

NOTIFICATION UNDER CUSTOMS ACT,
1962

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN-CHARGE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE AND BANKING (SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHERJEE): I beg to lay on the Table a copy of Notification No. G.S.R. 867(E), (Hindi and English versions) published in Gazette of India dated the 5th November, 1976, under section 159 of the Customs Act, 1962 together with an explanatory memorandum. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-11535/76].

11.03 hrs.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

TWO HUNDRED AND THIRTY-SECOND
REPORT

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta—North-East): I beg to present the Two Hundred and Thirty-second Report of the Public Accounts Committee on Paragraphs 5, 10, 16, 17, 18 and 21 of the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 1972-73, Union Government (Defence Services).

11.04 hrs.

HOUSE OF THE PEOPLE (EXTENSION OF DURATION) AMENDMENT
BILL—contd.

11.02 hrs.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE FROM THE
SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER: The Committee on Absence of Members from the Sittings of the House in their Thirty-first Report have recommended that leave of absence be granted to the following Members for the periods indicated against each:—

(1) Shri Shyamnandan Mishra...
23rd to 27th May 1976 (Sixteenth Session) and 10th August to 2nd September, 1976 (Seventeenth Session).

(2) Shrimati Shakuntala Nayar...
21st to 27th May, 1976 (Sixteenth Session) and 10th August to 2nd September, 1976 (Seventeenth Session).

Is it the pleasure of the House that leave as recommended by the Committee may be granted?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Members will be informed accordingly.

MR. SPEAKER: The House will now take up further consideration of the Bill for extension of the duration of the present House of the People.

I propose to call the Minister at 12-30. We have already spent one hour and fifty minutes. Let us finish this. We can spend another two hours for this and then finish with this. After lunch, we shall take up the Flood and Drought situation in the country. If necessary, we may sit up to seven of the clock. We can have five hours for this discussion.

I think that nobody was on his legs. Shri Indrajit Gupta.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore): Mr. Speaker, Sir, yesterday, for almost one hour, we were treated to a very interesting but somewhat irrelevant exchange between Shri Samar Mukherjee and Shri Stephen in which of course everybody, whom one can think of, from Lenin to Jesus Christ, was invoked. I don't propose to range so far but to confine myself to this Bill which has been brought before us by the Hon. Law Minister. I may say that I am opposing this Bill.

The Bill is coming on the heels of an unprecedentedly comprehensive

Constitution (Amendment) Bill which this House discussed for five days. As the House is aware, our party voted for that Bill despite some serious reservations and opposition to some clauses on which we moved and pressed our amendments. Despite that, on the Bill as a whole, we voted for it because, in our understanding, the essence of that Bill, the main thrust of that Bill, was to assert or to reassert the supremacy of Parliament, the sovereignty of Parliament and to try to close some of the loopholes by which that supremacy was being repeatedly challenged since 1969.

In fact, our party has been advocating for some time that the Constitution does require very radical reforms, measures, to amend it precisely so as to strengthen the substance and the content of our parliamentary democracy.

Coming on the heels of that Bill, this Bill seeks to extend the life of the present Lok Sabha by one year more, and more so, the grounds which have been given by the hon. Minister, we find, to be somewhat of an anticlimax. The point is that when talking about Parliament's supremacy and Parliament's sovereignty, we are not referring to this—I am sure, no student of political science will say that—that in a system of Parliamentary democracy, the sovereignty of the people means only this House, constituted as it is here, consisting of certain members, individuals, who happen, at a particular point of time, to be Members of that House. That is not the meaning of Parliamentary Democracy. That is only one part of it. Parliamentary Democracy, as we understand it and, I think, the hon. Minister will also agree, means a certain process. When he said the other day—I find he repeated it in the other House also—that to non-cooperate with Parliament is to non-cooperate with the people; it means that he is admitting that ultimately the sovereignty lies with the people in a system of parliamentary democracy

and the entire system and the process does not consist only of the House which has been elected in an election. It means that the people who are ultimately sovereign are to be given the right, at regular and fixed periods, of exercising their choice and determining who are the people, through whom, they wish to exercise their sovereignty in this Parliament. Minus that part, only this House, constituted as it is, cannot represent the whole of parliamentary democracy.

✓ SHRI D. BASUMATARI (Kokrajhar): Why?

✓ SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Because of what I have said just now. This House has no meaning minus the people. Therefore, I am afraid, this step which the Government has taken is going to seriously erode the confidence of the people in the present system which we wish to further strengthen. It is going to be weakened in fact.

I know for a fact, that is, from a report received by me three or four days ago that the initial reaction that has been there among the ordinary common people in Calcutta—the talk which is going on in the buses and trams—is: Oh! There will be no more elections. The Minister may take a technical stand that this particular Bill naturally does not mean that. It means that we are extending the life of the House for another year. I am not standing on technical arguments now. I am standing on political assessment of the situation. Although no official spokesman of the Government may have said so yet there are influential voices in this country which are heard everyday and which are reported quite extensively in the Press saying that we have no use for elections. The cumulative affect of all this is that a mood of cynicism will spread among the people. It shows that gradually and slowly an attempt is being made to give up this election process, to defer it as far as

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

possible and thereby prevent the people from exercising their right to which they are entitled as a basic birth-right which gives birth to parliamentary democracy.

I do not agree for a moment with the arguments advanced by the Law Minister. Sometimes the Government is saying that the situation has vastly improved during the period of Emergency. It has improved in many respects. In some other respects—as Mr. Samar Mukherjee pointed out in the early part of his speech yesterday—there have been certain negative developments also. But on the whole there is no doubt that there has been some improvement. If that improvement had not been there then the spokesman of the Government would not have been saying that we are confident that if we go to the polls we will have a sweeping victory. Obviously, it pre-supposes that the situation has vastly improved. That is why you are releasing many of the leaders of the de-stabilisation movement. Obviously, if you thought the situation was still fraught with great danger and that subversive forces are still strong you would not be releasing from jail some of the most prominent leaders of this de-stabilisation movement. In the States so many people who had been detained belonging to Jan Sangh and RSS—about which Mr. Stephen talked so much yesterday—have been released and some of them fortunately or unfortunately are trying to become members of the Congress party.

Obviously, if you go by these things the Government's assertion from time to time that the situation has greatly improved and on that basis their confidence has been strengthened is the conclusion one should come to. But when it comes to justifying this Bill then the Minister comes and paints a different picture and says that all those forces which were trying to destabilise the country are still very strong and active. Subversive forces

are working very actively below the surface and, therefore, if we go to the elections these forces will again get an opportunity. I do not understand these two contradictory arguments. I do not have to teach the meaning of subversion to Mr. Gokhale. Subversion is something which takes place below the surface and not above the surface. Above the surface there may be political expression of some point of view. You are trying to imply that by extending the life of the Lok Sabha for one year and putting off the elections somehow these subversive forces will be better controlled and better managed. But how! I do not understand it. In fact, this putting off the election on such a flimsy excuse is in our opinion the best ammunition that you could supply to these reactionary and subversive forces to go to the people to whom they were not able to go for many months and whisper in their ears and create all kinds of confusing propaganda. You are actually helping them by putting off the elections. The way to fight subversive forces is not to do counter subversion. As far as the people are concerned they cannot fight subversive forces by counter-subversion. They fight subversive forces by political mobilisation. That is the only way to fight subversive forces and we feel if the elections were held it would give an opportunity for a very big massive mass mobilisation throughout the country and if it were on a correct political position then it would be effective way of exposing these subversive forces.

Then, Sir, when we talk of the right reactionary forces then we have got the experience of our own country as well as that of the other countries. These right reactionaries are not existing in a vacuum. The right reactionary forces do not operate hanging in mid-air. They have got some roots in the society and the economy of our country. We have said repeatedly in the House and outside that if you really want to suppress these conspi-

ratorial right reactionary forces which are linked with external forces then you will have to uproot their economic and social basis in this country. If their economic and social base remains intact then even if you defeat them politically for some time they will again come back.

What are the grass roots of right reactionaries? Is it not the monopolies, big traders, speculators, the profiteers and the black-money operators? It is good that against a few of them, that is, smugglers and tax evaders you are taking punitive action. We welcome it. But the basic roots of these reactionary forces have not been touched. Can you fight right reaction without fighting monopolies? Regrettably we find during the period of Emergency action against the monopolists as a class was not taken. On the other hand, we find that Mr. Birla said while addressing the Stock Exchange Conference at Bangalore that Government had never been so understanding to them as it has been during these months. Government had never given them so many concessions. Further he said that the night-mare under which they used to live, namely, strikes and processions has gone and now they feel secured and confident. Do you think by allowing these monopolies to grow and by giving them more concessions you are fighting the right reactionaries? Please remember that these are the same monopolists who are the owners of big newspapers; the same big newspapers which are very powerful moulders of public opinion in this country; the same big newspapers which played a certain role before the Emergency was imposed. Please, remember it. Do not forget it. Do not forget what this press was demanding on the very eve of the emergency. Were they with Government, were they with the Prime Minister or were they howling for her blood? The owners of these papers are the same monopolists, those same Birlas, those same Goenkas, those

same Sahu Jains, those same Dalmias who are now extolling the emergency and saying that 'you are treating us so well; we are very happy'. Do you think that politically, for the time being because some people have been put in jail and some organisations have been banned, the danger of right reaction has gone so long as these people remain. Again the speculators, hoarders and blackmarketeers are trying to push up prices. Everybody knows it. Therefore, unless you take action against the class roots, the social and economic roots of these people, you will never be able to really suppress reaction.

But I regret to say that the experience of the period of emergency shows that Government is not moving in that direction, and now when the time was approaching for elections, they come and say that subversive forces are active, below the surface and if we go to elections, they will utilise it. How will they utilise it? Subversive forces do not like elections. They do not like people together in their thousands and lakhs to discuss politics and to pledge certain programmes. Election is the time when the political consciousness of the masses is raised to its highest peak. Do you think that is what the subversive forces want? So elections would be the best way to consolidate whatever gains we have managed to achieve and also to give an account to the people. What is wrong with that? Is anybody afraid of giving an account to the people? Nobody says that everything has been achieved. Nobody contends there are no negative features along with the positive ones. What is the harm in going to the people, who are our masters, speak to them that these are the things we wanted to do, this is what we have been able to do, these are things we have not been able to do, these are the obstacles and difficulties in the way and we want your co-operation in this way to fight them. That is the way you can wage a fight against these forces of right

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

reaction and mobilise the people. But this decision you are about to take will not only gladden the hearts of these right reactionary forces, but it will—that is what I am worried about—seriously erode the confidence of the people in this whole parliamentary system. That is something which will have a damaging effect which will go far beyond anything else.

I would also say this, particularly to my friends opposite. I am not trying to score a debating point. Please be patient and listen. We know the background against which this Constitution Amendment Bill came. We know what tremendous efforts were being made from various quarters, both inside and outside, to see that that Bill was not taken up. Everybody here has enthusiastically voted for the Bill and applauded when it was passed. But do not forget that had the Prime Minister not at the last moment come out clearly with a statement that we believe that parliament has got unfettered right to amend the Constitution, had she not said that, the voices, the chorus, that was being heard, by various, different arguments, was that this Parliament is not competent to make any far-reaching changes in the Constitution. Some people were saying only a new Parliament can do it; some were saying that a Constituent Assembly must be created; some people were saying this Parliament has lost its mandate. These were different ways of denigrating the whole sovereignty of Parliament in its constitution amending powers.

I know my friends of the CPI(M) also plumped for this idea of a Constituent Assembly thinking perhaps that we are in some period of insurrection or something—I do not know. Communists at least do not call for a Constituent Assembly except when it comes as a climax to some new revo-

lutionary situation when a new state has to be created.

✓ AN HON. MEMBER: No, no.

✓ SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Everything that Shri Samar Mukherjee said yesterday about bourgeois democracy would apply equally well to a Constituent Assembly created now in this situation in today's context with this balance of forces. Still they call for a Constituent Assembly, I should say, unwittingly siding with the worst reactionaries who do not want this Parliament to have the power to amend the Constitution. This was the situation which had developed.

I want to ask the Law Minister some straight questions. First, will he please assure this House that there will be no going back from the proposition that Parliament, this Parliament, has the unfettered right to amend the Constitution whenever and wherever it is required? Because some people are saying that we have passed this Bill, but more changes are required. May be they are required. We would also like many changes. But if such changes are to be brought about, can it be done by this Parliament or can it not be? Let there be no beating about the bush. All those people who are saying that it cannot be done by this Parliament are indirectly suggesting that Parliament has no power, and some new Constituent Assembly has to be created. How will it be created? Does the Constitution give this Parliament the power to constitute itself into a Constituent Assembly? I do not think there is any such power given in the Constitution. Then do you want to have a Constituent Assembly elected by the people? If you are game for election for a Constituent Assembly, you might as well have an election for Parliament—which you do not want.

The only justification for a Constituent Assembly would be if people are feeling, the ruling party is feeling,

that the entire Constitution and the structure of the State as it is at present, as it has been since 1950, should be scrapped and something new should be put in its place.

Last year a proposal for some sort of a presidential form of government was actively being canvassed. Who has forgotten it? Signatures were being collected. And the Swaran Singh Committee, in its recommendations, in its published report, had energetically contested this idea and said that 'we have considered the whole matter and come to the conclusion that in the conditions of our country, a parliamentary form of government is the best suited.' They dismissed that idea, and I would fully share their view. As I have said earlier, if for nothing else, for preserving the integrity of India, this huge sub-continent with so many States, with millions of people speaking different languages, having different cultures, the only way of keeping this country together is through a parliamentary form of government, through an elected Parliament, in which people from all corners of the country can find their voices through their representatives, and where by free and frank debate and exchange of views and consensus some decisions are taken in a democratic way. If anybody wants to leave this system and go to a more authoritarian form of government, some presidential form of government, whatever else may happen, I can tell you the unity of this country will not be sustained. It will fall apart; all sorts of fissiparous tendencies will raise their head and come to the surface.

