

12.50 hrs.

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE: APPROVAL OF PROCLAMATION OF EMERGENCY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Jagjivan Ram.

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA (Patan): Time has not been decided.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Six hours.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore): Why was it not settled in the meeting of the Business Advisory Committee?

MR. CHAIRMAN: There was no time. If you want, it will be called. We will extend the time if necessary.

कृषि एवं सिंचाई मंत्री (श्री जगजीवन राम) : मभापति महोदय, मैं जो प्रस्ताव मदन के सामने रख रहा है वह इस प्रकार है :

“यह मभा संविधान के अनुच्छेद 352 के खण्ड (1) के अधीन राष्ट्रपति द्वारा 25 जून, 1975 को जारी की गई आपात स्थिति की उद्घोषणा का और जम्मू और काश्मीर राज्य में यथाप्रवृत्त, संविधान के अनुच्छेद 352 के खंड (4) के उपखंड (ख) द्वारा प्रदत्त शक्तियों का प्रयोग करते हुए, उक्त उद्घोषणा को जम्मू और काश्मीर राज्य में लागू करने हेतु जारी किए गए राष्ट्रपति के दिनांक 29 जून, 1975 के आदेश का अनुमोदन करती है।”

मभापति महोदय, हम देश की एक गंभीर स्थिति में इस सदन में इकट्ठे हुए हैं— गंभीर और नाजुक स्थिति में। हमारे देश ने अपने देश के शासन के संभालने के लिए एक लिखित संविधान दिया है। संविधान के निर्माताओं ने उस वक्त कल्पना की थी कि देश में असाधारण स्थिति आ सकती है वह असाधारण स्थिति बाहरी कारणों से भी हो सकती है और आंतरिक कारणों से

भी हो सकती है और जब ऐसी असाधारण स्थिति पैदा हो जाय तो देश को संभालने के लिए, देश में गड़बड़ी अधिक दूर तक न बढ़ जाय, उस को संभालने के लिए क्या कदम उठाना होगा, उस का प्रबन्ध भी संविधान में किया हुआ है। अभी जो आपात स्थिति की घोषणा की गई वह संविधान में दी हुई शक्तियों के द्वारा ही की गई है।

आपात स्थिति कोई एक दिन में पैदा हो गई ऐसा नहीं माना जा सकता। इस को सम्पूर्ण रूप से समझने के लिए हम को पिछले सात आठ वर्षों की भारत की स्थिति को देखना पड़ेगा। 1967 का निर्वाचन हमारे लोक तंत्र में एक नया मोड़ बहुत सी विधान सभाओं में किसी एक राजनैतिक दल का निस्संदिग्ध बहुमत नहीं हुआ था और मिली जुली सरकारें कायम की गई थीं तो देश को उस का कैसा अनुभव हुआ वह आज इतिहास का अंश बन चुका है। विस्तार के साथ मैं उस पर प्रकाश डालना आवश्यक नहीं समझता। लेकिन इतना तो सर्वमान्य है कि उस का असर यह हुआ था कि विधान सभाओं में और कुछ हद तक लोक सभा में भी भद्रता के व्यवहार को ठेस पहुंची। बाहर भी गड़बड़ी पैदा हुई। किसी भी देश की सरकार प्रतिष्ठा के ऊपर आधारित होती है। शक्ति भी सरकार के पास होती है। लेकिन हर मामले में शक्ति का प्रयोग कर के देश को नहीं चलाया जाता है, प्रतिष्ठा के आधार पर ही चलाया जाता है। हमारे देश में पांच लाख गांव हैं। पांच लाख गांवों में शांति और सुव्यवस्था रखने के लिए सब गांवों में पुलिस या फौज की उपस्थिति बनायी जा सके, ऐसा संभव नहीं है। केवल सरकार की प्रतिष्ठा के ऊपर ही सब जगह शांति का कायम रखा जा सकता है।

1967 से ही कुछ राजनैतिक दलों के द्वारा यह प्रयत्न चलता रहा है कि सरकार की प्रतिष्ठा को खत्म किया जाय, सरकार

[श्री जगज्जबन राम]

की प्रतिष्ठा को धक्का पहुँचाया जाय जिस में देश के अन्दर स्थिति ऐसी पैदा हो सके कि लोकतांत्रिक तंत्र के अलावा दूसरे तंत्रों के द्वारा भी शासन में परिवर्तन लाया जा सके। 1969 हमारे देश की राजनीति में एक महान मोड़ का वर्ष था। यद्यपि उस का सम्बन्ध सिर्फ कांग्रेस से ही था लेकिन मैं ऐसा मानता हूँ और देश के समझदार लोग भी ऐसा मानते हैं कि कांग्रेस में जो कुछ होता है उस का असर देश की सम्पूर्ण राजनीति पर पड़ता है, देश की अर्थ नीति पर पड़ता है और उस का असर सारे देश के समाज पर पड़ता है। कांग्रेस को यह गरिमा प्राप्त थी कि उस ने महात्मा गांधी और जवाहर लाल नेहरू के नेतृत्व में देश की स्वतन्त्रता के लिए संघर्ष कर के स्वतन्त्रता प्राप्त की। उस वक्त कांग्रेस एक राष्ट्रीय मंच था। देश के सभी लोग उस में सम्मिलित हो कर के एक महान लक्ष्य के लिए प्रयत्न कर रहे थे और वह लक्ष्य भारत माता की स्वाधीनता। हम उस में सफल हुए। लेकिन उस वक्त कांग्रेस एक राजनैतिक दल नहीं थी जिस अर्थ में राजनैतिक दल या पोलिटिकल पार्टी को समझा जाता है। उस में भिन्न भिन्न स्वार्थ वाले लोग शामिल थे और भिन्न भिन्न प्रवृत्ति और मनोवृत्ति वाले लोग शामिल थे। इसलिए जब कभी हम किसी ठोस कार्य क्रम को हाथ में लेते थे तो बाहर जितना विरोध होता था वह तो था ही, अन्तर्विरोध भी था और 1969 में प्रयत्न हुआ कि इस अन्तर्विरोध का अन्त किया जाय। हमारे बड़े बड़े नेता जिन का स्वतन्त्रता के संग्राम में सराहनीय अंशदान था लेकिन जिन की मनोवृत्ति उतनी उदार नहीं थी कि प्रगतिशील आर्थिक और सामाजिक कार्यक्रमों को उदारतापूर्वक अपना सकें, वे अलग हुए। ऐसा लगा कि कांग्रेस के जितने महारथी नेता थे वे एक तरफ हो गए और कुछ वों एक आदमी दूसरी तरफ बच गए। उस वक्त बहुत दफे देशी और विदेशी पत्रकारों

द्वारा यह प्रश्न किया जाता था कि कांग्रेस के जितने बड़े नेता और महारथी थे वे तो एक तरफ गये, इंदिरा गांधी की तरफ कौन है— तुम और फखरुद्दीन, और कौन है। तो मैंने जवाब दिया था कि नेता एक तरफ गए लेकिन हिन्दुस्तान की जनता हमारे साथ है। इस में किसी को कोई संदेह हो तो 1971 का जो लोक सभा का निर्वाचन हुआ उस के नतीजे को देख कर के अपने मन को शांत कर सकता है। वह इसलिए हुआ कि कांग्रेस ने उदार कार्यक्रमों को अपनाया। वे कार्यक्रम जिन से देश के सर्वहारा समुदाय को भी उन्नत होने का अवसर मिल सके, वे कार्यक्रम जिन से देश में प्रचलित आर्थिक विषमता को कम किया जा सकता हो, वे कार्यक्रम जिनके द्वारा निहित स्वार्थ की शक्तियों को जो राजनीति में छाने का प्रयत्न कर रही थीं, दूर किया जा सके। और यह मानी हुई बात है कि यह कार्यक्रम ले कर जब कांग्रेस चली तो वे राजनैतिक दल और निहित स्वार्थ जिन को यह प्रोग्राम पसंद नहीं थे उनमें घबराहट पैदा हुई। और घबराहट पैदा होने के बाद वे प्रयत्न करते कि कांग्रेस की शक्ति छीन ली जाये। लेकिन वे जानते थे कि भारत की जनता का प्रेम और विश्वास जितना कांग्रेस को प्राप्त है उतना भारत के किसी अन्य राजनीतिक दल को प्राप्त नहीं है। इसलिए उन्होंने अनुभव किया कि जनता के समर्थन, विश्वास और प्रेम के भरोसे कांग्रेस को अपदस्थ करना असम्भव बात है। इसीलिए उन्होंने अलोकतंत्रीय प्रणाली को अपनाने का प्रयत्न किया। इतिहास में बहुत दूर जाने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। 1971 में भी चार दलों को संगठित करके एक चौकड़ी कायम की गई थी कांग्रेस को परास्त करने के लिए, और उस चौकड़ी का क्या नतीजा निकला था, वह इतिहास का अंश बन चुका है। विस्तार के साथ उस पर जाने की आवश्यकता नहीं है। 1972 के चुनावों में भी देश ने देखा और दुनिया

के लोगों ने देखा आश्चर्य के साथ, विस्मय के साथ और प्रसन्नता के साथ, कि भारत में लोगों की कठिनाइयाँ हैं, परेशानियाँ हैं, अभाव और अभियोग हैं, लेकिन उस के बावजूद भी भारत की जनता यह मानती है कि उम की मुक्ति का कोई मार्ग है, तो कांग्रेस के द्वारा है, किमी और राजनीतिक संस्था के द्वारा नहीं है।

13 hrs.

श्री के० एस० चावड़ा : गुजरात के चुनावों में क्या हुआ, वह आप जानते हैं ?

श्री जगजीवन राम : आप जरा शान्ति से रहें। मैं गुजरात का भी विश्लेषण आप के सामने पेश करूँगा।

उसके बाद देश के राजनीतिक दलों ने कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी आफ इंडिया के प्रतिरिक्त, ऐसा अनुभव किया कि लोकतांत्रिक तरीके से कांग्रेस को अपदस्त करना सम्भव नहीं होगा। गुजरात का इतिहास आप देखें। क्या किया गया था, किस तरह का व्यवहार शुरू हुआ, किस तरह विद्यार्थियों के अध्ययन का अन्त हुआ किस तरह से लूट और आर्सन (arson) की घटनायें घटी। उन से किसी भी समझदार नागरिक का सिर लज्जा में झुक जायेगा। यही गुजरात में हुआ था। इसी का विश्लेषण मैं करना चाहता था।

हमारे संविधान ने यह प्रबन्ध नहीं किया है कि जनता एक दफा विधान सभा या लोक सभा के लिए किसी को अपना प्रतिनिधि निर्वाचित कर दे, और निर्वाचकों को ऐसा अनुभव हो कि हमारा प्रतिनिधि सही तरीके से काम नहीं कर रहा है तो उस के परिवार का घेराव करो। हमारी संविधान ने यह स्वीकृति नहीं दी है कि उस का सड़क पर निकलना दूबर कर दो। हमारे संविधान ने इस बात की भी स्वीकृति नहीं दी है कि उन

प्रतिनिधियों के समर्थकों के घर जलाने और लूटने का काम करो। यही विश्लेषण है गुजरात का, वही इतिहास है गुजरात का।

उसके बाद के इतिहास में मैं जाना नहीं चाहता। वह तो मालूम है—जितना मुझे मालूम है, उस से ज्यादा श्री चावड़ा को मालूम है। उम के बाद मोरारजी भाई नेना हैं, गांधी जी के आदर्शों में विश्वास रखने का दावा करते हैं। उन्होंने आमरण उपवास का निष्ठा लिया, इस लिए कि गुजरात में विधान सभा को भंग किया जाये। पता नहीं, इसके लिए संविधान का कौन सा अनुच्छेद है। श्री चावड़ा अन्वेषण करेंगे और अगर उन्हें बोलने का मौका मिला, तो उस अनुच्छेद का उल्लेख जरूर करेंगे।

प्रधान मंत्री द्रवित हो गईं। एक स्वतन्त्रता-सेनानी की जान चली जाये और इतिहास में उसे अमर बना दिया जाये, यह कुछ उचित बात नहीं है। इसी लिए हम ने उन्हें मरने से रोका। सदन को मालूम है कि एक असंवैधानिक तरीके से गुजरात की विधान सभा को भंग कराया गया।

दूसरी तरफ बिहार में कुछ आन्दोलन चल रहा था। जय प्रकाश जी जिन्होंने न मालूम कितनी दफा घोषणा की थी कि मैं सक्रिय राजनीतिक में अलग रहूँगा लेकिन जितनी घोषणा करूँगे उतना ही सक्रिय राजनीति के सक्रिय भाते जाते थे। उन्होंने देखा कि विरोधी राजनीतिक दलों के पास कोई सक्षम नेतृत्व नहीं है और इसलिए वे अपनी अंधेरी कोठरी से बाहर निकले। गुजरात के विद्यार्थियों ने उनका मार्गदर्शन किया। यह मैं नहीं कहता, स्वयं उन्होंने अपने अखबार "एवरीमैन" में कबूल किया है कि अभी तक मैं अंधेरे में चक्कर लगा रहा था, मुझे प्रकाश की किरण नहीं नजर आ रही

[श्री जगजीवन राम]

थी कि किधर से निकलूँ लेकिन गुजरात के विद्यार्थियों ने कुछ प्रकाश उनको दिया। उनके आन्दोलन में उमने प्रकाश-स्नम्भ का काम किया और फिर वे इस नतीजे पर पहुंचे कि विद्यार्थियों का उपयोग करके कांग्रेस को अपदस्थ किया जा सकता है। बिहार में आन्दोलन चला। 18 मार्च, 1974 की घटना हिमो भी समझदार राजनीतिज्ञ को सोचने के लिए मजबूर कर सकती है। बेराव और विधान सभा के सदस्यों को लाञ्छित, अपमानित करने की जिनकी घटनायें घटी वह लोकतन्त्र के लिए एक ठेस पहुंचाने वाली चीज है। जय प्रकाश जी ने उसका नेतृत्व किया। उसके बाद और राजनीतिक दलों को एक अवसर मिला, उनको एक व्यक्तित्व वाला नेता मिल गया। जय प्रकाश जी को इसमें सहूलियत हुई कि प्रयत्न किए बिना भिन्न-भिन्न राजनीतिक दल उनके अनुयाई बन गए। फिर बिहार में मांग क्या हुई कि विधान सभा की भंग करो। विधान सभा को भंग कराने में तो उनका सफलता नहीं मिली लेकिन जिनने राजनीतिक दलों ने उनका नेतृत्व स्वीकार किया था उन दलों को खण्डित करने में उनको सफलता जरूर मिल गई। जनसभ के दो टुकड़े हो गए। जो निर्वाचन सदस्य और वे वे क्यों इस्तीफा देने? उन्हें चुनने वाले कोई और थे और उनसे इस्तीफा मांगने वाले कोई और थे। उन्होंने तरफ़ प्रारंभ संविधान—दोनों के आधार पर कहा कि जब तक हमारा निर्वाचक कहता है कि तुम में हमारा विश्वास है तब तक हमरा कान रहने वाला है कि तुम इस्तीफा दो। और हमारे यहां तो संविधान में ऐसा कोई प्रबन्ध नहीं है कि निर्वाचक यह तर्क कि पांच वर्ष पूरे हुए बिना वापिस चले आओ। हा, निर्वाचक को यह अवसर जरूर है जैसा मैंने पहले कहा—प्रारंभ उस का निर्वाचित प्रतिनिधि उसके मन के मुताबिक काम नहीं करता

है या जिस प्रोग्राम और कार्यक्रम या जिस नीति को उन के सामने रख कर उम में बोट प्राप्त किया था, उस के अनुसार काम नहीं करता है तो कल जब वह फिर चुनाव में खड़ा हो तो उस को बिलकुल न चुनने का जनता को पूरा अधिकार है। इस के अतिरिक्त हमारे संविधान में और कोई रास्ता नहीं अपनाया गया है। लेकिन बिहार में जो कुछ हुआ वह उस के विपरीत था। क्यों? जय प्रकाश नारायण भी समझ गये थे कि जनता का प्रेम और विश्वास जितना कांग्रेस को प्राप्त है, उस को डिगाना उन के लिए सम्भव नहीं हो सकेगा। इसी लिए बिहार में उन को सफलता नहीं मिली। वहां जो कुछ हुआ उमके आंकड़े दे कर मैं सदन का अधिक समय नहीं लगाना चाहता हूँ, उस के लिए एक पुस्तिका वितरित होगी, उसमें आंकड़े दिये हुए हैं और वे आंकड़े पहले भी बहुत दफा निकल चुके हैं, कितने स्थानों पर नूटा गया, कितने स्थानों पर आग लगने की घटनाये हुई, कितने एम० एल० एज को अपमानित किया गया, लाञ्छित किया गया और किस तरह से यह प्रयत्न किया गया कि अलोकतान्त्रिक तरीको से सरकार को मजबूर कर दिया जाय कि वह अपने गामन को छोड़े।

हमारी लोकतान्त्रिक परम्परा में संविधान में यह उद्देश्य है कि जनता का विश्वास प्राप्त कर के, विधान सभा या लोक सभा में जिन राजनीति दल का बहुमत हो जाय, उस का शासन, मंत्री-मंडल कायम हो सकता है, लेकिन आधार उम का जनता ही है। पार्लियामेंट सुप्रीम है, लेकिन पार्लियामेंट में भी सुप्रीम कोई संस्था है तो भारत की जनता है, भारत के नागरिक हैं, क्योंकि वे ही हम को बदल सकते हैं, हम उन को नहीं बदल सकते हैं। तो इन घटनाओं में अलोकतान्त्रिक तरीकों से काम करने का प्रयत्न चलता रहा।

यह भी कहा गया कि "पावर कम्ज फ्राम दि बरल आफ दि गन। (Power comes from the barrel of the gun) अर्थात् बन्दूक की गोली से सता हथियार जा सकती है।" लेकिन हमारा संविधान अपने किसी भी अनुच्छेद में ऐसा नहीं कहता है। वह यही कहता है—पावर कम्ज फ्राम दि बैलेट।

(Power comes from the ballot)

सत्ता मतदान पर आधारित है। एक तरह से हमारे संविधान के उद्देश्यों को पलटने का प्रयास किया गया। उत्तर प्रदेश में जो घटनाएँ हुईं, वहाँ के मण्डल सभासदों में जो 'विद्रोह' की भावना पैदा की गई, बार-बार पुलिस और मना के लोगों को भड़काने का जो प्रयत्न होता रहा, बार-बार कहा जाता रहा कि अनुशासन को नहीं मानो, आज्ञा और आदेश को नहीं मानो—यह किस तरह की बात का निदेश देती है, क्या इस में किसी भी समझदार व्यक्ति का शक रखने की गुंजाइश है? यह इस बात का निदेश करती है कि जो काम लोकतान्त्रिक तरीके से नहीं हो सकता है, उस को अनुशासन से करने की बात फनाकर किया जा सकता है। कोई भी सरकार जब तरह के कामों को कब तक बरदाश्त कर सकती है?

लेकिन हमारी प्रधान मन्त्री में एक 'टाइमिनास' (timeliness) का खूब है। कौन काम किस समय पर होना चाहिये, उस की विनम्र बुद्धि उनके अन्दर है। मैं एक उदाहरण दूँ—बंगला देश का प्राण अण्डा, पाकिस्तान ने हम को मजबूर किया युद्ध करने के लिये, लडाई भी हुई, बंगला देश से मजबूर हो कर एक करोड़ नागरिक शरणार्थी हमारे देश में आये और इस सदन ने एक मन, एक प्राण हो कर उनकी सहायता करने का निश्चय किया था। वह हमारे देश का एक स्वर्णिम अध्याय है। उस वक्त सदन को स्मरण होगा—सभी विरोधी दलों ने बार-बार यह मांग

की कि बंगला देश को मान्यता दे दी जाये। प्रधान मन्त्री ने कहा—समय पर मान्यता दी जायगी और जब समय आया तो मान्यता दे दी गई और उस समय विरोधी दलों ने स्वीकार किया कि यही उचित समय था उस को मान्यता देने का। इसमें शक नहीं बहुत से देशों में जहाँ लोकतन्त्र चल रहा है, प्रौढ़ बन चुका है, उन को आश्चर्य ही रहा था कि भारत में कैसे इतनी स्वतन्त्रता लोगों को दी गई है जो लोकतन्त्र की जड़ों को ही खोखला कर रही है। लेकिन श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी की विलक्षण बुद्धि ने जब समय आया तो दुनिया को दिखा दिया कि किस तरह से इस को काबू में रखा जा सकता है।

रेलवे में हड़ताल हुई, उस हड़ताल के पीछे बड़े बड़े मसूबे थे। मसूबे ये थे कि अगर रेलवे में हड़ताल सफल हो गई तो गवर्नमेन्ट को पैगलाइज कर दो, सरकार को पगु बना दो और जब सरकार पगु बन जायगी तो सरकार का हार माननी पड़ेगी। रेलवे की हड़ताल सफल हो जाय तो कोयले का आना-जाना बन्द हो जायेगा, इन्धन के कारखाने बन्द हो जायेंगे। जिन इलाकों में अन्न का अभाव है, वहाँ अन्न पहुँचना सम्भव न हो सकेगा। ऐसी परिस्थिति पैदा कर दो, जिस में सरकार के प्रवि, कांग्रेस के प्रति जनता का जो प्रेम और विश्वास है—दोनों दूढ़ जाय। लेकिन यह साबित हुआ कि रेलवे कर्मचारी देशभक्त हैं और लोकतन्त्र को चाहते हैं। सभी प्रयत्नों के बावजूद भी रेलवे की हड़ताल सफल नहीं हुई। हड़ताल करने वालों के जो मसूबे थे, वे ज्यादा-कमियाँ रह गये। जैसा मैंने पहले कहा है—एक के बाद एक घटनाएँ ऐसी घटती गइं जिन से साबित होता गया कि जो प्रयत्न चल रहे हैं वे लोकतान्त्रिक परम्परा को खत्म करने के लिये हैं। कहा यह जाता था कि हम लोकतन्त्र को मजबूत बनाना चाहते हैं और इस लिये सम्पूर्ण क्रांति की बात कर रहे हैं। लेकिन भारतीय इतिहास का जिस को भी ज्ञान

[श्री जगजीवन राम]

होगा, उस को मालूम होना चाहिये कि भारत में परिवर्तन हुआ करते हैं, क्रान्तियां नहीं हुआ करती हैं। बड़े बड़े परिवर्तन हुए हैं। लेकिन वे जब क्रान्ति की बात करते थे तो उन के दिमाग में वही बात थी—बैरल आफ दि गन वाली बात थी। उस क्रान्ति के पीछे भारतीय संस्कृति की पृष्ठभूमि की कल्पना नहीं थी और इसीलिये यह आवश्यक हो गया था कि इस प्रवृत्ति को रोका जाय। सभी विरोधी या विपक्षी राजनीतिक दलों का गठबन्धन हुआ। मैं जब "सभी" कहता हूँ तो उस में से कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी (सी०पी० आई०) को अलग कर के समझ लिया करें।

श्री जगन्नाथराव जोशी : लेकिन स्ट्राइक में हमारे साथ थे।

श्री जगजीवन राम : मैं कह रहा था—उन की एक एकजीजूटिव कमेटी बनी, एक प्रोग्राम कमेटी भी बनाई गई कि कांग्रेस सरकार को विफल करने के लिये कौन से कार्यक्रम बनाये जायें। 21 जून से लेकर 25 जून तक दिल्ली में उन की बैठकें हुई। चैयरमैन साहब, जो उन के प्रोग्राम थे, उन से साफ़ जाहिर होता था, स्पष्ट हो गया था कि उन की मंशा लोकतान्त्रिक तरीकों से नहीं, बल्कि अलोकतान्त्रिक तरीकों से सरकार को मजबूर कर के देश में ऐसी स्थिति पैदा करना है जिस में गड़बड़ी पैदा हो जाय। सदन को यह बताने की आवश्यकता नहीं है कि देश में जब अज्ञानि होती है, जब गड़बड़ी पैदा होती है तो सारे देश का जो लोगर-मिडिल-क्लास है, उसी को सब से ज्यादा नुकसान उठाना पड़ता है। जो देश का सर्वहारा है उसी को सब से अधिक परेशानी होती है। जो आज-कमाओ-आज-ही खाओ—इस श्रेणी के लोग हैं उन को ही सब से ज्यादा परेशान होना पड़ता है। इस लिये कांग्रेस, जिस का आधार भारत की जनता रही है, सर्वहारा समुदाय रहा है, निहित-स्वार्थी नहीं रहे हैं, वह इस को कब तक बर्दाश्त कर सकती थी

कि उन को परेशान करने वाले भारत में, स्वतन्त्रता से घूमते रहें। व्यक्तिगत स्वतन्त्रता हमारे संविधान की एक धनमोल धरोहर है लेकिन इस स्वतन्त्रता को यदि उच्छृंखलता समझ लिया जाय, तो मैं मानता हूँ कि नागरिकों को उच्छृंखल होने से रोकना सरकार का एक उचित कदम है। इस सदन को यह बताने की आवश्यकता नहीं है कि किसी भी सुसंगठित समाज में समाज की प्रत्येक इकाई के ऊपर कुछ नियन्त्रण डालने की आवश्यकता होती है। वह नियन्त्रण उस इकाई को, व्यक्ति को, स्वयं डालना पड़ता है। और वह अपने आप को नियन्त्रण में नहीं रखता है तो समाज को उस के खिलाफ कदम उठाना पड़ता है। सरकार का काम यही है। जहां एक तरफ जनता की भलाई के लिये काम करना जरूरी है वहां दूसरी तरफ सरकार का यह भी फर्ज हो जाता है कि सुसंगठित समाज चलाने के लिये नागरिक की स्वतन्त्रता के ऊपर जो नियन्त्रण आवश्यक है उस नियन्त्रण के बावजूद भी स्वतन्त्रता का दुरुपयोग किया जाता है तो शासन द्वारा उस नियन्त्रण को समाज में फिर से पैदा किया जाय। यही तो किया सरकार ने।

