTION RE: BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

THE MINISTER OF WORKS AND HOUSING AND PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH): I beg to move:

"This House resolves that the current session of Lok Sabha being in the nature of a special session to consider the Constitution (Forty-fourth Amendment) Bill, 1976 and certain unavoidable and essential Government business, only Government business be transacted during the session and no other business whatsoever including Questions, Calling Attention and any other business to be initiated by a private Member be brought before or transacted in the House during the session and all relevant rules on the subject in the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha do hereby stand suspended to that extent."

I might mention that I have also an amendment to this motion and if I am permitted, I shall read that also before I make my comments:

I beg to move:

"That in the motion,—

add at the end—

'Provided that after the disposal of the Constitution Amendment Bill, time permitting the Speaker may in his discretion allow Calling Attentions and Short Duration Discussions.' "

As the House is aware, this is a very special session to consider the Constitution Amendment Bill (Interruptions) As I was saying this is a very special session to consider the Constitution Amendment Bill and incidentally also, if there is time, to do such other essential business as may be necessary. For instance, I have placed an Ordinance on the Table of the House and it would be necessary to take it up and approve it

during this session. The main idea is to give an opportunity to the House and all the members thereof and the ministers to give their undivided attention to this most important measure. This is the spirit behind it. Secondly, the idea is to give each member as far as possible an opportunity to participate in the discussion. This is the reason why we wanted to save time. But as my proviso shows, I have not barred altogether any other business. The moment this is over, time permitting, the Speaker in his discretion, may allow calling attention and short duration discussions. Regarding the allocation of time, I have certain recommendations and submissions to make. I shall mention them after this motion is passed.

MR SPEAKER The motion and the amendment thereto moved by the hon Minister are before the House

श्री दामोदर साहूजी (पटना) -
 अध्यक्ष जी, यह जो संकल्प पेश किया गया है मैं इसका विरोध करता हूँ और विरोध करते हुए अपना सशोधन इसमें प्रस्तावित करता हूँ—जो इस प्रकार है—

I beg to move: ५ ५ ५ ५

That in the motion, after "only Government business" insert—
 "Short Notice Question, Calling Attention and a special debate on the flood situation in the country" (1)
 That in the motion, omit "whatsoever" (3)
 That in the motion, omit "Calling Attention" (4)

अध्यक्ष जी, अभी हमारे पार्लियामेन्ट्री ऑफिसर्स मिनिस्टर ने प्रस्ताव की पेश करते हुए जो बलील दी है कि हम लोग यहाँ पर केवल सविधान सशोधन विधेयक को पास करने के लिये ही एकत्र हुए हैं, इसलिये दूसरी बातें यहाँ पेश नहीं हो सकती हैं, दूसरे जो महत्वपूर्ण सवाल पिछले महीने में घटित हुए हैं उन पर यहाँ बातें नहीं हो सकती

हैं। उसके बाद उन्होंने फिर एक सशोधन पेश करने की कोशिश की कि सविधान सशोधन विधेयक पास होने के बाद यदि समय मिलेगा तो अध्यक्ष जी किसी और सवाल को पेश करने की इजाजत या प्रादेश दे सकते हैं। अध्यक्ष जी जहाँ तक मेरी जानकारी है—1 नवम्बर तक इन सविधान सशोधनों पर विचार किया जाएगा और यह जान भी बिल्कुल सही है कि बहुत महत्वपूर्ण सशोधन है इस पर ज्यादा से ज्यादा बहस होनी चाहिये इसलिये इन बात से हमारा विरोध नहीं है, इस पर जरूर बहस की जाय, लेकिन बाद में केवल दो दिन रह जायेंगे—

[2 तथा 3 नवम्बर, जिनमें यदि जरूरत हुई तो प्राप इजाजत दे सकते हैं। इन सब बातों को देख कर मैं तो यह समझता हूँ कि सरकार ने सदन में प्राप तौर से जो कार्यवाही होती है उस पर बन्दिश लगा कर बहुत ही गलत काम किया है, एक तरह से सदस्यों के अधिकारों पर कुठापघान किया है। पिछले अधिवेशन में इस अधिवेशन में बीच में देश के मामले बहुत में महत्वपूर्ण सवाल पेश हुए हैं—जैसे बिहार में बाढ़ की स्थिति, सुदामबीह और दूसरी कोयला खानों में बहुत ही भयकर दुर्घटना हुई, रेलवे एक्सीडेंट हुआ, बम्बई में हवाई जहाज की दुर्घटना हुई, जिसमें सारे लोग मारे गये, एक आदमी भी नहीं बचा, उड़ीसा, बंगाल और बिहार में सूखे की स्थिति, कीमतों का बढ़ना—एक तरह सरकार कहती है कि कीमतों में कमी हो गई है, इसलिये सरकारी कर्मचारियों को पाचवीं महलाई की किरत नहीं दे सकते हैं, तथा दी हुई राशि को भी वापस लेने की घोषणा की गई, लेकिन बाद में कुछ बुद्धि आई और दी हुई किरत को वापस न लेने का फैसला किया गया, उसके बाद बोनस का सवाल है, जिनको लेकर मजदूर बहुत ज्यादा एक्टिविटी हैं। मैंने ये कुछ सवाल आपसे सामने रखे हैं जिन पर बहस होना बहुत जरूरी है, जिन प्रश्नों के बारे में हिन्दुस्तान की जनता पार्लियामेंट की राय जानना चाहती है।