Therefore, since the voices which are advocating a Constituent Assembly are still not silenced—still I hear them speaking here and there—there are apprehensions in our mind—if they are unfounded, I will be very happy—that after this Bill postponing elections for one year, those people who want a Constituent Assembly and actually want to change the whole

system and establish some new kind of presidential form of government, to which we are totally opposed, will get another breathing space to again mobilise their forces, again raise this slogan and start canvassing for it.

I will appeal to my friends in the Congress to be on guard because you are going to assemble shortly for your party's meeting in Gauhati. We do not want that taking advantage of this one year postponement of the poll, this idea should again be brought up. If you want to change the Constitution further, this Parliament is fully competent to do it. That is the mandate.

✓ SHRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA (Bangalore): Agreed.

✓ SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: That mandate is with this Parliament and not in a Constituent Assembly, unless in the back of your mind, Shri Hanumanthaiya, you would want to do away with parliamentary democracy and bring something else in its place.

✓ SHRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA: When did I say that?

✓ SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: I did not say you said it. I saw you shaking your head. So I thought you were...

✓ SHRI K. HANUMANTHAIYA: One fault with the CPI is—they are very good people—that unnecessarily they make their imagination run against their own friends.

✓ SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: I would like to hear that from Shri Gokhale in more categorical terms that this is nothing but a figment of our imagination and no such thing can happen or will happen, and that Government at least will stand four square, and the Congress High Command will stand four square, in defence of the system of parliamentary democracy.

I also want to hear from him that the putting off of this election this time by another year is not the fore-

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

runner of successive postponements until we come to a stage where, after three or four years when elections are held, people become thoroughly disillusioned by that time and are cynical about the whole process. I do not know whether it will not open the floodgates to those very subversive forces, reactionary forces which you are wanting to fight. There are people who ask: what is the need for elections for the next 3 or 4 years? We hear them in the Central Hall; we do not have to go very far. On another occasion Mr. Gokhale said that somebody had stated that this was the beginning of the end of the process. I want to say that this is not the beginning of the end. Please tell us again, because your arguments in defence of this Bill are totally unconvincing. They do not show a spirit of confidence; they show a spirit of utter lack of confidence, if I may say so. Whatever you may say here, it shows utter lack of confidence in the people, because people are the only force which can ultimately save this country and save this democracy from any kind of subversion or destabilisation; nobody else can save it. Therefore, we are opposed to this Bill. We think that politically it will have a very damaging effect. I do not want to go into those remarks now because I have talked earlier about them and Mr. Gokhale said that I was being very uncharitable: the Congress Party is afraid to go to the polls. That is not the point. If they do not want to go to the polls there is some good reason for it. Do not tell us to swallow this. Nowhere will you find in any country, in world experience, that the ruling party which was so confident of victory at a particular moment by going to the polls is performing a supreme act of self-sacrifice and self-abnegation and say, instead of that we will not go because we want to serve the people. I think this is too much to swallow. In fact the astuteness of any political leadership, any ruling party's leadership consists in the fact of choosing the

right moment when it feels that its chances of victory are the best. That is how people generally fix the election schedule. On the one hand, you say: this is the moment; on the other hand, you say: we do not want victory for ourselves, we want to go and help the people. That argument also has given way to the other argument that subversive forces will utilise the election. How will they utilise the elections? I do not understand. That shows that you are lacking in self-confidence. I am not saying that you are afraid; but you are lacking in self-confidence. Lack of self-confidence tends to breed fear. Therefore, we are opposed to this Bill because politically it is in our opinion totally wrong. It is a wrong assessment that the government is making. I do not know wherefrom they are getting their reports. They collect reports from all over the country, through various sources, official and non-official, nowadays perhaps more official than non-official. I do not know what reports are being sent to the Prime Minister as to the state of affairs in the country and whether on the basis of those reports her confidence has increased or has gone down; I do not know. But the general impression being created in the country is that the ruling party does not want to fight elections for some very good reasons of its own party advantage and government advantage and that this is the beginning of a process in which people will gradually be deprived of their most cherished and sacred right, that is the right of electing their representatives through whom their sovereignty is exercised. To say that that is not the main right, that the basic right is having elected 525 people, those 525 people must continue for all time—this is a very peculiar kind of defence of parliamentary democracy which we have never heard. Therefore, we cannot support this Bill; we oppose it. I should even now request the Minister and the Government to think over this matter and if it is too late for them now to

withdraw the Bill, they should at least declare in this House that extending the life by one year does not necessarily mean that elections would be considered only at the end of one year. They can hold elections earlier. Elections may not be held in February 1977 but nothing prevents them from holding elections earlier than the extended period of one year. I know Mr. Gokhale will say: we will consider it; that is the technical position, I know. But I want some political assessment, some political discussion to be here. Therefore, we consider this to be a very harmful decision government is wanting to take; it will do immense damage to the country and to the people, in the sense that it will breed among them a feeling of utter despair and cynicism; so, we are opposed to this Bill.

Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence, there is a small point of explanation. I do not see Mr. Stephen here. He said, not yesterday but a couple of days earlier, something about this; he had a little jibe at us and said, with reference to our party here, they are opposing the extension but in Kerala they do not mind if elections are put off. I just want to point out that what he had stated is not a correct statement of facts. When the life of the Kerala assembly was due to expire, all the parties of the coalition government in Kerala, including our party, your party, are on record the Chief Minister is on record, that they wanted to have elections. It was not they who said: we do not want elections. That decision was not taken there, to put off elections; the decision was taken here. If I may just end by a small quotation from a very respectable paper. *Hindustan Times*, you know who owns it, it says: "The Kerala Chief Minister, Shri Achuta Menon said he favoured elections in his State; we in the coalition ministry are ready to face elections." He told a news-conference, that the "political climate is in our favour; on the whole our performance has also been good." Mr. Menon who met Prime Minister Indira

Gandhi earlier said: he had apprised her of the views of the coalition partners on the issue of early elections "but there was no definite answer." This is what the report says. It says further, that he "recognised that the time of the elections depended on the Central Government; they have their own considerations; what they have decided, they have not yet revealed to us."

So, it is not correct for Mr. Stephen to say that our party in Kerala was against early election. All the parties there were for elections. The decision not to hold election was taken in Delhi, not in Trivandrum. If there was any hesitation, it was here. He should not draw a parallel with this case because to put off elections in Kerala or to hold early elections even in Kerala at that time would mean an intervening period of President's rule. That is not the case here. There you should have to go to President's rule without having any clear commitment as to the time when elections would be held. But in spite of that they said: we are for elections. The decision which went against them was taken here in Delhi by the Central Government for its own reasons. I am sorry Mr. Stephen is not here while I reply to his point.

✓ SHRI N. K. P. SALVE (Betul): Mr. Speaker, if one were to give a little latitude to Shri Indrajit Gupta's speech, one may be able to understand reasonably his reluctance and the reluctance of his party to support this legislative measure extending the tenure of parliament by another year. But what completely beats me is that he and his party try to emerge as the greatest messiah of the parliamentary form of government. It is my party and my party's leadership which is inalienably committed to democracy, was always committed in the past to the parliamentary form of government; it has been committed; it is committed today and it shall remain ever committed. Then where is the question of doing this sort of shadow-boxing over a mat-

[Shri N. K. P. Salve]

tef which is not germane in any way to the Bill and to the issues which were there in the Bill? I appreciate why he and his party are not going to support this measure. This is not a legislative measure which either panders to the dictatès of political expediency or to political slogan mongering: we want elections. This is a measure which involves more grave and serious political responsibility towards the masses of the people whom we represent here.

Sir, my respectful submission is that Shri Indrajit Gupta and his party have been very wise in associating with us whenever we have taken measures, whenever we have taken decisions, which have helped us in bringing about an appropriate socio-economic milieu and to usher in a pace of socio-economic milieu that we have been striving to achieve. They have associated themselves very willingly in such measures; they did it in some important provisions of the Constitution only in the last week, because that brings to them political credit. Then if it is a measure that involves political responsibility, grave political responsibility, taking some burden on their shoulders at that juncture they are only too willing to back out themselves—the spirit of eating the cake and having it too.

I am, at the moment Mr. Indrajit Gupta, dealing with some of the exchanges of argument which you have advanced. I shall certainly argue on the merits of the case and shall make out the case. While you yourself condemned the right reactionary forces, the CPI(M) and their allies, the Jan Sangh, the R.S.S., Ananda Margis, are you not, willy nilly, standing in line with them? Or have you not virtually said the same thing which they have been saying in somewhat uncouth, invective and abusive language? Have you not said the same thing in a refined language which Mr. Samar Mukherjee said in a very unparliamentary language yesterday? Is it fair, is it just? Therefore, kindly see that you are

putting yourself in a very grave and dangerous position by adopting this attitude, that you are putting yourself in line with these very forces which subversive of this very form of democracy, the parliamentary form of Government, for which you are emerging as such a great messiah or such a great Caesar or such a great advocate. I want you to consider one thing. You have referred to cynicism of the people, people have started believing that this Parliament is going to extend its tenure, year after year, so on and so forth and to dispel this cynicism the argument ran, and the argument of despair ran that we to dispel the cynicism, all that we need is that we should go to the polls. This was the argument. If you think, the right course—if it is cynicism honestly you think that it is cynicism—or the remedy that lies in dispelling the cynicism is by explaining to them what are the reasons and what are those grounds on which still the time is not yet ripe, according to us, for elections. If it was not ripe last year, for which you voted and rightly agreed with us, then how were the conditions, how were the circumstances changed today so that they could say that the time was already ripe and we were going to have the elections? I submit respectfully that the merits of the Bill.....

✓ SHRI S. A. SHAMIM (Srinagar): Your idea.....

✓ SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Sometimes your interference is reasonable but sometimes it is extremely presumptuous and arrogant.

✓ SHRI S. A. SHAMIM: I am using the Parliamentary privileges according to 'Shakdhar and Kaul' on page 320.

✓ SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: I only hope that his parliamentary privileges are not different from those of mine—Shakdhar and Kaul page 433. So, Mr. Indrajit Gupta, I am replying to your arguments and if my replies are irrelevant, equally irrelevant must have been your argument. He said "to call off the bluff of right reaction of the left adventurists comprising CPI(M),

the Jan Sangh, the R.S.S., the Ananda Margis etc. and their tribe". Let us go to the people, mobilise the opinion of the people, mobilise the strength of the people, people who are our masters and thereby once for all try to put down all these efforts at subversion. This is the argument that was running. The question is this: whether the time is ripe to go in for the polls so that once for all we take care of these people who are unleashing divisive forces, who are unleashing the subversive forces, who are out to perpetuate themselves, who are out to mislead the people and is it Shri Indrajit Gupta's contention that these elections are only a make-belief elections, that there are not going to be free and fair elections and if there are not going to be free and fair elections, may I ask Shri Gupta how is he going to stop these people from unleashing a tirade and propaganda and all these things which they are using? Don't you know that in Gujarat our people were beaten? You know my party lost four prestigious seats for one reason only. That is because the Jan Sangh, the R.S.S., had unleashed such an amount of intimidation that we were not allowed to go to more than half of the mohallahs for house to house canvassing.

✓ SHRI S. A. SHAMIM: How did you win in 1971 there?

✓ SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: 'How did we win in 1971' is a matter of history. It is a matter of history, Mr. Shamim. All that I am talking about is what sort of forces come about. It is not only a question of winning the elections and that is the basic difficulty with you people. If you have any doubt about it, you can please yourself; nobody can help the person who is wide awake and still pretends to be sleeping. But for elections is this the most opportune time? I do not want to bank upon this, neither do I want to argue on that point. But I want to bring this point home that if the elections are going to be held and if the elections are held in an absolutely fair and free manner, then the Emergency has got to be diluted out of all shape. Are you in a position to dilute

the Emergency today without seriously imperilling the welfare of the very people in whose name you have postponed the elections for one year? Are the Heavens going to fall if their interests are seriously imperilled? You may put this question. For one reason I may tell you that these forces will once again join together, try to mislead them and God alone knows what is likely to happen. Is it seriously disputed, seriously doubted by you? I can understand Shri Samar Mukherjee who used a very unfortunate invective and abusive language yesterday. He rebuked us. He made all imputations against us. He said we were stooges and lickspittle of the monopolists, capitalists and that we were to establish capitalist society. The language that he used was most unfortunate. Well, it is up to him to see how it added to his argument. But while he abused us, he expressed his complete displeasure at the manner in which the country is functioning, the system which is functioning. Well, they have approved the present state of this country, they have approved the system which we are working—this Parliament and the Government. He eulogised China, Korea, Vietnam and Cuba. This is a manifestation of slavish mentality, a slave thing, that is the lord and the master are a paragon of virtue, and, therefore, China, Vietnam, Korea and Cuba are the countries which are utopian countries and this country is a third-rate country—a typical manifestation of the slave mentality. We are not against these countries whatsoever; if only Shri Samar Mukherjee were to get out of this mentality, he will realise the beauties of this country, the greatness of the people, the greatness of the system under which we are working. He had the gumption yesterday to quote Lenin out of context.

✓ AN HON. MEMBER: Are you also going to quote Lenin?

✓ SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: I am not going to quote Lenin because he is not here to defend himself! I am not going to quote him in support of the contention that this sort of Parliament or this sort of democracy has been

[Shri N. K. P. Salve]

working as a bourgeois democracy and the liberal democracy for which he and his colleagues and his allies, namely, Jan Sanh, R.S.S. and Ananda Margis are fighting is not bourgeois democracy, but the democracy in which we are putting the directive principles of the community above fundamental rights is bourgeois democracy! They are not prepared to share the responsibility with us, to sit in Parliament and join hands with us in giving primacy to directive principles over fundamental rights. And still, he quotes Lenin that this democracy becomes bourgeois democracy. I think he needs to go back to an elementary reading of Marxism and Leninism. After reading Karl Marx, Lenin and Engels, Mr. Mukherjee will do well if he does some reading of Swami Vivekananda, Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru. That will disabuse him of all this and he will understand what suits the Indian genius. The language that he used could have been a little more temperate and decorous. That would have done credit to what he was arguing.

Coming to the merits of the Bill, Shri Indrajit Gupta said he had a very serious quarrel with the objects of the Bill and he did not agree with them at all. The objects of the Bill are:

"The conditions which led to the extension of the duration of the present House of the People by one year also continue to prevail. It is felt that it will not be in the larger interests of the country to have general elections to the House before its present term expires."