हमारे अखबारों की स्वतन्त्रता के बारे में बात कही गई। क्या इस में कोई सन्देह की बात है कि हमारा प्रैस, हमारे देश के प्रैस के एक हिस्से ने अपनी स्वतन्त्रता का उच्छृंखलता के रूप में प्रयोग किया। हमारे प्रैस का एक दल ऐसा निकल आया था कि गाली देना ही जिनका काम है। मैं इस के बारे में क्या कहूँ। गाली देने वाला अपनी संस्कृति का इजहार कर दिया करता है। एकतन्त्रवादियों का जो सिद्धान्त है कि गलत चीज को भी बारबार दोहराते जाओ तो वह स्वीकार करने लायक बन जाती है, इसी चीज को मान कर के हमारे देश के विरोधी दलों के कुछ नेता और समाचार पत्र काम करने लगे।

सबसे घृणित काम जो हुआ वह हमारे देश के विद्यार्थियों का उपयोग करना, हड़तालों से कितनी क्षति हुई राष्ट्र की उस का तो आंकड़ा निकाला जा सकता है कि कितने घण्टे काम नहीं हुआ, इतने मैन आवर नुकसान हुआ। उस में कितनी दौलत की उत्पत्ति होती उस के आंकड़ तो निकाले जा सकते हैं। लेकिन विद्यार्थियों की पढ़ाई में जो खलल पड़ा उस में राष्ट्र का कितना नुकसान हुआ इस का आंकड़ा निकालना आसान नहीं लेकिन इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं कि इस में अप्रत्यक्ष नुकसान जो हुआ है वह राष्ट्र का बहुत बड़ा नुकसान हुआ है। जब विद्यार्थी को अपने जीवन का निर्माण करने का अवसर था वैसे समय पर जिन नेताओं ने विद्यार्थियों का उपयोग किया है, मैं ऐसा मानता हूँ कि उन्होंने महान घृणित काम किया है। तो इन सब को रोकना आवश्यक हो गया था।

ठीक है कि हम उस चीज में विश्वास करने हैं कि चुनाव के द्वारा सरकारें बदली जा सकती हैं। प्रत्येक राजनीतिक दल को यह अधिकार है कि वह जनता का विश्वास प्राप्त करे और अपना बहुमत बना कर के जो सरकार पावर (सत्ता) में हो उस को अपदस्थ करे। इस में कभी ऐतराज नहीं हो सकता। हमारा संविधान गढ़ी बनलाता है। चुनाव आता है तो चुनाव याचिकाएँ भी दायर की जाती हैं। यह भी हमारे संविधान में और इन्क्वेशन रूल्स में प्रावधान है। प्रधान मन्त्री के खिलाफ चुनाव याचिका थी। इलाहाबाद हाई कोर्ट का फैसला हुआ। जो फैसला हुआ उस में जो अंश प्रधान मन्त्री के खिलाफ पड़ता था उस की तो विरोधी दलों ने बड़ी प्रशंसा की, सराहना की, अदालत की बड़ी प्रशंसा की, अदालत की निष्पक्षता की प्रशंसा की। लेकिन उसी अदालत ने जो यह कहा था कि 20 दिन तक यह फैसला अमल में नहीं आयेगा उस को स्वीकार करने में उन को हिचकिचाहट

होती है। मैं नहीं समझता कि अदालत की सराहना कर रहे थे या निन्दा कर रहे थे, और उस पर एक देश व्यापी आन्दोलन चलाने का प्रोग्राम चल रहा था। सुप्रीम कोर्ट में अपील गई। सुप्रीम कोर्ट के जज का भी फैसला आया। उह फैसले में कोई सन्देह की गुंजाइश नहीं है। उस के ऊपर किस तरह का आन्दोलन चलाने का प्रयत्न होने लगा वह बताने की आवश्यकता नहीं है, और प्रैस के एक हिस्से ने किस तरह का आन्दोलन आरम्भ कर दिया वह लोगों ने पढ़ा है, उस को मैं नहीं कहना चाहता। लेकिन सब में चिन्ता की बात यह थी कि देश में अगर अशान्ति और गड़बड़ी की सूरत पैदा होती है तो देश के करोड़ों लोगों की जो क्षति होती है उस से देश को बचाना और लोगों को बचाना सरकार का कर्तव्य था। और इसलिये संविधान में जो अधिकार दिया गया है उस अधिकार का उपयोग कर के ही आन्तरिक स्थिति को सम्हालने के लिए। इस आपात स्थिति की घोषणा करनी पड़ी। उस के बाद की जो घटना देश में हुई है उस से कहीं सन्देह करने की कोई गुंजाइश नहीं रह जाती है कि देश ने उस का स्वागत किया है। और इस में लोगों की लाभ पहुंचा है।

यह बात सही है कि असाधारण स्थिति की हालत में देश को तभी तक रखे जाने की बात होगी जब तक यह समझा जाय कि गड़बड़ी करने वाली शक्तियाँ अपनी मनोवृत्ति में परिवर्तन ले आयी हैं, या देश में अशान्ति फैलाने वाले तत्व इस बात को महसूस करने लगे हैं कि अशान्ति फैलाने में काम नहीं चलेगा। अगर अशान्ति फैलाने का प्रयत्न वह करेंगे तो उस का नतीजा उन्हीं को भुगतना पड़ेगा। और इस में देश के सभी तत्वों का काम हो जाता है, विशेषकर प्रतिनिधियों को जो जनता के प्रतिनिधि हैं कि वह इस में सहयोग दें कि हम ऐसी स्थिति जल्दी से जल्दी ला सकें जो कह सकें कि भारत में साधारण स्थिति स्थापित हो चुकी है।

[श्री जगज्वन राम]

चेयरमैन साहब, मैं अधिक समय नहीं लेना चाहता। इन शब्दों के माथ में इस प्रस्ताव को सदन के सामने पेश करता हूँ और आशा करता हूँ कि इस सदन की सर्वोन्मत्त स्वीकृति इसे प्राप्त होगी।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution moved:

"This House approves the Proclamation of Emergency made by the President on the 25th June, 1975, under clause (1) of Article 352 of the Constitution as also the Order of the President dated 29th June, 1975 made in exercise of powers conferred by sub-clause (b) of clause (4) of Article 352 of the constitution, as applied to the State of Jammu and Kashmir, applying the said Proclamation to the State of Jammu and Kashmir."

SHRI A. K. GOPALAN (Palghat): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have heard Shri Jagjivan Ram's speaking. I am afraid that these are not the words of the Minister as I have seen him also sometimes looking at the Prime Minister. I know the reason why he was looking and I sympathise with him.

I rise to speak in an extraordinary and most distressing situation in which 34 members of Parliament are not here, not on their own volition, but because they have been detained without trial, and Parliament itself has been reduced to a farce and an object of contempt by Shrimati Gandhi and her party. I have to say that I myself had been arrested and kept in jail for one week and Jyotirmoy Bose, you know him very well, that Noorul Huda, another member of our party. I am an old man who cannot speak loudly now. I was released and both of them were kept inside the jail. The reasons are very clear. I am not afraid of jails because during the period of last 45 years, for 17 years I have been in jail. But I am only sorry for the inhuman treatment meted out to me for

two days inside the jail. I went on hunger strike. I sent a telegram to the Speaker and then only the condition was changed.

Sir, I am sorry to say that as a Congressman once who fought for the freedom of this country and who courted arrest and suffered so much I had been treated in this way. Sir, I am released only two days back. I know the reason. What about 2,000 or 3,000 of my comrades who are inside the jail to-day? Why myself and Shri Nambudripad alone are released? It is to show to the world that no Marxist or Leftist parties or Opposition party Members are arrested, but it is only the reactionaries who are arrested and who are responsible for all these things. I do not want to go into the details of it. I only say this because, as a political leader both in the Congress and afterwards in the Communist Party, I have my own feelings. That is why I expressed my feelings about the treatment given to me when I was arrested. Had not my comrades prevented the policemen my head would have been broken. But I got only injuries because my comrades saved me. I wanted that my comrades should not have prevented that and that I should have died. It would be a glory for me that by fighting the cause of working class in this country, and for saving the democracy in this country, I died. Unfortunately I did not die and I am here to-day to express my feelings.

Sir, this is an emergent session of Parliament to transact the government business, mainly, to ratify the fresh declaration of emergency by the President on the 26th June under the plea of internal security to the country, and the Opposition is being prevented from playing its role. Why?

The hon. Minister, Shri Jagjivan Ram has given that side of the picture. I am giving the other side of the picture. What the Opposition thinks about this emergency and why

this emergency was introduced and what is happening in this country. I request you, Mr. Chairman, to give me some more time till I finish my speech. You said that only six hours are allotted. On behalf of my party I want to express our attitude and what we have to say as far as the emergency is concerned and what happened after the emergency was declared.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I shall allow fifteen minutes for your party.

SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI: This is an important Proclamation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is what I am saying. I shall give you half an hour. Will that be all right?

SHRI A. K. GOPALAN: I shall try to finish it within this time. If I take some more time, I hope you will give me the extension.

MR. CHAIRMAN All right.

SHRI A. K. GOPALAN: As I said this sudden declaration is not because of a real threat to internal security but because of the judgment of the Allahabad High Court, the verdict against the Congress in the Gujarat elections, and the refusal by Mrs. Gandhi to step down from the office of Prime Ministership till the final verdict of the Supreme Court, in the context of rising disillusionment and discontent of the people with the ruling party under Smt. Gandhi's leadership for turning the economy of the country into shambles, making the rich richer and the poor poorer in pursuit of the bankrupt path of capitalist development.)

We are already in the midst of emergency since 1971—why another proclamation of emergency? Under that emergency, there are more powers and under that power even the censorship of press could have been there. But, there was a new proclamation of emergency. I do not know why. I do not want to go into details of it.

It has been maintained and used to curb and suppress the trade union and other democratic movements and the Opposition Parties including C.P.I.(M), D.I.R. and MISA have been freely used against the Opposition Parties and forces. The use of DIR and MISA to suppress the last railway strike and arrests of the leader of the opposition MLAs of Tripura Assembly along with the State Government employees' leaders are the glaring examples.

(The warning given by our party about the rise of the tendency to totalitarian and one party dictatorship since last three years has proved true with the sudden declaration of new emergency. By this parliamentary democracy has been replaced by the dictatorship of one party with full power concentrated in the hands of one leader, Mrs. Gandhi. This is not an expression of the strength of the ruling party but the expression of an extreme weakness and crisis of the party and the ruling classes.) This abrupt turn in the situation and the sudden change from democracy to dictatorship is to find the way out of the crisis to keep the ruling party and the classes in power. Because the democratic rights enjoyed by the working class and people under parliamentary democracy have turned to be a threat to their power. That is why (we find growing attacks on trade union and democratic rights and suppression of the opposition forces. Semi-fascist terror and rigging of elections as in West Bengal, maintenance of emergency and special powers like MISA became essential for the ruling party to keep them in power. This growth of authoritarianism is directly linked up with the growth of monopoly capital and intensification of the exploitation of the people by the exploiting classes and peoples growing resistance against this.

The slogan of one leader, one party and one country raised by a section of Congressmen sometimes before, is nothing but a political reflection of the tendency towards authoritarianism.) This slogan has been coined by the

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

Congress President after the adverse judgment of Allahabad High Court and Supreme Court and adverse verdict of the Gujarat elections, into the slogan "Indira is India and India is Indira". This means that she will remain the sole dictator throughout her life, so no need of any democracy, any parliament, any opposition and any election. In this connection I remember the story of Casabianca who said from mid-ocean: I am lord of what I surveyed and my right there is none to dispute.

On behalf of the Communist Party of India (Marxist), I totally oppose the new declaration of Emergency and its ratification in this House. We know full well that in the present situation no one is immune from arrest and detention. As I have already told you there are hundreds of persons inside the jail including Congressmen. (*Interruption*).

There was a rumour—when I was inside the jail—that Shri Jagjivan Ram and Shri Chavan were under house-arrest. I do not know how far it is correct or not. (Many leaders of Opposition as well as 39 Members of Parliament, including some Congress leaders,—are inside the jail. We cannot betray the interests of the people and give our assent to the obliteration of all vestiges of democracy in India—freedom of the person, freedom of speech, freedom to form associations, freedom to approach the courts, freedom of the press, freedom to criticise the Government and work for its replacement by a Government of the people's choice.) A word about 'freedom'. What is freedom? There are differences on that. It was said from the Government side that freedom is to say that we support everything what the Government is doing and not to criticise it. Therefore, there is difference. Our freedom is freedom of expression. Whatever the Opposition or the people in the country including Congressmen think about the policies of the Government they must also have the freedom to express what

they feel; that is freedom and that freedom is curtailed.

Sir, how is this butcher, of democracy being sought to be justified? What case is Shrimati Indira Gandhi making in her defence? She has claimed that it is to defeat the right reaction and also the so called left extremists. All this left manoeuvring is meant only to deceive the public opinion in the country and also abroad. This is the only purpose of the high powered propaganda campaign about the so called conspiracy and coup and much is being made of a call to the Police and Army not to obey illegal orders. Against this high-powered hoax of a campaign, what is the reality? Take the Government's attitude to the RSS and the Anand Marg which it has now banned. It seems that the Government's attitude to these organisations changes from time to time to suit its convenience. In 1965, during the Indo-Pak War, the then Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri handed over Delhi to the RSS for civil guard duties. The present Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi paid glowing tributes to the RSS Chief, Golwalkar, some time ago in the Parliament. (*Interruptions*). It is no record. If you go through the proceedings.... (*Interruptions*). If they put questions to me, say looking into the records, the answer is available.... (*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is probably making a reference to some abituary reference, to some good work that might have been done. That is uncharitable to say. That is what you mean? Is there any other record? I must get it clear. If there is any other record, it is for him to show. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI A. K. GOPALAN: You can cut out everything. Nothing goes outside. Nothing is printed. It is only in the record. It is there in the obituary reference.

As for the Anand Margis, the Government did nothing when it tried to assassinate Comrade Jyoti Basu at Patna Railway station and the person standing next to him was killed. The Chief of the Anand Marg along with three thugs are facing charges of killing their own men. Twelve lakhs of rupees were given to this same Anand Marg by the Government for relief of Bangladesh refugees in 1971 of which Rs. 2,80,000 are not accounted for. I am only saying what was the attitude taken then by the Government towards these organisations. Take the case of the so-called extremists. At one time, the ruling party encouraged the Naxalites and gave them all assistance in West Bengal to liquidate the cadres of our party. Today, they stand disreputed and in total disarray.

It is too naive to expect the people to believe that these organisations with no mass base have suddenly become a threat to internal security which can be met only by the imposition of a state of emergency. The politics and ideology of these parties have to be fought and defeated politically and ideologically. If they are involved in criminal activities, they should be proceeded against under normal laws.

Against whom then, are the government measures taken mainly directed? (The measures taken by the Government in the wake of the declaration of emergency unmistakably show that the thrust is against the people. Whatever democratic rights were available to the people have been completely obliterated. Chapter III of the Constitution enshrining the fundamental rights has become a dead letter. Articles 14 and 22 have been suspended.) Today's papers say that a Bill is coming under which some other articles of the Constitution also may be suspended. Why not change the whole Constitution or throw away the Constitution and take power in the hands of the Prime Minister? So every day constitution changes are

coming—every day, every hour. So this means that there is not even equality before the law. Any discrimination can be practised by the executive. (Any person arrested need not be produced before a court. The news of his arrest, whereabouts and condition can be kept completely secret. He may be physically liquidated by the police and nobody need know anything about it. That is the position today.

Meetings and demonstrations have been banned throughout the country. In Kerala, in every district, in every village, there is 144. So not more than 5 persons can meet. As regards cinemas, second shows are also stopped, because in some places after 8 O'clock, nobody can walk in the streets. That is the position.

No criticism of the Government or the Congress Party, however, mild is allowed to be published. No news of exploitation of the people by the vested interests, of workers by the capitalists, of peasants and agricultural workers etc. which may contain even a remote criticism of the Government is allowed. No movements of the workers, peasants, agricultural labourers etc. can take place under the plea of obstruction to production.

No strikes can take place under the same plea. But I have to say that there are lock-outs and lay-offs in many factories, even in the government undertakings. Will the Government take any steps to lift them? Even two days ago, I sent a telegram to the Labour Minister saying that for the last one month, there is lay-off in some of the factories. I know in many factories in Bengal also there is lock-out and lay-off. So lock-out and lay-off are still continuing.

In whose interest is this dictatorship imposed? Whose interest does it safeguard and protect? It is not the interest of the working people; it is not the interest of the middle class employees; it is not the interest

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

of agricultural labourers. It is only the interest of the members of the chambers of commerce who went to the Prime Minister and supported her. It has been declared openly that there would be no nationalisation of any industry. 'So don't fear that there will be any nationalisation'.

The camouflage of the emergency being used only against right reactionary parties has been fully exposed by the indiscriminate arrests of thousands of CPI(M) and other left and democratic party leaders and workers. The police have been let loose on the people. In Kerala for example, thousands of political workers belonging to the Opposition parties including the CPI(M), the Kerala Congress, the Socialist Party and so on were arrested and large numbers brutally beaten up by the police. I ask the Prime Minister to make an enquiry whether when an MLA went to jail, his cloth was stripped off and he had only a *langoti*. That was how they behaved towards him. People who were arrested with me were taken to the police station by the SI at noon, at 1 O'clock. He said: 'You have not taken your meals: you come in batches of three or four. I will take you'. They were taken away, they were beaten and they were stripped and left on the roadside—beaten 23 of them who were arrested with me were taken away and beaten; and they were told. Oh, you have not taken your food; we will give you food. This was the food. It was stated in the Assembly six months back that an MLA who was arrested was made naked; even his *lungotee* was taken away and he was beaten and he was made to stand on the roadside. This is what is happening because the Home Minister there was a very kind man; he wants to see people as they are born; he wants such an exhibition to the people and so he made them naked. This is what is happening in Kerala and other States of India to-

day. The Emergency is there. Certain articles had been suspended. All these things are there. But are there humanitarian considerations? Even the Opposition consists of human beings. A large number of the arrested people had been brutally beaten up by the police. E M S Nampoodripad, Leader of the Opposition in the Kerala Assembly, Shri K. M. George, Shri R. Balakrishna Pillai M.P. and several other Opposition leaders were arrested under MISA and given not only 'C' class status, but given such ill-treatment reminiscent of the British colonial days. During the British days also we were inside the jail. We could understand how the Britishers were behaving. But we cannot understand why the present Government is doing this. Many political leaders and workers were beaten up both inside and outside the jail. Never before did Kerala witness such indiscriminate and brutal show of police high-handedness. Similarly in West Bengal, Andhra Pradesh, Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, U. P., Himachal Pradesh and so on, the Government had arrested workers of the CPI(M) and other Opposition parties. Reports have come to me which are shocking. For example, in Kerala in certain places as I said earlier, police stripped political prisoners naked and committed atrocities against them. In Indore the office of the CPI(M) and the CITU were raided and sealed. Similar reports have come from Kanpur. In many places, people are terrorised and life after sunset has become insecure. In the name of Emergency the police and the CRP and other coercive instruments have been given such brutal power over the people, that semifacist and autocratic rule has replaced the norms of civilised behaviour. I strongly condemn this attempt to create terror among the people and to let loose the police against the people.

The industrialists in the name of productivity can impose any workload and retrench workers and any

protest will be crushed. Wage cuts and DA cuts can be resorted to; any resistance will be crushed. Working conditions can be worsened and the least protest will be met by summary dismissal. No movements against this exploitation will be allowed. In the rural areas too agricultural workers fighting for better wages, tenants fighting against evictions, all will meet the same fate. No movements against this terrible exploitation will be allowed. That is why these measures virtually amount to a dictatorship of the bourgeois and landlords against all other sections of the people. No wonder these measures have received full throated support of the vested interests—the various chambers of commerce and industries and associations of big traders. No wonder that for the first time in independent India big industrialists like Birla go in demonstration and express their support to Shrimati Indira Gandhi. No wonder, because while the Government talks about its measures being against the right reaction, over 3000—that is the figure till the 15th of this month—leaders and cadres of our party, are arrested beaten and let off or kept in jail. Among them Com. M. Basavapunnish, a Member of the Political Bureau, Com. Mohan Punamia, a member of the Central Committee and two Members of the Lok Sabha, Coms. Jyotirmoy Bosu and Noorul Huda—have been arrested and the threat of arrest hangs over everyone who dares to struggle against the vested interests and in defence of democracy. The arrests of the leaders of Central and State Government employees and various trade unions are going on. These arrests are meant only to crush trade union and democratic movement.

This is the inevitable culmination of the last 27 years of the anti-people policies of the Government which has helped the monopolists and landlords to thrive and fatten themselves at the expense of the people. Despite its

mouthings slogans of Socialism, Garibi hatao, etc. who has grown in this period? The monopoly houses have been fattened. The landlords have grown enormously rich and powerful in the rural areas. Evictions have taken place on a colossal scale which is admitted by official reports and other enquiries such as those of Ladajensky. The ranks of the landless labour have swelled enormously as the successive census figures reveal. The handicraftsmen, the handloom and powerloom workers, coir workers, etc. as also small scale industrialists are facing ruination. Prices have risen to dizzy heights.

13.58 hrs.

[SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT in the Chair]

The Prime Minister may say that conditions of the rural masses have improved. But her own Government's official statistics show that those living below the poverty line have increased from 50 per cent to 70 per cent of the population. When Smt. Gandhi took over in 1966 the number of registered educated unemployed in the country was 26.3 lakhs. In just under a decade, the number has swelled to 81.5 lakhs.

Sir, our party has been in the forefront of the struggle of the masses against the daily deteriorating conditions, in defence of their lives and democratic rights. And for this we have been for years subjected to continuous repression.

Semi-facist terror let loose in West Bengal since 1971 putting thousands in jails, organising political murders, gangster attacks on office of political parties, trade unions mass organisations and individual houses of political elements, beatings and killings in lock-ups and jails, forceful evictions of thousands of people from areas dominated by left influences even murder, torture and raping of women etc. all have been perpetrated by the

[Shri A. K. GOPALAN]

Congress Government at the State with the full knowledge and direction of the Congress Government at the Centre. Again it was under the direct leadership of the Prime Minister that faced with sure electoral defeat, her party rigged the elections in West Bengal in 1972 with the use of official machinery combined with terror. Sir, it was said here by Shri Jagjivan Ram that an elected Government cannot be removed because it is elected. I want to ask the Prime Minister what has happened in Kerala in 1959 when it was an elected Government. She herself as the President of the Congress, organised liberation struggle. She led the struggle and she liberated. Now she is saying, Kerala Government should not be touched! I do not understand the meaning why in 1959 there could be a liberation struggle and now no liberation.

14 hrs.

(The people and the forces against which this semi-facist terror and rigging were directed are not the right reactionary forces but the left democratic forces representing the workers, peasants, employees, teachers, students, refugees, women and poorer sections.) Though now it has been admitted by the Chief Minister that in West Bengal the right reactionary forces are very insignificant, the condition of semi-facist terror and attacks on the left and democratic forces are in full sway. The ruling party and the Government have tried to hide this ugly reality by a barrage of systematic false propaganda throughout the country and outside.

The same is now being sought to be extended to Kerala. I have already said what happened in 1959.

Facing this repression, not only has the movement developed in these two States but it has extended to other areas. The people cannot be deceived for long by the rulers and people are

on the move and calling the bluff of garibi hatao and bekari hatao.

It is in this background that the Movement led by Shri Jayaprakash Narayan gathered momentum. Our party has clearly stated our differences with Shri Narayan, but at the same time given our support to the democratic demands which he has championed. Whatever our differences with the movement, we have defended and will defend their right to organise satyagraha, strikes, bandhs, etc. which are all legitimate weapons in the hands of the people.

The movement led by Shri Jayaprakash Narayan had accepted the challenge of Shrimati Gandhi to face elections and was preparing for them. It is Shrimati Gandhi who developed cold feet after the verdict in Gujarat. Sections of the ruling Congress were themselves involved in the Gujarat and Bihar movements. The factional struggle rampant in all the States had spearheaded to the Centre too and it is no secret that after the Allahabad judgment and the Supreme Court order there was a massive challenge to Shrimati Gandhi's leadership in the Congress Parliamentary Party itself. The threat to the Congress monopoly of power combined with the threat to Shrimati Gandhi's position in the party and in the Government was the immediate cause for the rape of democracy, its long-term aim being the ruthless suppression of common people.

I have read in today's newspapers that the elections in Kerala due in September are being postponed and the term of the existing Assembly is being extended by six months. I do not know why this is being done.

Now, to hoodwink the people, Shrimati Gandhi has come forward with a 20 point programme, but what is new in it? Who prevented the implementation of the ceiling laws all these years?