केफिन आप तो सब पर बन्दित लगा रहे हैं। नसबन्दी को लेकर धरती भुजफर नगर में कोली चली, हमारी खबर है कि उसमें 40 आदमी मारे गये। यहाँ के कांग्रेस एम० एल० ए० बबराये हुए हैं कि यह क्या हो रहा है। इन सब सवालों पर किसी न किसी रूप में, काल एटेन्शन के रूप में, विशेष बहस के रूप में, हाई नोटिस क्वेश्चन के रूप में इस सदन में बहस होनी चाहिये ताकि सरकार का स्टैप उन मामलों पर क्या है, सरकार की क्या नीति है—इन सब बातों की जानकारी हमको मिल सके।

इस लिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि आखरो दो दिनों में ही नहीं, बल्कि बीच-बीच में इन सवालों पर बहस करने की इजाजत आपको और से दी जानी चाहिये। प्रति दिन आप एक-एक ध्यान आकर्षण प्रस्ताव स्वीकार करे और अन्य सवालों पर भी बहस का मौका दीजिये। बिहार में, जैसी भयकर बड़ इस साल आई है—आपको विदित है। स्वयं अपने मौल को आप देख कर आये हैं। इस लिये इन तमाम सवालों पर यहाँ बहस होनी चाहिये। मैं पार्लियामेण्टी अफेयर्स विनिस्ट से आपके द्वारा अनुरोध करूँगा कि वे हमारे सशोधनों को स्वीकार कर लें और इस मद को गम्भीरता के साथ उन तमाम महत्वपूर्ण सवालों पर विचार करने का मौका दें और साथ-साथ सविधान सशोधनों पर भी विचार किया जाय। इन महत्वपूर्ण सवालों को नजरअन्दाज करना जनतान्त्रिक प्रणाली के विपरीत है, एक प्रकार से जनता की मनादशा को नजरअन्दाज करना होगा। इसलिये, अध्यक्ष जी, मेरा अनुरोध है कि आप भी अपनी शक्ति सरकार को इस बात के लिये राजी करने में लगायें कि इन सवालों पर यहाँ बहस होनी चाहिये।

इन शब्दों के साथ मुझे विश्वास है कि सरकार मेरे इन सशोधनों को अवश्य स्वीकार करेगी।

MR. SPEAKER: Sardar Swaran Singh Sokhi.

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA (Serampore): The Motion moved by Mr. Raghu Ramaiah should be given preference I cannot understand, Sir, the procedure that you are following. We are opposing the very Motion itself. So, that should be given preference after the main motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Sardar Swaran Singh Sokhi

SHRI S M BANERJEE (Kanpur): The procedure is that when a Motion is moved, and immediately if any Member wants to oppose it, (interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, there is a lot of noise in the House

SHRI S M BANERJEE: I want only to make a submission, Sir, and get your guidance. The parliamentary procedure is that whenever a Motion is made either from this side or from the other side, if immediately any Member has approached you to oppose that Motion, he should be given a chance, and after that Motion and after his opposition comes the amendment.

SHRI DINEN BHATTACHARYYA: Samar Babu approached you, Sir, on our behalf to say that we want to oppose the Motion to be moved by Mr. Raghu Ramaiah Preference should be given to our Motion because we are opposing.

SHRI S M BANERJEE: I want to speak on the amendment of Mr. Shastri

MR. SPEAKER: Later on, I will put them all together, and I will give everybody a chance

SARDAR SWARAN SINGH SOKHI: In view of the amendment moved by Shri Raghu Ramaiah to the

Motion, I do not move any amendment.

MR SPEAKER Mr Shastri, have you moved amendments No 3 and 4? Have you moved all?