We do not feel we are obliged to explain this to everybody, but certainly to Shri Indrajit Gupta and his party and to the country we need to explain. Is it not known that the global economic situation is explosive? Although we are having a slightly comfortable time, if Mr. Indrajit Gupta is kind enough to look into the recent report of the IMF about the economies of the development countries, he will know in what a terrible mess those countries

are, what a terrible deficit in the balance of payment position they are having and what a terrible mess they are having in inflation. What about even the developed countries? U. K. has got 22 per cent inflation. Do you think we have so mastered the economic situation that without the requisite economic discipline today, we can get rid of the emergency? For going to elections, if it is election worth its salt, we will have to dilute this emergency substantially.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Who said it?

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: I say it because we are not going to hold elections as they are held in the Soviet Union. Elections are going to be held as they have been held all these years in this country. That is the type of elections we are used to and that is the type of elections we talk of when we talk of elections, not the controlled elections of one party. If that be so, what is the answer? It is purely and entirely as a result of the economic discipline which the emergency ushered in that we have been able to take cheer on the economic front. The developing countries are languishing in a morass of economic misfortune out of which they are finding it very difficult to get up. Their balance of payment position is miserable and their inflation is terrible. The position on the food front, shelter front and other fronts is extremely difficult. We have taken several measures. These measures are still half way round. We have still a long way to go. The system that we will bring about, the altered procedures and practices that we have set in should be so stabilised that the good effects we are having of the emergency are having some degree of permanence about them. Are we assured of such a thing today? If you think so, why did you complain just now that the prices have started rising again? Why did the price indices rise high between March and July? Do you think that the gains of emergency are stabilised and the aims of the emergency have been fully achieved? Do you think the time has

come to end the emergency? If the time to end the emergency has not come, what Mr. Gokhale has written here is absolutely valid and correct. The objects very much exist. If the objects exist, we must pass this Bill. With these words, I commend the Bill to the House.

श्री ज्ञानचंद्र बोटे (नागपुर) : प्रथम महोदय, आपातकालीन स्थिति की दो घोषणाओं के बाद और उन पर प्रमल के चलते हुए, आज चुनाव का प्रश्न खड़ा हुआ है। आपातकालीन स्थिति में हम सामाजिक और आर्थिक क्रान्ति करना चाहते हैं। आपातकालीन स्थिति का फायदा उठा कर हम गरीबों के लिये, मेहनतकश लोगों के लिये, पद-दलितों के लिये, आदिवासियों के लिये कुछ करना चाहते हैं। यदि आपातकालीन स्थिति का इस्तेमाल केवल सर्वहारा जनता के उत्थान के लिये होता है, तो उस आपातकालीन स्थिति का स्वागत इस देश में होगा।

लेकिन प्रश्न यह है कि क्या वास्तव में इस आपातकालीन स्थिति का फायदा मेहनतकश लोगों को, पद-दलितों को, गरीबों को मिल रहा है? मैं तो ऐसा देख रहा हूँ कि इस आपातकालीन स्थिति का फायदा इस देश के उद्योगपति, इस देश के पूंजीवादी, इस देश के ब्रिटेड इन्स्ट्रेट के लोग उठा रहे हैं। इस में कोई शक नहीं कि आपातकालीन स्थिति से कुछ फायदे बखर हुए हैं, लेकिन जैसे-जैसे उस का असर कम होता जा रहा है, जैसे-जैसे ब्रिटेड इन्स्ट्रेट के लोग, वे शक्तियाँ उभर कर आगे आ रही हैं और इस को एक्स्प्लॉइट कर रही हैं। ऐसी अवस्था में आप चुनाव एक साल के लिये स्थगित करते हैं या दो साल के लिये स्थगित करते हैं। इस से कोई अन्तर नहीं पड़ेगा। संसदीय प्रजातन्त्र पूंजीवाद की ही एक देन है, इसी लिये पूंजीवादी वर्ग हमेशा संसदीय प्रजातन्त्र के पक्ष में दलील दिया करता है। इस से अंग्लो-प्रोटेक्ट होती है। अमेरिका, ब्रिटेन, फ्रांस जहाँ जहाँ पार्लियामेन्ट्री डेमोक्रेसी है, वहाँ हमेशा

ही ये ब्रिटेड इन्स्ट्रेट के लोग प्रोटेक्ट होते हैं और पार्लियामेन्ट्री डेमोक्रेसी की ही देन है—चुनाव।

आज चुनाव के बारे में हम लोगों के मन में इतनी लालसा क्यों है? यदि हमारे जैसे लोग पार्लियामेन्ट्री डेमोक्रेसी में विश्वास नहीं करते हैं, तो फिर हम डेमोक्रेसी की रीढ़ में चुनाव के पक्ष में दलीलें क्यों देते हैं। यह बात सब जानते हैं कि चुनाव में समय, शक्ति और सम्पत्ति का अपव्यय होता है। चुनाव के दौरान जो सम्पत्ति का अपव्यय होता है, जो शक्ति या तो ताकत का अपव्यय होता है, जो समय का अपव्यय होता है, इतना अपव्यय, इतना खर्चा और किसी काम में नहीं होता है। जब-जब चुनाव होता है, पूंजीवादियों की शक्तियाँ खुलती हैं, पैसे वालों, उद्योगपतियों की शक्तियाँ खुलती हैं; हमारे यहाँ के पूंजीपति अपने पैसे के बल पर चुनाव लड़ाते हैं, अपनी पूरी ताकत के साथ वे लोग चुनाव के मैदान में उतर आते हैं। ऐसे समय में बाहर के देशों का पैसा, बाहर के देशों की शक्ति भी इस चुनाव के माध्यम से इस देश में कार्य करती है। बाहर के देशों का पैसा भी चुनाव में इस्तेमाल होता है।

वृत्त, सम्पत्ति और शक्ति का अपव्यय जिस चुनाव के जरिये होता है, उस चुनाव की माँग हम बार-बार किस लिये करते हैं।

12.00 hrs.

अर्थशक्त महोदय, मैंने अपने श्रेय में जाकर देखा है। वहाँ की जनता में, वहाँ के मतदाताओं में चुनाव के बारे में कोई रस नहीं पाया जाता। वे मतदाता बन कर भी चुनाव से दूर जा रहे हैं, उदासीन हो रहे हैं। ऐसी अवस्था में चुनाव कराना कहां तक लाभदायक होगा, यह सब जानते हैं। ये सो-काल्ड राइटिस्ट पार्टीज, राइट रिप्रेजेंटरी पार्टीज, सो काल्ड सेलिफ्टिस्ट पार्टीज, जो वहाँ

[श्री जांबुवन्त घोटे]

भाकर कुछ कहती थीं और बाहर कुछ कहती थीं; इनके बहुत सारे लोग जेलों में हैं। हमारे देश में एक के बाद दो आपातकालीन स्थितियां विद्यमान हैं। हुकमरानों की तरफ से कई बार कहा गया कि आपातकालीन स्थिति में भी चुनाव हो सकते हैं। जब तक हमारे देश के हुकमरान, हमारे देश में आपातकालीन स्थिति की जरूरत समझते हैं, उस वक्त इस देश में चुनाव जरूरी नहीं हैं, बिल्कुल जरूरी नहीं हैं।

कहा जाता है कि चुनाव के वक्त सारी पार्टियां उठ जाती हैं और देश के प्रश्नों पर बहस होती है, राजनीतिक प्रश्नों पर बहस होती है, हज़ारों की तादाद में, लाखों की तादाद में लोग इन प्रश्नों पर, इन सिद्धांतों पर विचार करते हैं। अध्यक्ष महोदय, ऐसा होता नहीं है। चुनाव के वक्त सारी साम्प्रदायिक शक्तियां उठ जाती हैं; चुनाव के वक्त जातिवाद को लोग उठाते हैं, चुनाव के वक्त धर्म की बात लोग उठाते हैं और इस सब से चुनाव का वातावरण सब से गंदा हो जाता है। चुनावों के दौरान हमेशा पार्लियामेंट्री डेमोक्रेसी ऐसी अवस्था में पहुंच जाती है और लोग ऐसे ही वातावरण में बोट देते हैं।

प्रश्न किया जा सकता है कि हमारे देश में आपातकालीन स्थिति की जरूरत है या नहीं? हमारे से पहले, हमारे सभी पड़ोसी देशों में आपातकालीन स्थिति है। बर्मा में है, नेपाल में है, सीलोन में है, बांग्लादेश में है। क्या इन देशों में आपातकालीन स्थिति नहीं है। मैं कहता हूँ कि हमारी पार्टी मार्क्स के सिद्धांतों, एक वर्गविहीन समाज के सिद्धांतों को मानती है। इसमें भी आपातकालीन स्थिति चलती है। उसके सिवा क्या है? प्रश्न पूछा जाता है कि क्या दो पक्षों की राजनीति हो या एक पक्ष की राजनीति हो? क्या रूस में एक पक्ष की राजनीति नहीं है? क्या वहाँ रेस्ट्रिक्टेड डेमोक्रेसी नहीं है? एक ही दल वहाँ चुनाव

लड़ेगा, उसके बाद वही दल लगेगा। हम वन पार्टी डेमोक्रेसी की मांग नहीं करते, हम वन पार्टी डिक्टेटोरशिप की मांग नहीं करते। यह जो पार्टियों का संघर्ष हमारे देश में है, उस संघर्ष में जो चुनावों की बात आती है और चुनावों के दौरान जो चीजें सामने आती हैं, अध्यक्ष महोदय, प्रश्न सारा उन चीजों का रहता है।

प्रश्न यह भी है कि चुनाव के जरिये हम सारे लोगों को खुश करने की चेष्टा करते हैं, चुनाव के लिए हमें पूंजीवाद का पैसा भी चाहिए। मुझे मालूम है, इधर-उधर की कई पार्टियां पूंजीपतियों की बैलियों में से पैदा होती हैं। अनेक पार्टियों के लिए साम्राज्यवाद की तरफ से भी पैसा आता होगा, पूंजीवादियों की तरफ से भी आता होगा। इन सारे पैसों के जरिये से चुनाव लड़ने के लिये, इस चुनाव की मांग बराबर करने से हम नेशनल इन्स्टीट को कंसे पूरा कर सकते हैं?।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, चुनाव में पैसा, वक्त और शक्ति का खर्चा होता है। आज जो पार्टी इन पावर है, उसका दो-तिहाई बहुमत इस सदन में है। अगर चुनाव होते हैं तो यह पार्टी मैजोरिटी में आएगी, इसको बहुमत मिलेगा, हो सकता है कि दो-तिहाई बहुमत नहीं मिले। लेकिन हम लोगों को उतना बहुमत नहीं मिल सकता, जितना कि चाहिए। अब चुनाव को अगर पोलिटिक्स की हैसियत से या राजनीति की हैसियत से इस्तेमाल किया गया तो उसका कोई फायदा नहीं होगा।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं चाहता हूँ कि आपातकालीन स्थिति को रख कर यदि हम गरीबों का उत्पथान कर सकते हैं, आपातकालीन स्थिति के जरिये से यदि हम मेहनतकश लोगों को ऊपर उठा सकते हैं, पार्लियामेंट्री डेमोक्रेसी में जो विलम्ब होता है, उसको रोकने के लिए, पार्लियामेंट्री डेमोक्रेसी के ढांचे को तोड़ कर यदि हम

वैस्टेड इन्ट्रेस्ट्स के लोगों को क्रय कर सकते हैं, उनको दबा सकते हैं वो वह हमें करना चाहिए। अभी 44वां संशोधन विधेयक इस सदन से पास हुआ। अगर हम इसके बाद 45वां संशोधन विधेयक लाकर प्रापर्टी राइट को निकाल देते हैं तो वह हमें करना चाहिए।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस आपात्कालीन स्थिति का इस्तेमाल मेहनतकश लोगों के हित में; सर्वहारा जनता को जो चूसा जा रहा है, उसके हित में होना चाहिए। गरीबों को ऊपर उठाने के लिए इसका इस्तेमाल होना चाहिए। केवल कुर्सी के लिए यदि हम इसका इस्तेमाल करते हैं, हकूमत के लिए, सत्ता के लिए यदि हम इसको चलाना चाहते हैं तो अध्यक्ष महोदय इस देश की जनता एक साल में दो साल में या पांच साल में इन राजकत्तियों को कभी क्षमा नहीं करेगी। आज प्रश्न यह है कि हम इस आपात्कालीन स्थिति में गरीबों का भला करना चाहते हैं। इसके लिए एक साल क्या, पांच साल भी यदि चुनाव बढ़ाया जाये तो भी चलेगा। इसलिए यह चुनाव बढ़ाने का एक साल का जो प्रश्न है, उसका हम समर्थन करते हैं।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस विधेयक का समर्थन करता हूँ।

MR. SPEAKER: Before I call the Minister, I can accommodate some of the opposition Members if they confine to five minutes each. Otherwise, I have to call the Minister at 12-30. Shri/Sokhi.