The Planning Commission Task Force report bears eloquent testimony to the fact that it was the Congress Government and the Congress Party that effectively sabotaged the implementation of the ceiling Acts because there was lack of political will and because of the innumerable links of the landlords with the administration. In West Bengal, during the rule of the United Front Government, 6 lakh acres of benami land were unearthed and distributed to the agricultural workers—a fact testified again by the Planning Commission and after the Government was removed more than half of that land has been forcibly taken away by the landlords with the assistance of the Congress Government's police—a fact which is vouchsafed by the

Congress Party's ally the C.P.I. But why? Because the party is dominated by landlords. Who again sabotaged the State monopoly of wholesale trading in foodgrains which was tommed from the roof tops as a revolutionary measure. Was it not the Congress State Governments and Congress? In Kerala in 1969 Comrade EMS Namboodiripad Ministry passed a land reforms legislation. But the Government that came in power later have not implemented it. The left and democratic parties fought for the implementation and as a result of this struggle the landlords were forced to give an account of 1½ lakhs acre surplus land to the Government. But till now the Government has taken only 2843 acres of land from them.

The nationalisation of banks in 1969 was termed as a great revolutionary measure. But whom have the nationalised banks helped? Have they not helped as ever the big monopoly houses and speculators all these years to grow more rapidly and play havoc with the people's livelihood? And what are these wonderful measures which are so radical that these so-called right reactionary parties would have opposed? Is an emergency necessary to distribute house sites to the landless in villages?

Despite all the tall talk what the Emergency amounts to is suppression of the democratic forces. Who will believe that by suppressing the popular forces who are fighting against the monopolists and landlords, by suppressing their agitations and by denying them all democratic rights Smt. Gandhi is fighting right reaction?

It is unfortunate that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and some other Communist Parties have allowed themselves to be misled by the facade of attack against right reaction and do not see that the real thrust of these measures is against the people fighting for a better existence. They do not see that because of the basic policies of the Government the contradictions between the Government and the people are intensifying. The CPI, the wretched traitors to the working class and the toiling people, continues to function as Her Majesty's loyal opposition. Our party considers if its foremost task to awaken and organise the people against the grave peril they are facing and throw them into the struggle for the withdrawal of the emergency and restoration of whatever democratic rights they wrenched after innumerable struggles and untold sacrifices for the resignation of Smt. Indira Gandhi from Prime Ministership and for release of all political prisoners. We appeal to all democratic forces and men of goodwill, all who cherish the right of the people to struggle for a better life to join with us in this struggle. Whatever be the price we may have to pay our party will be with the people in their struggles, for the CPI(M) has no other interest apart from the interests of the people. The interests of the people demand that the emergency, the all pervasive measures taken under it, the total denial of democracy be fought and the broad based united struggle against the exploiters be carried on with the strength of the people.

We will never surrender ourselves to the ruling classes, we will never

[Shri A. K. GOPALAN]

betray the toiling people and democratic forces of our country. History will vindicate us. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri C. M. Stephen,

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Muvattupuzha): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to support this motion. There is not much which I have to add to what Babuji has already said. He has explained before the House in great detail the circumstances which compelled the Government to make use of the constitutional provision for declaring emergency, so that the democratic fabric and the Constitution of India could be saved from the dark forces which are trying quite vigorously to subvert it. I want, however, to advert to certain observations made by hon. Shri A. K. Gopalan. He started his speech complaining about his arrest and the arrest of certain other members of CP(M) in Kerala. He should have, in fairness, told the House how the arrest took place and why the arrest was executed against him. It is not as in the course of a normal step in emergency that the arrest was made. The Communist Party (Marxist) in Kerala announced two programmes. One was to violate the bans which were declared under the Police Acts by the various district collectors. The other was, two days hence to that, to have a 'bandh'.

SHRI A. K. GOPALAN: No bandh was announced.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: These two programmes were announced by them; and I have seen how the Marxist Communist Party violates the bans, in previous days. I have seen them violating the orders. It was never a case of somebody going and declaring that he was violating. It has always been a case of mass processions violating the bans; but in this case, what happened? A few people entered a car. The car came to the particular place. They jumped out of the car and declared that they violated the ban. The

Marxist Communist Party, the Kerala Congress—all of them combined—made this declaration of violating the ban; and they could not put in a demonstration by way of violating the ban. When the ban is violated, the Government arrest them. Now, here is the real question. Here is a democratic government; here are certain laws, laws accepted by the people, laws accepted by the sovereign parliament, laws accepted by the various State Assemblies. We are not under an imperial government to-day. Is it, or is it not the obligation of the citizen and the political party to conform to the law as far as possible? And when you violate the ban, what do you expect the Government to do? The whole process has been debased during the last 27 years. The person who violates the ban claims protection. The enforcers of the ban do not need, do not get protection; this is the attitude. They were arrested and put in jail for violating the ban. Subsequently, they called for a bandh. All the united parties gave a call for bandh. We have seen the bandhs in Kerala. Whenever a bandh was announced, whether in Kerala or Bengal, we have seen what was happening. Traffic will not move, buses will not move and transport will not ply. Aircraft will not land and schools will not function. Factories will be closed. In honesty, let Mr. Gopalan tell us what happened on that day of bandh. What happened was that all the factories worked, schools worked and the traffic moved. Is it not correct? Am I making a wrong statement? Everything was all right.

SHRI A. K. GOPALAN: What—every thing was all right? What is the normal procedure,

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gopalan, I am sorry; no discussion across the table.

SHRI A. K. GOPALAN: He asked me a question.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: I asked him whether on the day of the bandh the buses did not ply, the factories did not

work, the schools did not function, whether life was or was not normal. Life was normal on that day.

Mr. Gopalan says that in the course of the last 25 years the Government has become unpopular, that all the Opposition parties have become popular, that this emergency has not the approval of the people. After the proclamation, what is the reaction in the country? May I draw a parallel? In 1942 in the Quit India Movement Gandhiji and all the national leaders were arrested and were whisked away in the night. Every repressive law was imposed. What happened? The country was aflame. Masses of people moved, they offered themselves to be massacred. There was an upheaval in the whole country. Today has the same thing happened: The so-called glorious leaders of the Opposition parties are today in jail. Lok Nayak Jaya Prakash Narayan is in jail. He was taken to the hospital in an open car. Nobody looks at him. Not even a dog barks. I am not pooh-poohing or making fun of anybody.

In 1942 the people's leaders were arrested and there was an outburst in the country. Today the so-called pretending leaders were arrested by a people's Government, which Government Mr. Gopalan says is unpopular. In spite of that unpopularity, things are quiet. They cannot muster even ten people to observe their bandh. They have to go in a car and get into the police van and escape into prison.

I was amused when he was speaking about the Home Minister of Kerala. If an M.P. is put in jail and is kept in jail, there can be a complaint. In spite of the fact that he is released in time for the Parliament Session and he comes here, he makes a complaint.

The point is whether or not the people have reacted favourably to this. I was only attempting to answer the plea of Mr. Gopalan that the Government has become unpopular. The

proof of the pudding is in the eating thereof. The way the people have reacted is the test. Nobody denies that the people have reacted in favour of this.

They are talking about the Constitution. In November, 1949 we gave unto ourselves a Constitution. An independent judiciary has been provided for, fundamental rights have been provided for, Parliament is provided for, election machinery is provided for, democratic freedom is provided for, everything is provided for. Things were moving perfectly well, but during the last four years we have seen a peculiar situation in India. Babuji has given a detailed statement of what has been happening. We saw it here in Parliament itself and in the different Legislative Assemblies. They are speaking about liberty, about freedom. Is it the democratic freedom of anybody to compel an M.L.A. to resign? Is it the democratic freedom of anybody to obstruct the proceedings of Parliament? Is it the democratic freedom of anybody to go up to the rostrum and threaten the Speaker? Is it the democratic freedom of anybody to demand that the Assemblies and Parliament be dissolved?

Mr. Gopalan was speaking about the Prime Minister's resignation. Democracy is an arrangement by understanding among the people and by understanding we have arrived at our Constitution. The Constitution provides for a particular method of running the Government. The method is that the majority party will run the Government the majority party will elect its leader, that leader will be the Prime Minister or Chief Minister as the case may be. In 1970 elections took place and by a two-thirds majority the Congress Party was elected. The question is whether or not you accept the fact of an appointment by the people of a particular party to run the Government. Do you or do you not give that party freedom to operate here? You can criticise, but that is

[Shri C. M. Stephen]

not what you did. You obstructed at every stage.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have taken ten minutes. Normally Congress Members are expected to take not more than ten minutes.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: I shall finish soon.

Therefore, what happened here was that democratic freedom and liberty degenerated into licence. I remember a statement by the philosopher Aristotle. He said that when in a democratic set up freedom and democratic liberty degenerate into licence, democracy will get off the hinge and disintegration will start in democracy and despotism will take over. This degeneration was what took place in this country. If this degeneration was permitted to continue, democratic freedom would have come to a complete crash. It had to be saved. There was internal insecurity prevailing in this country. Discipline had gone off the hinge everywhere. Anybody could do anything. No law was being observed and a stage had arrived in which even Legislatures and Parliament could not function.

He was speaking about the Prime Minister. They speak about an independent judiciary. That judiciary stayed the judgment and in the event of stay the law says that it should be deemed that the judgement has not come into operation, yet they demanded resignation. Those went to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court clarified that the Prime Minister has got full right in law to continue as Prime Minister. Even after that agitation continues in the streets and a call is given to the military, to the officers, to everybody. They said: if the Parliament meets we will not permit it to assemble. This was said by Mr. A. K. Gopalan in Kerala. They said that they would not permit Parliament to function if it was summoned, that they would gherao the Prime Minister, that they would not accept her as Prime

Minister. Is it for a minority to decide whether the Prime Minister has to be accepted or not? Do you or do you not accept the Constitution and law? When the law says that it does not stand in the way of her continuing as Prime Minister, you are protesting that she should go. Are you observing the law honestly?

Why it was started will be explained by subsequent speakers. The right reactionary forces were certainly gang-ing up. I would have expected CP(M) to have a look at the situation in the country, but they seem to be very happy in the new company of Jana Sangh. We cannot save them. This is all I have to say. But if this action had not been taken, the fabric of democracy could have been torn to pieces.

I may recall what Mr. T. T. Krishnamachari said in the Constituent Assembly on behalf of the Drafting Committee when this particular article was debated in the Constituent Assembly. He said:

"After the First World War England passed the Emergency Act of 1920 wherein they gave full powers to the Executive to deal with the situation as they liked and to issue proclamation of emergency subject only to Parliamentary approval and subject to a limited duration. In fact, that particular Emergency Act was not brought into being for the purpose of meeting a foreign enemy it was not brought into being for the purpose of meeting any force which would threaten or upset the Constitution as such but in order to meet the grave economic consequences that would arise if the Government were not acting. That was the justification for a country like England framing an Act like the Emergency Act of 1920 which perhaps surpasses in its scope and comprehension any of the Acts that have been passed by the British Government in India when they were in

power. I would ask my friends who criticise us for inserting this provision to look at history.

Do you really want us to provide the means by which the Constitution could be saved? This emergency provision is merely intended to meet one purpose namely, that all our efforts of this year pending Constitution making may not go in vain, and those people, who will be in power, would in future be adequately empowered to save the Constitution. I would ask the House to consider this chapter as a sort of safety valve which is intended to save the Constitution."

After 27 years of our operation of this Constitution, we have come to a stage in which the Constitution is cracking, its operation has been made impossible, discipline has been dissipated and the march of the nation towards the progress has been stopped everywhere. An anarchy has started flying about and everybody is being torn to pieces. This constitutional democracy has to be saved. Therefore, this particular provision which was incorporated in the Constitution to save the Constitution has to be resorted to. As I said, the taste of the pudding is in the eating. The people have accepted the whole thing and there is absolute calm and complete reception to the whole thing.

I will conclude by just quoting one sentence. In 1937, the Parliament of England again promulgated an Emergency Act and Sir Samuel Hoare said on page 69 of the Parliamentary Debates Fifth Series—Vol. 351, House of Commons, Official Report, as follows:

"If for the time being we are setting in abeyance the liberties and privileges that we have prized so much in the past, we set them aside, not as a result of any dictation, but as an act of our own volition, and as an insurance that in setting them aside for a short time, we shall retain them permanently in the future."

This is the spirit in which the emergency was proclaimed by the President of India.

The whole responsibility for the present development must lie at the door of the Opposition who made their main task to defy the law and the Constitution, to stop the march of the nation, to take the country to the path of anarchy, to hand it over to the reactionary forces and make the people their slaves for all time to come.

This House must thank the Prime Minister for a timely action in invoking this constitutional provision so that democracy might be safeguarded and might be handed over to the posterity with all the solemnity with which the fathers of Constitution handed it down to us. I support this motion with the fullness of my heart.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore): Mr. Chairman, Sir, our party after due deliberations, and after trying very seriously to collect all possible and reliable information that it is possible for us to acquire, is of the firm view that this stern measure and the swift measures which were taken on the 26th and subsequent days in order to put down the danger which had developed to internal security, were fully justified and we supported them. In fact, one of my quarrels with the Government is and it is my experience down below in the States also among the people that people have not been informed adequately and sufficiently yet as to what actually was developing here in the Capital City of Delhi just prior to the 26th June. People do not know.

SHRI JAGANNATH RAO (Chattrapur): Why can't you tell them?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: I am going to tell. I am going to tell you, but that will be incomplete information, because the Government does not share the information.

SHRI JAGANNATH RAO: You tell us.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: I want the Government to tell the entire country and put at the disposal of the country all the facts and information that they have got.

In 1962 emergency, the then Home Minister, Shri Gulzarilal Nanda, did not waste much time in coming out with the Government's white paper, which, in my opinion, was not a very good white paper. It was full of inaccuracies: it was misinformed. But I do not know why the same method cannot be used at least this time. Whether these swift and stern measure could or could not be taken without the promulgation of another Emergency, a second Emergency is a technical matter which can be discussed.

Now, some friends on this side have made a big point out of that, saying that all the powers which were exercised were already in existence. They have asked what was the need of promulgating a second Emergency. I do not know whether they mean to say that if the second Emergency had not been promulgated, then they would have no objection to the measures taken. Certainly, that is not their argument, as I understand it. That is a technical matter. I myself feel that, perhaps, the Government has thought it necessary to safeguard its legal position since the first Emergency of 1971 pertains only to the threat of external aggression. Maybe, their legal advisers thought that it was better to promulgate a second one also in terms of the provisions of the Constitution which relates to the danger of internal disturbances. But even if the second Emergency had not been promulgated, it is true that under the existing Maintenance of Internal Security Act, under the Defence of India Act and Rules, under the Presidential Powers which already exist, the actual measure which have been carried out, including the arrests, including the imposition of pre-censorship of the press, including

the banning of certain organisations, etc., could have been carried out. That is an academic point into which I do not want to go.

Now, the starting point made by our friends on this side of the House and I am sorry to say, among them my C.P.M. friends also, was that there was no danger of internal security. This is the crux of the question. Once you accept this that it is all a big hoodwinking trick and nothing else, that there was no actual threat to the internal security, then I can follow the entire logic of their arguments. But if you accept the fact that there was a very serious and grave threat to the internal security which developed, in our opinion, particularly in those few days between 12th June and 24th or 25th June, then you will have to look at the matter in an entirely different way.

Sir, I am sure, you will not give me enough time to allow me to go into the details. Mr. H. M. Patel is very anxious to know it, I want him and the other people also to know it. I want the Government to tell it because they have got access to all the facts whereas I have not.

**THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE
MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS
(SHRI F. H. MOHSIN)** Sir, the Government has published a booklet "Why Emergency" If you permit me, I can lay it on the Table of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN You can lay it on the Table of the House.

SHRI ERASMO DE SEQUEIRA (Marmago). Can we also lay on the Table our reply?

SHRI F. H. MOHSIN: I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the publication "Why Emergency?" on the Table of the House. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-9802/75].

MR. CHAIRMAN: You should have laid it on the Table earlier, not in the midst of a speech. Anyhow, I permitted you.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: He should be a little more alert during the period of Emergency. He suddenly woke up when I referred to that. After I have perused the document, whatever it is, we will decide whether it meets our request or not. I do not know what its contents are. I do not want to go into all the developments of last one year and a half because I have not got enough time at my disposal. I think the mover of the motion recounted that part of it fairly well through he could have brought in some more facts. That was the background—that certain Parties had formed a sort of Front with which the CPM leadership was not entirely identifying itself at all times. I should say they were flirting with it, sometimes saying they were with it and sometimes saying they were not entirely with it and so on, when ultimately, in West Bengal at least, they openly participated with this Front and joined meetings, demonstrations and all these things. Anyway this Front was, under the leadership of Jayaprakash Narayan, trying for the last year or year and a half to seize power in various States by means which, (as the mover of the motion has said in very delicate language, I should say) were not entirely constitutional methods. If you want to play the game of Parliamentary democracy, you have to abide by rules also; otherwise, don't play it. I can understand those groups and parties who had taken the stand from the very beginning that 'we do not believe in this Parliament and Parliamentary democracy and we propose to boycott Parliament and will not come anywhere near Parliament', but will carry out our programmes somewhere in the maidan, but I don't understand the Parties who want to eat their cake and have it too,

we want to play the game of Parliamentary democracy and also want to subvert that Parliamentary democracy by certain other actions outside. I don't want to recount all this. I am at least today gratified by the fact that, on behalf of our Party, it was I who first drew attention in this House about a year and a half ago to the first call that was made publicly by Jayaprakash Narayan to the Army and Police to disobey orders. At that time, many people on that side of the House, including the Minister, tried to pooh-pooh it and minimise it by saying 'why should we make so much of it'. Today they have understood better. (*Interruptions*).

I am convinced about it because I see what is happening in so many countries in the world. Mr. Gopalan has said, Communist Parties in different countries, including the Communist Party in the Soviet Union, have been misled and they have not understood what is happening. Even the Communist Party of Democratic Vietnam has been misled, after fighting for thirty years with arms in their hands for independence against American imperialism. The only people who have not been misled are the CPM leaders!

The whole trouble is that this is, if I may say so, one of the weaknesses of Shri Jagjivan Ram's presentation of the case. So far as he spoke, it was all right. But there is a very vital, a very relevant international context. (*Interruptions*). There is a very relevant international background, in the context of which these developments are taking place. What kind of politicians and political students of world affairs are we if we cannot relate the two and if we think that this is happening in isolation, that these are internal events that have no connection or relevance to the international context? Unfortunately, Mr. Jagjivan Ram did not mention it. The fact is that the United States' imperialism—this is a word that a censor

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]
does not like; I may point out that the first day we published our resolution, the censor said "you must cut out the words 'U.S. imperialism'; what is this kind of thing going on?" Of course we did not give way easily and after some quarrels and jagdas it was eventually passed. But this is also the mentality of some bureaucrats, which I wanted to point out.

Anyway, here is the United States Government with its top leaders—statesmen and spokesmen—times without number describing what is their global strategy, particularly in this part of the world—people who talk openly of de-stabilisation of regimes they do not like. And what do they mean by 'regimes they do not like'? It is obvious what is happening in the world. They mean those regimes belonging to the third world or non-aligned countries which refuse to toe their line completely, which follow broadly a line of supporting initiatives for peace, which support the struggles of people all over the world for their national independence, which, while maintaining friendly relations with all countries, also develop their relations and friendly ties with the socialist countries. They do not like such countries. They have tried, times without number, to subvert and overthrow the regimes in those countries where this type of Government was functioning.

We know what this Government's policy internally is. Do we agree with it? We do not agree with it. When they come down against the workers and peasants and so on, we fight against them and we shall continue to fight against them if they do that. But that is our internal affair.

This American imperialism, which was kicked out of Vietnam, which was kicked out of Cambodia, which had to give up the whole of South East Asia and retreat from there, which failed miserably in its attempt to intervene in Bangladesh during the Bangladesh people's liberation strug-

gle by sending its Seventh Fleet in the Indian Ocean, this American imperialism is in trouble in West Asia also today where the Arab countries have stood up on the basis of their oil resources and are refusing to be brow-beaten; today we have the strange spectacle of Dr. Kissinger trying to pressurize his favourite Israeli statesmen to come to terms with the Arabs because, otherwise, they would not get oil. This is the crisis in which the Americans are and that is why we have said, times without number, that in this part of the world they are looking for what they call 'soft countries', which they consider to be soft, that means countries which they think are still open to them for penetration, ideological penetration, penetration by means of financial resources through multi-national corporations, penetration by subversive agencies like the CIA and pressurizing them militarily. We consider these things not to be isolated things. Take the resumption of arms supply to Pakistan. Everybody in this House was agitated. Is it an accidental, separate phenomenon—building up of the Diego Garcia base in the Indian Ocean? These are all links in the chain. It was just at this time when India was one of their prime targets, when they were being kicked out of West Asia and South East Asia, when they wanted to find a base and a foothold to hang on, when they were trying to pressurize India, it was at that time that, within the country, there was this Front of parties, the rightist parties! I do not consider the Socialist Party to be anything, but a right Party. It may call itself Socialist until it is blue in its face, but the leaders of the Socialist Party at least have identified themselves completely with the rightist forces. They just chose this moment to dig out Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan from his Ashram, bring him out and launch this new type of movement. Is there no connection between the two? Do we learn nothing from other countries? Do we not read the books that have come out every day from America,

written by the ex-CIA men themselves. You read horrifying things—what is being revealed before the United States Senate Committee now, before the Rockefeller Commission which went into the work of CIA; it reads like fiction stories; you cannot believe what these people are capable of doing. They admit now that it was they who were responsible for the killing of Partrice Lumumba in Congo; it was they assassinated President Trujillo of the Dominican Republic. Now they admit that their hand was there in overthrowing Allende in Chile, a legally constituted elected Government. It was at this time when Pakistan was being re-armed, when Diego Garcia was being built, Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan came forward and called upon the army to get ready to revolt; 'At the appropriate moment, I will give you the call'—this was what he said in Bihar last year—'Do not obey the orders of this Government'. (*Interruptions*). It was in this context that this thing was taking place. It was after the Allahabad High Court judgment that all these parties naturally thought—I do not think it was anything surprising—"Here is a God-sent opportunity; now strike while the iron is hot". The Court has given a certain judgment. We cannot discuss the merits of the judgment just now. But they thought 'Here is the opportunity; her image is down before the whole world; she is discredited and so on; inside the Congress Party even, people are shaky, wondering what is going to happen; this is the moment to strike'. In those few days, between 12th and 24th or 25th, whatever information we have been able to gather with some measure of reliability—I cannot vouchsafe for everything because Government has to tell; I do not know what is in that little book laid on the Table by Mr. Mohsin, but this much we know that under this cover of the call, which was given for peaceful civil disobedience from 20th, something else was also being prepared and there was a purpose behind that which I

will explain. What was also being prepared was violent disturbances in which the main role was to be played by the RSS. We know, the Sangharsh Samiti announced on the 25th on the Ram Lila ground was to have as its Secretary and main organizer, Shri Nanaji Deshmukh, who has disappeared and has evaded arrest and probably has gone underground, as far as I know. These trained RSS people—I have great admiration for their discipline and efficiency and so on for creating trouble—were being mobilised in Delhi from all the surrounding areas for several days previously. Concentration of RSS was taking place in the city of Delhi. Was it for the purpose of peaceful civil disobedience? Lists have been found of certain peoples' houses, names have been listed and which were going to be the targets of physical attack. The All India Radio station headquarters was also on that list for obvious reasons.

SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI
 Let Mr. Mohsin keep this information on the Table.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Joshi, you will have your opportunity to speak.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: I do not know, whether Mr. Mohsin has revealed this in his booklet, because I know one thing, that Government must have some information about the very hectic activities that were going on during those days of certain personnel belonging to the US Embassy. Our party has got information of at least one meeting; they may have several such, I do not know. We know, when and where it was held, who were present there. In confidence, I can tell you, who were the gentlemen of the American Embassy present. I have checked up the name from the diplomatic list later. These gentlemen are there, these are not bogus names. And four or five people from our side were present in that meeting. There may have been many such meetings. These things

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]
were going on, and on the 25th June rally at Ram Lila ground, Mr. Jaya-Prakash Narayan, as you know very well, not only again made a very aggressive speech appealing to the military and the police, but he also warned the present Chief Justice of the Supreme Court saying "If you dare to sit on that Bench which is going to hear the final appeal against our wishes, a day will come, when you will be tried and punished by the people's court." These are people who are great respectors of the judiciary and at other times they tell us that judiciary must be always honoured and respected.

It is foolish for them to think that by creating some trouble and burning a few places and having clashes with police in Delhi city and attacking a few houses, this Government will fall down and collapse. They could not do it even in Patna where plenty of arson took place on the 18th March, many people were beaten up, but the Government did not fall. Government does not fall so easily. What were the reasons for it—I do not want to dwell on it now—but I must say that that is a very serious omission in the description of events given by the mover of this resolution. The whole object of this was to create an atmosphere in which they would be able to bring about certain changes, certain realignment within the Congress Parliamentary Party. That part we have not been told about; I do not know, whether Mr. Mohsin's book tells us. The serious matter that you have to explain is, why the leading personalities of the Congress Parliamentary Party are behind the prison bars? Why? They had not left your party. It is not any four-anna member, but the member of the Congress Working Committee, the Secretary of the Parliamentary Party of the Congress. The point is, it is known to everybody here, now if you want to hush it up, it is a different matter, but it would not help us in the days

to come. There was a whole plot. The whole conspiracy was that if you could create enough trouble and enough violence and disorder all-round, within the Congress Parliamentary Party there are certain number of people who were vacillating or weak elements or opportunist elements or anything you may call them who would be brought over to the idea of having a change of leadership telling Indira Gandhi that all this gadbad is taking place only because 'you are refusing to quit and if you want to control the situation, then kindly step down.' I believe their calculation was that roughly if they could get hold of about 130 members, then, with the support of all these friends, they would have immediately been able to form another government. I would like my CPM friends to consider—I am asking them in all seriousness, I am not attacking them or anything—please consider from your experience. If such a government had been brought about—of course, it would not have spared us—but would it have spared you? You are sitting here to-day, able to make your speeches and all that. I am glad, I am very happy. But if such a change had come about and if a more right reactionary government come to power with the backing and support of America, do you think your party, your trade unions and your workers and peasants would have survived?... (Interruptions). To-day you are able to come here and have your say. In that event, I would not have been here nor would you have been here....