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI I have already moved.

MR SPEAKER Although it was rather late, it was a special request. Now, Mr Siddayya

SHRI S M SIDDAYYA (Chamarajaganagar) I am not moving.

MR SPEAKER Mr Samar Mukherjee approached me to say that he wanted to oppose this Motion. Although it was late, because it is an important Motion and an important subject I am allowing him to move it. I have also received a request from Mr Indrajit Gupta who wants to oppose this Motion. I allow both the hon Members

Now Mr Samar Mukherjee

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE (Howrah) Mr Speaker, Sir, I oppose the motion moved by Shri Raghu Ramaiah. No special session is required for passing the Bill on the Fortyfourth Amendment of the Constitution, suspending all non-official business. Our Party's stand with regard to these amendments, and the procedure to be followed to involve the whole people in the debate to seek their verdict has been made clear by me in the last session, when I opposed the introduction of the Bill.

We are in favour of radical changes in the Constitution to strengthen the aspects of democracy and the role and sovereignty of the people. The thrust of the present amendment, incorporated in the Bill, is in the opposite direction, to strengthen authoritarianism and one-party dictatorship. That is why the Government is interested in getting them passed in a hurry by a Parliament which

has lost its mandate and in conditions of total suppression of free expression of views while putting thousands including MPs and MLAs in jail.

We are opposed to the Bill being discussed in this Parliament and to turn this session into a special session, suspending all non-official business, when many urgent issues involving the interests of the people require attention and intervention of the House.

Constitutional amendments of far-reaching implications must always have the sanction and mandate of the people. For this an atmosphere and conditions must be created for free expression of views. Just on the eve of this session we saw the demand for a Constituent Assembly raised in joint meetings of State Congress Committees and Legislature Congress Parties in the four States of Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Punjab and Haryana. The purpose behind this move will be considered as a manoeuvre to cover up the opposition they face from various sections of the people and to further postpone the elections that are due unless steps are taken to secure the real verdict of the people.

When the issue has come to the forefront we wish to make our party's stand clear about the Constituent Assembly. It will be a real forum of the people to bring about basic changes in the Constitution if the following conditions are fulfilled:

(1) The Constituent Assembly should consist of members directly elected by the people.

(2) The system of proportional representation should be adopted for the election of members to the Constituent Assembly.

(3) A minimum period of six months should be given for free dis-

cussion on the various aspects of the Constitution.

(4) The Emergency should be lifted, the pre-censorship withdrawn, the political prisoners including M.Ps. released, the MISA, the DIR and the Press Objectionable Matter Act and other repressive legislations repealed and the Opposition should be given as much freedom to propagate their views as the ruling party has to propagate its views.

(5) An All-Parties' Committee should be formed to supervise the elections, with powers to make rules for preventing corrupt practices and misuse of official machinery.

I demand that the Constitution (Fortyfourth Amendment) Bill be withdrawn and this session be declared as a normal session.

In any case we refuse to participate in the debate on the Constitution (Amendment) Bill. We are walking out in protest.

Some Hon. Members then left the House.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore): On behalf of our Group, I cannot support this motion which has been moved by Shri Raghu Ramaiah, and I will give the reasons for it, confining myself to this motion for the present. We will deal with the Forty-fourth Amendment when it comes.

This is the first time we are being told that the current session of the Lok Sabha is in the nature of a special session. When was this decided, who decided it? Neither the Rules of Procedure, nor the Constitution, nor anything else provides for such a thing as a special session. Just because the ruling party feels that this should be treated as a special session, that cannot be used as an argument for moving a motion whose effect is to suspend all the normal

rules and practices of this Parliament. I do not like the way it has been done. Nobody was ever consulted. The Opposition was never taken into confidence. That, of course, is now unfortunately the habit, on many occasions, I find.

Secondly, you are the Speaker, who presides over the deliberations of this House, who is the custodian of our rights and privileges, but suddenly in a blanket fashion a motion is moved saying that nothing emanating from any private Member, no non-official business whatsoever of any kind, should be permitted during this session. If it is purely a question of time, then he could have consulted with us as to how to make such an adjustment. I know later on he is coming up with a proposal that we must suspend the Lunch Hour and sit on Saturday. Have we ever opposed these things whenever necessary? During the annual consideration of the Budget Grants, this House sits for one, two or three hours extra sometimes. Could it not have been adjusted? Is this any ground for coming forward and saying that no kind of non-official business will be permitted? We protest strongly against this. This betrays a very wrong attitude, I should say, towards this Parliament and towards the rights of Parliament.