श्री शंकर दयाल सिंह (चतरा) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, सूखे और बाढ़ की स्थिति पर बहस करनी है इसलिए इस पर जल्दी कीजिए और गोखले सहाय को भाषण देने के लिए बुलवाइये। सूखे और बाढ़ की स्थिति एक गम्भीर समस्या है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आर्डर, आर्डर प्लीज। श्री सोखी।

सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह सोखी (जमशेदपुर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह जो बिल लाया गया है, इसके लिए मैं मंत्री जी को हार्दिक धन्यवाद देता हूँ और बधाई देता हूँ। ये ऐन मोके पर बिल लाये हैं। एमजेंसी का जो फायदा देश में हुआ है, एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन में हुआ है और बहुत सारी इकोमिक प्रब्लिवमेंट्स हुई हैं और दूसरी भी वजुहात उन्होंने बताया हैं उन सब को देखते हुए इस बिल का लाना बहुत जरूरी था।

मैं अपोजिशन पार्टी के जो लोग बोल रहे थे, उनके भाषण बहुत गौर से सुन रहा था। उन्होंने कहा कि प्रोडक्शन जो इंक्रीज हो रही है, उसकी वजह से अनएम्प्लॉयमेंट क्रियेट हो रही है। मैं भी इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट सेक्टर से आता हूँ, मेरी समझ में यह बात नहीं आयी। कोई अनएम्प्लॉयमेंट नहीं हुई है।

मैं एक बात इनको याद दिलाना चाहता हूँ। हालांकि इंग्लैंड में लड़ाई चार साल चली, उसके बाद भी वहां पर इलेक्शन मूलतः कर दिये गये क्योंकि वहां पर ऐसी स्थिति नहीं थी कि इलेक्शन कराये जायें। इनको तो खुश होना चाहिए कि इलेक्शन एक साल के लिए बढ़ाये गये हैं। ये लोग इसलिए इसका विरोध कर रहे हैं कि इन्होंने जो पइयंत्र रचे थे, उनमें ये कामयाब नहीं हो पाये हैं।

मुझे पता है कि मेरे इलाके में सर्विस-एलीमेंट्स एक्टिव हैं और उन्होंने कम्पनी के अन्दर कर्मचारियों को भड़का कर नुकसान कराया है। सबाल यह है कि इन के मनसूब पूरे नहीं हो रहे हैं इसलिए इस बिल का विरोध कर रहे हैं। आप की भावना होना चाहिए कि जब पता लगा जाये तो

[सरदार स्वर्ण सिंह सोबी]

वाले हैं तो चीजों के दाम बढ़ने लगे। बड़ी मुश्किल से अब नीचे आये हैं। इसलिए चुनाव अभी नहीं होने चाहिए।

भगर विरोधी दल के लोग इस बिल का विरोध करते हैं तो मैं समझता हूँ कि उन्हें पॉलियामेंट से त्याग-पत्र दे देना चाहिए, या अपनी सेलरी ड्रा न करें। लेकिन मुझे पता है ऐसा कोई विरोधी नहीं करेगा। उन्हें विरोध भी करना है और पैसे भी लेने हैं। यह लोग ऐसी ही बातें करते हैं। मैं तो कहूँगा कि जब तक इकोनामी स्टेबिलाइज न हो जाय तब तक चुनाव नहीं होने चाहिए क्योंकि यह मुल्क के हित में है। इस वक्त चुनाव करने से सबर्वासव एलीमेंट कई किस्म की गलत बातें करेंगे। एक साल भगर चुनाव नहीं होता तो क्या बिगड़ा जा रहा है। अपोजीशन का विरोध केवल पॉलिटिकली मोटिवेटिड है।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस बिल का समर्थन करता हूँ।

✓ SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR (Ahmedabad): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose this measure because it exhibits lack of faith in the people and also because it shows the government's and the Congress Party's certain contempt for the people. I am sorry to say this is an unwise and unfortunate measure. I wish Shri Gokhale had not brought this bill. The way he was defending it yesterday perhaps gave us some evidence of his unwillingness really to justify what is expected to be justified by a Minister of a government committed to postponement after postponement of the Elections! I am opposing this measure because it is born out of the twin-instinct of fear and selfishness of diffidence and greed; and it is also a peculiar attitude of hankering after security. We are so secure in this House and in this Parliament for one more year, and yet one more year. But if this kind of a false idea of security grows, not only the whole system of parliamentary

democracy will go to shambles, but a day will soon come—sooner than you and I expect—when people will say that these people in Parliament have lost their respect and their confidence. Let us not, therefore, go to that logical extreme. The Constitution Amendment Bill was the main business during the first 8 days of this special session; and during that period, the Law Minister very cleverly pushed into the proceedings, this particular bill also, dealing with the extension of the life of the House of the People. I strongly oppose this. On the one hand Mr. Gokhale said that the life of the Lok Sabha will be not more than 6 years. What were the reasons in favour of this argument, viz. not more than 6 years? The argument surely was that if we have more than 6 years, not only the people's credibility goes down, but even the mandate gets weakened—the mandate which was given individually and collectively—party-wise or Independent-wise. But that is the argument which he has forgotten when he has brought in this bill.

I also oppose the bill because the Law Minister's statement came here on the morrow of the public statement made already in Bombay by someone! If Parliament is supreme, and if Parliament is in session, I cannot understand why and how a government takes a decision outside Parliament; and then the Minister comes before this House, 24 hours later almost, and tells us what was announced by somebody somewhere outside. It is not in consonance with the spirit and traditions of Parliamentary democracy.

I cannot understand the prolongation of the term. It cannot be justified. The mentality behind it is very dangerous and very unfortunate. I would ask Mr. Gokhale whether the prolongation of Parliament is going to become a permanent feature of his revised Constitution. Any extension dilutes the mandate behind that particular election by which people have

electd us. If you make it 6, 7, 8 or 9 years, the people's mandate gets further and further weakened and the whole thing is reduced to an absurdity. In a democracy, elections afford an opportunity for people's political education, people's involvement and people's participation. If participation and involvement by the people are taken away, how will it add to the democratic forces and democratic processes in our country? Every election means more education for the people and to the electorate. I want to suggest, moreover, that by these actions, you are doing something by which people's faith in a democracy would get more and more eroded. It is an invitation to subtle and surface frustration and violence which are the very anti-thesis of democratic processes. We want things to come out openly and we want things to be said openly. If you go on postponing the elections and postponing the open methods, you are making people and their opinions go underground. It is a negation of democracy. Political cynicism will also grow and political apathy, which is already at a low ebb, will go deeper. I cannot understand this fear of the people. It is not proper that you and I, the representatives of the people, should fear our masters. My charge is that Mr. Gokhale and the Government by their recent massive Constitutional amendments have drastically curtailed the powers of the judiciary, and now by this extension, which I am sure will be almost an annual affair, government is going to curtail the powers of the people. If you go on doing this, I warn you with all the humility at my command, that it will recoil on you and on all of us who are sincerely devoted and dedicated to parliamentary democracy and who have faith in peaceful methods.

✓
SHRI SHANKERRAO SAVANT (Kolaba): I wholeheartedly support the bill before the House. Yesterday we were treated to an amusing speech by Mr. Samar Mukherjee on the merits of proletarian democracy and

parliamentary democracy. Uptill now, we have heard only about proletarian dictatorship. It seems that the word 'dictatorship' has changed to 'democracy' overnight in the minds of the Marxists of India.

Mr. Mukherjee was very much critical of the present industrial peace; and yet unwittingly, he gave out his grievance and said that there were no strike and gheraos. They are what exactly we wanted to abolish. If he is sorry for this situation, we are glad that it is so. Can he be blind to the fact that India has shown a remarkable recovery from the economic morass in which it found itself earlier? (Interruptions) The Pound is toppling and the Dollar is also toppling, whereas the value of the Indian rupee is being revised upwards from month to month. Should we not be happy about it? They say that there is no economic recovery. There is economic recovery; and it is for maintaining that recovery that we want to extend the life of our House. The bill is opposed by several people, including Mr. Indrajit Gupta, in the name of democracy. Let me tell you that these people have opposed democracy during the first four years of our term. The obstructionist tactics which they employed during the first four years of this Lok Sabha have taken away a lot of time of Parliament and, therefore, it is these very people who are forcing us to have this extension.

It has already been said that there are some gains of Emergency to be consolidated. Much has been said about it. I do not want to dilate on that. We have just now passed the Forty-fourth Constitution Amendment Bill. Thousands of wait petitions will be thrown out of the courts and, therefore, some arrangements will have to be made by passing some six or seven measures for the appointment of tribunals, their functions and powers and their procedures, etc. That work must be done. If it is not done, there will be chaos because, as soon as the Forty-fourth Constitution

[Shri Shankerrao Savant]

Amendment comes into effect, all the writ petitions will be thrown out of the courts. It is on administrative grounds also that we have extend the term of the Lok Sabha. In order to complete the work which was started by passing the Forty-fourth Constitution Amendment that we have to do this follow-up work in regard to the appointment of tribunals, laying down their functions and powers and procedures, etc. It is very necessary that we complete the work which we have started.

The idea of convening a Constituent Assembly is once and for all gone. There will be nobody either on this side or on that side who will dispute the power of Parliament to amend the Constitution to any extent it likes. Therefore, my contention is that even on administrative grounds, it is necessary that this Parliament should have one year more. Those who have taken away the time by adopting obstructionist tactics in the first four years of this Lok Sabha have no moral right to contend that there should be no extension.

With these words, I support the Bill.

श्री एस० ए० शशीम (श्रीनगर) :
 जनाब स्पीकर साहब, यह बात बजाय खुद परेशानकुन है कि पार्लियामेंट की इस मियामत में एक साल की तोसीम हो रही है। लेकिन इस से ज्यादा परेशानकुन बात यह है कि इन्तखाबात को एक मुसीबत के तौर पर, एक अजाब के तौर पर, इस मुल्क के सामने पेश किया जा रहा है। अगर यह बात कही जाय कि इन्तेखाबात इस लिए नहीं हो सकते कि हुक्मरान जमाअत की अपनी कुछ मुश्किलात हैं, तो जहां हम ने और बहुत सी नागवार बातें मन्जूर कर ली हैं, वहां शायद हम इस बात को भी कुबूल कर लेंगे।

लेकिन कहा जाता है कि इन्तेखाबात का नाम चुनाव पर आते ही मुल्क में सबवर्सिव

एलिमेंट्स, होर्डेज और ब्लैक मार्केटियज वगैरह सिर उठाने की कोशिश करते हैं। इस दलील को अगर अग्रे बढ़ाया जाय, तो एक ही नतीजा निकलता है कि मुल्क में अब कभी इन्तखाबात नहीं होंगे। यह इतना बड़ा और इतना बलीग मुल्क है। यहां कभी न कभी कोई न कोई छोटा मोटा हंगामा तो होता ही रहेगा।

इस मुल्क ने हुक्मरान जमाअत को इस पार्लियामेंट में इतनी ज्यादा मैजारिटी दी थी, जितनी इस से पहले कभी नहीं थी। उस मैजारिटी के होते हुए भी अगर यह जमाअत इस मुल्क में डमोक्रसी को उस तरीके पर कायम नहीं रख सकती, जैसा कि उस के फोर-फादरज ने सोचा था, तो फिर यह बात साफ जाहिर है कि अगर इस जमाअत के बहुमत में कमी होती है, तो वह हुक्मत करने के अहल नहीं होगी।

कहा जाता है कि इन्तखाबात का जिन्न होते ही चीजों की कीमतें बढ़नी शुरू हो गईं। इस दलील के दूसरे मानी ये हैं कि जब भी डालडा या चाय या गन्दुम की कीमत में एक पैसे का भी इजाफा होगा, तो हमें बताया जायगा कि अब इस मुल्क में इन्तखाबात नहीं होंगे।

मिनिस्टर साहब ने कहा है कि सबवर्सिव एक्टिविटीज फिर शुरू हो गई हैं। इतने मेम्बराने-पार्लियामेंट नजरबन्द हैं। इतने दूसरे लोग जेल में हैं। कहीं कोई आवाज नहीं है। उस के बावजूद हालात खराब हैं। श्री जयप्रकाश नारायण डाइआलिसिस पर जिन्दा हैं। श्री मोरारजी देसाई जेल में बन्द हैं। श्री अटलबिहारी वाजपेयी अपने घर में नजरबन्द हैं। श्री ज्योतिर्मय बसु भी बन्द हैं। इसके बावजूद हुक्मत को यह खतरा है कि अगर किसी आदमी को रिलीज किया, तो फिर क्रांति होगी, गड़बड़ होगी।

इसके मानी ये हैं कि इमर्जेंन्सी के मुताल्लिक हुकूमत का यह दावा झूठा है कि इस से बहुत फायदे हुए हैं। इस के मानी ये हैं कि कोई फायदा नहीं हुआ है। यह महज एक ढकोसला है।

श्री साल्वे और दूसरे मम्बरों ने श्री समर मुकर्जी और श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्त को यह जवाब दिया कि ग्राम लोगों का पार्लियामेंटरी डेमोक्रेसी में विश्वास नहीं है, आप किस मुंह से पार्लियामेंटरी निजाम की बात करते हैं। मैं प्राइम मिनिस्टर के ये अलफ्राज दोहराना चाहता हूँ कि इस पार्लियामेंट से भी बड़ी एक पार्लियामेंट है, और वह पार्लियामेंट है इस मुल्क के लोग।

हम ने फंसला किया कि यह पार्लियामेंट सुप्रीम है, एंड आई एम ए पाटी टु बंट। यह पार्लियामेंट सुप्रीम है, और उस को सुप्रोम होना चाहिए। लेकिन इस पार्लियामेंट के सुप्रीम होने के लिए यह जरूरी है कि इस मुल्क के लोगों को भी यह विश्वास हो कि पार्लियामेंट में हम ने जो लोग भेजे हैं, वे बिल्कुल दयानतदार, काबिल और ईमानदार हैं और वे कोई गलत बात नहीं करेंगे। लेकिन अगर पार्लियामेंट हर साल अपनी जिन्दगी में एक एक साल का इजाफ़ा करती रहे, तो क्या लोगों की निगाह में वह कभी सुप्रोम रह सकती है? जब एक साल के लिए बढ़ाया, तो लोगों ने सोचा कि शायद इस साल हालात बहुत खराब थे, शायद इसके बाद इन्तखाबाद कराये जायेंगे। लेकिन

अब इस पार्लियामेंट की जिन्दगी को डीबारा बढ़ाया जा रहा है।

हुकूमत खुद कहती है कि हालात पहले कभी इतने अच्छे नहीं थे। वर्ल्ड बैंक की रिपोर्ट उसके हक में है। सी० बी० आई० और हुकूमत की जारी इन्टेलिजंस की रिपोर्ट उस के हक में है। प्राइम मिनिस्टर का दावा है कि मुल्क की हालत इस से बेहतर पहले कभी नहीं थी। जिस मुद्दक की हालात को एक पोलू मोदी, एक चरण सिंह, या ऐसे एक, दो या तीन प्राइम, दहला सकते हैं, जिन के बारे में हुकूमत का दावा है कि उन के साथ कोई नहीं है, तो उस मुल्क के लोगों को यह दावा करने का क्या हक है कि हम इस मुल्क पर हुकूमत करने के अहल हैं?