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I point out to you that you have taken 27 minutes.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Anyway I have been pulled up by the Chair. So I cannot go into further details on this. At least what I have said has produced a little bit of provocation. Some targets they had found somewhere.

"Therefore, it would absolutely be the height of folly to go on suggesting that there was no threat to internal security. There was a very serious development which had never before developed. We never mince matters. We have always said and during the last two to three years we have been saying and warning our friends of the Congress Party that these rightist forces are gathering strength and are being able to confuse and mislead people mainly because the ruling Party is failing to carry out the pledges and promises that it had given to the people during the 1971 elections and if you had fulfilled those commitments and if you had carried out those pledges, it could never have reached the proportion it was beginning to reach and it is because of the discontentment of the people, it is because of growing unemployment and high prices and it is because the peasants and agricultural labourers did not get the land that was promised to them. It is because of this that these parties are able to masquerade as their champions and friends and utilise them for something else and for nefarious ends. However, better late than never, this danger was realised in the nick of time. Otherwise, I am sure and our Party is sure that if this matter had been delayed by another 8-10 days, something else would have happened. This we consider to be a catastrophe. You may consider it of no consequence. We do not want an American-backed government to sit in Delhi. I can see what is going on in countries all round. There are people who do not understand it and cannot see what is happening. Well, I am only sorry for them. That is why we support this action which has been taken.

As far as the hon. Members of this House who are in detention, it is a very unfortunate affair. But, obviously, there seem to have been made some selective arrests because I do

not find everybody has been arrested....

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA HALDER (Ausgram): You are sorry for it?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: I am quoting what Prime Minister said recently—

"Only those directly involved in these activities to paralyse the Government have been taken into preventive custody. Many other senior leaders of these parties have not been arrested."

I think the senior leaders of these parties who are free can be taken into confidence by the Government because it relates to the members of their party. He is asking what Shri Noorul Huda has done? Mr. Gopalan says everybody who has been fighting for freedom is being locked up, as if people outside have not been fighting. There is no point in it.

I think the arrests in Kerala had nothing to do with it. Their party had launched local satyagraha or civil disobedience and that is why they have been arrested. They have been subsequently released. If Mr. Gopalan had been treated badly Government should look into the complaint of ill-treatment. If it is a fact, it is very unfortunate and Government should look into it.

I will conclude in five minutes. The main point I should commend is that if you do not want the recurrence of these events; if you want that this danger should really be eliminated, it is by no means being eliminated by arresting a few people and banning R.S.S. and Jamaat-e-Islami or pre-censorship of papers. Thousands of people have escaped who are underground. But more important than that is the fact that unless the socio-economic base on which they have

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

been operating is changed, you cannot finish with this danger and, therefore, the main thing is that people must be rallied and mobilised and these economic measures must be implemented seriously which can give them immediate relief and some benefit.

I know it is also true that these economic measures which have been announced are nothing new. These things had been said two or three years back. People say they did not implement it even with the massive majority at their command. How will they implement it when there is an emergency? Emergency has not been brought in, in my opinion, to implement these measures. Emergency measures were brought in for some other purpose, to suppress what I said, was developing. But now the opportunity is there and it may be the last opportunity. This time if you fail, no power on earth can save us or save this country from this conspiracy of the rightist forces and external imperialist forces. Nothing will save this country. So, with that sense of urgency the measures have to be carried out.

15 hrs.

The programmes announced by the Prime Minister, in our opinion, do not by any means go far enough. Much more radical measures should be taken. But even those measures she has announced, if properly implemented, will go some way to alleviate the situation and mobilise the people.

I have to point out two or three things and then finish. We have suggested of course that certain nationalisation measures are needed. The Prime Minister—prompted by whom, I don't know—has, in my opinion, done a very unwise thing, unpolitic thing, to go on the Radio and announce that there will be no more nationalisation. If she had not wanted to do anything just now, she could

have kept quiet. There was no need to go and broadcast that 'there is some rumour going about that nationalisation will take place, but I want to dispel this rumour'.

Sir, these multi-national companies are operating here and they are the conduit-pipes through which the C.I.A. operates. How much evidence do you want? There are books and volumes of evidences which are available now to everybody including the report of a United Nations Sub-Committee, of which Mr. L. K. Jha was the Chairman. Please read these two or three bulky volumes and see the evidence and material which they have brought in there as to how these companies operate.

Here is an Authority. Please read it sometime. This is a very famous American Journalist, I. F. Stone, who published his private paper called "I. F. Stone's Weekly". You please read it. You will find here one company which operates in this country, Bechtels, which, you will remember, was brought in here to design Haldia-Barauni Oil Pipeline and got away with it. Later on it was found that the whole work was done defectively. They were given huge payments and they went away. Mr. Stone said in his book that at the time when Bechtels were operating in this country, one gentleman, by the name of Mr. John A. McCone was appointed as head of the C.I.A. in the United States. He was head of the C.I.A. and he was also the head of the Bechtels. There are people in this country whose names I will not say just now but a day will come when I will expose them here, who are now negotiating in order to bring Bechtels into this country again. Who are they? What are they doing here? At whose instance they are doing it? Are you serious about these things? Are you serious about fighting this danger? I say this because some things are tak-

ing place which require a much more urgent look.

You have pledged yourself to introduce public distribution system of commodities at fixed prices. But it is yet to come. In the meantime prices of several items have been raised by the Government itself. Take kerosene, cooking gas, controlled cloth, coal, aluminium, which will affect the aluminium utensils also, steel and so on. The explanation given is, for production we require to give them higher prices, this and that. But, at the moment, please look at it from the point of view of the common man. The public distribution system has not come. The slight fall which has taken place in some wholesale prices does not yet benefit the retail consumer. Whether you will do it or not, I don't know. But in the meantime, prices of these controlled items have been raised by the Government, items like kerosene, coarse cloth, etc. Only the other day, you raised the price of cooking gas. Is this the way to inspire confidence in the people that something will surely be done now with these emergency measures? I don't know.

There is the other question of seeing that all impediments to production are removed. Very good.

But the major impediments are not coming from the strikes by employees. I can prove it. The major impediment is coming from the employers.

In my State of West Bengal, now big business houses are running factories; all of them are running below their installed capacity. They have declared lock-outs or closures; Birlas have declared lock-outs; Metal Box Company has declared a lock-out; Sen Ralleigh & Co. which manufactures bicycles have threatened closures; J.K. also has threatened closures. In Hindustan Motors 6,000

people are laid off. Installed capacity of these industries is being sabotaged not by the workers but by the employers. Apart from the power shortage which is also a big constraint of course, if steps are taken to bring the employers to book and the installed capacity alone can be utilised, that itself will raise the production by 25 to 30 per cent. In some cases, they are deliberately keeping an idle capacity so that they can create an artificial shortage in the market and keep the profits in their pockets. What measures are you going to take against them?

Finally, one word more that I would like to say about pre-censorship. I know that it is a sore point for our journalists and correspondent friends because they feel that and one of them was saying that 'our pen has been taken away from our hands; now what can I do?'

Sir, the mover of the Motion has very correctly mentioned that certain groups of newspapers were playing an active role in working up a conspiracy for seizing power. We know the big groups, the monopoly press, which has the biggest circulation in the country. If they had been allowed to function normally freely today, by now, within 20 or 25 days, they would have created a havoc in the country. Everyday all kinds of imaginary and cooked up stories would have been pedalled out. One day they would have said that Indira Gandhi is making a secret trip, overnight dash, to Moscow, to get her orders from there and rush back. What can you do? That would be in the headlines. They would have also said that the Soviet army is massing on the border and they may march in any time. As it is, they say the C.P.I. is supposed to be running this Government. The tragedy of it is that we are not taken into confidence in what they do. That is our complaint. There is a purpose behind this game. I say that pre-censorship

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]
is necessary for the time being at least to muzzle and control the monopoly Press. This is the kind of dangerous role that the Press was playing and the consequence is that the other papers belonging to our party and other parties also have to suffer. But, whatever we may say, the circulation of our papers is minimal or fractional compared to the mighty press owned by the Birlas, Tatas and Ramnath Goenka and such gentlemen. How can we compete with them?

The reflection of all this is now in the western press. And now the reflection is seen in the West German and American Presses as also British Press carrying on their vituperative campaign against our country and against Mrs. Gandhi's government. They are writing every day. But, I have no time to quote all these things. It is very interesting. But the actual administration or working of the censorship should be at least intelligent. After all, censorship is imposed for a particular purpose. It is imposed for the purpose of weakening the rightist forces and for strengthening the forces of the people, democratic forces. It must be used for that purpose only and it must not be used in a stupid, wooden headed and bureaucratic way. It is happening and complaints are coming that the people are taking advantage of this. Somebody told me that he had come from the United Nations and in the U.N., the impression is being given that in the land of Indira Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru and Mahatma Gandhi and Rabindra Nath Tagore have become taboo because the quotations from them are being ruthlessly cut by the censors. This is being taken advantage of not to our benefit at all. Therefore, I would say that on the one hand we are not allowed to publish anything to expose the vested interests, by name I would like to expose some places which have been raided in Calcutta and what was found there

and who were the people involved. But the names are cut out by the censors. Take for example the *Ananda Bazar Patrika*—a big combine. There an overnight raid had been carried on. The raid has been carried out there but can any paper publish the news that *Ananda Bazar Patrika* premises were raided and they found such and such thing. I cannot publish the names of persons who are indulging in lock-outs and lay-offs. What is the point of censorship? Against whom is it directed? So, Sir, I suggest that some sort of advisory committee or some sort of editorial committee be formed which will constantly review the work of censorship and attend to complaints which come to them and re-formulate and modify guidelines as and when necessary so that this kind of stupid and un-intelligent censorship does not take place. I hope the ruling party—because they have to take the initiative in the matter—will get down seriously to the task of doing something and not just talking. Time for talking is over. Stop talking now. It is a life and death question. Do something for God's sake. Mobilise your people and tell them to go down to the masses and do some political campaigning. Fulfil the land distribution programme.

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT (Shahabad):
Mr. Chairman, Sir, I rise to support the resolution so ably moved by Babuji on the proclamation of emergency. The Prime Minister has described this proclamation of emergency as an attempt by Government to bring back on rails the democracy which was being subverted and even destroyed by certain elements in the country.

Babuji while moving the Resolution has, very categorically and lucidly described these attempts over a period, particularly since 1967, by the vested interests and the political parties representing the vested interests. Secondly, certain interested communal

parties tried to subvert democracy particularly because they were thwarted by the strength and the policies of the Congress party and the massive support enjoyed by the Congress party. Since they could not dislodge the Congress party in elections, after the elections they took to extra-democratic and anti-democratic methods which have led to the present situation. I would not go into those details. It is neither necessary nor possible in the short time at my disposal. But I would like to deal with two or three aspects of the present question.

My predecessor, Shri Indrajit Gupta, has described the situation as a very grave one. He has said so very rightly. It is a situation of now or never because if we do not succeed in meeting the challenge of the emergency, and the reasons that led to it, the country's future and the future of democracy and all that we stood for in our struggle for freedom are at stake and, therefore, I hope we will realise the gravity of the situation. On the other hand, the achievements of democracy during the last 27 years are something which we can be proud of. In the perspective of world history, if we see this experiment on such a gigantic and vast scale, it is so exciting to see this functioning in all parts, with great difficulties, in one of the poorest lands, emerging after colonial rule and all that. It is so exciting to see the way it is functioning. It is going to be a most shining example in history, not only in this Century, but ever since human experiment began. But, the fact that democracy is being subverted by certain people, certain groups, is such a shocking thing and I think it is necessary for the Government and the ruling party and the parties who believe in it, to educate the people. One of the purposes of calling this Session is to have a debate on this and there could be no better education, public education of the situation, the dangerous situation that the coun-

try is facing, than to debate it, I am glad this debate is going on on healthy lines. The forces that were subverting democracy were working on all fronts. It has been described how the agitation in Gujarat and subsequently the plunge in Bihar, were manoeuvres to subvert the representative character of the Legislatures.

Sir, what have we seen in the last two years in this House itself? We have seen the way the House was being conducted—I and my friends on both sides including Prof. Hiren Mukerjee have spoken several times—and particularly, the way certain elements and certain groups in this House were behaving, holding the House to ransom and denigrating the whole system. Their aim was to denigrate parliamentary process in the country. Some of the Members were saying 'What is there in Parliament?' They have spoken like this. Some of the leaders of the Opposition have spoken that Parliament is nothing, that Parliament is powerless, and therefore, they are interested outside Parliament, in direct action, in agitations, in Satyagrahas and in mass movements. They were saying this. In repeated elections they thought they will be returned to power, but, since they did not get majority, they declared Parliament was useless for them. That was their feeling. During the last two years, that is how, in this House, all those Members who took oath to uphold the Constitution and to work in Parliament, were making it less purposeful, were denigrating it and were behaving in a manner that Parliament has become more and more redundant. This was the view expressed by many Members. This led to a situation in which the Proclamation of Emergency had to be taken recourse to. It was the last attempt to save democracy and we are grateful to the Prime Minister and the Government for taking this step. History has shown that in similar situations, in many other countries, in Germany and other countries,

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

the minority forces, the forces of vested interests have taken advantage of the national crisis, the economic crisis, the discontent and frustration among youth and others and they have been able to destroy democracy. This was because the leaders of the majority party flinched, developed cold feet and they did not take strong and determined action. I am glad that history will record that this was not the case in this country. It was a moment of crisis, a grave crisis and the leaders of the Government, particularly the Prime Minister and senior leaders of the Congress Party realised that this was the time in which any defeatism, any weakness on their part will set at naught whatever the Congress stood for throughout its career, and particularly during the last 27 years of Independence. They realised that the future of the country and the aspirations and objectives for which we stand were all at stake.

It was a moment of crisis and it was a moment of leadership as well. The Prime Minister showed that in proclaiming the Emergency. This shows what a determined leadership can do. But, this is just a beginning. We have stalled these forces of reaction. We have stalled, at the moment, the forces of chaos and anarchism. Particularly, during the last one year, they were having the initiative. It appeared that these forces had the initiative in the country. They were running the country, they could do whatever they like with the Legislature, with the Parliament, with the Government and they were also exhorting the Army and the Police to revolt. It appeared that these anarchist forces were on the march and everything was in their hands. What has been done through these various steps taken by the Government was to snatch the initiative and to stall their progress. But, we have to go ahead so that these forces are defeated once and for all.

I agree with my hon. friend, Shri Indrajit Gupta, that these forces are not only national in character; these forces of reaction, of vested interests, of right reactionaries, or feudal reactionary forces as you call them, are operating in the villages, are operating in the cities, although in their present character, they have confined themselves to the cities. Even the middle class, the intellectuals, students and youth were mobilised for disintegrating the Establishment and defeating representative rule in the country. Vested interests in the rural areas were also being mobilised. We could see the naked violence enveloping all their efforts. In the UP elections, we saw the same forces in operation. They thought they would be able to defeat and dislodge the Congress in UP. When they did not win, it was a watershed in Indian politics. It was at that time that they decided that they would henceforth not be able to defeat the Congress in elections. Therefore, all these direct action methods were adopted. This is what happened (*Interruptions*). Do not divert. We are discussing a very serious matter. Bahuguna is an individual. We are concerned with the forces. Do not confuse the issue. It is big policies that matter, individuals do not matter. You and I would quit the stage. We are concerned with the future of the country, with the future of democracy in the country which we try to build up.

As I said, they are not only national in character. See democracy's record in the country, in the fifties, in the sixties. Compare it with anywhere. They were talking of denigrating that process, the process of Indian democracy. The mass political strength, the political will of the people was strengthened. In the Bangladesh crisis, we saw what was the strength of the fibre of the country. Despite imperialist intervention in the Bay of Bengal, despite the big forces ranged against us, the unity and strength of the leadership of the country showed that India is a power

that is emerging which has to be reckoned with.

In the international world today, those who have experience of international forces operating all over know that no incident is isolated, no incident is nationalistic. Therefore, we should not keep our view confined to our borders. The present-day world structure is such that India playing a strong role is not liked. Prime Minister Nehru had stated once that India could stand, would stand, as the tallest country or else it would fall down. But the world powers will never like any tall country to emerge because it disturbs the *status quo*. India emerging as a strong power in this part of the world and playing its role in the comity of nations is going to disturb the world view of many powers. Therefore, they are also interested in a destabilising process. It has been described in very lurid details. But the fact is that if the country is strong, their move cannot succeed. India can only be strong if it follows the democratic process. No process of totalitarianism, no process of despotism in such a vast country with so many diverse elements of language, creed and religion, can succeed. India can be governed only through consensus. Our founding fathers, our leaders, gave us a Constitution the essence of which is based on majority rule and respect for the minorities and existence of political parties based on a broad spectrum of policies. A democracy based on a sectional or communal policy is no democracy. If a party is formed on the basis of a communal appeal or a sectional approach, it is not a political party, a democratic party in that sense. It is on the existence of political parties on a broad spectrum of policies that the country can be kept together, strong, united, on the basis of consensus. Anybody who is trying either through 'total revolution' or 'partyless democracy' or satyagraha or direct action to disturb that, tries to disturb or snap the fibre of

the unity of democracy in this country and strikes at the root of Indian nationalism. This process is not only anarchic, but it is anti-national as well.

So we are fighting and grappling with a situation of various kinds, complex, varied and dangerous. It is a situation where the economic crisis is there. Prices rose, not only in this country but in other countries also. Economic crisis was faced not only by this country but even by many other countries. The Opposition parties in other countries did not behave in the manner as the Opposition Parties behave here. I shall give two examples.

The Soviet Union functions in a different manner the Chinese function in a different manner. There are groups inside the party. There the party hierarchy is such that democracy is provided within the party itself. Soviet Union imported 27 million tonnes of foodgrains, the highest in history. We imported much less and paid for it in cash. China imported in that year 10 million tonnes; later on it imported regularly 8-10 million tonnes. Chinese population is more than ours but the Soviet population is half of ours. Yet neither in that country nor outside a feeling was created that the country was collapsing or breaking down. But here what did the opposition do? I give another example of a parliamentary democracy, the United Kingdom. As a person experienced in economic affairs I can say that the United Kingdom had been going through a far worse economic crisis during the last three or four years than India or any other country has ever gone through. Faced with a situation Heath declared that he would go for an election; they went for a general election and they lost the election. Wilson came and Wilson had to go again for a general election. What do the Opposition Parties do here? They say that

[Shri B. R. Bhagat]

this Government must go; they indulge in all kinds of character assassination. These things never played any role in the general elections there. Is it democracy, Babuji asked is it democracy to indulge in the character assassination of the leader? When you cannot attack the policies, you attack the personalities. That is what has been done here. Corruption has to be eliminated. But by painting a picture that everybody who is somebody is corrupt you are creating a situation in which respect for the Government, for law goes down, the credibility of the Government goes down. This is the first nail in the coffin of destruction of democracy.

We have taken the correct steps. But we have to go a long way to implement the programme and create confidence among the people. The Emergency is not to stifle Opposition. Some hon. colleagues of ours are in jail. This is inevitable in the present situation. It has been done on a very selective basis. Neither the Government nor anybody else are happy over it. What matters is the programme that has to be implemented. What is the role of the Government, the ruling party or all other parties in this? Shri Indrajit Gupta supported it. He may have difference on certain points. It is true that there is nothing dramatic about the 21 point economic programme. But what is dramatic is that it has been brought in a situation when the country was on the brink of disaster. Many of us have spent 30-35 years in public life before and after independence. Senior leaders had spent about fifty years in public life. Democratic experience is there for 27 years. The independence, unity of the country and other things that we stand for were in jeopardy. Therefore, Government had to function efficiently; the party has to function more efficiently. Credibility has to be created through direct implementation of the programme so that people feel that democracy which was put 'off the rails' by some opposition parties

for their own purpose has not only been brought back on the rails but it is also functioning and the future of the country is safe and a calm atmosphere prevails in the country. It is absolutely necessary for the functioning of democracy and all that we stand for.

श्री जगन्नाथराव जोशी : (शाजापुर) :
सभापति महोदय, 1971 से आपातकालीन स्थिति जो चालू थी उस के साथ साथ उसी धारा का सहारा ले कर, धारा 352 के अन्तर्गत अशान्ति को आधार बना कर दोबारा आपातकालीन स्थिति की घोषणा हुई। किन्तु 1971 में जब आपातकालीन स्थिति की घोषणा हुई उस समय लोक सभा चली, यहां बहस हुई। किन्तु इस समय जो आपातकालीन स्थिति की घोषणा हुई है इस की यह विशेषता है कि कुछ प्रमुख दलों के प्रमुखों को हिरासत में बन्द किया गया है। अब आपातकालीन स्थिति क्यों—इस के दो कारण बताए जा रहे हैं। एक तो यह है कि 21 सूत्रीय कार्यक्रम को अमल में लाना है। दूसरी बात यह है कि यहां ऐसी स्थिति पैदा हो गई थी जिसका वर्णन मेरे मित्र इन्द्रजीत गुप्ता ने किया कि यदि इन नेताओं को पकड़ कर जेल में बन्द नहीं करते तो पता नहीं इस से देश का क्या होता। अब इन दोनों के बारे में हमें सोचना होगा।

जहां तक 21 सूत्री कार्यक्रम का सवाल है मैं प्रधान मन्त्री का ही हवाला देता हूं मैं उन्हीं को उद्धृत करना चाहता हूं, प्रधान मन्त्री जी ने इस बात को स्वीकार किया है :

"In reply to another question she said, it was correct that the economic programmes announced on July 1, were part of the pledge made to the people. There was some glacial-
laking in their implementation and part of the fault is ours."

"Part of the fault is Government's for not implementing the programme."

यानी कांग्रेस ने शुरू किया दस सूत्री कार्यक्रम से। फिर दस सूत्र का बन गया नरौरा में 13 सूत्र और अब बन गया 21 सूत्र। अब इस में कौन सा सूत्र क्या है, वह मंगल सूत्र है या अमंगल सूत्र है.... (व्यवधान).... आखिर इन सूत्रों का सूत्रपात करके, इन को व्यवहार में लाने की जिम्मेदारी जो आप लोगों पर थी वह जिन्होंने नहीं निभाई उनको सजा कौन देगा? क्या केवल यह कहने से काम चल जायगा कि दि फाल्ट इज अक्सर्स?