For example, why should not the Question Hour be there? The Question Hour never goes beyond one hour. You are here to control the House. Has the Question Hour ever gone beyond 12 O'Clock? It never goes beyond 12 O'Clock. For that one hour if you want an adjustment, we could have suggested that we could sit one extra hour in the evening. But, no, they have decided: no questions, no other business, no calling attention.

Mr. Shastri has already mentioned, I do not want to repeat them, some of the very important and very ur-

gent matters arising out of recent events and incidents which have taken place. We are assembling here after a couple of months. The public of the country naturally expects that some of these matters will be raised here, that Government will make some statement and explain its position. Just now Mr. Shastri made reference to something very disturbing, I should say, to put it mildly, which we are told has taken place in Muzaffarnagar. One Member there jumped up and said it was all wrong. If it is all wrong, we would like to hear. Let us raise it and let somebody explain that our information is wrong, that this is what actually happened. But, no, nothing is to be permitted.

So, the Home Minister need not say anything. The Minister of Civil Aviation need not say anything about this ghastly air accident in which so many people have perished. The Minister of Mines need not say anything about what has happened in Sudamdih. While the ghost of Chasnala is still haunting us, another major accident has taken place in which several minors have lost their lives.

Are we not to discuss anything? What is the idea? What is this Parliament for? It is a question of arranging the business and adjusting time and seeing that Government's essential business also goes through. Nobody wants to obstruct. We are prepared to co-operate in the discussion fully. Why should it be a one-sided thing? Why should Private Members' business be completely shut out in this way?

I am not at all mollified by this late amendment which the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs has brought saying that, after the disposal of the Constitution (Forty-fourth Amendment) Bill, time-permitting, the

Speaker may in his discretion on the last two days allow Calling Attention, etc. This is the mercy that has been shown to you by the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs. This cavalier sort of attitude, this kind of interference with the normal practices and procedures of the House and the rights of Members should not be encouraged to go on in this way.

I still appeal to him. Of course, we cannot restore the Question Hour now because no notices of Questions were permitted or invited. Short Notice Questions can be permitted. One Calling Attention Notice taken up at your discretion on a particular day or days will not mean that heavens will fall. At least, the Members will get some relief, some satisfaction, of raising some important things. The country will also know what the Government's position is, their explanation, their statements, their replies and their correction of any wrong things being said. Do they not want such an opportunity?

We are opposed to this motion. It is not a question of deciding something here by vote. You can vote anything through. We know it very well. I am making an appeal in the spirit of cooperation. We are not here wanting to obstruct the discussion on the Constitution (Forty-fourth Amendment) Bill. But you should be also reasonable and try to meet us half-way. There should not be this kind of riding rough-shod over us just because you know you have got a big majority and, therefore, you can do anything. I do not know what the reaction of the Speaker is. I am not entitled to ask him here. Once this sort of a thing is allowed to go on, every now and then, we will be told, "This is a special session to consider urgent Government business. Therefore, all non-official business must be suspended." Where are we heading to?

We are totally opposed to this kind of attitude, the procedure by which it was done without consulting anybody, without making any serious attempt to see if some adjustment could be made, just relying on your big majority.

Finally, though this may not concern directly the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs—I am glad to see that the Minister of Information and Broadcasting is present here—incidentally, I would like to know, if you were to permit him to remove our apprehensions, whether in this session also we are going to be reported in the press. For example, when the debate takes place on the Constitution (Forty-fourth Amendment) Bill—our party supports many things in the Bill and there are many other things which we do not support—are we going to be reported in the press? Is the press going to be allowed to report what we say or not? I am glad to see, in recent days—there may be some special factors responsible for it; I do not want to make a conjecture—obviously, the Censor had instructions to permit a fairly detailed reporting of the discussions held at certain recent seminars and conferences most of which were highly critical of the Constitution Amendment Bill. The meetings which have been organised by certain political parties, certain rightist parties, certain other groups or individuals have made very trenchant criticism. Even one month ago, such things were never permitted to appear in print. Suddenly, I found to my surprise that lengthy reports were appearing in the press, giving even details of the speeches of many of these gentlemen. I do not object; it is a good thing. Let the public know what they have to say. Let the other people's views also be published. If you have permitted, if your Censor has permitted, all these things to be published, if Mr. Kamath, for example, can say something sitting in the Vithalbai

Patel House which gets him half a column or one column of publicity, I would like to know whether what I say inside this House is at least going to get an equal treatment or is going to be blacked out.