लेकिन यह बात नहीं है। बात दरअसल यह है कि पिछले दो सालों में इस मुल्क में जो सिस्टम इवाल्ब हुआ है, वह बड़ा कनवीनियन्ट है। अब प्राइम मिनिस्टर के खिलाफ कोई बात नहीं करता है। और तो और मुझे भी प्राइम मिनिस्टर के खिलाफ कोई बात कहने की हिम्मत नहीं होती है। अब श्री गोबले के खिलाफ भी कोई बात नहीं करता है। यह सिस्टम इतना कनवीनियन्ट और इतना पुरलुस्क्र हो गया है कि अब हुकूमत या मिनिस्ट्रों के खिलाफ न यहाँ कोई बात हो रही है और न बाहर हो रही है। इस लिए रफ़ूता-रफ़ता हम उस मन्जिल की तरफ जा रहे हैं, जिसे डेमोक्रेसी नहीं, डिक्टेटरशिप कहते हैं।

[श्री एस० ए० शर्मा]

तमाम दुनिया में शोअथ आफ़ फ़ाशियम की हिस्ट्री आप देखिए । हर जगह यही हुआ है । पहले एक कदम, उस के बाद दूसरा कदम, उस के बाद तीसरा कदम । हम दो कदम उठा चुके हैं । ऐसा लगता है कि पीछे मुड़ने का कोई सिलसिला नहीं है । हम डाल्डा पर अपनी जम्हूरियत की बुनियाद रखी है— डाल्डा की कीमत बढ़ गई है, अब इलैक्शन नहीं होंगे । और कीमत बढ़ाने वाले कौन हैं ? यह नहीं कि कीमतें और कोई बढ़ा रहा है । स्मगलर्स और होर्डर्स, सब बन्द हैं । उन की रिहाई का कोई मुतालिबा नहीं करता है । फिर कीमतें क्यों बढ़ रही हैं ? ये कीमतें इसलिए बढ़ रही हैं कि इस मुल्क की हुकमरान जमाअत इन्तखावात नहीं चाहती । और चूँकि वह इन्तखावात नहीं चाहती, इस लिए इस जादू के पिटारे में से कभी डाल्डा, कभी साबुन, कभी घी और कभी गन्दुम निकाले जाते हैं, ताकि इस मुल्क में कमी इन्तखावात न हो ।

श्री गोखले इस बात को याद रखें कि अब अगले साल यह मिनिस्टर नहीं होंगे । उन की कारकर्दगी और उन का काम देखा जा चुका है । मैं उन की बताना चाहता हूँ कि इस मुल्क में अगले साल भी इन्तखावात नहीं होंगे और उस के बाद भी इन्तखावात नहीं होंगे । अगर मैं गलत साबित हुआ, तो मैं तारीख के सामने मुजरिम हूँगा । अगर वह गलत साबित हुए, तो उन्हें अचामी अदालत से सजा पा कर फ़्रांसी के तख्त पर तो चढ़ना ही है, लेकिन वह अगवान् के सामने भी जवाबदेह होंगे ।

[श्री एस० ए० शर्मा - अ-श्री एस० ए० शर्मा]
[श्री एस० ए० शर्मा] : جناب سپیکر صاحب - یہ بات واقعی پریشان کن ہے کہ پارلیمنٹ کی اس معاہدہ میں ایک سٹل کی طوعی ہو رہی ہے - لیکن اس سے زیادہ پریشان کن بات یہ ہے کہ انتظامات کو ایک مصیبت کے طور پر - ایک عباب کے طور پر اس ملک کے سامنے پیش کیا جا رہا ہے - اگر یہ بات کہی جائے کہ انتظامات اس لئے نہیں ہو سکتے ہیں کہ حکمران جماعت کی اپنی کچھ مشکلات ہیں - تو جہاں ہم نے اوو بہت سی ناگوار باتیں منظور کر لیں ہیں - وہاں شاید ہم اس بات کو بھی قباضا قبول کر لیں گے -

لیکن کہا جاتا ہے کہ انتظامات کا نام زبان پر آتے ہی ملک میں سپورسٹر اہمیت روز روز اور بلہک مارکٹرز وغیرہ سر اٹھانے کی کوشش کرتے ہیں - اس دہل کو اگر آگے بڑھایا جائے تو ایک ہی نتیجہ نکلتا ہے کہ اس ملک میں اب کبھی انتظامات نہیں ہونگے - یہ اتنا بڑا اور اتنا وسیع ملک ہے وہاں کبھی نا کبھی کوئی نا کوئی چھوٹا موٹا ہلکا موٹا ہوتا ہی رہتا ہے -

اس ملک نے حکمران جماعت کو اس پارلیمنٹ میں اتنی زیادہ مہجورتی دی تھی جتنی اس سے پہلے کبھی نہیں تھی۔ اس مہجورتی کے ہوتے ہوئے اگر یہ جماعت اس ملک میں تیسرے نمبر پر قائم نہیں رہ سکتی تھی تو اس کے فوراً فائدز لے سوجا تھا تو پھر یہ بات صاف ظاہر ہے کہ اگر اس جماعت کے بہبود میں کمی ہوتی ہے تو وہ حکومت کرنے کے اہل نہیں رہیگی۔

تھا جاتا ہے کہ انتخابات کا ذکر ہوتے ہی چھڑوں کی قہمتوں بڑھتی شروع ہو گئیں۔ اس دلیل کے دوسرے معنی یہ ہیں کہ جب بھی قاندا یا چائے کا یا گندم کی قہمت میں ایک پیسے کا بھی اضافہ ہوگا تو ہمیں بقایا جائے گا۔ کہ اس ملک میں انتخابات نہیں ہونگے۔

مستور صاحب نے کہا ہے کہ سپورٹو ایکٹو پیپر شروع ہو گئیں ہیں۔ اتنے مسبران پارلیمنٹ نظر بند ہیں۔ انہی دوسرے لوگ جہل میں ہیں۔ کہیں کوئی اولڈ

نہیں ہے۔ اس کے باوجود حالات خراب ہیں۔ شری چہرہ کھائی نارائن قائلہمشسز پر زندہ رہیں۔ شری مرارجی تیسائی جہل میں بند ہیں۔ شری اتل بپاری واجھائی اچھو کھڑے میں نظر بند ہیں۔ شری جوترمئے بسو بھی بند ہیں۔ اس کے باوجود حکومت کو یہ خطرہ ہے کہ اگر کسی آدمی کو ریلوے کیا تو پھر کوانتی ہوگی۔ کڑ بڑ ہوگی۔

اس کے معنی یہ ہیں کہ پیرجھلسی کے متعلق حکومت کا یہ وعدہ چھوٹا ہے کہ اس سے بہت فائدے ہوئے ہیں۔ اس کے معنی یہ ہیں کہ گوئی فائدہ نہیں ہوا ہے۔ یہ متحد ایک تھکوسلہ ہے۔

شری سالو اور دوسرے مسبران نے شری سدر مکرچی اور شری اندرچھت کو یہ جواب دیا کہ آپ لوگوں کا پارلیمنٹری ٹیموکریسی میں وشواس نہیں ہے۔ آپ کس ملے سے پارلیمنٹری نظام کی بات کرتے ہیں میں پرائم میںسٹز کے یہ الفاظ دھراننا چاہتا ہوں۔ کہ اس پارلیمنٹ سے بھی بڑی ایک پارلیمنٹ ہے اور وہ پارلیمنٹ ہے اس ملک کے لوگ۔

[شری ایس۔ اے۔ - ششم]

ہم نے فیصلہ کیا ہے کہ یہ پارلیمنٹ سہریم ہے۔ ایسا آئی ایم اے پارٹی تو اب یہ پارلیمنٹ سہریم ہے۔ اسکو سہریم ہونا چاہئے لیکن اس پارلیمنٹ کے سہریم ہونے کے لئے یہ ضروری ہے کہ اس ملک کے ووٹوں کو بھی یہ دعواس ہو کہ پارلیمنٹ میں ہم نے جو لوگ بھجے ہوں۔ وہ بالکل دیانتدار۔ تامل اور ایہ نادر ہیں۔ اور وہ کوئی فلفلا بات نہیں کریں گے۔ لیکن اگر پارلیمنٹ ہوسکل اپنی زندگی میں ایک ایک سال کا اضافہ کرتی رہی تو کہا لوگوں کی تکانہ میں وہ کہیں سہریم رہ سکتی ہے۔ جب ایک سال کے لئے بھایا تو لوگوں نے سوچا کہ شاید اس سال حالات بہت خراب تھے۔ شاید اس کے بعد انتخابات کرتے جائیں گے۔ لیکن اب اس پارلیمنٹ کی زندگی کو دوبارہ بھایا جا رہا ہے۔

حکومت خود کہتی ہے کہ حالات پہلے کہی اتنے اچھے نہیں تھے۔ ورلڈ بنگل کی رپورٹ اس کے حق میں ہے۔ سی بی آئی۔ اور حکومت کی سی بی آئی انتظامیہ کی رپورٹس اس کے حق میں ہے۔ پوائنٹ منسٹر کا دعویٰ ہے کہ ملک کی حالت اس سے بہتر ہے کہی نہیں تھی۔ جس ملک کی حالت کو ایک پہلو مودی۔ ایک چرن سنگھ یا ایسے ایک دو یا

توں آدمی دھلا سکتے ہیں۔ جن کے بارے میں حکومت کا وعدہ ہے کہ ان کے ساتھ کوئی نہیں ہے۔ تو اس ملک کے لوگوں کو یہ دعویٰ کرنے کا کہا حق ہے۔ کہ ہم اس ملک میں پر حکومت کرنے کے اہل ہیں۔

لیکن یہ بات نہیں ہے۔ بات دراصل یہ ہے کہ پچھلے دو سالوں میں اس ملک میں جو سسٹم ایسا ہوا ہے۔ وہ بڑا کورپٹ ہے۔ اب پرائم منسٹر کے خلاف کوئی بات نہیں کرتا ہے۔ اور تو اور مجھے بھی پرائم منسٹر کے خلاف کوئی بات کہنے کی ہمت نہیں ہوتی ہے۔ آپ شری گوکھلے کے خلاف بھی کوئی بات نہیں کرتا ہے۔ یہ سسٹم اتنا کورپٹ ہے اور اتنا ہر لطف ہو گیا ہے کہ اب حکومت یا منسٹروں کے خلاف نا پھل کوئی بات ہو رہی ہے اور نا باہر ہو رہی ہے۔ اس لئے رفتہ رفتہ ہم اس منزل کی طرف جا رہے ہیں۔ جسے ڈیموکریسی نہیں ڈیکلینر شپ کہتے ہیں۔

تمام دنیا میں گروتھ آف فاسہزم کی ہسٹری آپ دیکھئے۔ ہر جگہ یہی ہوا ہے۔ پہلے ایک قدم اور اس کے بعد دوسرا قدم۔ ہم دو قدم ہاتھ چکے ہیں۔ ایسا لگتا ہے کہ پچھلے مرنے کا کوئی سلسلہ نہیں ہے۔ ہم نے بقا پر اپنی جمہوریت کی بلہاد

رکھی ہے - قالذا کی قیمت بڑھ گئی ہے - الیکشن نہیں ہونگے - اور قیمتیں بڑھانے والے کون ہیں - یہ نہیں کہ قیمتوں اور کوئی بڑھا رہا ہے - سکلرز اور ہوررز سب بلند ہیں - لی کی دھائی کا کوئی مطالبہ نہیں کرتا ہے - پھر قیمتیں کیوں بڑھ رہی ہیں - اس لئے بڑھ رہی ہیں کہ اس ملک کی جماعت انتخابات نہیں چاہتی - اور چونکہ وہ انتخابات نہیں چاہتی اس لئے اس جادو کے پتارے میں سے کہی قالذا اور کہی صابن - کہی گھی اور کہی گندم نکالے جاتے ہیں - تاکہ اس ملک میں کہی انتخابات نہ ہوں -

شری کوکبلے اس بات کو یاد رکھیں - کہ اب اگلے سال وہ منسٹر نہیں ہونگے - ان کی کارکردگی اور ان کا کام دیکھا جا چکا ہے - میں ان کو بتلانا چاہتا ہوں - کہ اس ملک میں اگلے سال بھی انتخابات نہیں ہونگے - اس کے بعد بھی انتخابات نہیں ہونگے - اگر میں غلط ثابت ہوا تو میں تاریخ کے سامنے مجرم ہوں گا - اگر وہ غلط ثابت ہوئے تو انہیں عوامی عدالت سے سزا پا کر پھانسی کے تختے پر نو چھوٹا ہی ہے لیکن وہ بھگوان کے سامنے بھی جواب دہ ہونگے -

✓ MR. SPEAKER: I am extending the time by another 15 minutes. I will call the Minister at 12.45 P.M. I would like three more Members to participate in the debate, Shri Mayathevar, Shri Lakkappa and Dr. Kailas. I will give them five minutes each.

✓ SHRI K. MAYATHEVAR (Dindigul): I rise to oppose the Bill on behalf of the All India Anna D.M.K. because we think that the people are sovereign, that the people are our masters. Of course we do accept that Parliament is supreme, but much more supreme are people. The final sovereignty rests with the people and we are nothing but the servants of the people of India. Why should we and the Law Ministers and the others, who are nothing but servants, fear to face our masters? We ought to have faced our masters and got their verdict last year itself but we extended the life of the Lok Sabha by one more year and, this year, you are seeking to extend it further. This further extension is totally opposed by the all-India Anna DMK because the continuous extension of the life of Parliament is a negation of the spirit of democracy. Again, if we go to the electorate by way of elections, the ruling Party will be able to know whether they have the confidence of the people and where they stand in the minds of the people. I don't accept the philosophy advanced by the various ruling Party Members that the conducting of elections would divert the attention of the people from the economic development and welfare work of the Government. In fact, to come to that point, it will not obstruct the implementation of the 25 point programme at all. On the contrary, it will instill more spirit in the minds of the people for implementing the 25 point programme as well as the five-point programme. The 25-point programme and the five-point programme were supported and welcomed by the all-India Anna DMK and the Emergency was also welcomed by the Anna DMK throughout India because, when there is a conflict between the country's welfare and the welfare of a particular political Party, the country's welfare, the national welfare and the security of the country should be safeguarded and protected first. It was only on this basis that the Anna DMK welcomed the 25-point programme as also Sanjay's five-point programme.