अब मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ, तस्कर विरोधी अभियान चलाने की मानो शपथ हमारे गणेश जी ने लेकर श्रीगणेश किया। उन्होंने कहा-कूसेड अगेंस्ट स्मगलर्स, और वह बम्बई से ले कर कोचीन तक घूम कर आए। किन्तु मंत्रिमंडल के रिशफल से ही गणेश जी को जब उस विभाग से बदल दिया गया तो जाने अनजाने में देश के घटकर यह हवा फैल गई कि दि गवर्नमेंट इज नाट सीरियस ऐंड सिसियर। जब यह स्थिति थी, जो गणेश जी ने कही थी कि इन के खिलाफ कूसेड करेंगे तो कोई दल नहीं था जिस ने स्मगलर्स का साथ दिया हो। मेरे मित्र शमीम ने कहा कि बम्बई में किसी कांग्रेसी मंत्री ने उन का हाजी मस्तान के साथ परिचय करा दिया। उन्होंने किसी विरोधी दल का नाम नहीं लिया था। आप के किसी भी सूत्र के कार्यक्रम में कोई विरोधी दल बाधक था नहीं। इसलिए स्वयं प्रधान मंत्री ने इस बात को स्वीकार किया है कि "दि फाल्ट इज अक्सर्स"। किन्तु मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या इस के लिए जरूरी था कि विरोधी दल के नेताओं को पकड़ कर जेल में बन्द किया जाए? जैसे किसी आदमी की नौकरी चली जाए, और वह बेकार हो जाए तो घर आ कर पूछता है कि लड़का कहाँ गया, लड़की कैसे फेल हो गई? क्यों कि उस की खुद की नौकरी चली गई इसलिए उस को यह चिन्ता हो गई? जब तक नौकरी थी तब तक उस को चिन्ता ही नहीं थी कि लड़का ठीक अभ्यास कर रहा है या नहीं, लड़की क्या कर रही है, घर कैसे चलता है? अब एकदम चिन्ता शुरू हो गई कार्य-

क्रमों की। इसलिए जहाँ तक प्राथमिक कार्यक्रम का सवाल है मैं इन्द्रजीत गुप्ता से बिल्कुल सहमत हूँ उस बात में कि विरोधी दल यदि उससे कोई लाभ ले सके तो आप उस को भौका देते क्यों हैं? आप मेजारिटी में है। जैसे बाबू जत्ती ने कहा कि पांच लाख गांव हैं। उन में से 1 लाख 16 हजार गांवों में पीने का पानी नहीं है। यह 1969 से नहीं है। मेरे एक सवाल का जबाब दिया था उस समय कि 1 लाख 19 हजार गांवों में पीने का पानी नहीं है। पांचवीं पंच वर्षीय योजना के आरम्भ में स्वीकार किया जबाब मिला कि 1 लाख 16 हजार गांवों में पीने का पानी नहीं है। 69 से 71 तक पहुंचे तो 3 हजार गांवों में पानी पहुंचा पाए। इस के लिए विरोधी दलों की जिम्मेदारी नहीं है। आज तक जो नहरी पानी की योजनाएं खटाई में पड़ी हैं उन के लिए कौन जिम्मेदार है? मेरे एक सवाल का जबाब यह मिला है कि दि प्रोजेक्ट्स इन डिस्प्यूट नम्बर मोर देन 100। इस के लिए विरोधी दल जिम्मेदार नहीं है। 100 से ज्यादा पानी की योजनाएं खटाई में पड़ी हैं। खेती पानी के लिए तरसती है, किसान पानी के लिए तरस्ता है। तो इस जिम्मेदारी पर अमल कौन करेगा। क्या विरोधी दल इस के लिए बीच में आ कर रोकता था? इसके लिए जिम्मेदार विरोधी दल की नहीं हैं। जो अधिकारारूढ़ दल है वह इसकी जिम्मेदारी को स्वीकार करे।

मैं मानता हूँ, होर्ड्स हैं, मैं ने यहां मोदी की बात उठाई थी एसेशियल कमोडिटीज केस में। उस के गोडाउन में 9 हजार टन फलोवर मिला। मिलने के बाद उस के खिलाफ कौन सी कार्य-बाही हुई? केवल कानून कड़ाई से बनाने से काम नहीं चलता। उस को अमल में लाएगा? सवाल यही है कि उस को अमल में लाएगा कौन? होर्ड्स हैं, जमाखोर हैं, ब्लैक-मार्केटियर्स हैं? उस को पकड़ेगा कौन? उनको सजा देगा कौन? पिछले अक्टूबर में आप ने स्मगलर्स को पकड़ा। बार बार हम इस बात

[श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी]

की मांग करते रहे कि उन को मिसा के अंदर क्यों पकड़ रहे हो ? जिन्होंने इनकम टैक्स डेबिट किया है, जिन्होंने एक्साइज कानून, फारेन एक्सचेंज कानून का उल्लंघन किया है उस के घाघार पर उन के खिलाफ मुकदमा चलाओ और सजा दो। क्यों नहीं किया। यह काम किस का था? यह काम हमारा था। स्मगलर्स जिन कानूनों को फ्लाउट कर रहे हैं उन कानूनों में उन को पकड़ना और उन को सजा देना किस का काम था? वेग ग्राउन्डस कौन देता था? आप के ही अधिकारी देते थे। यानी व्यूरोक्रेट कह कर काम नहीं चलेगा। गरीब की जोरू सब की भाभी हो जाती है। अगर ऊपर वाला कड़ाई से काम नहीं करता है तो नीचे वाला भी नहीं कर सकता।

इसलिए जहां तक इम्प्लीमेंटेशन का सवाल है, मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी को इस बात के लिए धन्यवाद देता हूं, कि कम से कम प्रधान मंत्री ने इस बात को स्वीकार किया है कि दि फाल्ट इज अक्सर्स। इन इम्प्लीमेंटेशन देयर बाज स्लैकेनिंग इम्प्लीमेंटेशन हुआ नहीं... (व्यवधान)...

श्री एस० ए० शशीम (श्रीनगर) : पार्ट थाफ दि फाल्ट कहिए नहीं तो पकड़े जाइएगा।

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी : मैं तो गोवा जेल में भी रह चुका हूं। तो जेल में जाने से डरने की कोई बात नहीं है।

मेरा कहने का मतलब यह है कि जहां तक गरीब का भला करने का जो कार्यक्रम है वह कार्यक्रम यदि हम अमल में नहीं लाएंगे तो स्वयं प्रधान मंत्री जी ने चंडीगढ़ में अपने भाषण में कहा था कि जनता उस के लिए आप को कभी क्षमा नहीं करेगी। इसलिए मैं यहां कहता हूं कि आप इस कार्यक्रम को अमल में लाइए। कभी कभी बुराई में भी कुछ अच्छाई निकल आती है जैसे आजकल मैं देखता हूं कि इस बड़े खटाखट खटाखट लोग आते हैं। किन्तु सिर्फ एमजेंसी है इसलिए समय पर आना, एमजेंसी है इसलिए पूरी ताकत लगा कर काम करना, यह बात ठीक नहीं है। मैं 1942 में

मिलीटरी एकाउण्ट्स डिपार्टमेंट में काम कर रहा था। उस समय जो मेरे दोस्त बेबे कहते थे कि हम अंग्रेज का काम क्यों करें? मैंने कहा कि एक बार तुम्हें गलत काम करने की आदत पड़ गई तो जायगी नहीं। मैंने कहा कि अंग्रेज के खिलाफ हो, तो काम छोड़ दो, नौकरी छोड़ दो। किन्तु एक बार इस टेबल पर बैठ कर और यह सोच कर कि यह फारेनर है इसलिए हम दस घंटे में, 8 घंटे में सिर्फ दो घंटे काम करेंगे, यह एक गलत आदत लग गई तो आज रेलवे में है, हर डिपार्टमेंट में है, यह जो स्लेकनेस है यह हर जगह है। इमजेंसी का इसमें कोई मतलब नहीं है। कल एमजेंसी चली जाय तो इसका मतलब यह नहीं कि देरा से आए इसका मतलब यह नहीं काम न करे इसका मतलब यह नहीं कि छोटा आदमी है, छोटा किसान है तो उसको रगड़ा जाय। यह बिल्कुल नहीं होना चाहिए। एमजेंसी हो या न हो, यह जीवन की एक स्वाभाविक अवस्था होनी चाहिए। कर्तव्य दक्षता से हर व्यक्ति काम करे, ऐसा संस्कार हो, शिक्षा से ऐसा संस्कार हो, व्यवहार से ऐसा संस्कार हो, सिनेमा से ऐसा संस्कार हो, साहित्य से ऐसा संस्कार हो, जहां तहां यह वातावरण संस्कार का बने जिसमें प्रत्येक व्यक्ति अपनी पूरी शक्ति लगा कर जनता का काम करने की कोशिश करे।

जहां तक दूसरा सवाल है कि यदि यह कदम हम नहीं उठाते तो इतने लोगों को हम नहीं पकड़ते तो एक दम बड़ी भारी गड़बड़ होती और यह हमारे मित्र इन्द्रजीत गुप्ता ने कहा है, पालिटिक्स बिग्स स्ट्रेंज बेडफ़ेलोव... (व्यवधान)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member's time is up.

SHRI JAGANNATHARAO JOSHI: Give me some more time. Our party is the only target now, right from the Prime Minister down to the Congress President. Nothing is going into the press and if you are not going to allow us to reply here, what is to be done?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You may take a few minutes more.

SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI: No time has been fixed by the Business Advisory Committee. And you cannot decide the time yourself.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You please carry on. I just want to tell you that your time is up and you can take a few minutes more.

श्री जगन्नाथराव जोशी : अब यहां तक दूसरा सवाल है मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ— यही इन्द्रजीत गुप्त जी 1930 में सदा महात्मा गांधी जी को ब्रिटिश इम्पीरियलिज्म का एजेंट कहते थे ... (ध्वंशघान) ... मैं था रहा हूँ, मैं 1967 से इस सदन में बैठा हूँ, मैं सब लाया हूँ, आप ऐसा मत समझिए। 1942 के दिनों में ये सारे लोग कहां थे ? मैं उतनी पुरानी बात में नहीं जाता। 1962 में जब चीन ने इस देश पर हमला किया तब ये कहां थे ?

श्री एस० एम० बनर्जी : हिन्दुस्तान में।

श्री जगन्नाथराव जोशी : हां, हिन्दुस्तान में थे ? किन्तु उस समय जब हमने आपसी विरोध को भूल कर राष्ट्रीय संकट को समझ कर बंगलौर में कांग्रेस अध्यक्ष के साथ एक मंच पर भाषण दिया था। हनुमंतैया जी इस के गवाह होंगे। उस समय हम आपसी मतभेद भूल गए थे। लेकिन यह जो लोग इस को एग्जेशन कहें, न कहें, इन्कार न कहें, फलाना-डिमाका कहें, किन्तु जब इन्होंने देखा—हिन्दुस्तान की जनता के बलबूते पर इस देश में कभी क्रान्ति नहीं हो सकती—Then they have evolved a new pattern of palace revolution. इन्होंने सोचा कि छन्दर ही घुस कर हम कुछ करें। धीरे-धीरे इस की शुरुआत हुई—चन्द्रजीत यादव से, जो उत्तर प्रदेश में कांग्रेस पार्टी के एम० एल० ए० बने। आज बम्बई

में रजनी पटेल—हम को यह समझावें कि कांग्रेस क्या है, कांग्रेस के सिद्धान्त क्या हैं ? क्या वह बात हम रजनी पटेल से समझने का कोशिश करें।

जहां तक जनसंघ का सवाल है—1951 से हम देश में काम करते आये हैं। आप जब किसी पर नाराज हो जाते हैं तो ऐसा नाराज हो जाते हैं जिस का कोई मतलब नहीं। जैसे शेख साहब को आप ने दस साल अपनी जेल में बन्द किया.....

श्री एस० ए० शमीम : 14 साल।

श्री जगन्नाथराव जोशी : शेख साहब पर आरोप था—ट्रीजन का। कोई मामूली आरोप नहीं था। मेरी जानकारी में 1953 से 1963 तक बन्द रहे। किन्तु शमीम साहब कुल मिलाकर 14 साल कहते हैं। आज वही शेख साहब कांग्रेस में नहीं हैं, किन्तु जम्मू-काश्मीर के मुख्य मंत्री बने हैं। मैं उनका कोई विरोध नहीं कर रहा हूँ, किन्तु यह बता रहा हूँ कि आप का प्यार कब किस के साथ आएगा, समझ में नहीं आता। 1930 में जो कम्युनिस्ट आप के साथ नहीं थे, 1942 में आप के साथ नहीं थे, उन्होंने स्ट्रेटेजी बना कर 1965 से छन्दर घुसने की कोशिश की और आप के मित्र बन गए और लगातार जब जब राष्ट्र पर संकट आया—तो क्या भारतीय जनसंघ इस सरकार के साथ रहा या नहीं रहा। मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ—आप बताने का कोशिश करें तो हम मानने के लिए तैयार हैं—गोघ्रा का सत्याग्रह हुआ तो मैं स्वयं गोघ्रा की जेल में पहुंच गया। कच्छ का भूदान हमें मन्जूर नहीं था, हम ने सत्याग्रह किया। काश्मीर के मामले में हमारे नेता ने बलिदान किया और आज भी मैं बतलाना चाहता हूँ—1971 में—प्रधान मंत्री जी यहां हैं—उन्होंने वाजपेयी जी को अस्पताल में होते हुए भी बुलाया था, क्यों बुलाया था ? मैं उन के विश्वास की सराहना करता हूँ। लोकतन्त्र में विरोधी दल और सत्तारूढ़ दल दो धांधों जैसे होते हैं। धांधे दो हैं, किन्तु दीखता एक ही है—राष्ट्र का हित। हम यहां बैठे हैं और आप वहां

[श्री जगन्नाथराव जोशी]

बैठे हैं। इसलिए कोई हमें बतलाने की कोशिश करें कि जनसंघ ने क्या किया है। प्रधान मंत्री जी बैठे हैं—अणु विस्फोट हुआ तो उस दिन रेल स्ट्राइक के बारे में हम प्रधान मंत्री जी से मिलने के लिए गए—18 मई को। मैंने कहा—बताइये, बढ़ाई किस को दूँ? बाबू जी को दूँ या आप को दूँ।

We want a strong India, we want a strong Centre. We do not want pulverisation of our country. We want a strong leader. कश्मीर से लेकर कन्या कुमारी तक देश एक है किन्तु स्ट्रांग लीडर का मतलब बिरोधियों को जेल में बन्द करना नहीं है। इस लिये मैं कहता हूँ कि 1971 में बंगला देश के बारे में स्वतः घटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी ने प्रधान मंत्री जी को पत्र लिख कर अभिनन्दन किया कि आपने अच्छा काम किया है। उस के बाद सिक्किम का मामला आया, उस समय हमारे कम्युनिस्ट मित्र भी आगे-पीछे देख रहे थे। उस समय एक म. टि. ग. की थी—मैं सबसे पहला व्यक्ति था, जिसने प्रधान मंत्री जी को कान्फ्रेंसलेट किया था, मैंने कहा था कि यह बहुत अच्छा काम हुआ है। उसके बाद एटामिक एक्स्प्लोजन हुआ, उस वक्त भी हम ने कहा कि आपने बहुत अच्छा किया। कुछ लोगों ने बिरोध किया और कहा कि देश गरीब है, अणु विस्फोट क्यों करें। लेकिन हमने कहा कि नहीं, करना चाहिए। इतना ही नहीं हम यह भी चाहते हैं कि भारत विस्फोट करके केवल यहीं नहीं दिखाये कि भारत में इसकी बुद्धिमत्ता है, बल्कि यह भी [दिखाया कि दुनिया का नेतृत्व करने की क्षमता भी भारत के अन्दर है। भारत जब शक्तिशाली बनेगा तो दुनिया के कई देश भारत के साथ मित्रता रखने की कोशिश करेंगे। इसलिए जो भी अणु विस्फोट का कार्यक्रम किया गया, हम ने उसकी सराहना की, उस का बिरोध नहीं किया।

इसलिए भारतीय जनसंघ के बारे में, जब से हमारा जन्म हुआ है, 1951 से, आप बतायें—

कोई भी गैर कानूनी काम हमने किया है? तब हम मानने के लिए तैयार हैं। हमने कश्मीर के बारे में सत्याग्रह किया, गोवा के बारे में सत्याग्रह किया, कच्छ के बारे में सत्याग्रह किया, बतलाइये, कौन सी ध्वंसात्मक कार्यवाही की।

इसलिए जो कार्यक्रम एक्शन कमेटी का नाम लेकर बतलाया जाता है—बतलाइये, एक्शन कमेटी क्या करने वाली थी? पिछले दो सालों से कार्यक्रम चालू है। कलकत्ता में एक बड़ी रैली जयप्रकाश जी की हुई, दूसरे दिन सिद्धार्थ शंकर राय ने भी अपनी रैली की। लोकतन्त्र में यही होता है। जैसे दिल्ली में आपने भी रैली की और 6 मार्च को हम ने भी की और कोई गड़बड़ी नहीं हुई। मार्च की बात श्री इन्द्रजित गुप्त ने कहा पटना में गड़बड़ हुई लेकिन उसमें कम्युनिस्ट एम० एल० ए० रैडहैण्डेड पकड़ा गया था। इन्दिरा बिप्रेड के कार्यालय से खुले-आम गोली चली थी। मैं फुलेनाराय का नाम साफ बतला रहा हूँ। किस शान्तिपूर्ण तरीके से इस देश के अन्दर प्रदर्शन करने का अधिकार है या नहीं? यदि आप को लगे कि कोई वैसा कार्यक्रम है तो उस को खींचो, कोर्ट में खींचो, एविडेंस सामने लाओ और उस को सजा दो। किन्तु यह न करके, सिर्फ बोलते जाना, बोलते जाना, बोलते जाना—इस का मतलब क्या है?

प्रधान मंत्री जी बैठे हैं—मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ—गुजरात के चुनाव में जनसंघ का नाम ले लेकर प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कहा कि ये महात्मा गांधी के हत्यारे हैं—डायरेक्टली नहीं, किन्तु ऐसे वातावरण का निर्माण किया...

प्रधान मंत्री, परमाणु ऊर्जा मंत्री, इलेक्ट्रॉनिक्स मंत्री तथा अंतरिक्ष मंत्री (श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी) : आर०एस०एस० कहा है।

श्री जगन्नाथराव जोशी : वह भी तो मैं बोल रहा हूँ—यह बात 1948 से देश में चालू है—किसी ने घर जलाने की बात कही

हे—1948 में क्या हुआ? चम्हाण साहब कहाँ है, सतारा कोल्हापुर जिले में गांव गांव में घर-घर जलाये गये, किन्तु हमारे मुंह से एक शब्द नहीं निकला। हम ने कहा— ठीक है, यह अपना समाज है, उन्होंने हमको गलत समझा, हमको ठीक नहीं समझा। यदि हमारे नज़दीक आयेंगे, जैसे जय प्रकाश जी आये। क्या पहले हमारे साथ थे, 1948 में हमारे खिलाफ मोर्चा लगाने वाले जय प्रकाश नारायण थे। लेकिन जब वह हमारे नज़दीक आये, हमारे साथ आये, तब उनको पता चला। जैसे मुझ को देख कर कई लोग सोचते होंगे कि जोशी जी, कितना खाते होंगे। किन्तु साथ बैठ कर जब देखते हैं कि कितना खाना हूँ तो कहते हैं कि बहुत कम है। इसलिये हम नाराज नहीं होते हैं। 1948 में संघ पर प्रतिबन्ध लगा तो हम नाराज नहीं हुए....

श्री राम सहाय पाण्डेय (राजनंदगाव) : वाजपेयी जी ने स्ट्रीट्स, सड़क, चौराहे सभी जगहों पर फाइट करने की बात कही थी, इस लिये आप अपनी सफाई न दीजिये, पार्टी की सफाई दीजिये।

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी : मैंने बात पूरी नहीं की है। 1948 से लेकर क्या आप लोगों ने यह प्रचार नहीं किया। इतना होते हुए भी हम यहां पहुंचे कैसे? हमारे विद्याचरण शुक्ल यहां बैठे हैं—उनके बड़े भाई श्यामाचरण शुक्ल ने शाजापुर में जा कर कहा, मेरे खिलाफ प्रचार किया कि यह कर्णाटक का भ्रादमी है, बाहर का भ्रादमी है, इसको वोट मत दो....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Joshi, you will kindly try to wind up.

SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI: As a matter of fact, I am saying that the Prime Minister said this and that the President of the Congress went to the extent of threatening that if the Jan Sangh does not behave, it will be banned.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have said that. Now you try to conclude.

SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI: If I cannot express myself here, if you do not allow me to express myself here, it will be very unfair. I know that nothing is going to the press I know it. Still, I should express myself. If I am speaking anything irrelevant, you can stop me. But I am requesting you that a little bit more time should be given to me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please listen to me. There is a time limit prescribed, and that time-limit is before me. Please try to conclude.

SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI: The time limit has not been fixed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please listen. The Chair is bound by certain regulations and certain limits fixed on time and on other matters. The Speaker announced this morning that six hours would be allotted for this, and the Speaker has got the authority for that. He has fixed the time. There is allotment of time for different parties. Still, there is a latitude shown to Jansangh. Though 13 minutes has been allotted for it has taken 25 minutes. Let him conclude within two or three minutes.

SHRI P. K. DEO (Kalahandi): The Business Advisory Committee is yet to meet and allot time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please resume your seat. I can understand Shri Joshi setting up and making a submission. But for other members to make submission on his behalf it is not necessary, because he is enough of a parliamentarian to look after himself. So, kindly resume your seat, especially when the Chair is standing.

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM: Now that you are sitting, may I make a submission. Even though the time-limit is fixed, it is not adhered to and applied in every case. Ultimately, it so happens that the independent members

[Shri S. A. Sharma]

will not have any time. So, please stick to the time limit right from now on.

SHRI H. M. PATEL (Dhanduka): Why did you not follow the time-limit earlier than? You have to give more time to opposition members. In fact, it is more desirable. I suggest to the Prime Minister that she herself agrees to see that more time is given to every speaker on this side of the House. We are all asked to say that we approve of the proclamation of emergency. Now, if we do not approve of it, let us give our reasons why we do not wish to approve of it. This attempt to gag us....(Interruptions). There is complete gagging. So, I say that adequate time should be given to us. May I request the Prime Minister, through you, that she be good enough to agree to allow the speakers on this side of the House to have the maximum possible time that she can spare?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I thought that the BAC was going to meet to settle this matter. I do not know when it is meeting. It is true that so far the time-limit has not been adhered to. I think "the maximum possible time" is a very wide term. I think a little more time can be given, but not the maximum possible time.

SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI: I will try to make a very humble submission.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You take five minutes more and try to conclude.

SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI: The description given by my hon. friend, Shri Indrajit Gupta, was that there would have been a catastrophe if those leaders had not been arrested. If you are not going to give me an opportunity to express myself on those points, then what is the use of my coming here. Had I been put in jail, I would have been satisfied to sit in jail. But now I come here and I cannot express myself.

मेरे कहने का मतलब यही है कि 1948 से लेकर 1975 तक जब जनता न शापका साथ नहीं दिया, तो ग्राज पुलिस और मिलिट्री के बलबूते पर सब की आवाज को बन्द करना—क्या यह प्रजातंत्र है, लोकतंत्र है ?

I will read certain passages from the Kapur Commission. Please allow me to conclude.

क्योंकि बार-बार प्रधान मंत्री जी कहती हैं—मैंने उनसे कन्सल्टेटिव कमेटी में भी पूछा था, जब सुमद्रा जोशी जी ने यह आवाज निकाली थी।

The question is not whether to ban RSS or not; the question is who is to decide whether the activities of RSS are harmful to the country or not. Are you prepared to appoint an impartial committee to go into all the details? We are prepared for that. Look here. This is a democracy. Everybody has got the right to agree or disagree; everybody has got the right to go to court; everybody has got the right to meet peacefully....(interruptions) If you examine them, you will find that they are bamboo swords or wooden swords.

इस तरह की बात कह कर देश को भ्रमित करने का प्रयास करना है, यह लोकतंत्र नहीं है। इसको कौन लोकतंत्र बोलता है। इसीलिये मैं कपूर कमीशन से कोट करने जा रहा हूँ.....

श्री बचत साठे (प्रकोला) : भ्रमित करने के लिए तलवार रखी जाती है।

श्री जनसाधन राव जोशी : यह तो खेल के लिये है। मेरे साठे जी—
In the Constitution you have given this right to every Sikh in this country. You cannot stop me from making myself Jagannath Singh instead of Jagannath Joshi. Then I can carry a

dagger and a sword. That is my constitutional right. The question is not which weapon you carry; the question is the motive. साथे जी,

यह तो खेलने के लिए जो दण्ड होता है, वह है। अभी इलस्ट्रेड वीकली में निकला था—गार्ड-आफ-भानर इन्द्रज त गुप्ता का हुआ, वह भी दण्ड से हुआ था। तो आप को नाराज होना है तो जरूर हो जाइये, हम ने यह नहीं कहा कि आप नाराज मत होइये, लेकिन हमने बैन की बात नहीं कही, जब कि आप घेराव और बन्द की बात करते हैं।

Do you know who started this word "gherao" or bandh? It is Shri Dange, who spoke in this House "tomorrow we will ghcrao you" (Interruptions)

वह जो शब्द है, यह फ्रिजियोलोजी हमारी नहीं है, यह कम्युनिस्टों की फ्रिजियोलोजी है जो आज कल आप के मित्त बन हुए हैं...

श्री एस० ए० शमीम : घेराव में काफी 5हराव आ गया है।

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी : यह जो कपूर कमीशन था, मैं उसके कुछ एबसट्रेक्ट्स पढ़ कर अपना भाषण समाप्त करना चाहता हूँ—

श्री एस० ए० शमीम : यह कौन सा कपूर कमीशन ?

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी : यह सरकार ने नियुक्त किया था। मैं, सभापति महोदय, उसी में से उद्धृत करना चाहता हूँ—

"R. M. BANERJEE: 'Although RSS was banned, it should not be taken to be an acceptance by the Government of the allegation that the murder of Mahatma Gandhi was by the members of the RSS as such' "

(Volume 2, page 62)

The Commission further comments:

"In Delhi also there is no evidence that the RSS as such was indulging in violent activities as against Mahatma Gandhi or the top Congress leaders." (Page 66)

Having made a searching enquiry into the conspiracy to murder Mahatma Gandhi, the Kapur Commission categorically declared:

"An experienced administrator like Mr. R. N. Banerjee has stated that the RSS as such were not responsible for the murder of Mahatma Gandhi, meaning thereby that one could not name the organisation as such as being responsible for that most diabolical crime, the murder of the apostle of peace, the like of whom the world does not see excepting after centuries."

आप न उन दिनों में हमारे प्रमुख जो थे गुरुजी, उनको 302 में पकड़ा था। उनको खींचते कोर्ट में। 80,000 लोगों ने सत्याग्रह किया उनको पकड़ते, किसी के सामने सिद्ध करते, उनको सजा देते। किसने आप को रोका था? आप ने आर०एस०एस० को 1948 में बैन करते समय जो चार्जज लगाये थे

They were all cyclostyled charges right from arson to murder.

16 hrs.

Then I quote the view of the Chief Justice of this country, Shri K. Subba Rao. It is on page 14. It says:

"Friends, I am very happy to have come here to meet you all and say a few words to you."

(Interruptions)

"Friends, I am very happy to have come here to meet you all and say a few words to you. I am not a politi-

[Shri Jagannathrao Joshi]

cian, and hope I will not become one. What I have said is only as a person who has been watching the activities of the R.S.S. It is helping the country to develop national consciousness"

(Interruptions)

This is the respect you are showing to the judiciary. Mr. Chairman, I am not allowed to read it out.

"and I am sure this will become one of the powerful instruments of national integration. What is more, I feel that this institution tries to build up the character of our youngmen, and if it succeeds in that attempt it will succeed in rebuilding our nation".