I know, Mr. Shukla will say, "There is no censorship on coverage of parliamentary proceedings. I have already told you. There are only some guidelines." But let us not beat around the bush. These guidelines or whatever they are have been acting and operating a very effective censorship of the entire press. As far as I know, of course, some sections of the press, even if censorship goes away, may not publish certain things said by certain people whom they do not like. I am not bothered about that. I am not at all upset by the fact that certain sections of the monopoly press would like to black us out. That does not worry me at all. But at least the coverage of Parliamentary proceedings on such an important Bill must be permitted freely. They already permitted things to be published in the last week or two. Certainly Parliament and Parliament Members deserve no less favourable treatment than that. Therefore, I would suggest, as this is connected with the whole way in which this Session is going to be conducted, the guidelines or whatever they are remaining still, should be removed, and as far as coverage of Parliamentary proceedings goes, the press should have absolute, unfettered freedom to publish whatever they want to.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur):
Mr. Speaker, Sir, this particular motion which has come is one where not even the Business Advisory Committee was consulted. Previously, whenever a Session was called, three or four days before the Session, the Speaker used to call a meeting of the leaders of all Parties. Your predecessor, Dr. Dhillon is here; he used to call such a meeting and also give lunch. In this particular case, Mr.

Raghu Ramaiah has not even relied on your wisdom, and has just come forward with this motion. This was simply circulated. I was expecting that the Speaker would call a meeting or the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs would call a meeting of the Business Advisory Committee. That was not done.

I support Shri Ramavatar Shastri's motion for this reason. Suppose this motion is passed by the House. Even you, as Speaker, cannot amend it because the House has passed it. I was, in fact, expecting *suo motu* statements by the Minister on the accidents that have taken place. 95 persons died in the plane crash; not a single person survived. At least on previous occasions they used to express their sympathies. Even that has not been done. About the mine disaster, nothing has been said. About the rising prices, nothing has been said. The Finance Minister was kind enough to withdraw those orders on the recovery of dearness allowance with retrospective effect. But the fifth instalment of dearness allowance has been withdrawn at a time when prices of all essential commodities are rising in the country. For these reasons I would request the House to support the amendments moved by Shri Ramavatar Shastri.

I now come to the last item which was mentioned. I can tell you in all sincerity that I saw the Congress MLAs, who came from Muzaffarnagar they were in tears over what happened in Muzaffarnagar. The U. P. Chief Minister has, no doubt, taken note of it. Muzaffarnagar is a district in U. P. where the maximum number of people have undergone sterilisation—about 26,000 or so. Even there the District Magistrate or the Deputy Commissioner—I do not know who he is—was so brutal that he started firing. Some of the bureaucrats want to sabotage the whole family planning programme; they want to give it a bad name and create hatred among the

members of the minority community. Such officers should have been immediately suspended. There should be an inquiry into what happened there. I stand for family planning; I not only support, but also practise it; I thought of family planning when nobody else thought about it. There should be a judicial probe into the whole thing. I appeal to the Prime Minister—the MLAs who have come have also appealed to the Prime Minister to send two or three Congress MPs to Muzaffarnagar. I would request you, Sir, to allow certain discussions. There should be no question of withdrawal of the fifth instalment of dearness allowance.

I would request the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs to withdraw his motion. We shall abide by your directive, Sir. We have full faith in your sense of impartiality and justice. We know, you will allow only such motions which are important.

SHRI P. K. DEO (Kalahandi): Mr. Speaker, Sir, while appreciating the emergency and the importance of the Constitution (Amendment) Bill, I feel, a motion of this type moved by the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs will virtually amount to encroachment on the rights of the Members. When the Parliament meets, all the eyes of the country are rivetted to what is happening here. The people would like to know about the development that have taken place in the inter-session period. If these are being highlighted, if the Government attention is being drawn to them, what action is being taken about them. If the session is going to be treated as special session, I feel that our purposes will not be served.

I fully appreciate the amendment moved by Shri Raghu Ramaiah but there are no many 'ifs' and 'buts' in it. 'Time permitting' and 'at your discretion' would virtually amount to nothing.

[Shri P. K. Deo]

So far as Orissa is concerned, there has been an acute drought condition. We would like to take the opportunity of this forum to have a discussion on the drought conditions prevailing in the eastern States of Orissa. I would like that at least you will kindly permit a Calling Attention Motion or a two-hour discussion regarding the acute drought conditions in the State of Orissa.

SHRI EBRAHIM SULAIMAN SAIT (Kozhikode): Mr. Speaker, Sir, at the very outset, I would like to make it very clear that as far as our group is concerned, we are not objecting to concentrating in this session mainly on discussion about the Constitution (Amendment) Bill. We do not want to have any obstruction placed on the discussions here, but what is objected to is that we do not want that non-official business should be completely suspended. Nothing is going to be lost if the session is extended for a week or two and non-official business is also discussed in this House.