[Shri K. Mayathevar]

But we are opposing this further extension because we fear that the continuous extension of the Lok Sabha would amount to slow poisoning of democracy. Therefore, there should not be any further extension. (*Interruptions*)

The Prime Minister and the Law Minister also repeatedly told us in this House that the Emergency is no bar to holding elections. Therefore, even according to them, there is no bar and no political impediment and no social impediment. And if you fear that any anti-social forces or anti-national forces would cause damage to democracy during the elections, we have the Police and the Government at our disposal to put down such forces. Therefore, we feel that we should not fear facing our masters. We should not forget that we are the servants of the people of India.

So far as the all-India Anna DMK Party is concerned, we feel that his measure should have been avoided in the larger interests of the country. I know that a majority of the Members of Parliament welcome this extension because, if election is conducted, these Members may be politically unemployed. If election is ordered by the Government, the majority of the Members of the Ruling Party and other parties, excepting certain Parties of the opposition, will become unemployed. But if it is the unemployment problem that they are thinking of, they know that the Hon. Prime Minister and the Law Minister have provided for pension. So, why should they worry about defeat or success? Therefore, it is high time to face the people of India and to get their support for the implementation of the 25-point programme.

Then, what is the object of declaring emergency? It was to root out corruption in the Indian administrative machinery and to implement the 20-point programme. Now, you must honestly accept that the prices came

down at the time of the declaration of emergency but, in the last two months the prices are going up again by leaps and bounds. Is the Government aware that the people are suffering and that the people are saying that the 20-point programme is not being effectively implemented? Who are responsible for this? You must find out. I say honestly on behalf of the people of Tamilnadu that certain Police Officers, certain Civil Supplies officers and certain Revenue Divisional Officers are directly opposing the 20-point programme and its implementation; especially the Bank officers, when they are approached by the masses, say 'you go to Prime Minister Indira Gandhi and get your notes'. These are words which I heard with my own ears that I am repeating.

Therefore, implementation should be done immediately and most effectively. When prices are going up, you must take immediate steps and effective steps to arrest a further rise in the prices.

✓ MR. SPEAKER: Please conclude; you have covered most of the points now.

✓ SHRI K. MAYATHEVAR: Then, you have declared Emergency to root out corruption also. Now, corruption was being practised in Tamilnadu by the D.M.K. Ministers and DMK M.Ps. They were robbing the people of their money through corrupt practices. Now, when the job has been undertaken by the Government or rooting out corruption throughout the length and breadth of Tamilnadu, I would request the Hon. Prime Minister of India and the Minister and other Ministers to incite the Governor and his advisers to implement the 25-point programme effectively and to give compulsory retirement to those corrupt officers who are opposing the 25-point programme and who are the faithful dogs and servants of the corrupt Karunanidhi group.

With these words, I oppose this Bill.

✓ THE MINISTER OF WORKS AND HOUSING AND PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH): We are anxious to co-operate with the Chair and we are aware of the fact that the other debate is to begin at 2.00 p.m. But, nevertheless, many of our Members are anxious to speak. You may kindly call these four names.

✓ MR. SPEAKER: If they will confine themselves to this point, it is all right. Now. Mr. Lakkappa.

✓ SHRI K. LAKKAPPA (Tumkur): I have heard the speeches from the other side and I think there is no substance in them; they are merely political speeches. The speakers have forgotten that on this side also we are representatives of the people and we are making reforms, including reforms in the election rules and in the People's Representation Act. Therefore, it is not a question of making political gains out of it; it is a question of the implementation of the economic programme for the people of this country. What for we have been elected and whether we are discharging our duties properly or not is not to be measured by political speeches like the one made just now on the other side. The extension of the Lok Sabha is not engineered by any political motive; it has been engineered on the basis of the constitutional provision, and on the declaration of Emergency and, therefore, what we are proposing is on the basis of democratic functioning. There are instances in other Parliamentary democracies also where, at the time of emergency, elections were postponed, and this has happened in England also. Therefore, it is not a new thing or a new measure that the Government of India or the Prime Minister is taking, but it is the biggest achievement of our time. It only shows that we are making every effort, after the declaration of Emergency, to see that the gains of the Emergency are consolidated. We know what had happened to the representative character of this country before Emergency was declared. There was arson, looting and violence, not only in the body-

politic of this country but also inside Parliament. These reactionary forces are demanding that type of democracy which was there before Emergency. Is that democracy? We are not going to allow that sort of situation to prevail—which was there before the declaration of Emergency.

The extension of the life of the Lok Sabha by one more year is necessary to consolidate the gains of the Emergency. Elections are not necessary in the present situation. We have seen how the people's representatives were being threatened outside and man-handled by the reactionary forces and the vested interests. They are ganging up again. My colleagues have given a fitting reply to Mr. Samar Mukherjee and his friends. They are forming again a Grand Alliance—CPM, Jan Sangh, the vested interests and the reactionaries. These forces are ganging up again. In the name of cultural revolution, these reactionaries, vested interests and anti-national elements are raising their heads once again. I want that Government should take stern action and see that discipline is enforced in this Emergency. It is very necessary for the implementation of the 20-Point Programme announced by our beloved Prime Minister. Unless we bring about these reforms, the atmosphere would not be conducive for holding elections, it would not be possible to implement the economic programme. It is essential that the gains of the Emergency have to be consolidated.

The Constitution Amendment Bill has just been made. It should be implemented in letter and spirit. Naturally it will take time. We are not afraid of facing elections. We have faced a number of elections. And if we go to polls now, we have no doubt that we would come out with flying colours. But what is more important now, than elections, is the consolidation of the economic gains. We must give full economic freedom to the country. That is very necessary (Interruptions). The gains of the Emergency should be consolidated.

[Shri K. Lakkappa]

Elections are not necessary now. Therefore I support this Bill.

डा० कलस (बंबई दक्षिण) : माननीय अध्यक्ष महोदय, छोटे जी को मैं बहुत छन्यवाद देना चाहता हूँ कि उन्होंने अपने छोटे से भाषण में ठोस बातें इस सदन के सामने रखीं। श्रीमत् साहब छोटे जी को तुन नहीं रहे थे क्योंकि वे अपने आप को बहुत बड़ा आदमी समझते हैं। श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्त बड़ी दुहाई लोकतंत्र की दे रहे थे जिन्होंने कांस्टीट्यूशन अमेन्डमेंट में तो हमारी सहायता की तथा बहुत बुद्धिमानी से वे उस समय बोल रहे थे। श्रीर कोई दलील सोक तथा की अर्वाधि न बढ़ाई जाय वह उन्होंने रखी हो या नहीं लेकिन हमारी पार्टी में उन्होंने कुछ निर्गमना या फूट फ़ैलाने का प्रयत्न अवश्य किया। मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी पार्टी में पूरी एकता है। अगर हमारी पार्टी के कुछ सदस्यों की ओर से कांस्टीट्यूट असेम्बली को पांग की गई थी तो वह इसलिए की गई थी कि हम नए सिरे से तथा ठीक प्रकार से कांस्टीट्यूशन को बना सकें। जब हमारी नेता श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी जी ने यह कहा कि हमें इसे इस ही प्रकार पास करना है और आगे चलकर कुछ और सोचेंगे तो किसी ने भी इस प्रकार की आवाज नहीं उठाई। श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्त ने यह भी कहा कि उप्रीमेसी आफ पार्लियामेंट के बारे में हमारी पार्टी में दो राय हैं—यह बिल्कुल असत्य है; सत्य से परे है। मैं नहीं चाहता कि श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्त इस तरह से आगे मैं आकर अपनी दलीलों को आगे बढ़ाये।

श्रीमत् साहब को मैं कोई उत्तर देना नहीं चाहता क्योंकि वे अपनी घिसी पिटी आदत के अनुसार अपनी बातें कहा करते हैं। इसी प्रकार मैं श्री सभर मुकजी से कहना चाहता हूँ कि अगर आज लेनिन जिन्दा होते

तो क्या वे नहीं देखते कि आज इस देश में, संसार में क्या हो रहा है। श्री सभर मुकजी को इस बात का अन्दाज नहीं है कि क्या वे सिर्फ लाल कितान और घिसी-पिटी बातें ही सोचते रहें। वे हमें डिमोक्रेसी का अर्थ समझा रहे थे, वास्तव में उन्हें समझना चाहिए कि डिमोक्रेसी किसको कहते हैं, वह भी आज संसार की गति अनुसार।

अन्त में मैं गालिब का एक शेर पढ़कर बैठ जाना चाहता हूँ जो कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी वालों पर है। यह बता देना चाहता हूँ कि अगर देश को आगे बढ़ना है तो एलेक्शन का सर्टिफिकेट हमें श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्त से नहीं लेना है; देश को महान बनाने के लिए, गरीबों की सेवा करने के लिए अगर एक दो वर्ष और एलेक्शन आगे बढ़ाना पड़े तो कोई हर्ज की बात नहीं होगी। गालिब का शेर इस प्रकार है, जिस पर श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्त सोचें :—

बना है कम का मुसाहिब फिर है
इतराता
वगरना इस शहर के अन्दर गालिब की
भावक क्या थी।

*.... (अवधान) अगर सभस न सके हों तो बाहर प्राकर मुख से सभस लें कि मैं क्या इक्षरा कर रहा हूँ।

श्री श्रीमत् साहब श्रीमत् : इन्होंने गालिब को मिसकोट किया है। (अवधान)

डा० कलस : प्राप मेरी आवाज को दबा नहीं सकेंगे।

श्री श्रीमत् साहब श्रीमत् : एक तो शेर पढ़ो, वह भी गलत। होना चाहिए—बना है शहर का....।

डा० कलस : मैंने "शहर" ही कहा था आपने गलत सुना। मैं बिल का समर्थन करना हुआ बैठ जाता हूँ।

✓ SHRI D. BASUMATARI (Kokrajhar): Mr. Speaker, Sir, our Law Minister has rightly said that in the larger interests of the country the elections are not being held now and that is why he has come forward with this Bill.

The other day the Law Minister said that Shri Indrajit Gupta and his party might be accepting this smilingly, they were supporting this Bill in their heart of hearts. But today, Mr. Indrajit Gupta appears to be opposing only for the sake of opposing it. He wants that there should not be elections now; that is how I have understood him. As I said, he is opposing it, merely for the sake of opposition.

We on this side, the Congress Members, are very much disappointed over the fact that there would be no elections now, because, if elections are held now we would come back with a thumping majority.

Our Prime Minister has already said, times without number, wherever she was put any question about elections, that, though elections are important, the more important thing is establishing democracy, bringing about a sense of duty and responsibility among all: she has stressed that unity is much more important, all round economic development is more important. Therefore, in accordance with what the Prime Minister has said, we should not go for elections now, though we are not at all afraid of facing the elections. Therefore, I support this Bill.

✓ SHRI P. GANGADEB (Angul): Sir, I rise to support the Bill, brought forward by the Government for extending the duration of this Lok Sabha. We are aware of the fact that Emergency has restored the authority of the State and the power of the Government. We are also conscious that Government can act as a dynamic instrument for bringing about socio-economic changes to ameliorate the

lot of the common man. In fact, the Emergency has brought in, a sense of awareness for discipline and order in all spheres of activities and more so, in our economic life.

Sir, it has provided the atmosphere in which production, both in fields and factories has been stepped up. It has controlled inflation. It has curbed the activities of speculators and black marketeers. It has released bonded labour. To say all this is not to be complacent about, because a great deal still remains to be done. Therefore, we really require more time to further the cause of our teeming millions of India. It is, therefore, in the fitness of things that at this juncture, it is proposed to extend the life of the Fifth Lok Sabha.

It is significant to mention that with the recognition of the supremacy of the Parliament in our Constitution, the Parliament has been vested with larger duties and responsibilities, in the affairs of the nation and in the cause of democracy. Therefore, it cannot be over-emphasised that we have yet to do much to create conditions for a dynamic upsurge in the economy.

The question arises how to fructify the dream. The answer that I can give is that this can be done only by a series of measures that are formulated in the 20 plus 5-Point National Programme, and that too only when they are duly implemented properly, smoothly and uninterruptedly. Therefore, Sir, I whole-heartedly welcome this Bill with the hope that we, Members of Parliament, will rise to the occasion in discharging our duties to the country. With these words I conclude and support this Bill.