These are the views of Mr. Subba Rao

Now, I am reading the Mysore High Court's verdict. It is on page 13. This case was brought before the Mysore High Court in 1966. It says:

"The Mysore High Court in one of its celebrated judgements, after listening to the various charges of 'communalism', 'subversion', 'violence' etc., advanced by the Government against Sangh, declared unambiguously: "All the above materials show that *prima facie* the RSS is a non-political cultural organisation without any hatred or ill-will towards non-Hindus and that many eminent and respected persons in the country have not hesitated to preside over its functions or appreciate the work of its volunteers. In a country like ours which has accepted the democratic way of life (as ensured by the Constitution), it would not be within reason to accept the proposition that mere membership of such peaceful or non-violent Association and participation in activities, thereof, will render a person (in whose character and antecedents there are no other defects) unsuitable to be appointed to the post of a Munsiff."

इस के बाद सभापति, महोदय, बंन हटाने के लिए श्री वैकटरमन शास्त्री ने, जो लिबरल पार्टी के लीडर थे, उन्होंने कहा . . .
(व्यवधान)

Then T. R. Venkataraman Sastri, President, Indian liberal federations referring to fascism said like this:

"A Government or a State can be characterised as fascist, but not a private association to which no one is compelled to belong."

I put an Unstarred Q. No. 7998 dated 24-4-74, but the Government had not replied.

This morning itself, I had raised a point.

अब हम आप को फ़ासिस्ट इसलिये कहते हैं कि कल आप ने समन दे कर बुलाया। जो सज्जन मेरे पास आये उनको आप पकड़ कर ले गये दो ढाई बजे के करीब। मैं ने उनको आश्वासन दिया था कि पार्लियामेंट खुलेगी और सरकार जवाब देगी। किन्तु हम को कोई जवाब नहीं मिला।

What guarantee is there that tomorrow I will not be arrested.....

(व्यवधान)

मैं दो साल गंग्रा जेल में रहा। किन्तु मैं बनाना चाहता हूँ

This is for the Home Minister, Mr. Mohsin, to know that this question was tabled by me on 24-4-74.

मैंने सवाल किया जानने के लिये।

नम्बर दो मैंने पूछा था:

What was the question? It was;

"whether Government are aware of such cases wherein courts of law have decided that the Rashtriya Swyamsewak Sangh (RSS) has been responsible for acts of violence State-wise and if so, the facts, thereof;"

यह जवाब है प्रार.एस.एस.के बारे में कि कुछ नहीं। और जो कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के बारे में सवाल पूछा था कि :

"whether Government are also aware of cases wherein members of Communist Party of India have been held guilty for acts of violence Statewise and, if so, the facts thereof."

इसका जो जवाब दिया गया वह भी मैं पढ़ देना चाहता हूँ।

"In Guntur district during August and September, 1973, in dehoarding campaign, 220 members of the CPI and C.P.(M) were arrested for various acts of violence and were held guilty.

In Nalgonda district, on 8-8-73, 12 CPI workers were convicted.

Karnatak—During 1972, 12 CPI workers were prosecuted for acts of violence and were convicted.

Orissa—During the year 1972, 174 CPI members and supporters, were found guilty of acts of violence for staging demonstration against price rise."

तो जो सवाल मैंने पूछा था उसका जो जवाब दिया, इतना होने के बाद भी जब ऐसा होता है तो जाहिर है कि आप प्रजातंत्र पर भरोसा नहीं करते। माननीय वाजपेयी, माननीय श्यामनन्दन मिश्र, माननीय मधु इंदवते को, जो कमेटी के काम के लिये बंगलौर गये थे—वहाँ उनको पकड़ा। हाई कोर्ट ने उनको छोड़ा। छोड़ने के बाद फिर आप ने उनको पकड़ा। यह तो बुद्धिमयरी वर्सेज ऐग्रीक्यूटिव का मामला हो जाता है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या 1962 के बाद इमरजेंसी नहीं थी? 1971 के बाद इमरजेंसी नहीं थी? क्या अभी 21 सूची कार्यक्रम को अमल में लाने के लिये यह तरीका अख्तियार

करना चाहिए था? आज देश में शांतिपूर्ण तरीके से प्रवर्तन करने के लिये कोई अधिकार नहीं रखा है। माननीय मोहन धारिया की अध्यक्षता में जो आवश्यक वस्तुओं के वतरण के लिये कमेटी बनी थी उसने पिछले अगस्त महीने में अपनी रिपोर्ट दी। नवम्बर और फरवरी में मैंने सवाल किया तो यही कहा गया कि वह रिपोर्ट विचाराधीन है। और आज आप हम को कहते हैं कि 21 सूची कार्यक्रम हम अमल में नहीं लाये। आप के इलेक्टेड मेम्बर श्री राम धन, चन्द्रगोबखर जो वर्किंग कमेटी के मेम्बर हैं, क्या वह भा.देश के अन्दर खतरा पैदा कर रहे हैं? नहीं। आप को ऐसा लगा कि इन की तादाद बढ़ेगी। नेतृत्व में बदल करने के लिये आप तैयार नहीं थे। इसलिये आप ने ऐसा किया। यह पाबन्दी हमारे लिये नहीं है, बल्कि माननीय साठे जी मराठी कहावत को जानते हैं कि "नेकी बोली सुना लागे" यानी पत्नी को तो धप्पड़ मार नहीं सकते, इसलिये बच्चों को मार कर पत्नी को डराना चाहते हैं। प्रजातंत्र की पान्चाली का चीर हरण होते समय कौरव सभा; सारी सभा चुप थी तब कम से कम धारिया, राम धन और लक्ष्मीकान्तम्मा ने विकर्ण बन कर कहा कि यह गलत हो रहा है। यह बात भले ही आज सही न निकले, लेकिन इतिहास इसका साक्षात् होगा।

श्री भागवत झा आजाद (भागलपुर) : सभापति महोदय, आपात स्थिति की घोषणा कितने आवश्यक, महत्वपूर्ण और उचित थी उस समय शायद कुछ लोगों को संदेह रहा हो लेकिन आज देश के विभिन्न वर्गों ने अपने समर्थन से सिद्ध कर दिया है कि यह उपयुक्त समय था और परमावश्यक था। इस देश के सभी वर्गों के सभी लोगों ने इस स्थिति का समर्थन किया है। प्रधान मंत्री के बुद्धिमत्तापूर्ण और साहसिक कदम का स्वागत किया है। इसलिये वे बधाई को पात्र हैं। आज भारतीय संसद् के जन-प्रतिनिधि यहाँ फिर उसके समर्थन के लिये इकट्ठा हुए हैं।

[श्री बाबूबाबू साहू]

प्रश्न यह है कि हम इस स्थिति का समर्थन क्यों करते हैं? प्रधान मंत्री ने स्वयं इस आपात स्थिति की घोषणा करते हुए कहा था कि हम इस देश के गणतंत्र को पुनः बैक मान दी रेज ला रहे हैं।

उन्होंने कहा था कि क्योंकि इस देश की जम्हूरियत की हत्या करने के लिए एक छोटा सा अल्पमत जिसमें य राजे-महाराजे, जिसमें यह जन संघ, जिसमें यह आर०एस०एस० और ऐसे ही दूसरे व्यक्ति हैं, उतारू था, इसलिए जम्हूरियत को उसकी हत्या से बचाने के लिए यह आवश्यक था कि आपात स्थिति की घोषणा की जाये। इस देश में वर्षों के बाद एक गणतंत्र का महल खड़ा किया गया है और एक इंस्टीट्यूशन बनाया है। उस इंस्टीट्यूशन को तोड़ने के लिए यह छोटा सा अल्पमत जो है, देश में बगावत करा रहा था, जिस को बचाने के लिए यह आवश्यक था कि कदम उठाया जाता। श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी, जो आज गणतंत्र के नाम पर बोलते हैं, ये वे पुरुष हैं जिनके मुंह में राम और बगल में छुरी है और इस देश में ये फासिस्ट, प्रतिक्रियावादी शक्तियां विरोधी पार्टी के नाम पर, उनका मुखौटा बन कर जनतंत्र का गला घोटने को बराबर तैयार रहती हैं और कुछ राजनीतिक पार्टियां जिनका दृष्टिकोण फासिस्टवादी है और कुछ हुताश और पिटे हुए राजनीतिज्ञ, जो बार-बार सम्पूर्ण क्रान्ति की बात देश में करते हैं आपस में मिल गये और यह कोशिश करने लगे कि देश के विश्वास को तोड़ दिया जाये, देश की जनता के विश्वास को तोड़ दिया जाये और तमाम जनतंत्रीय प्रणाली की हत्या कर दी जाये और स्वयं सत्ता में आ जायें। सभापति महोदय, ये लोग गणतंत्र की तुहाई देते हैं मगर भयंकर, हिंसापूर्ण आन्दोलन कर के देश की जनता का ध्यान आर्थिक और सामाजिक प्रश्नों से हटा कर देश में अराजकता और गड़बड़ी फैलाते हैं

और जनता के चुने हुए प्रतिनिधियों और उनकी सरकारों को उखाड़ फेंकने की कोशिश करते हैं।

16.12 hrs.

[SHRI ISHAQUE SAMBHALI in the Chair]

इस भयानक अराजकता, हिंसा और भयंकर अव्यवस्था की आड़ में फासिस्टवादी शक्तियों के, जम्हूरियत के जानी दुश्मनों के हाथ को किस तरह से मजबूत होने दिये जायें किस तरह से उनको सत्ता में आने दिया जाये ताकि इस देश के गणतंत्र के महल को उखाड़ा जाये। यह भयंकर षड़यंत्र, सभापति महोदय, आज से नहीं, कई वर्षों से चल रहा है। प्रधान मंत्री जी ने देश का ध्यान इस षड़यंत्र की ओर बार-बार आकर्षित किया है। आज जो हुआ, प्रधान मंत्री जी ने इस सदन में, इस सदन के बाहर बराबर देश की जनता का ध्यान इस बात की ओर आकृष्ट किया था और कहा था कि इस देश में कुछ मिस-क्रयेन्ट्स, मिसडाइरेक्टेड पोलिटिशियन्स और फासिस्ट ग्रुप अराजकता फैलाना चाहते हैं। जब यह बात सीमा को पार कर गई तब मेसिब मेडेट को लेकर आई हुई सरकार और उसके प्रधान मंत्री ने अपना कर्तव्य समझा कि अपने कर्तव्य को निभाने के लिए प्रधान मंत्री को अप्रिय कार्य करना पड़ा जो वह नहीं चाहती थीं। संविधान के अनुच्छेद 352 के अन्तर्गत दी गई शक्ति का प्रयोग कर के आपात-स्थिति की घोषणा हमने इसलिए की कि देश में गणतन्त्रात्मक ढांचे की रक्षा के लिए और आर्थिक विकास की प्रगति के पथ पर ले जाने के लिए, उसको बढ़ाने के लिए यह आवश्यक था।

कौन नहीं जानता कि इस देश में कितना बड़ा षड़यंत्र अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय पूंजीवाद ने और इस देश के पूंजीवाद ने और इस देश की प्रतिक्रियावादी शक्तियों ने, इस देश की उन पार्टियों ने जो आर०एस०एस० हैं, जो आन्दोलनवादी हैं और जो जनसंघी हैं, जो

गणतंत्र में विश्वास नहीं करती हैं, किया था। किसने क्यों से, 1971 से जब यह चुनाव में हार गये, ये चिसे-पिटे मोहरे जो ये उन्होंने फिर एक नया रूप पकड़ा और उस समय "इन्दिरा हटाओ" अभियान बना था। 1971 में जब यह हार गये, तब हारने के बाद जनता के विशाल बहुमत से संगठित इस लोक सभा के प्रांगण में, सदन में जमहूरियत के उज्ज्वल सिद्धान्तों के अनुसार चुने हुए प्रधान मंत्री की आंखों के सामने ही, उगते सूरज की प्रथम किरण से डूबते चांद की धूमिल चांदनी में इन बगों के लोगों ने लोक-सभा को गणतंत्र के प्राणों को, उस की हर सांस को तोड़ना चाहा ताकि जनता के अरमानों की नाश पर उनकी सत्ता का महल खड़ा हो सके। इस सदन को इन्होंने कहां चलने दिया? एक बार भी यह सही ढंग से नहीं चला। आज के महाभारत के दुर्योधन गुजरात से प्रेरणा ले कर बिहार की, बौद्ध और महावीर की भूमि पर, अशोक और डा० राजेन्द्र प्रसाद की भूमि पर, उसकी शस्य श्यामला भूमि पर टूट पड़े। वहां के भोले विद्यार्थियों ने जलस निकाला अपनी मांगों के लिए, तो उस जलूस के पीछे टीन में पेट्रोल और हाथों में दियासलाई लेकर, ये जनसंघी ये आर०एस०एस० और ये आनन्दमार्गी चल पड़े और उन्होंने 'सर्चलाइट' और 'प्रदीप' को जला डाला। आज यह स्वतंत्रता की मांग करते हैं प्रेस के नाम पर? जागरण के उन पहलुओं को किस ने जलाया? यही हैं आर०एस०एस० और जनसंघी, जिन्होंने पटना और बिहार की शस्य श्यामला भूमि में लोगों को लूटा और अग्नि लगाई और उसके नेता बने श्री जय प्रकाश नारायण जी, सबसे बड़े सर्वोदयवादी और गांधीवादी। आज यह कहते हैं कि उन्होंने अणु-शक्ति का समर्थन किया है। जोशी जी ने कहा कि "हम ने आप के अणु-परीक्षण का समर्थन किया है" और जब जय प्रकाश जी ने कहा कि इस परीक्षण का नहीं आर्यघट्ट का कोई महत्व नहीं है, तो उन्होंने उनका भी समर्थन किया।

तो यह इनके दो मोहरे हैं। वहां भी समर्थन किया और यहां भी समर्थन किया। आर०एस०एस० का यह रूप है कि मुंह में राम और बगल में छुरी। इसलिए यह देश के लिए बराबर एक खतरा बना रहता है और इस कारण आर०एस०एस० को जो बंद किया गया है, वह प्रधान मंत्री जी ने एक बहुत सही काम किया है और भारत सरकार ने बहुत सही काम किया है। बात यह है कि आज इस देश की आर्थिक अवस्था को तोड़ने के लिए रेल स्ट्राइक किया गया और सोशलिस्ट पार्टी, समाजवाद में विश्वास करने वाले नेता श्री जार्ज फरमान्डीज ने कहा रेलवे मंत्रियों से "ओ, स्लीपिंग ज्यान्ट्स, जागो और अपनी शक्ति पहचानो"। तुम देश के अन्दर हर स्टील मिल को बन्द कर सकते हो। उन्होंने कहा कि एक बार स्टील फरनेस बन्द हो गई, तो फिर यह 9 महीनों में री-फायर होगा। तुम सात दिन के अन्दर हर पावर स्टेशन को बन्द कर सकते हो, तुम 15 दिन के अन्दर इस देश की जनता को भूखों मार सकते हो क्योंकि रेल से अनाज नहीं जायेगा। किसने उकसाया इस बात के लिए? यह जनता के प्रति भावना थी। उस रेल स्ट्राइक में इस देश में करीब-करीब 124 करोड़ रुपये की क्षति हुई लेकिन उसका 10 गुना यानी 1240 करोड़ रुपये की इस देश की सम्पत्ति की क्षति हुई। इतना बड़ा षड़यंत्र किया था। इस तरह से इस षड़यंत्र का रेल स्ट्राइक भी एक रूप था। सम्पूर्ण देश में यह चले थे क्रान्ति करने, सम्पूर्ण क्रान्ति करने। श्री जय प्रकाश नारायण बिहार का परिणाम देख ही चुके थे। उन्होंने देखा कि बिहार में तो कुछ हुआ नहीं। लूटजनी हुई और सब कुछ हुआ लेकिन वहां की जनता में कुछ नहीं हुआ तो वे चले और जगहों पर। आगे-आगे वह और पीछे-पीछे नचनिया, भजनिया, ढोल बजाने वाले, ये जनसंघी, आर०एस०एस० और आनन्दमार्गी, जीरो कांग्रेस। ये तमाम लोग पीछे पीछे चले और आगे-आगे जय प्रकाश नारायण जी। कहीं की ईंट कहीं का रोड़ा

[श्री भागवत झा याजद]

भानमती ने झुनवा छोड़ा। तो वे मजिनिया, मजिनिया बिहार टाइप का भ्रान्दोलन करने के लिए उड़ीसा गये और वहां पर सर्वोदय कार्यकर्ताओं को मड़काया, मध्य प्रदेश में जनसंघियों का भारतीय लोक दल से पाणि-ग्रहण कराया और पंजाब में जन संघ ने भ्रकाली दल में मुहब्बत की ज्वाला फूकी और प्रेम पत्र लिखवाया और दिल्ली में अखिल भारतीय विद्यार्थी परिषद् और भारतीय युवा संघ ने जन संघ के नेतृत्व में कमान संभाला और ऐसा लगा कि सम्पूर्ण देश में सब तो और कुछ रह ही नहीं गया है और 83 साल का बूढ़ा नौजवान झाम्मी बन कर चला सम्पूर्ण क्रान्ति करने और यह जन संघी अपनी तलवार लिये हुए, अपनी ढाल लिये हुए और छुरा लिये हुए अहिंसा के नाम पर क्रान्ति करने के लिए चल पड़े। लेकिन बात यह है कि इन तमाम चीजों को करने के बाद श्री जयप्रकाश नारायण जी ने और उनके इन जनसंघी साथियों ने, आर०एस०एस० वालों ने और आनन्द मार्गियों ने देश में क्या क्या किया? इन्होंने सरकार के खिलाफ तमाम सबवरसिव एलिमेंट्स को जुटाया, एन्टी नेशनल एक्सट्रीमिस्ट्स को जुटाया और स्वयं जय प्रकाश जी जब बंगाल गये तो वहां पर उन्होंने सेवाल मित्रा से सम्बन्ध स्थापित किया। यह वही सेवाल मित्रा हैं जो लन्दन गये थे माऊ से पूछने के लिए कि किस प्रकार हिन्दुस्तान की जम्हूरियत को उलटया जाये। उन से श्री जय प्रकाश जी ने सम्बन्ध स्थापित किया कलकत्ता में और उन्होंने माऊ और चीन की प्रशंसा की। उन्होंने कार्यक्रम के नाम पर कार्यक्रम बनाया कि जेल तोड़ो, असेम्बली घेरो, सचिवालय घेरो। सम्पूर्ण क्रान्ति का उन्होंने जो नारा दिया उसका उद्देश्य सम्पूर्ण देश में और भराजकता फैलाना था, भयंकर घृणा और द्वेष की ज्वाला फैलाना था। उन्होंने गणतंत्र की पद्धति में परिवर्तन की मांग की, न्यू पीजिटी का नारा दिया जिसका कुछ पता

नहीं कि कब से और किस रूप में यह चाहते थे। सभापति महोदय, धरर मुझे छोड़ा सा समय दें तो मैं आपको जय प्रकाश जी के भाषणों से उद्धरण दे सकता हूँ जिनसे यह स्पष्ट हो जाएगा कि उनका कभी भी देश में गणतंत्र में विश्वास नहीं रहा। चुनाव प्रणाली के सम्बन्ध में एक तरफ वह कहते हैं कि इस चुनाव प्रणाली से देश में पार्लिमेंट के जरिये, संसद् के जरिये क्रान्ति नहीं आयेगी, इस चुनाव प्रणाली में बहुत गलत काम किये जा रहे हैं लेकिन दूसरी तरफ जब प्रधान मंत्री उन से कहती हैं कि आप भाइये और बताइये कि चुनाव प्रणाली में किस प्रकार के परिवर्तन किये जाये प्रधान मंत्री ने स्वयं स्वीकार की—

"No engine works if it is not kept in constant repairs; no system works without vigilance."

जब प्रधान मंत्री उन से कहती हैं कि आप और हम मिल कर समाधान करे तो जय प्रकाश जी उस आमंत्रण को ठुकरा देने हैं और कहते हैं कि हम बातचीत करने के लिए नहीं जायेंगे, उसमें भाग लेने नहीं जायेंगे। देश में सम्पूर्ण क्रान्ति लाने के लिए उन्होंने देश के विद्यार्थियों में अनुशासनहीनता को बढ़ावा दिया। चारों तरफ देश में भाग और लूट का बाजार गर्म किया, आर०एस०एस० की पैरा मिलिटरी फोर्स की बकालत उन्होंने की। पटना के गांधी मैदान में तथा देश में जगह जगह उन्होंने देश की पुलिस और फौज को कहा कि तुम आर्डर मत मानो। जब उन से इस चीज का स्पष्टीकरण करने को कहा गया तो उन्होंने कहा कि नहीं हम ने ऐसा नहीं कहा, हम ने यह कहा है कि तुम गलत आर्डर न मानो। इस बात को जो उन्होंने कही मैं मान लेता हूँ। इन्हीं को मैं सही मान लेता हूँ। लेकिन मैं पूछता हूँ कि कोई आर्डर गलत है या सही इसका फैसला कोन करेगा? क्या इसका फैसला जय प्रकाश जी

करेंगे और उनको बुलाया जाएगा इसका फैसला करने के लिए? कौन फैसला करेगा? गणतन्त्र में ज. सुनी हुई सरकार है वह इसका फैसला करती है, उसके कमाण्डर करते हैं, प्रधान मन्त्री करती हैं, डिफेंस मिनिस्टर करते हैं या जो फौजी हैं उनको कहा जाएगा कि वे फैसला करें कि क्या गलत है और क्या सही है? बराबर उन्होंने फौज में और पूर्णिम में बगावत करवाने की कोशिश की। ऐसी किसी भी चीज को कोई भी शासन, कोई भी सरकार अंजूर नहीं कर सकती थी।

कुछ मित्रों ने जिन्होंने भाषण नहीं किया है और हमारे अपने भी कुछ मित्र जिन्होंने बहुत बढ़िया भाषण दिया है और एक ने तो पत्र भी लिखा है और एक हमारी पार्टी के भी हैं उन्होंने भी सरकार की आलोचना करने में कोई कमर उठा नहीं रखी थी। मुझे एक वान याद आती है :

मन्त्री के पावन पद की यह शान
नहीं दीखना दोष कही शासन में
भूतपूर्व मन्त्री की यह पहचान
कहना है सरकार बहुत पापी है।

और तो और जब तक मन्त्री रहे मौन थे। किन्तु पदच्युत होते ही, टूटने लगे हैं बड़े जोर से, भाई भ्रष्टाचार पर।

एक माननीय सदस्य : आप कौन सी कटेगरी में हैं।

श्री भागवत सा आजाद : मैं चार बरस पहले जैसा था वैसा ही आज भी हूँ। मैं उस कटेगरी में नहीं हूँ। मैंने कोई इस तरह का गलत काम नहीं किया।

चुनाव पद्धति में अगर परिवर्तन करना था तो उसके लिए यह आवश्यक था कि बैठ कर बात की जाती। लेकिन उन्होंने इसको अंजूर नहीं किया।

आप जानते ही हैं कि आनन्द मार्गियों ने कितनों का कत्ल किया। आनन्द मूर्ति जमालपुर के डिप्टी जज क्लर्क श्रीमान् सरकार ने अपने भबधूतों के जरिये 26 लोगों का कत्ल करवाया। उनकी प्रसेम्बली को उड़ाने की योजना पकड़ी गई। क्या यह सब सही नहीं है? क्या यह भी सही नहीं है कि श्रीमान् जय-प्रकाश जी ने और उनके समर्थकों ने आनन्द मार्ग को बड़ी अच्छी सस्था बताया था, उसको एक सुन्दर सर्टिफिकेट दिया था? अब अगर उनकी योजना को हम पकड़ते हैं तो हम जालिम हैं। "वे कत्ल भी करें तो कुछ भी नहीं, हम उफ भी करें तो बागी हैं। वे लूटें हमारे गुलशन को, हम शोर मचाना क्या जानें।" हिन्दुस्तान के गुलशन को आनन्द मार्गी लूटें, वे कत्लेआम करें और अगर सरकार उनको पकड़े तो हम डिक्टेटर हैं, अधिनायक हैं और वे दूध के घले हुए हैं? गणतन्त्र विरोधी बराबर कत्ल करते रहे, हिन्दुस्तान के बागीचे को तोड़ते रहें, बरबाद करते रहें और हम कुछ न बोलें?