Today, very serious developments are taking place in this country and very tragic events have been taking place. People have been butchered and are being murdered in this country, particularly in Uttar Pradesh. The House would like to know, what has happened at Muzaffarnagar, what has happened in Kirana and what has happened in other parts of the country. I am very happy that the Prime Minister has always said and declared that there would be no compulsion and force as far as family planning and sterilization are concerned, but the officials are going against it and they are not abiding by the directions or the declaration of the Prime Minister. This is what is actually happening. I understand that there is a conspiracy on the part of these officers and they want to create a gulf between the minorities and the Government. The Government should realise that these officers who are doing this are really

communal minded people and they should be suspended and action should be taken against them. This is clear to everybody and everybody knows about it. I would request the Prime Minister to send a team of Members of Parliament to find out the facts as to how many people have been killed ruthlessly at Muzaffarnagar and how many people have been killed at Kirana. It is reported that the police has entered the mosque and shot people. There are bullet marks as also blood stains inside the mosque. All this should be got verified. I do not want to hide the facts, I do not want to exaggerate the things, but I want the Government to realise what has been happening in this country because we want peace in this country, and the minorities to have confidence in the Government, so that we can support this Government and have a better atmosphere in India.

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM (Srinagar): Mr. Speaker, Sir, for once, I find myself in complete agreement with the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs. Much has been said about the advisability of calling it a special session. I am grateful to the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and the Prime Minister that they have called it a special session. This is a special session, whether the rules say so or do not say so. This is a special occasion, unprecedented in the annals of history of this country. Therefore, let us not get side-tracked in other issues. Question Hour is a very important part of the Parliamentary business; we have had Question Hour for the last five and a half years. I think, this occasion does demand special concentration, a particular frame of mind, so that the rest of the country also knows that this is a very special occasion. We are amending the Constitution; some people call it 'ending the Constitution', but I will not enter in that debate at this juncture. I want to make it abundantly clear that I do not support the Constitution Amend-

ment Bill. But I do grant the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs the right to call this session a special session because so many fundamental basic amendments in the Constitution warranted the calling of a special session. Nothing will be lost if we devote all these five days for all those who support it and for those who oppose it in discussion so that the entire country and the world knows that this is a special occasion.

By introducing Question Hour, by introducing Calling Attention, what are we going to achieve except to satisfy our ego that we have discharged our parliamentary duties? To-day we have been called for a specific purpose. Please do not dilute the effect. I am saying from a different point of view also. The Members on the opposite side understand me. It seems that the Members on this side are trying to dilute the effect. I sense it may not be a deliberate conspiracy. It may be an unwitting partnership, so that we can say that it was a very normal situation—the House met there was Question Hour there was Calling Attention Motion, debate on family planning including debate on the 44th Amendment of the Constitution. It is not so. Let us have a separate session for discussing the effects and after effects of the family planning. Do not mix up the issues. Let us concentrate on the 44th Amendment of the Constitution. Honourable Minister, surprisingly you are getting support from a very unexpected quarter. I want you to withdraw the latter amendment. Only the 44th Amendment of the Constitution may be discussed. This is what everybody is looking forward to. That is what the whole country is concentrating upon—the Government, the Congressmen, the Opposition, including myself. I, therefore, support your motion. I oppose everything that has been said on this side.

MR SPEAKER, We have a number of Members who want to participate.

S/Shri Manoharan and Dhote may take two minutes each.

SHRI K MANOHARAN (Madras North) I am not going to oppose the motion moved by Shri Raghu Ramaiah for the simple reason that after having heard

SHRI S A SHAMIM Having heard Shri Shamim

SHRI K MANOHARAN I have heard Shri Shamim....

After having heard the remarks made by certain Members, particularly the convincing arguments given by my friend like Shri Indrajit Gupta barring Shri Shamim, I am sure Shri Raghu Ramaiah will withdraw this motion. That is why I am opposing it. So far as the 44th Amendment of the Constitution is concerned, we will offer our comments later on but I may now submit that in order to preserve democracy and the democratic spirit of this Parliament and the country Shri Raghu Ramaiah will come forward to withdraw this motion. I am sure he will do it in consultation with the Prime Minister who is the custodian of the country's democratic spirit and tradition. I hope, Mr Speaker you can also exercise your influence to see that undemocratic attitudes are not adopted in this House.