✓ डा० सूर प्रताप सिंह (बाराबंकी) : माननीय अध्यक्ष जी, लोक सभा के काल-विस्तार के सम्बन्ध में जो विधेयक यहाँ पर पेश हुआ है, मैं उस का हृदय से समर्थन करता हूँ। चूँकि, समय कम है इस लिये

[डा० रुद्र प्रताप सिंह]

हमारे विरोधी दलों की जो आपत्तियाँ हैं, उन के सम्बन्ध में ही मैं कुछ निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ।

श्रीमान्, देश का विरोधी दल इस बात को जानता है कि आज जिस प्रकार से बीस सूत्री कार्यक्रम और पांच सूत्री कार्यक्रम का देश में कार्यान्वयन हो रहा है, यदि यह कार्यान्वयन एक वर्ष और हो जायगा तो अगले चुनाव में विरोधी दलों को एक भी सीट नहीं मिल सकेगी, इसी लिये वे लोग इस विधेयक का इतना विरोध कर रहे हैं।

श्रीमान्, उन्होंने अपने मन में इस बात को अच्छी तरह से समझ लिया है कि जिस प्रकार से आपातकालीन स्थिति की घोषणा के पूर्व उन्होंने देश के अन्दर षडयन्त्र किया था, देश के लोकतन्त्र को, देश के समाजवाद को, देश की धर्मनिरपेक्षता को समाप्त करने का प्रयास किया था, यहाँ तक कि चौधरी चरण सिंह ने अपने एक बयान में कहा था कि बैलैट के जरिये जो चीज हम को प्राप्त नहीं हुई है, उस सत्ता को हम बजट के जरिये प्राप्त करेंगे—उन की वे सब आशायें आज घूमिल हो गई हैं। उन्होंने इस बात को अच्छी तरह से समझ लिया है कि आज इस देश की 60 करोड़ जनता हमारी प्रधान मंत्री जी के साथ है ऐसी स्थिति में, श्रीमान्, यदि आपातकालीन स्थिति को उठा दिया जाय तो हमें भय है कि देश के अन्दर उसी प्रकार की अराजकता हिंसा और उपद्रव का वातावरण खड़ा करके देश के अन्दर लोकतन्त्र को समाप्त करने की चेष्टा की जायगी।

हमारे विरोधी दल के कुछ माननीय सदस्य कहते हैं कि उन के क्षेत्र की जनता के विचार के अनुसार लोक सभा के चुनाव होने चाहिये, लेकिन हमारे कांग्रेस के जो संसद सदस्य हैं, हमारे क्षेत्रों की जनता

बीस सूत्री और पांच सूत्री कार्यक्रमों का कार्यान्वयन चाहती है। इस से स्पष्ट होता है कि यदि उन के क्षेत्रों की जनता चुनाव की मांग करती है, तो उस जनता का उन विरोधी दलों के नेताओं पर से विश्वास उठ चुका है, उन नेताओं को उन के क्षेत्रों की जनता उन के पदों से अपदस्थ करना चाहती है, उन के स्थानों पर कांग्रेस के एम पीज को चुनना चाहती है—इसी लिये वह ऐसी बातें कह रही हैं।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस विधेयक का हादिक समर्थन करता हूँ।

✓ THE MINISTER OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI H. R. GOKHALE): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I heard with great interest and attention last evening the speech of hon. Member, Shri Samar Mukherjee. I felt at that time as if I was attending the study circle of his party; anyway, I have no objection to that. But what I have found was that the speech was full of internal contradictions; in fact it was an essay in contradictions. But one thing was clear that what I had said day before yesterday, was confessed by him in his speech in so many words. He said that he is not in favour, he is not in support of parliamentary democracy because, according to him, that is not true and genuine democracy.

✓ SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE (Howrah): I have never said that.

✓ SHRI H. R. GOKHALE: I will read it out from your speech.

Shri Samar Mukherjee said yesterday that parliamentary democracy is not the real type of democracy, in which he has any faith. So many things were said, why a parliamentary democracy is bad, but, of course he said at least that we must have a parliamentary democracy, because that is the democracy in which all the activities which he wanted to indulge in can be indulged. I am quite sure that

none of us on this side and quite a good many on the other side will not accept this thesis, and that the faith of our people and of this Parliament in Parliamentary democracy will remain unshaken irrespective of what Shri Samar Mukherjee says. Actually, he gave us some lecture on socialism and he said that if we have adopted socialism as our motto and symbol, we must know what socialism is. I was then reminded of a book by Dale Carnegie, 'How to Win Friends' written several years ago and which I read long time back. I also read a book later, How to Learn Socialism. But what Shri Samar Mukherjee said really inspires me to advise him to write a book on how to misunderstand socialism.

We need not be told that Lenin was a great man. Of course, he said one great truth, and I agree with him. At some stage, he did say that Lenin is a greater authority than himself. Well, I say, that none of us will have any doubt about it; that is a fact. But we need not be told of the role of Lenin in this world and that he made a decisive dent in the events of the world history for the last 50 years. But surely, we are not prepared to accept Shri Samar Mukherjee's interpretation of Lenin, when that interpretation particularly is not accepted by other socialist countries themselves. They might have been called revisionists or by other names, but the fact is that even today there are a good number of countries in Europe and elsewhere, who have said that these things were said at that time and did provide a very good basic foundation to the understanding of setting up socialism in the world. You have got to understand socialism not in the air, as someone said, but in the context, in the situation, which we are dealing with. Therefore, we need not be told about socialism and we need not be told about the greatness of Lenin. We more than all of you there know more about it; I can tell you that. Of course, cat was out of the bag, when he said: I want parliamentary democracy and I will be able to use it. But

obviously, he intended to say that he can use the instruments of democracy for destroying the democracy itself. He said that almost, not in these words. Therefore, these things need not worry us at all.

Usual arguments were advanced for holding the elections now, and there is nothing new which was said, nor have I anything new to say here. It was said that when we go to the people now and say that the elections are not likely to be held, the people would lose their faith in the democratic system. This was the assessment of Shri Indrajit Gupta.

13-00 hrs.

That is not our assessment. It is a matter of assessment and all that we can say from what we know, perhaps as much as, if not more than you, is that the people in this Party are in touch with the people and they know how they react to the situation. That is why there is good reason for us to say that in this country the people have shown such a maturity even in circumstances involving great stress and strain that they have reacted almost invariably the correct way and I have no doubt that the people in this country understand that what is being done is not at all to destroy democracy but to maintain and protect that democracy which you want and which I want. That is the position here to-day. And in that context as I said yesterday, if there were reasons which you gave very eloquently last year for saying that the elections should be postponed for one year and if these reasons exist now, I would appeal to you to consider this situation and support this measure. Even now, though late, I would appeal particularly to my CPI friends to rethink on this matter and support this measure. It is not the same thing to say which many people have, of course, been saying as a matter of course and as if there is some logic in it that if there are going to be no elections next year, there will be no

[H. R. Gokhale]

elections for ever. We have said it repeatedly and I repeat it here that this does not follow either. In fact this country will not deviate from the path of democracy. In this country we will regard elections based on the adult suffrage as one of the basic patterns of the functioning of the democratic system. I agree with him that the democratic system does not mean, and the theory of the supremacy of Parliament as he referred to, does not mean, that this Parliament and this Parliament alone will be regarded supreme and there is nothing else more important than maintaining this supremacy. We know that. We regard that the supremacy can be maintained by strengthening democratic institutions which include Parliament in it and, therefore, in order to strengthen Parliament, we will not hesitate to go to elections and I can say with confidence that it will not happen this country that elections will not be held in future and, as a matter of course, the duration of Parliament will be extended for all times to come. They know it. But they have to say these things. I can understand that. It is only in that spirit that I am giving this answer once again that there is no idea at all that the elections will be given a complete go-by. They are not.

Mr Indrajit Gupta referred to the power of Parliament, the supremacy of Parliament and, particularly, the competence of Parliament to amend the Constitution. I have said on many an occasion in this House and outside also unequivocally that this Parliament is fully competent to amend all or any of the provisions of the Constitution. I cannot put it higher than this. Prime Minister has said about this. Prime Minister has said even in the course of the debate on the constitutional amendments that this Parliament has the fullest competence to amend any provisions of the Constitution. To put it on a higher plane, I can say short of saying that this Constitution is hereby repealed, every ot-

her provision of the Constitution can be amended, changed or altered by this Parliament. There is no doubt about it in my mind at any rate. Maybe in some States, people in a country like ours, may think that it can be done only by some other methods. They did talk about it. I would like to tell Mr Indrajit Gupta that our party is disciplined. It is not regimented. It is quite possible that in our party people may have different views on dicrent matters. But ultimately they go by the decision of the party as a whole and I do not agree that our Members were not willing to go ahead with the Constitution, Amendment Bill. It is not true at all. As a matter of fact, at every stage, it was being said that it may be that you will have to look at some other provisions of the Constitution also and you may have to make many more wide and far-reaching changes. Nobody said that the present amendments should not be passed. That was not how I understood it at all. Therefore, I would like to mention it. He wanted an assurance from me that once for all this should be placed beyond doubt. How many times have we to put it beyond doubt? We have said it here. Prime Minister has said it. Maybe some people thought that something else may be necessary in addition to this, but that does not mean that it is accepted by the Party. The Party did not accept it and went ahead with the Constitution Amendment Bill as it was brought before the House. Therefore, there should be no doubt about this in the minds of anybody that we are going to deviate at any time and go back from what we have been saying all along. I think it will be our endeavour always to say that this supremacy for which we have fought in courts and outside will be something for which we will ever continue to fight if a fight becomes necessary in future.

I have mentioned yesterday some larger reasons. No doubt I did say that after the emergency there are cer-

tain gains, I mentioned those areas, particularly, the economic field in which certain achievements are there. There is no doubt about it. In fact, the whole purpose was to have these achievements and we have these achievements. I have also added that they are not achievements with which we can be satisfied in the sense that all that we wanted to-day has been done. That is also not to say that until all that has been done, there will be no elections. All I said was that here we have come to a certain stage in this country where we have begun to feel that things particularly economically are beginning to stabilise. Somebody referred to the World Bank. Yes, the World Bank did say that this country had made tremendous strides in economic development and we said it and, I think, with some sense of pride and justification. But all that I said was that at this stage when we are just on the brink, when we are coming to a level where we wanted to come and want to go further ahead, this situation should not be disturbed for the time being. A greater stabilisation of this is necessary and an endeavour in this direction not only by the people from my side but also on your side is necessary and if all of us join together.

✓ SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA (Jainagar): Including the price trend.

✓ SHRI H. R. GOKHALE: ... to achieve this objective, it is perhaps possible that we will be able to have elections sooner than we thing. Mr. Indrajit Gupta asked me: does it mean that for one year you cannot hold elections? No. I am not going to give legal reply. The legal reply he knows. The legal reply is that there is power in the appropriate authority to dissolve Parliament at any time. Therefore, I am not giving the legal reply. What I am saying is that if at any time in the history of this country during the last 10-15 Years anybody has shown a greater sense of understanding as to what is the correct moment for a particular correct decision, I think it is only the Prime Minister.

And, perhaps, the Prime Minister, if she is convinced sometime later that all the difficulties have gone or at any rate, are not so much as to distract us from going to the polls, she will take that decision. How can. I tell you now what she will do? To say that now that you have extended it for one year, therefore, you have really stopped it for all time to come, is neither in accordance with the law nor is it in accordance with what our experience is with regard to our leader and also the leader of the House. Therefore, there should be no doubt or apprehensions in this regard.

Mr. Mavalankar, of course, spoke too. I think he spoke but did not say anything unfortunately because what happened....

✓ SHRI S. A. SHAMIM: That is true of you also.

✓ SHRI H. R. GOHALE: I should have thought that Mr. Mavalankar with all his ardent faith in democracy, at least when conditions were bad and there was violence all around and we know which were the elements which were trying to create that, at least I expected, would come out and condemn this. Did he ever do it? I have not heard of it.... (Interruptions)

✓ SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: I have never supported any violence.

✓ SHRI H. R. GOPHALE: I know, Sir. This discussion has gone on....

✓ SHRI S. A. SHAMIM: Then you had elections in Gujarat. Even that violence did not prevent you from holding elections.

✓ MR. SPEAKER: Order, please, Mr. Shamim, you are not referred to.

✓ SHRI S. A. SHAMIM: The Law Minister is talking of unlawful activities.

✓ SHRI H. R. GOKHALE: For all the reasons which I gave yesterday and some of which I have given to-day, I would very strongly urge on this House to accept this motion.

✓ SHRI S. A. SHAMIM: All the daily-wagers should have to support it.

✓ MR SPEAKER: Now I will take up the motions.

I will put Mr. Jharkhande Rai's motion to vote.

The question is:

✓ "That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 3rd February, 1977."

(1)

✓ The motion was negatived.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall put the motion again.

The question is:

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

The Lok Sabha divided:

Division No. 38]

[13.12 hrs.

AYES

Achal Singh, Shri
Aga, Shri Syed Ahmed
Ahirwar, Shri Nathu Ram
Alagesan, Shri O. V.
Ambesh, Shri
Anthony, Shri Frank
Austin, Dr. Henry
Awdhesh Chandra Singh, Shri
Aziz Imam, Shri
Babunath Singh, Shri
Banamali Babu, Shri
Banerjee, Shrimati Mukul
Barman, Shri R. N.
Barua, Shri Bedabrata
Basumatari, Shri D.

Bhatia, Shri Raghunandan Lal
Bheeshmadev, Shri M.

Bist, Shri Narendra Singh
Chandrakar, Shri Chandulal
Chandrashekarappa Veerabasappa,
Shri T. V.

Chandrika Prasad, Shri
Chaudhary, Shri Nitiraj Singh
Chavan, Shri Yeshwantrao

Chellachami, Shri A. M.

Chhuttan Lal, Shri

Chikkalingaiah, Shri K.

Daga, Shri M. C.

Dalbir Singh, Shri

Deo, Shri R. R. Singh

Dhamankar, Shri

Dhillon, Dr. G. S.

Dhote, Shri Jambuwant

Dinesh Singh, Shri

Dixit, Shri G. C.

Doda, Shri Hiralal

Dwivedi, Shri Nageshwar

Gandhi, Shrimati Indira

Ganesh, Shri K. R.

Gangadeb, Shri P.

Gautam, Shri C. D.

Gill, Shri Mohinder Singh

Godara, Shri Mani Ram

Gokhale, Shri H. R.

Gomango, Shri Giridhar

Gopal, Shri K.

Goswami, Shri Dinesh Chahndra

Gowda, Shri Pampan

Hari Singh, Shri

Hashim, Shri M. M.

Jadeja, Shri D. P.

Jeyalakshmi, Shrimati V.

Jha, Shri Chiranjib

Joshi, Shrimati Subhadra

Kadam, Shri J. G.

Kader, Shri S. A.

Kailas, Dr.