देश में जो आपात स्थिति की घोषणा हुई है इसका समर्थन न केवल इस देश के अखबारों ने बल्कि सम्पूर्ण विश्व के अखबारों ने किया है, जनमत इसके पक्ष में है। कुछ साम्राज्यवादी यहां भी और बाहर भी हैं जिनकी आंखें बराबर इस बात पर हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान का गणतन्त्र मजबूत न हो, ससार में जो गणतन्त्रीय देश है, जो राष्ट्रमण्डल है उसमें हमारा गणतन्त्र मजबूत होकर सामने न आए। उन्होंने इसका विरोध किया है। कुछ अब भी विरोध कर रहे हैं और कुछ चुप हैं।

मैं अपने भाषण को उपसहार की ओर ले जाना चाहता हूँ। बात बिल्कुल स्पष्ट है। 1971 के बाद हारे हुए, घिसे पिटे राजनीति के मुहुरे, ये तथाकथित नेता दो बरस तक चुप रहे। कारण यह था कि हमारी पार्टी को, श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी की मंसिब बंडिट मिला

[श्री भाग्यत हा/ आजाद]

था। इनको डर था। इंदिरा गांधी जी मैसिब मैडल लेकर आई थीं। दो बरस चुप रहने के बाद इन्होंने षडयन्त्र रचना शुरू किया। इस षडयन्त्र का रूप बन्दों, हड़तालों, बगावत फँसाने के रूप में सामने आया पुलिस और फौज में। जोशी जी कहते हैं कि सिर्फ काठ की तलवार लेकर ये घूमते हैं। मैं उनसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि अब आप जनता की आंखों पर पर्दा नहीं डाल सकते हैं। जो रेड हुए हैं उनमें आपके दफ्तरों से सैकड़ों की सख्या में तलवारें, छुरे और किरपानें तथा दूसरा ऐसा बहुत सा मॅटोरियल मिला है जो इस बात का परिचायक है कि आपने आर० एस० एस० की पैरा मिलिटरी फोर्स को इसलिए तैयार किया कि देश में घृणा का वातावरण फैलाया जाए और वह फलाया गया। देश में जो अलसंख्यक हैं उनके प्रति घृणा का वातावरण आपने फैलाया। यह काठ की तलवार नहीं, यह वह तलवार है जो इन बेचारी निरीह भारतीय जनता को छती में तब उतर जान है जब आप घृणा की आग फैला कर, जहर फैला कर देश की भोली भाली जनता को गुमराह करने हैं। अगर आज प्रधान मन्त्री ने यह काम नहीं किया होता तो वह इस आरोप की दोषी होती कि मैसिब मैडल उन्हें इसलिए नहीं दिया गया कि लोकसभा को अपोजीशन वाले चलने न दें और इसकी उनको खूली छूट हो, देश में हड़तालें हों और लोगों की सम्पत्ति और जान-माल मिट्टी में मिल जाए। इनके प्रति उनका मोह दो बरस तक बना रहा। महाभारत में आता है कि अर्जुन को दो घंटे का मोह हुआ था और उसने कहा था कि हमारे सामने हमारे दादा हैं, हमारे स्वजन हैं, हमारे परिचित हैं, हम किस तरह से उनको मारें। हिन्दुस्तान की प्रधान मन्त्री का दो बरस तक इन लोगों के प्रति मोह बना रहा और वह कोशिश करती रही कि गणतन्त्र में इनको साथ लेकर चला जाए, बुला कर टेबल पर इनसे बात की जाए। दो बरस के प्रयत्न जब विफल साबित हुए

तो मुझे प्रसन्नता है कि हिन्दुस्तान की प्रधान मन्त्री ने, भारतीय जनता की नेता ने उस मोह को त्यागा, उनका यह मोह टूटा और गणतन्त्रीय मूल्यों की रक्षा करने के लिए उन्होंने जो कदम उठाया है उसका इस देश की जनता ने विशाल रूप में स्वागत किया है।

इलाहाबाद के एक जज ने फैसला दिया। यह सही बात है कि उन्होंने एक फैसला दिया। जब फैसला दिया उस समय मैं प्रधान मन्त्री के निवास स्थान पर गया हुआ था। हमने उस जजमेंट को स्वीकार किया। पता नहीं कौन सी टेलीपथी थी जिससे इनको दस मिनट में जानकारी प्राप्त हो गई और आर० एस० एस०, जनसभ और जीरो कांग्रेस के लोगो ने ट्रकों में आना शुरू कर दिया और नारे लगाने वहाँ आकर शुरू कर दिए कि श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी इस्तीफा दें, प्रधान मन्त्री इस्तीफा दें और साथ साथ लोकनायक जिन्दाबाद के नारे लगाने शुरू कर दिए। हम जजमेंट को मान रहे थे। हमे दोम दिन का स्टे दिया गया था। उसके बावजूद भी ये क्यों आए? यह इनका एक षडयन्त्र था। एक तरफ तो कोर्ट का फैसला था और दूसरी तरफ हिन्दुस्तान की गलियों में, सड़कों पर 20-20 और 30-30 की टुकड़ियों के जल्स इन्होंने निकालने शुरू कर दिए होते और यह प्रचार करने शुरू कर दिये होने कि हिन्दुस्तान की जनता कांग्रेस और प्रधान मन्त्री के खिलाफ है। हम लोग भी राजनीति में रहते हैं। हमने इसका जवाब नहले पर देहला दिया। हमने कहा ठीक है, अगर हमारे खिलाफ लोग हैं तो हमारे साथ भी लोग हैं, हमारा भी बे समर्थन करते हैं। उसके बाद वे जनता आई और एक तांता लग गया। प्रधान मन्त्री के निवास स्थान के सामने देश की जनता ने विशाल प्रदर्शन किया। उससे इन लोगों की आंखें नहीं खुलीं, मुंदी रहीं। लेकिन बीस तारीख को श्री इंडिया गेट पर अभूतपूर्व रैली हुई उसका असर यह हुआ कि इनकी 21 तारीख की रैली बन्द हो गई और राम-

लीला बाउन्ड में चुपके चुपके इन्होंने मीटिंग की। उस रैली के जवाब में इन्होंने क्या कार्यक्रम बनाया? कार्यक्रम यह बनाया कि देश में बन्दो का आयोजन किया जाए, कार्यक्रम यह बनाया कि 21 एमपीज का एक डेलीगेशन प्रधान मन्त्री के पास भेजा जाए जो उनसे इस्तीफे की मांग करे, कार्यक्रम यह बनाया कि उनके मिसड्रीडज का एक चार्टर बनाया जाए। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि चरित्र हनन का इससे नीच और कौनसा उदाहरण हो सकता है? जिस प्रधान मन्त्री ने पिछले 10 वर्षों से इस देश की जनता की, इस देश के लोगों को इतना बड़ा नेतृत्व दिया, उसके बारे में ये विरोधी कहते हैं कि उस प्रधान मन्त्री को इस्तीफा देना चाहिये, उनके खिलाफ चार्टर बनाना चाहिए। मैं मानता हूँ कि गणतन्त्र में विरोधियों का सम्मान होना चाहिये। गणतंत्र का मुख्य आचरण यह है कि वहाँ एक चुनी हुई संसद् होगी, उसका उत्तरदायित्व सरकार समझेगी और उस उत्तरदायित्व से जो बहुमत के फ़ैसले होंगे, उन्हें अल्पमत मानेगा। क्या इस अल्पमत ने कभी उसको माना?

आपका याद है, जब आप कुर्सी पर थे या और लोग थे, तो यह है वह अल्पमत, ये हैं वे विरोधी, जिन्होंने अगर उनके मन के अनुसार एलिंग नहीं मिली तो कुर्सी का घेराव किया, पोंडियम को पकड़ लिया और आज कहते हैं कि बड़ा अन्याय हो रहा है। अन्याय तो इन्होंने किया, गणतन्त्र के सिद्धान्तों की हत्या इन्होंने की। देश में हड़ताल, देश में काम बन्द, घेराव यह तमाम इन्होंने किया।

हम तो इस देश के न्यायालय में विश्वास करते हैं। हमारे पक्ष या विपक्ष में जो जजमेंट दिये गये हैं, हम उनका सम्मान करते हैं, लेकिन आप हैं वह जो आपके पक्ष में कुछ हो तो भी उसको लेकर जिल्लाते हैं और विपक्ष में हो तो कहते हैं, कोर्ट बड़ा खराब है। यह काम हम नहीं करते हैं।

यह स्पष्ट है कि इस देश की प्रधान मन्त्री इस बात को चुपचाप देख नहीं सकती थीं कि संविधान टूटता रहे, देश में अराजकता बढ़ती रहे और जान-माल की सुरक्षा घटती रहे। अस्तु, प्रधान मन्त्री ने बड़े दुःख और हिचक के साथ वह कदम उठाया, जो कदम आज के समय में आवश्यक था।

सभापति महोदय, इनका डबल स्टैंडर्ड देखिये, चिमन भाई और बीजू पटनायक जैसे व्यक्ति कांग्रेस में हों तो बड़े खराब, जब कांग्रेस ने उन्हें निकाल दिया तो श्री जयप्रकाश नारायण और आर० एस० एस० के गुरुजी ने इन तमाम लोगों को अपने मन्त्रोच्चारण के जरिये दूध से धोकर ईमानदार इंसान बना दिया और उसके बल पर गुजरात में सरकार बना ली और कहते हैं कि हमारे साथ विशाल बहुमत है, लेकिन वोट कम हैं।

गुजरात में हमें 41 परसेंट वोट मिले जबकि इनमें से किसी को 19 परसेंट, किसी को 10 परसेंट और किसी को 5 परसेंट। सब मिलाकर इन्हें 34 परसेंट मिले। तो वहाँ कहते हैं हमको बहुमत है। कौनसा स्टैंडर्ड है इस अल्पमत का?

इसलिये इस प्रकार ये बातें स्पष्ट हो गई कि इन्होंने इस देश में अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय और राष्ट्रीय स्तर पर विशाल षडयन्त्र किया था जिसके जरिये इस देश की चुनी हुई सरकार को ये उलटमा चाहते थे और इस देश के मूल्यों को बिगाड़ना चाहते थे।

अन्त में मैं यह कहूँगा कि आज संसार का सबसे बड़ा भारतीय गणतन्त्र अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय और राष्ट्रीय धनतन्त्र के साथ लोमहर्षक युद्ध में लगा हुआ है। कम्बोडिया में हारे हुए पैटन टैंक, वियतनाम के मारे-हारे सैबरजेट और 1952 से 1971 तक हर चुनाव में पिटे और हारे हुए ये राजनीति के मोहरे, ये प्रति-क्रियावादी और फासिस्ट शक्तियाँ युद्ध के नये

[श्री भागवत झा साजद]

थियेटर खोजते हैं। खबर और बोस्टर दरें फिर कुलबुला रहे हैं। प्रश्न यह है कि क्या हिन्दुस्तान की फासिस्टवादी और प्रतिक्रियावादी शक्तियों को भारत की भूमि पर नया बॉम्बला बनाने दिया जायेगा? क्या 'सत्यमेव जयते' 'जे जयते स सत्यमेव' बन जायेगा? आज हिन्सा, घृणा और अव्यवस्था के आकाश पर गणतन्त्र के मूल्यों का आकाश अहिंसा की धरती को भूम कर हिन्दुस्तान के पुत्रों और पुत्रियों से गणतन्त्र के मूल्यों का उत्तर मांगता है? आज भारत भूमि की भारत पुत्री, श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधीने जवाब दिया है कि हम गणतंत्र और उसके मूल्यों की रक्षा करेंगे।

समय शेष है नहीं पाप का, अपराध है व्याघ्र, जो तटस्थ है, (जो पदस्थ है), समय गिनेगा उनके भी अपराध।

हम इस अपराध को मजूर करते हैं। जिन व्याघ्रों ने गणतन्त्र के सुनहरे और सुनहले पक्षी का पंख तोड़ दिया है, उनसे उसको बचाने के लिये यह आवश्यक था कि आपात कालीन स्थिति की घोषणा की जाये। यह सही है और हम इसका समर्थन करते हैं। सम्पूर्ण देश समर्थन करता है गणतन्त्र की रक्षा के लिये, उसके मूल्यों की रक्षा के लिये।

SHRI SEZHIYAN (Kumbakonam): I rise to oppose the resolution moved by Shri Jagjivan Ram. It would have been more appropriate if this resolution had been moved by the Minister for Home Affairs because the convention has been that the Minister holding the particular portfolio has to come before this House. In parliamentary democracy, the accountability of the Government is more to this House, though I hold the other House also in great esteem. It does not mean, I undervalue the seniority or the respect with which Shri Jagjivan Ram is held. Nowadays we find, the traditions and conventions are at a great discount and things are done in their own way.

Before I go into this particular Resolution approving the emergency made by the President on 25th June, 1975 under Clause 1 of Article 352 of the Constitution, I wish to point out that a proclamation exactly under the same Article, the same Clause, was made on 3rd December, 1971. May I tell you how that proclamation was made? On the night of the 2nd December, we were all called to South Block to meet the Prime Minister, we were informed of the circumstances, of the situation facing this country for emergency to be proclaimed. Therefore, it was not as if an emergency was proclaimed and we were asked to here over the radio. On December 3rd, 1971 when we came to this House we gave a whole-hearted support to the Government's action. Even now, if I am convinced, I will do it. I am not an unreasonable man I am also a reasonable man, a reasonable human being who can be convinced. I am not a traitor. I belong to this country. I have been one among you, for the past 13 or 14 years. In my humble capacity, as a Member on this side, I have also tried to help this House, and help the functioning of our Parliamentary Democracy. Often-times we may not have agreed with you but we all did agree on the functioning of democracy in this country and in this House. What has happened to that atmosphere? Why are we arraigned against each other, facing each other, to make you call us traitors, and equate us with those who are anti-national? Sir, two classes have been created. Those who support the emergency are equated with those who are supporting the economic programmes. Those who are not supporting emergency are equated with those opposing the economic programmes. I support all the twenty points programme and if you want, I will add one or two more items also.

On that day, that is, the 2nd December, 1971, when the proclamation came in this House, I think Mr. A. K. Gopalan was also here on that day,—we all supported. When this unanimous

support was given in this House, we were assured that this was for a very specific purpose, the proclamation of emergency was to meet a situation, rightly conceived and enshrined in the constitution. Therefore, only to that extent, proclamation of emergency would be utilised. We were very clear and very categorical in giving our support. I remember, on that day, it was piloted by Mr. K. C. Pant who said that the emergency would not be there for a day longer than it was needed. But India has had the longest day. The Bangla Desh war went on for 14 days. The cessation of hostilities came about 10 million refugees who came to this country, have happily been rehabilitated. Normalcy has been restored. Simla meeting was there and the agreement of peaceful relation came about. Afterwards we were able to exchange many goodwill missions, trade was partly restored and communications were also restored. But the emergency continued. Why? It is the official down or whoever he may be who has the powers that is benefited by this. They do not want to surrender the power. Very many things are done in the name of the emergency. We had been demanding during the last session and before that that the utility of the emergency had been over and that normalcy should be restored. There has been no valid reason for extending the emergency.

Many friends have said many things in support of the emergency. Some of the newspaper reports and radio broadcasts have pictured that a very serious situation, a very catastrophic situation is prevailing in our country. Economic offences are being pointed out here. I shall not be silent if any body indulges in economic offences. We have been saying that economic offences are not being taken proper care of. The big sharks are going scotfree while only very small fries are caught. Therefore, not only strong laws but stricter laws are required. Apart from strong laws, a strong political will is also needed. That has been absent. We have been pointing

that out. In Mr. Jagjivan Ram's speech while introducing this Resolution, he stressed and gave the background on how the conflict arose in this country between the Opposition who did not like the economic programme and the Central Government. In 1969 I was also a Member in this House and my party gave an unstinted support to very many economic measures that you brought forward in the House.

When the banks were nationalised, when privy purses were abolished, we gave our full support at the time you did not have a majority—out of 532 members or so you were only 240 in number—still we did not topple you down. We did not think of pulling down Shrimati Gandhi. But, we gave her unstinted support because we believed in the programme of bank nationalisation, in the programme of abolition of privy purses. Therefore, whenever there was a good programme we gave our support to it. Even then I may point out that in 1971 when MISA came before the House, we opposed that even though we were in the friendly alliance.

When we support, it is not out of likes or dislikes of one individual or the other. What is the programme what is the policy? And what is it that you want from us? By the proclamation of emergency what are the objectives you want to achieve? You have a twenty-point programme for the implementation of land reforms, distribution of lands to the landless, giving homes for those who are homeless. Cannot all these things be achieved without the emergency? Lakhs and lakhs of houses have been built and given in Tamil Nadu without the emergency. Shri Jagjivan Ram himself came there and distributed so many houses to the homeless people without the use of this emergency. Emergency by its very connotation means an extraordinary, shortlived, abnormal situation. But, unfortunately, this extraordinary, abnormal and shortlived situation has become a normal, ordinary and longlived one. If

[Shri Sezhiyan]

you resort to a potent life saving medicine for an ordinary ailment, when the real emergency comes, you have nothing else to fall back upon.

Many Members of this House have been detained for reasons best known to the Government. On this occasion, as soon as I received the summons of calling the Parliament session, I wrote to the hon'ble Speaker and a separate letter to the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs. I am yet to receive an acknowledgement for the same. The Member may not reply; but when a Member feels apprehensive at least courtesy, if not duty, demands that he acknowledges the letter. I have not received the acknowledgement. This shows what is the motive behind all this. Why has this House been put almost in this unenviable position? The entire galleries are vacant. I cannot meet the Press as I used to in the past in the Central Hall. There is no communication between this House and the outside public. The paper will not publish what is happening outside and what is being said in this House. This has become an unreal and infructuous task.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your party was allotted 12 minutes. Twelve minutes are already over. Please try to finish in another three minutes.

SHRI SEZHIYAN: I thank you very much. I want to sit. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI MOHAN DHARIA (Poona): Mr. Chairman, when we are discussing an emergent measure and when the democratic rights themselves are in danger is it not necessary that ample time should be given to the Members. We can sit for longer hours. (*Interruptions*)

THE MINISTER OF WORKS AND HOUSING AND PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH): Sir, we do not want to stifle any discussion. Kindly give them reasonable time and you are the best

judge of what is reasonable. Let them have sufficient time.

SHRI P. K. DEO: Sir, I need a clarification from the Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No point of clarification.

SHRI P. K. DEO: I am not on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down.

SHRI P. K. DEO: Sir, the Minister has stated that some reasonable time should be given.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are speaking without my permission.

आप क्या हाऊस का टाइम बरबाद कर रहे हैं? मैं ने नहीं परमिट किया है आप का। एक बड़े रेकार्ड पर नहीं जायगा। आप जा कुछ बोल रहे हैं एक लज्ज रेकार्ड में नहीं जा रहा है।

SHRI P. K. DEO:*

SHRI SEZHIYAN: Mr. Chairman, I have great respect for the Chair and just now my respect is all the more, for insistence and following the rules that have been laid down by this House. My only plea is that the same spirit, the same attitude should be shown even to the ordinary men, to the politicians in the country, and to the leaders of the Opposition; not only to the leaders of the Opposition but to the Members of the ruling party as well. We should respect the democratic procedure, the rule of law. This is my only plea. If those that are in authority have been given the same discretion and the judgement as the wise Chair is employing now, nobody will be more happy than I. We have been pleading that the rule of law should be applied equally. There should not be a lawless law. You just now told me that I should finish my speech, not in an irrational way, not in an undemocratic way, not in a high-handed way. You said that this is the time limit, that I have exceeded the time limit, and that

therefore, I should sit down. The same spirit might have been shown to every one of those Members who have been arrested, or who are likely to be arrested. Before you put me in jail, let me know what crime I have committed. This is the simple thing I ask.

It may be that JP has incited the Army, he might have exhorted the police and what he said might do harm to the country. I am one with you that such incitements should be severely punished. Why don't you put him before a Court and say that he has committed the highest treason in the country? Expose him to the whole world, bring out the evidence, prove it to the hilt that he has done a heinous crime. However, eminent he might be, however glorious his past might have been and however popular he might have been, if he has done something against the country and against the people, put him before a Court, prove the guilt and give him the wildest punishment possible. That is the only thing we all have been pleading for throughout this day. If some organisations have been against the interests of the people of this country, take suitable action, the most sternest possible action, but, take it in the legal way, in the democratic way. Sir, I say this to the hon. Members here that if you are looking without any perturbation on your conscience, remember, when freedom is diminished for an individual citizen in the country, the time will not be far off, when the freedom of every one in this country will be diminished, will be in danger. I am saying this not for an applause, but, I say it from the heart. It has been the fate of many countries. It is very difficult to attain freedom. Once you lose it, it is still more difficult to regain it. Authoritarianism may become handy for some things, sometimes you feel this is a short-cut. Sometimes I think some of us even feel why have a Parliament? Why should 500 members come here to take a decision which one person can take? That was what Hitler thought.

That was what Mussolini attempted. But these systems did not work, because in a democracy, if the executive does a wrong, there is a check, but if a dictatorship does a wrong, there is no check, because as is said, parliamentary democracy is still the least unsatisfactory form of the governments possible.

Therefore, my appeal to the other side is this. I may not be in a position to make the same kind of appeal again. The same opportunities may not be available to every one of us—probably in the atmosphere that is now prevailing, that may not be available. Previously what we said here was recorded and could at least be read by the people outside. But what I speak today is only for my friends here. For good or bad, for ill or well, we have been in this House. The people have elected us to run a parliamentary democracy in this country. We may be in a minority, you may be in a majority. I bow to the decision of the majority, but after due process, after due debate, taking both sides into account. Out of hundred occasions, I may be wrong in ninety, but at least you should have the benefit of the ten occasions when we said something good for the country.

Democracy functions not by simple counting of numbers. If simple counting alone is going to decide the fate of this country, Mr. Chairman, after the election was over, with 360 members on the other side, we might as well have closed this House and said: 'All the decisions of the executive are supported by 360 members; therefore, for five years you need not meet at all'. I think much time and money would have been saved for this country if instead of coming here, that procedure was adopted.

Even as I enter this Houses, I am fully conscious of the numbers. Whatever may be the weighty arguments and lengthy quotations I make or the instances I relate, it is not for our

[Shri Sezhiyan]

benefit; it is not even put as something before you to show what we know. If that were so, perhaps we would have gone to some universities or colleges to teach students. But we felt that by presenting the other side of the case we could help you and help the country.

That is why the two sides of Parliament are always taken into account. I am quite conscious that Parliament is not there to govern. In Parliament, only speaking is done. But if there is a restriction even on what I speak, if there is a restriction that what I have said here cannot be reported outside, if there is a restriction that what is happening outside I cannot raise it inside, what is the use of this Parliament? You can have any amount of constitution. You can have any amount of law. I tell you do not quote again and again the Constitution and say that everything is done as per the Constitution. I may concede that whatever has been done is completely constitutional. Within the framework of the Constitution, you can do everything; everything can be legal also. But that does not take you to the democratic way. Democracy is something more than being constitutional, than being legal, because what had happened to one of the best constitutions, one of the most liberal constitutions, of the 20th century, namely the constitution of the Weimar Republic? Hitler did not subvert that constitution. Hitler did not break that constitution. Hitler did not break the constitutional procedures laid down there. But using that very constitution, a dictatorship arose there. By just saying that, I do not want to equate the Prime Minister with him. My own feeling is that pressed by exigencies.....

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM: You have almost done it.

17 hrs.

SHRI SEZHIYAN: Therefore my appeal is this. If you are meaning

by parliamentary democracy only the form and the constitutional procedures, it is not going to make democracy function in this country. The spirit should also be there not the form alone. A spirit of respect for the Opposition, not merely tolerance, but positive recognition of the opinion of the opposition should be there. Unless there is a chance in our country to criticise the Government without fear and to change the Government without violence—that is the essence of democracy—you may retain the form and not the substance. If you think that I indulged in anything violent, by all means put me before a court and give me the sternest punishment that is possible. I for one will gladly accept it. You enact a law and you want to be the judge also. I can trust the Law Minister who was a judge, but how can I trust the executive?.

SHRI MOHAN DHARIA: Judges are not to be trusted these days.

SHRI SEZHIYAN: I do not know whether my assessment is absolutely correct. My argument may be wrong but accept my sincerity. When I differ from you do not call me a traitor; when I differ from you, do not equate it with treason. That shows that you are taking a bigger role than a government: you think that you are the nation. The Bourbon monarch said: "I am the State." We know about the divine right claimed by the Stuart kings of England, we do not belong to that clan of monarchs or Bourbons. We belong to the clan of the democratic people. Many persons on this side may go to that side and those who are on that side may come to this side.

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM: No chance.

SHRI SEZHIYAN: I have nothing personal against the Prime Minister, against the leader of your party. Your Members have held rallies; they

have given unequivocal and unstinting support. That is good thing. I do not say what the majority party should do for its leader. But it is not the personalities that count. I am on the principle, the tradition the convention and the democratic practice in this country.

I have got respect for everyone of you. I know you also want to usher in a welfare State in this country. When I say so, I should also say that I have a little more respect, a little more love for this country, for democracy and for the people of this country. I may be wrong; I wish I were wrong, in fact I want to be proved wrong on this occasion and if my apprehensions about the non-functioning of democracy proved wrong, I will be the happiest man on earth. But I am afraid that is not the way things are going, that is not the way trends are developing. The parliamentary democracy for which reasons on both sides had been striving cannot be safeguarded.

We had been proud that we were the biggest democracy in the world. When the freedom struggle was going on in our student days in the colleges and schools, we also fought on the side of Mahatma Gandhi; the scars left by the lathis wielded by the police of the British days are still there. Therefore at least account the sincerity, if not of the post independent era, at least of the pre-independent era. Some of us felt the same urge, the same concern for the people of this country, for the freedom of this country. We still want this to be a free country, a democratic country. In those days, as a young college student, I used to take notes. One of the old notes taken down by me gives a quotation from Mahatma Gandhi. It says:

"Real swaraj will come not by the acquisition of authority by a few but by the acquisition of the capacity by all to resist authority

when it is abused. In other words, Swaraj is to be attained by educating the masses to a sense of their capacity to regulate and control authority."

We all fought for that Swaraj. We all suffered. My suffering is very very small. But hundreds of persons who went to jail never came out. Hundreds of youth who were sent to Andamans never came back. In those days, Andamans were considered to be a graveyard. Many patriots who fought for the freedom of the country never came to India back and never saw the freedom of the country. Many of us have been fortunate enough to see the independence of the country and the freedom of the people.

But remember the day when the most precious life that human history would have seen and the man who gave us the very thought of freedom in this country; was himself shot by a fanatic. Even at the gravest hour, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru did not clamp down the freedom of speech. Even the man who fanatically said that he killed the Mahatma in a fiendish way, was also given a fair trial.