श्री कान्हुबल बोडे (नागपुर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, 44 वें संविधान संशोधन विधेयक का मैं केवल समर्थन ही नहीं करता, बल्कि उस का स्वागत भी करता हूँ। इस संशोधन के ऊपर चर्चा करने के लिये जो एक खास अधिवेशन बुलाया गया है इस अधिवेशन में केवल इस संशोधन विधेयक पर ही चर्चा होनी चाहिये, यह जो भूमिका है इस का मैं पार्टी की समर्थन करता हूँ।

[श्री जाब्तुस बोडे]

अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह संविधान का जो 44 वां संशोधन है। मेरे बयान से यह केवल संशोधन नहीं है और न ही ये केवल तबदीलियाँ हैं, बल्कि संविधान के संशोधन के नाम से इस हाउस को एक नया संविधान बनाना है। इस 44वें संशोधन को मैं केवल संशोधन नहीं समझता हूँ, इसमें मेजर तबदीलियाँ भी जा रही हैं जैसे कि इसके टाइटल में ही हम फर्क करते जा रहे हैं। यह एक नया संशोधन नहीं, बल्कि एक नया संविधान है। इस देश का जो संविधान बना हुआ है, उसे संविधान सभा ने बनाया है। संविधान में संशोधन करना हम सारे लोग समझ सकते हैं, लेकिन यह केवल संविधान का संशोधन नहीं, एक नया संविधान है। इस-लिये मेरी बरब्यास्त यह है कि हमारे साथी शास्त्री जी ने मोशन रखा है, संकल्प रखा है उस संकल्प को स्वीकार करें और जो सारे नैर-सरकारी कारोबार है, काम हैं, उन पर ही इस प्राविशेन में विचार हो और जिस संविधान को संविधान सभा ने बनाया है और अब हम जो नया संविधान बनाने जा रहे हैं, इस पर विचार करने के लिये एक नई संविधान सभा हम बनायें।

अब हम 44वें संशोधन के रूप में जो प्रमोवमेंट पेश कर रहे हैं, केवल उसी को नहीं, बल्कि उस संविधान सभा में जो हमारा अब कांस्टीट्यूशन है, जो व्स्टेड इन्ट्रेस्ट के लोगों को प्रोटेक्ट करता है, जो कांस्टीट्यूशन क्विंटिफिस्ट तोसावटी को प्रोटेक्ट करता है, उसकी पहली सस्पेंड करें और फिर नई संविधान सभा में एक नया गरिमा देने वाला एक प्रच्छा कांस्टीट्यूशन जो सारे लोगों को लाभ करे, वह बनायें।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : प्रमोवमेंट पर बोले।

[श्री जाब्तुस बोडे : मैं शास्त्री जी के प्रमोवमेंट पर ही बोल रहा हूँ। मेरी बरब्यास्त यह है कि शास्त्री जी का जो संकल्प है, उसे

स्वीकार करें और यह सारा प्राविशेन केवल नैर-सरकारी कारोबार के लिये रखें और एक नई संविधान सभा का निर्माण कर के उसमें इस संशोधन पर विचार कर।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : सपसेना जी, आप इस पर बोलना चाहते हैं या आपका कुछ और है ?

श्री० एल० एल० सक्तावा (महाराज-गंज) : मैं केवल एक ही बात कहना चाहता हूँ। मैं इस मोशन के बारे में यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे जिले में कई जगह पर लोग गो-नी से मारे गये हैं, उस पर भी विचार होना चाहिये।

मैं चाहता था कि इस सेशन के दो या तीन दिन बाद या शुरू में ही इस तरह की बातों पर विचार होना। प्रच्छा होता नि संशोधन होता और स्पेशल सेशन की बात ब होती। रूस में ऐसी बात नहीं है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि बल्स के मुताबिक काम किया जाये और इसमें सब चीजों को लागू किया जाये।

THE MINISTER OF WORKS AND HOUSING AND PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI K RAGHU RAMAIAH) I am extremely grateful to Mr. Shammur for his very generous support and if I may say so, deserved support. As for Mr. Samar Mukherjee unfortunately he is not here—all I can say is that his speech is full of wrong statements and inuendoes. He has made a political use of it instead of confining himself to the motion before the House. He has given a policy statement on the substantive points concerning the Constitution Amendment Bill itself, taking advantage of this opportunity which is only of a procedural nature. And regarding Mr. Indrajit Gupta, the grammar of his charge is that I have not assaulted him.