Therefore, the same rule of law, in the name of the father of the nation, in the name of the Swarajya for which he fought and suffered should be applied in all the cases. I appeal to one and all that if you feel that you are right please carry on. I wish I were wrong. Even if there is some faltering suspicion such as I have, some apprehensions such as I have, when some of your own colleagues have been arrested, go and ask them why they have been arrested, why they have been put in jail and what crime they have done more than the smugglers. Many of the smugglers are still at large. Many of them are still indulging in anti-social activities, but they are still at large. Law has not taken care of them. But friends, I would beg of you again, again and again, to remember that once freedom of an individual is taken away today, the day is not far off when the free-

[Shri Sezhiyan]

dom of everyone of us will be taken away!

SHRI DINESH CHANDRA GOSWAMI (GAUHATI): Mr. Chairman, the learned Member who preceded me spoke a lot about the freedom of speech and though his entire speech was on a hypothetical plane without reference to the reality, his ultimate conclusion seems to be that by clamping the present Emergency, freedom of speech and the freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution have been taken away and that a situation of unreality has been created in this country and the Parliamentary system has lost all its relevance. Sir, this argument presupposes that before the Emergency was clamped, the situation was such that everyone could express his views freely, normalcy was the order of the day and that everyone was enjoying the rights and freedom guaranteed by the Constitution. If the situation would have been such, I would have been the first person to say that clamping down the emergency was not just and proper. But let us see the reality as it existed before the emergency. Undoubtedly the right of freedom of speech and other fundamental rights are important, but what was the situation existing in the country? What percentage of people were enjoying the rights? The common man, the vulnerable sections of the society did not have the means to enjoy these rights nor could they approach a court if their rights were violated. We in the legal profession know how so long these rights have been used by a section to frustrate the rights of the common man. The common man wants that the fundamental rights should not be the end in itself but should be a means for the creation of a healthy society in which he can live in an atmosphere of security, he can have the essential commodities at reasonable prices, he can educate his children, he can be free from red tapism and he can exercise his democratic right of franchise without any pressure

from any quarter whatsoever. Was this the position in the country before the emergency was clamped down?

My friends opposite talked about the right of speech. But we know there have been situations where persons were feeling helpless and could not express their views freely because of various anti-social and pressure groups. Only a few days ago, in my State there was an agitation in which students were prevented from appearing in examinations and the teachers boycotted the examinations. We met the parents and they told privately, "We want our children to appear in the examinations, because we cannot afford the burden of one year's additional expense on their education. We want them to prosper in their lives" When we asked them, "Why don't you express it in public?", they said, "We are afraid that the moment we do so, we will be the target of attack from certain quarters." What is most important—so-called freedom of speech guaranteed under article 19 or such freedom for the common man who cannot afford to go to a court of law, to be in a position to express himself freely whatever he thinks just and proper? Not to speak of ordinary persons, even legislatures were prevented from expressing their views outside the legislatures according to their own conscience and counsel. We know what happened in Bihar and Gujarat.

17.13 hrs.

[SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD in the Chair]

May I ask whether the situation prevalent in the country before the emergency was such where a person could really and effectively exercise his valuable rights according to his own choice? My opposition friends are talking so much about their valuable rights. Did they help the Government in creating an atmosphere where essential commodities were available at reasonable prices? Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad and some other

friends spoke about the British legislature. In these days of economic crisis, the Leader of the Opposition in the British Parliament said, "We will not create any situation where the economic complexity in the country may be aggravated. We will not permit our workers to ask for higher wages." But in our country, we know what happened during the railway strike. The loyal workers enabled the railways to move on. I also know that many of the workers who joined the strike were really given a wrong picture about its objectives and were misled. What was the motivation of the leaders who started the strike? Was it for improvement of the condition of the workers? The motivation becomes apparent if we read the speech of Mr. George Fernandes at Madras on 29th March. '74:

He said:

"Realise the strength which you possess. Seven days strike of the Indian Railways—every thermal station in the country would close down. A ten days' strike of the Indian Railways—every steel mill in India would close down and the industries in the country will come to a halt for the next 12 months. If once the steel mill furnace is switched off, it takes nine months to re-fire. A 15 days' strike in the Indian Railways—the country will starve."

This is his speech. He wanted the country to starve so that it may serve his own political ends. The Members of the Opposition did support that strike.

Where is the common man today *viz-a-viz* his constitutional and fundamental rights? Unfortunately, a situation has been created in this country where the common man is not at all concerned with fundamental rights or constitutional rights. A sense of defeatism has been created in this

country by the Opposition parties. That is why, even after proclamation of emergency not a single voice has been raised by the common man. They have made two complaints against us. The first complaint is: why did you not bring it earlier so that at least for one year we could have lived in an atmosphere free from tension. And the second complaint is: if this is the situation where we can live in an atmosphere of relaxation, where we can get commodities at cheaper prices, where there are regular office hours from 10 to 5, where our children can go to schools and appear in their examinations calmly, we want this feature to continue. I am not happy at such type of reactions. Because I do not want such a situation should continue indefinitely. But when a man says so, obviously we should all search our hearts and find out as to why this reaction is there in the country in an ordinary average man. After this emergency was proclaimed, there has been no grievance from the common man's side. Rather, he has felt a sense of relief. That is why when our opposition friends talk at the top of their voice about constitutional rights, about fundamental rights and legal rights. I want to urge and impress upon them that by merely saying something about the provisions of the Constitution, speaking to the people that they have got all these rights without creating an atmosphere in the society where these rights can really be enjoyed by the society, these rights cannot be enjoyed at all. Unfortunately, a situation had been created in the country where the people did not know whether these rights existed at all. He did not want any fundamental rights. He wants a situation where there is peace and relaxation. He wants a situation in which he can educate his children; he wants a situation created so that he can have certain amount of security. They want this more than the right of association and the right of speech. Unfortunately a situation was created where these aspirations of the indivi-

[Shri Dinesh Chand Goswami]
duals were completely frustrated. I know cases after cases when you wanted to punish a delinquent official, there was agitation and such a situation had been created that the administration could not do anything and he felt helpless. I know of a case where a certain delinquent official was to be removed from job and even orders were passed, there were agitations and ultimately the orders had to be withdrawn. I know of a case where a passenger was assaulted by one porter but when action was taken against this porter such a situation was created that ultimately the order had to be withdrawn. Now obviously, I want the rights and interests of the porters to be protected; I wanted at the same time that my rights as a passenger should also be protected; and there should be a harmonious balance between the two. Unfortunately, an atmosphere was sought to be created by a design on the part of certain forces, where law and order, discipline became a word of the past. I do not want to associate every one of the Opposition in that; but it was part of a deliberate design; because of their debacle in 1971, they know well that if they were to come back to power—and it is quite natural for any political personality to try to come back to power—they can do it only in two ways. Number one, by destroying—or by creating a slur on—the image of the Prime Minister who has a mesmeric appeal on the people; and secondly by really creating a sense of lack of confidence in the minds of people and instability in the society; and that is why people who proclaimed in the name of democracy just created a situation where democracy cannot survive. Mr. Chairman, You have yourself quoted Jayaprakash Narayan. I want also to quote a few words for purposes of record. Jayaprakash Narayan says:

“A violent people's revolution can be successful only if the Army and the Police rebel, as happened during the Russian Revolution.”

He further says that he was no confidence in democracy. He says:

“A revolution will not come either through elections or from Parliament or Assembly, but a revolution, peaceful or bloody, will always be of the people and by the people.”

Therefore, what he wanted was, not a change of government by parliamentary means, but a change of government by bloody revolution, by inciting the Army and by inciting the police. I can understand it very well if somebody says that he has no confidence whatsoever in the parliamentary democracy and that he wanted a change of the government, a change of the political climate in the country. I can understand him. But having a seat in the Opposition, when you proclaim in the name of parliamentary democracy but at the same time support a person who says that he has no confidence in parliamentary democracy and, that he wanted a change in the political climate of the country through revolution, I cannot understand this. Mr. Jagannathrao Joshi spoke about RSS and the sudden change of Jayaprakash Narayan. In 1968, it is Mr. Jayaprakash Narayan who made the following observations regarding RSS:

“When, following Gandhiji's murder the Sangh was under a shadow, there were many protestations made about its being entirely a cultural organisation. But apparently emboldened by the timidity of the secular forces, it has thrown its veil away and has emerged as the real power behind, and controller of, the Bharatiya Jana Sangh. The secular protestations of the Jana Sangha will never be taken seriously unless it cuts the bonds that tie it so firmly to the RSS machine. Nor can the RSS be treated as a cultural organization as long as it remains the mentor and effective manipulator of a political party.”

I do not know what change took place either in the RSS or in Jayaprakash Narayan, in between 1968 and 1975, that the happy union has taken place to-day. In fact, I am happy to-day that my learned friend quoted Mr. Hegde and Mr. Subba Rao. The quotation of Hegde only confirms to-day that the decision of the Government to supersede Hegde was just and proper. It was Mr. Hegde, while he was a judge, was a politician and was not a judge. Therefore, Sir, I feel that if we analyze the situation of this country as it existed before the Emergency, the proclamation of emergency was necessary; and that is why we have found a new enthusiasm in the minds of the people, a new change from a sense of defeatism and helplessness to a climate of new enthusiasm. I am conscious, as Mr. Indrajit Gupta has said, that it has given us also immense responsibilities. I am in entire agreement when he said that if we fail this time, we will be failing history; and history will never forgive us. I am entirely in agreement with him that to-day these forces, the reactionary forces, aided and abetted by the internal and external forces, will still try to create a situation in order to frustrate whatever we have really pledged to do. That is why, when we listen to certain foreign—BBC or foreign—correspondents, we see various kinds of news. Therefore, we should be conscious of our responsibilities. My only appeal to the members of the Opposition who really believe in constructive programmes, who really believe in building a prosperous India with a fully and properly democratic set-up, will be that whatever may be the case in the past, please join hands with us, please cooperate with us in the economic programmes and other constructive programmes that we have taken; and frustrate the efforts of reactionary forces, so that democracy, secularism and all the lofty ideals about which we talk, are made a reality and we can fulfil the aspirations of the people.

SHRI P. M. MEHTA (Bhavnagar):
Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to make it absolutely clear, in fact I would like to throw a challenge on behalf of my party that we have done nothing which may threaten the peace, tranquillity and the integrity of this country.

I oppose the motion which seeks approval for the proclamation of emergency. In fact, the situation was very normal in the country, absolutely normal. In Gujarat we had the elections in which all parties contested. The parties were free to express their views and they placed their manifesto before the people and asked them to give their verdict. Before the elections we thought that like-minded parties, those parties which believe in democracy, should come to some arrangement to go to the people with a common programme. We evolved a common programme and placed it before the people. The people gave their verdict, which went against the ruling party. Thereafter, those in power at the Centre tried to see that a government could not be formed by the Janata Morcha. Yet, that Government was successfully formed.

Now, what are the real reasons for the proclamation of emergency. The real reason is only fear. On the 12th of June the election results came and the verdict went against the ruling party. On the same day, the Allahabad High Court gave a judgment, which was against the hon. Prime Minister.

SHRI JAGNNATHRAO JOSHI: It was a very bad day.

SHRI P. M. MEHTA: It is not the opposition that gave that judgment, it was the independent judiciary of this country which gave that judgment. Thereafter, the leaders of the

[Shri P. M. Mehta]
various opposition parties were exploring the possibility of federating and actually the idea was taking shape. Further, the denial of absolute stay by the vacation judge of the Supreme Court did create a fear complex and that resulted in the proclamation of the emergency. It is said that a deep-rooted conspiracy was going on between the leaders who were put behind the bars. What was the conspiracy? They were doing all the things publicly and openly, and the press was publishing the views expressed by the leaders freely because at that time there was no censorship.

I agree with Babuji in one respect, that the situation has not been created overnight. You will recall that the people of India gave a mandate to the ruling party on their programme in the 1971 election in respect of Parliament and to the State Assemblies in the 1972 elections. Thereafter what happened? The rate of growth gradually declined. If we wanted to sustain our economy, it was absolutely necessary to maintain the rate of growth at 5.75 per cent in industry and agriculture. But due to the misrule and mismanagement of the ruling party and because of the fighting and quarrelling in the ruling party, production gradually fell in both agriculture and industry and the rate of growth gradually came down to practically zero. How can you expect the economic progress of the nation when the rate of growth comes to zero?

Discontent and unrest were rising. Is it not the duty of the Opposition to highlight the grievances of the people, to highlight their unrest and to cultivate public opinion against the ruling party which was not governing properly, which was misruling? What has the Opposition done during all these years? They have highlighted many problems, they have made good suggestions, but the composition of the ruling party is such that they could not function properly.

In Gujarat they kicked out Shri Ganshyambhai Oza. It was the members of the ruling party who kicked out Shri Ganshyambhai Oza who was sent from the Centre for good rule. He was not elected during the 1972 elections in Gujarat. He was a Minister here at that time.

SHRI SAT PAL KAPUR (Patiala):
What about Chimanbhai Patel?

SHRI P. M. MEHTA: He was your party men.

सतपाल कपूर : अब किसके साथी हैं ?

क्या एग्रीमेंट है ।

श्री पी० एम० मेहता : कोई एग्रीमेंट नहीं है ।

No agreement. It has been made clear more than once. This happened in Gujarat. What is the position in Madhya Pradesh? Bitter in-fighting and quarrelling are going on there today also. What happened in Bihar? Ultimately Shri Ghafoor had to go. And what happened in U.P.? A team of legislators, Members of the Assembly, came here and in the Central Hall addressed the press and they narrated the avagunas of Bahuguna. And the demand was to remove Bahuguna. It is these eternal internal quarrels and political instability in all the States that shook the faith of the people. The credibility gap was getting larger and larger and was increasing day by day. That credibility gap was not created by the Opposition.

You may remember that when we came to this House in 1971 we were speaking from these Benches opposing some Bills or participating in some debates and making suggestions. The Press people were not publishing our speeches. They were publishing our speeches only in one line. But the public opinion outside compelled the Press to publish the contents of the speeches properly and appro-

priately so that the voice of the people should be heard. It was the reflection of the pressure of the public opinion outside, because we were the same people who were speaking in 1971 after the elections. The Press was not giving proper place to the Opposition, but, ultimately, the public opinion was roused and the Press was compelled to publish the speeches of the Opposition properly and appropriately.

What is the position of the Constitution today? The Government is acting in accordance with the constitutional provisions. But it has resulted in what? The Constitution of India has become inoperative for the citizens of India. It is only operative for the Government. You have taken such measures which have resulted in inoperation of this Constitution for the citizens of this country. Mr. H. V. Kamath apprehended this Constitution. I would like to quote from his speech on page 108 of the Constituent Assembly Debates Official Report Volume No. IX, 1949. At that time, the present Article 352 was 275 of the Draft Constitution. Mr. Kamath, while participating in the debate, said as follows.

"We are making a Constitution which will be promulgated in the last year of the first half of this century, and we will enter upon our life as a Republic in the second half of this century, a period to my mind pregnant with possibilities, pregnant with dangers, but pregnant also with great hope and good faith. Sir, let us beware of the dangers and pitfalls in our path. Let us see to it that the Constitution that we are framing today is honoured, is observed and not subverted, not merely by agitators, rebels and revolutionaries but also by those in office or in power."

Now, it has come true.

Therefore, Sir, actually, there is no justification for the proclamation of

emergency. Everything was normal. When the people went home on the 25th evening or late night, after finishing their normal work, they had nothing in their mind. But on the morning of 26th, they heard that there was an emergency in the country.

SHRI JAGANNATHRAO JOSHI:
 Even the Ministers also.

SHRI P. M. MEHTA: Mr. Morarji undertook fast on three matters: Gujarat elections removal of the state of emergency and improper or misuse or abuse of MISA. As for as Gujarat elections were concerned, he was successful in making the Government agree to hold elections. He was also assured that there would be no improper or misuse or abuse of MISA especially against the political workers. Thereafter, immediately, the Members of the Tripura Assembly were arrested under MISA. So, it was a breach of faith and a violation of the assurance given on behalf of the Government. Now, Mr. Morarji Desai himself and other M.P.s have been arrested under MISA. Everyday, we are finding new Ordinances ultimately depriving the people's right to go to the court.

My hon. friend, Shri Sezhiyan, rightly pointed out that if J. P. activities were subversive and anti-national, then certainly we have every right to bring him to book. He should be produced before the court and he should be given an opportunity either to prove that he is not guilty or otherwise. But in the Republic of India, we have snatched away the rights of the people, not only of the leaders but of the people. We have snatched away the right of every citizen to go to the court.

What is happening today? I have heard here the hon. Members saying that the people feel some relief. You go and see the feelings of the people. Corruption is increasing. The people

[Shri P. M. Mehta]

are so much afraid that they cannot even ask a question from the policeman. This situation has been created. I want to submit that by these measures, it will not be possible to do what you want to do. It is just not possible in such a vast land. Therefore, this Proclamation of Emergency is unwarranted and I oppose the motion seeking its approval by the House.

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have heard with great attention the speeches made by my learned predecessors, particularly on the opposite side, the speeches made by Shri Era Sezhiyan, Shri P. M. Mehta, Shri Jagannathrao Joshi and others. I believe, they were speaking from their heart. I have no reason to doubt their *bona fides*. As hon. Members of this House, they are completely entitled to their views with which I may not agree. I will presently say why I differ with them.

What struck me most was that while they were lamenting that individual freedom is being curtailed during this Emergency and they were giving examples of a few arrests that have been made, it is agreed, I believe, that among a large number of arrests that have taken place, the political arrests are very few. The arrests under economic offences are the major arrests. But while lamenting that individual freedom is being curtailed, let us introspect a little and see the background as to why we came to this state of affairs. I did not hear anyone of our friends condemn it when, in the name of democracy itself, apart from people being gheraoed, elected representatives were dragged out of the House, shaved, blackened in the face, put on an ass and made to parade on the streets of the town. There was no condemnation. Was that a proof of freedom being assured for the people?

I would like to know from my friends how many of them really condemned it when, not once but again and again, even a great leader like Jay Prakash Narayan called on the army and the police not to obey the orders which they considered as illegal. Is this done in any democracy in the world?

Therefore, I am really sorry to hear them. If they were sincere and if Mr. Era Sezhiyan was really feeling that there was some danger to democracy in this country, let him search his heart and ask himself whether he raised any objection when Mr. Jayprakash Narain....

SHRI C. T. DHANDAPANI (Dharampuram): We did; we personally told Jayprakash Narain.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: How do we know what you told him personally? (*Interruptions*). I concede you told Jayprakash Narain personally, but how do we know?

See how things were developing I want you to, as you said, introspect a little. Let us search our hearts. Were we not all responsible? If we were also guilty on our side to a certain extent, I will concede that we were also wrong. But let us think together. Were we not making a mockery of the Parliamentary system in the House when, on non-issues, we were wasting so much time? Were we discussing economic issues? Were we not dragging the Parliament towards irrelevance day by day? What is it that we were trying to do?

That is why, I want to know from my friends, what did we do when democracy was being eroded every day by these acts inside and outside? What was the dharna; what was the rushing on the dais and snatching the mike from the Speaker? Was it all respect for Parliamentary democracy?

I would ask my friend Mohan Dharia—I know he disagreed with that view—in regard to this demand for dissolution of the Assembly, whether it was not a fact that Jayaprakash Narain insisted that the only ground on which a dialogue can be had with the Government was if the dissolution demand was conceded. He insisted on that. On two points, about the electoral reforms and others, there was agreement and people were willing to sit for discussions but he made it a point that unless dissolution is agreed to there will be no dialogue with the Government. Jayaprakash Narain said it and you all supported him. Was that the respect for democracy? You say that elected representatives must be respected. The normal process of democracy is that, after five years, you get a chance; you could defeat us as you did in Gujarat. That was the right thing to do. I thought that, after the Gujarat experiment, you would be encouraged to learn a lesson—come together and form one party and try to remove the Congress after eight months when we would be going to the polls. But you had no patience. You were planning to take the matter to the streets. What was the plan. Even in Gujarat what happened? My hon. friend, Mr. Prasannabhai Mehta, was talking of Gujarat. You went on a fast for dissolution. After that you went on a fast for election—and election at the worst possible time. Yet to save the life of a great leader, Shri Morarji Desai it was conceded. What did you do in Gujarat? You asked for elections in Gujarat. It was conceded and we went for elections in Gujarat. I would like to know this from Mr. Prasannabhai Mehta. Was there a single meeting of the Janata Front which was disturbed by Congressmen? Was there a single meeting of the Janata Front in which young Congressmen threw stones? But not a single meeting of the Congress was allowed to be conducted peacefully. I have been, personally a victim of that attack—a bar-

rage of stones thrown by young men. It would have been even fatal. I would like to know this from you. Did you avoid giving a sort of lip sympathy to them? Did you really stop that? Did you condemn that? Were they not your followers? Who were they? Nobody claims that they were their followers. Yet, they were shouting: 'Moraji Bhai zindabad; Janata Morcha zindabad; Jayaprakash Narayan zindabad' and they were throwing stones. Was that democracy? What is the use if you could not stop your followers? Are you trying to suggest that those people were not willing to listen to you? And then you say that the people were with you and they elected you to power in Gujarat. Therefore, do not apply double standards. When you talk of democracy, let us also introspect and see what they were leading this country to. My friend has already spoken about it. You wanted to paralyse the whole thing. This was precisely what was done in Chile. Do not forget the experience of Chile: how the communications were first paralysed and then the armed forces were made to revolt. Mr. Allende, the elected President, was shot. You wanted India also to go towards the same state of affairs. It has been accepted now that international forces have been interested in de-stabilisation of countries like Chile. No wonder, they would be happy if this de-stabilisation takes place in India. Whether you are a party to it willingly or not, you are falling into that trap. Were you not leading the country, more or less, to a paralysis—trying to paralyse the whole thing? I would like to know this from you. When so much was on your side, when you thought that it was easy after the Gujarat experiment to go the polls, then what was the necessity to ask the people to take the matter to the streets? My friend, Mr. Prasannabhai Mehta, was asking: has the Opposition no right to agitate peacefully; has the Opposition no right to help the people express their grievances in non-violent way. They

[Shri Vasant. Sathe]

have. There is no doubt it. But, have the Opposition the right to ask the people to gherao the Ministers and their bungalows? Have they also the right to ask the people to see that the TV and radio do not function under any circumstances? Was that also a right under democracy? Was that also a right to speak from the ramparts of Ram Lila Maidan asking the policemen not to obey the orders? Was that also democratic to declare that on 29th you were going to start a country-wide Satyagrah, Gheraoing Ministers, M.L.A.s, M.Ps, the Prime Minister with volunteers and then forcing them to resort to firing? You know what happened in Gujarat. They let loose an era of terror, a reign of terror, burnt buses, stopped railway trains, burnt post offices captured police stations etc. Was that the idea to do that in the country? Is that where you wanted to take the country and did you expect that any Government worth the name should quietly watch you leading the country to that state of affairs helplessly and to surrender to you and say, right, Sir, please do not burn, and all take the Government? Is that what you expected?

SHRI S. A. SHAMIM: That is what you did till 12th June.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: We were giving you the longest rope.

Mr. Jagannathrao Joshi, you were talking about RSS I and you know too well about this organization. RSS is the organization which was born in Nagpur in 1925. I ask you straight question. Was Hitler not the ideal of RSS? Did you not want to build RSS on the lines and example of Hitler and storm troopers? This is how the boys were asked to drill (Interruptions).

AN HON. MEMBER: Hitler did not come in power in 1925 when the RSS was born.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: I know that, I am not talking when he came to power. You also thought that like Hitler, you will also come to power by the same methods. You started teaching people, youngmen, putting in their minds stories of the glory of Shivaji and Rana Partap in a twisted manner, brain-washing and then spreading and preaching hatred against Muslims and Christians. Was it not what you did in RSS? That is why, when the words were used in the Kapur Commission as such, it was said that you as RSS as such may not be guilty of killing Gandhiji, but it is the mentality, it is the attitude that you preached which created a man like Godse. Do you deny this? This is precisely what will happen. You and the men like Anand Margis under the garb of religion preach hatred, youngmen become fanatics and think and do dangerous things. And that is what you are leading to and that was the plan. When the plan was exposed of you wanting to assassinate certain VIPs, should we have waited for that day? That is why, it was high time and right time for the Prime Minister, after having given all the latitude to the opposition for so many days to take this step and promulgate the emergency.

If you want that we should go back to the system of democracy ..

18 hrs.

SHRI P. K. DEO: You would not go back.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Democracy as yourself have been saying needs a certain improvement so that we make it more relevant. We have been saying that instead of Parliament just sitting for days together and everyone of us talking for a few minutes, let us have a committee

system or any other system in which we study matters in depth and help and influence the government. This is the time when we can think of bringing in certain useful reforms to make our parliamentary system more relevant and more effective and properly functional.

Therefore, I would plead with you. Don't look at it only from a biased angle. Don't look at this emergency as if it is an onslaught on democracy. Nobody wants to have any onslaught or any erosion of parliamentary democracy in this country. This was a measure which was required to be taken to stop the erosion. Therefore, if you co-operate and if we all introspect and work together, I am sure we will have a healthy democracy and that too, a healthy parliamentary democracy.

8.02 hrs.

ARREST OF MEMBER

MR. CHAIRMAN. I have to inform the House that the speaker has received the following communication dated the 20th July, 1975, from the Sub-Inspector, Madhya Pradesh Police, District Panna:—

“As per District Magistrate, Panna (Madhya Pradesh) order No 1/CST 653/75, dated 18th July, 1975 Shri Narendra Singh, Member of Parliament, arrested under MISA on 20th July, 1975.”

Now the House stands adjourned till 11 a.m. tomorrow.

18.03 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, July 22, 1975/Asadha 31, 1897 (Saka).