Sir, of all people in the world, I am not a man to be accused of such a thing. I always consult, even unnecessarily sometimes, all the leaders of the House. Everybody knows about it. In fact, consultation requires the presence of two parties. When the leaders of the Opposition are not in Delhi, whom I have to consult? Government have to take a decision. I cannot leave out one party or consult only one party. Incidentally, if I may say so, I did mention to Shri Indrajit Gupta yesterday morning because it was only yesterday that we met and I did not get the impression that he was so vehemently opposed to this. I am sorry to say this, if I mistake not, I did not get that impression. I got the impression that he might have wanted me to act otherwise. I did not get the impression that he was going to oppose it on the floor of the House. However, I shall leave it there.

Now, Sir, I would like to give one assurance that the intention is not to stifle the discussion on an important matter. As a matter of fact, if one reads my motion carefully, it does not prevent any Minister from laying any statement on the table of the House. I am happy to say that some Ministers are ready with their statements and, in due course, they will place them on the table of the House. The only point is, as Mr. Shamim put it, that if you want to give that importance to this subject, we should not divert attention to other matters however important they are? They are not more important than the constitutional amendments. As I have explained earlier and I have a proposal which will enable these matters to be discussed during the course of two days and, if necessary, I am prepared to come before the House with a request that the House may sit one day more to discuss any important matters.

As regards the general proposition that the Question Hour should not be

suspended, may I remind the hon. Member, Shri Indrajit Gupta, that on many occasions, the Opposition themselves had come forward with their motions to suspend the Question Hour for very minor and insignificant purposes?

Some Members of the Opposition did come forward and it is on record (*Interruptions*)—not your party, but some other party—and you know that. Therefore, there is nothing fundamentally wrong in asking the House on a very special occasion like this to suspend the Question Hour and postpone these things by five, six or seven days. That is all. I am only asking you to please have patience for seven days, till the time we pass this Bill and then you can ask me whatever you like and the Speaker may give permission to whatever you like and I shall be guided by the Chair. Therefore, I do not think that any apprehension is justified in this context and I can assure you, as in the past, that in future, wherever it is possible and wherever it is necessary, I shall consult you all.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: I want to say one thing. I do not think it is fair of the Minister in this House to refer to certain impressions he got at a private meeting. I also got some impression from you. Shall I say that here? This is not a matter of Parliamentary debate. Please do not make it personal.

SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH: Kindly listen to me. Because you said that I did not consult you earlier, I had to say here that I mentioned to you earlier..

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: I said that the Opposition should have been consulted on how to adjust their time-table and programme. Did you do that?

SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH: As I said, it was not possible because the

[Shri K. Raghu-Ramaiah]

Opposition Leaders were not available at that time when I moved the Motion. That was all my point. (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: Now, I think, the Minister was a little more accommodative. In view of this, do you want to press your amendments? He said that if necessary, the House might be extended by a day or so and his intention is that no important subject which needs to be mentioned and then debated will be left out.

So, I shall now put amendments Nos. 1, 3 and 4 moved by Shri Ramavatar Shastri to the vote of the House.

Amendment Nos 1, 3 and 4 were put and negatived.

12 hrs.

MR. SPEAKER. The question is:

"That in the motion,—
add at the end—

"Provided that after the disposal of the Constitution Amendment Bill, time permitting, the Speaker may in his discretion allow Calling Attention and Short Duration Discussions"

The motion was adopted.

MR. SPEAKER: I will now put the motion of Shri K. Raghu Ramaiah, as amended, to the vote of the House. The question is:

"This House resolves, that the current session of Lok Sabha being in the nature of a special session to consider the Constitution (Forty-fourth Amendment) Bill, 1976 and

certain unavoidable and essential Government business, only Government business be transacted during the session and no other business whatsoever including Questions, Calling Attention and any other business to be initiated by a private Member be brought before or transacted in the House during the session and all relevant rules on the subject in the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha do hereby stand suspended to that extent.

Provided that after the disposal of the Constitution Amendment Bill, time permitting, the Speaker may in his discretion allow Calling Attention and Short Duration Discussions."

The motion was adopted.

SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH: Sir, I want to make a suggestion. It is very necessary that the discussion on the Bill is concluded latest by the evening of 1st November because it has to go to the Rajya Sabha which is meeting on the 3rd. Keeping that time-schedule in view we may allot seven days—three days for the general discussion and four days for clause-by-clause consideration and the third-reading. In order to conclude it on the 1st November, I submit that we may sit on Saturday the 30th and I request the hon'ble Members to forgo the lunch-break from today as this will enable more Members to participate in the discussion.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it accepted by the House?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Now, we take up Forty-fourth Constitution Amendment Bill.