Kamala Prasad, Shri

1

Kamble, Shri N. S.	Ramshekhhar Prasad Singh, Shri
Karan Singh, Dr.	Rao, Shrimati B. Radhabai A.
Kedar Nath Singh, Shri	Rao, Shri Jagannath
Kisku, Shri A. K.	Rao, Shri M. S. Sanjeevi
Lambodar Baliyar, Shri	Rao, Shri M. Satyanarayan
Lutfal Haque, Shri	Rao, Shri Nageswara
Mahajan, Shri Vikram	Rao, Shri P. Ankineedu Prasada
Maharaj Singh, Shri	Rao, Shri Pattabhi Rama
Majhi, Shri Gajadhar	Rathia, Shri Umed Singh
Majhi, Shri Kumar	Raut, Shri Bhola
Mallikarjun, Shri	Ravi, Shri Vayalar
Mandal, Shri Jagdish Narain	Reddy, Shri K. Ramakrishna
Manhar, Shri Bhagatram	Reddy, Shri M. Ram Gopal
Mirdha, Shri Nathu Ram	Reddy, Shri P. Ganga
Mishra, Shri Bibhuti	Reddy, Shri P. Narasimha
Mishra, Shri G. S.	Reddy, Shri P. V.
Mishra, Shri Jagannath	Reddy, Shri Sidram
Modi, Shri Shrikishan	Saini, Shri Mulki Raj
Naik, Shri B. V.	Salve, Shri N. K. P.
Oraon, Shri Kartik	Samanta, Shri S. C.
Oraon, Shri Tuna	Sankata Prasad, Dr.
Painuli, Shri Paripoornanand	Satpathy, Shri Devendra
Pandey, Shri Narsingh Narain	Satyanarayana, Shri B.
Pandey, Shri R. S.	Savant, Shri Shankerrao
Pandey, Shri Tarkeshwar	Sen, Shri A. K.
Pandit, Shri S. T.	Shafee, Shri A.
Panigrabi, Shri Chintamani	Shailani, Shri Chandra
Paokai Haokip, Shri	Shambhu Nath, Shri
Parthasarathy, Shri P.	Shankaranand, Shri B.
Patil, Shri E. V. Vikhe	Sharma, Shri A. P.
Patil, Shri Krishnarao	Sharma, Dr. H. P.
Patil, Shri S. B.	Sharma, Shri R. R.
Patil, Shri T. A.	Sharma, Dr. Shanker Dayal
Peje, Shri S. L.	Shashi Bhushan, Shri
Pradhani, Shri K.	Shastri, Shri Sheopujan
Purty, Shri M. S.	Shenoy, Shri P. R.
Raghu Ramaiah, Shri K.	Shetty, Shri K. K.
Rai, Shri S. K.	Shinde, Shri Annasaheb P.
Ram Hedao, Shri	Shivappa, Shri N.
Ram Prakash, Shri	Shivnath Singh, Shri
Ram Sewak, Ch.	Shukla, Shri B. R.
Ram Surat Prasad, Shri	Siddayya, Shri S. M.
Ram Swarup, Shri	Sinha, Shri Nawal Kishore

Sinha, Shri R. K.
Sohan Lal, Shri T.
Sokhi, Sardar Swaran Singh
Suryanarayana, Shri K.
Swamy, Shri Sidrameshwar
Swaran Singh, Shri
Tiwary, Shri D. N.
Uikey, Shri M. G.
Verma, Shri Balgovind
Verma, Shri Sukhdeo Prasad
Vidyalankar, Shri Amarnath
Yadav, Shri N. P.
Yadav, Shri R. P.

Mukherjee, Shri Samar
Mukherjee, Shri Saroj
Muruganantham, Shri S. A.
*Nayak, Shri Baksi
Pajanor, Shri Aravinda Bala
Panda, Shri D. K.
Reddy, Shri B. N.
Roy, Dr. Saradish
Saha, Shri Ajit Kumar
Saha, Shri Gadadhar
Sen, Dr. Ranen
Shamim, Shri S. A.
Shastri, Shri Ramavatar
Somasundaram, Shri S. D.
Subravelu, Shri

NOES

Bhargavi Thankappan, Shrimati
Bhattacharyya, Shri Dinen
Bhattacharyya, Shri Jagadish
Bhattacharyya, Shri S. P.
Deb, Shri Dasaratha
Deshpande, Shrimati Roza
Dutta, Shri Biren
Goswami, Shrimati Bibha Ghosh
Gupta, Shri Indrajit
Halder, Shri Krishna Chandra
Hazra, Shri Manoranjan
Jha, Shri Bhogendra
Kathamuthu, Shri M.
Kiruttinan, Shri Tha
Krishnan, Shri M. K.
Krishnan, Shrimati Parvathi
'Madhukar', Shri K. M.
Manjhi, Shri Bhola
Manoharan, Shri K.
Mavalankar, Shri P. G.
Mayathevar, Shri K.
Modak, Shri Bijoy
Mohammad Ismail, Shri
Mukherjee, Shri H. N.

Mr. Speaker, The result** of the division is: Ayes 156: Noes 39.

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2. (Further extension of duration of the present House of the People).

MR. SPEAKER: Now we take up Clause 2. There are amendments.

SHRI B. V. NAIK is not there.

SHRI KARTIK ORAON (Lohardaga):

I beg to move:

Page 1, line 5,—

for "duration" substitute "tenure"
(4)

Page 1, line 6,—

for "Duration" substitute "Tenure"
(5)

Page 1, line 17,—

for "six months" substitute "one year" (6)

*Wrongly voted for NOES.

**The following Members also received their votes:—

AYES: Sarvashri P. Antony Reddi, Dalip Singh, Purushottam Kakodkar and Baksi Nayak.

NOES: Shri N. Sreekantan Nair.

(recorded)

Page 1, lines 18 and 19,—

omit "but not beyond the said period of two years" (7) ✓

MR. SPEAKER: I shall now put amendment Nos. 4, 5, 6 and 7 to the vote of the House. ✓

Amendments Nos. 4 to 7 were put and negatived. ✓

SHRI KARTIK ORAON: I have not been allowed to speak on my amendment No. 3 to clause 1, Shri Kiyahu Ramaiah told me to put the amendments and speak. ✓

MR. SPEAKER: No, no, not at this stage.

The question is: ✓

"That Clause 2 stand part of the Bill." ✓

The motion was adopted. ✓

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall now come to Clause 1.

clause 1 (Short title) ✓

SHRI KARTIK ORAON: I beg to move:

Page 1, line 4,—

"for "Duration" substitute "Tenure" (3) ✓

I have moved this amendment because I felt that the word 'duration' appears to be rather unusual. We never say 'duration of the Lok Sabha' but we say 'term of the Lok Sabha'. The word 'term' is more popular and appropriate.

Though I have asked for the word 'tenure' to be substituted, I would like to say that the hon. Minister may come forward with some official amendment making it 'term' rather than 'duration'.

I have also said that in place of 'six months' substitute 'one year'. About this extension there was a discussion

in the Executive Committee. At that time I stated that the duration of the term of the Lok Sabha should be fixed at six years on the ground that the term of the Rajya Sabha and the term of the Legislative Councils in the States is six years. Just to keep parity with the Legislative Councils and the Rajya Sabha I pleaded for the term to be kept at six years.

(Interruptions)

The reason was that we wanted to do certain significant things for economic stability before going to pull. If Emergency is withdrawn six months earlier, the date to which we come is 18th of September. How can the date be fixed that on such and such a date emergency is going to be withdrawn? Either you fix the period of six months or of two years.

After proclamation of emergency we started 20-point and 5-point economic programmes. My point is that they are the vehicles of social change. We started in the first gear in the year 1975. Then we came to the second gear in 1976. Now we have to go to the top gear in year 1977. This period should be as flexible as is our Constitution. I, therefore, say that it should be one year. I have asked 'not beyond the period of two years' to be omitted. ✓

SHRI H. R. GOKHALE: This mistake was not committed by me. But it was committed by the Constituent Assembly. It is in the marginal note. ✓

MR. SPEAKER: I shall now put Amendment No. 3 to Clause 1 moved by Shri Kartik Oraon to the vote of the House.

Amendment Nos. 3 was put and negatived. ✓

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title stand part of the Bill." ✓

The motion was adopted.

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

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

✓ "That the Bill be passed."

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

✓ "That the Bill be passed."

✓ The Lok Sabha divided:

✓ Division No. 39]

[13.21 hrs.

AYES

Achal Singh, Shri
Aga, Shri Syed Ahmed
Ahirwar, Shri Nathu Ram
Alagesan, Shri O. V.
Ambesh, Shri
Anthony, Shri Frank
Austin, Dr. Henry
Awdhesh Chandra Singh, Shri
Aziz Imam, Shri
Babunath Singh, Shri
Banamali Babu, Shri
Banerjee, Shrimati Mukul
Barman, Shri R. N.
Barua, Shri Bedabrata
Basumatari, Shri D.
Bhagat, Shri H. K. L.
Bhatia, Shri Raghunandan Lal
Bheeshmadev, Shri M.
Bist, Shri Narendra Singh
Brahmanandji, Shri Swami
Chakleshwar Singh, Shri
Chandrakar, Shri Chandual
Chandrashekharappa Veerabasappa,
Shri T. V.

Chandrika Prasad, Shri
Chaudhary, Shri Nitiraj Singh
Chavan, Shri Yeshwantrao
Chellachami, Shri A. M.

Chhotey Lal, Shri
Chhuttan Lal, Shri
Chikkalingaiah, Shri K.
Daga, Shri M. C.
Dalbir Singh, Shri
Dalip Singh, Shri
Darbara Singh, Shri
Deo, Shri R. R. Singh
Deo, Shri S. N. Singh
Dhamankar, Shri
Dhillon, Dr. G. S.
Dhote, Shri Jambuwant
Dinesh Singh, Shri
Dixit, Shri G. C.
Doda, Shri Hiralal
Dube, Shri J. P.
Dwivedi, Shri Nageshwar
Gandhi, Shrimati Indira
Ganesh, Shri K. R.
Gangadeb, Shri P.
Gautam, Shri C. D.
Gill, Shri Mohinder Singh
Godara, Shri Mani Ram
Gokhale, Shri H. R.
Gomango, Shri Giridhar
Gopai, Shri K.
Goswami, Shri Dinesh Chandra
Gowda, Shri Pampan
Marij Singh, Shri
Hashim, Shri M. M.
Jadeja, Shri D. P.
Jeyalakshmi, Shrimati V.
Jha, Shri Chiranjib
Jitendra Prasad, Shri
Joshi, Shrimati Subhadra
Kadam, Shri J. G.
Kader, Shri S. A.
Kailas, Dr.
Kakodkar, Shri Purushottam
Kamala Prasad, Shri
Kamble, Shri N. S.
Kamla Kumari, Kumari
Karan Singh, Dr.

Have

Kedar Nath Singh, Shri	Ram Prakash, Shri
Kisku, Shri A. K.	Ram Sewak, Ch.
Kotrashetti, Shri A. K.	Ram Surat Prasad, Shri
Kureel, Shri B. N.	Ram Swarup, Shri
Lambodar Beliyar, Shri	Ramshekhar Prasad Singh, Shri
Lutfal Haque, Shri	Ranabahadur Singh, Shri
Mahajan, Shri Vikram	Rao, Shrimati B. Radhabai A.
Maharaj Singh, Shri	Rao, Shri Jagannath
Majhi, Shri Gajadhar	Rao, Shri M. S. Sanjeevi
Majhi, Shri Kumar	Rao, Shri M. Satyanarayan
Malaviya, Shri K. D.	Rao, Shri Nageswara
Mallikarjun, Shri	Rao, Shri P. Ankinedu Prasada
Mandal, Shri Jagdish Narain	Rao, Shri Pattabhi Rama
Manhar, Shri Bhagatram	Rathia, Shri Umed Singh
Mirdha, Shri Nathu Ram	Raut, Shri Bhola
Mishra, Shri Bibhuti	Ravi, Shri Vayalar
Mishra, Shri G. S.	Reddy, Shri K. Ramakrishna
Mishra, Shri Jagannath	Reddy, Shri M. Ram Gopal
Modi, Shri Shrikishan	Reddy, Shri P. Ganga
Naik, Shri B. V.	Reddy, Shri P. Narasimha
Negi, Shri Pratap Singh	Reddy, Shri P. V.
Oraon, Shri Tuna	Reddy, Shri Sidram
Painuli, Shri Paripoornanand	Roy, Shri Bishwanath
Pandey, Shri Narsingh Narain	Rudra Pratap Singh, Dr.
Pandey, Shri R. S.	Saini, Shri Mulki Raj
Pandey, Shri Tarkeshwar	Salve, Shri N. K. P.
Pandit, Shri S. T.	Samanta, Shri S. C.
Panigrahi, Shri Chintamani	Sankata Prasad, Dr.
Pant, Shri K. C.	Satpathy, Shri Devendra
Paokai Haokip, Shri	Satyanarayana, Shri B.
Parthasarathy, Shri P.	Savant, Shri Shankerrao
Patil, Shri E. V. Vikhe	Sen, Shri A. K.
Patil, Shri Krishnarao	Shafee, Shri A.
Patil, Shri S. B.	Shailani, Shri Chandra
Patil, Shri T. A.	Shambhu Nath, Shri
Patnaik, Shri Banamali	Shankaranand, Shri B.
Pradhani, Shri K.	Sharma, Shri A. P.
Purty, Shri M. S.	Sharma, Dr. H. P.
Raghu Ramaiah, Shri K.	Sharma, Shri R. R.
Rai, Shri S. K.	Sharma, Dr. Shanker Dayal
Rai, Shrimati Sahodrabai	Shashi Bhushan, Shri
Ram Dayal, Shri	Shastri, Shri Sheopujan
Ram Hedao, Shri	Shenoy, Shri P. R.

Shetty, Shri K. K.
Shinde, Shri Annasaheb P.
Shivappa, Shri N.
Shivnath Singh, Shri
Shukla, Shri B. R.
Shukla, Shri Vidya Charan
Siddayya, Shri S. M.
Sinha, Shri Nawal Kishore
Sinha, Shri R. K.
Sohan Lal, Shri T.
Sokhi, Sardar Swaran Singh
Suryanarayana, Shri K.
Swamy, Shri Sidrameshwar
Swaran Singh, Shri
Thakre, Shri S. B.
Tiwary, Shri D. N.
Uikey, Shri M. G.
Ulaganambi, Shri R. P.
Verma, Shri Balgovind
Verma, Shri Sukhdeo Prasad
Vidyalankar, Shri Amarnath
Yadav, Shri N. P.
Yadav, Shri R. P.
Zuifquar Ali Khan, Shri

NOES ✓

Bhargavi Thankappan, Shrimati
Bhattacharyya, Shri Dinen
Bhattacharyya, Shri Jagdish
Bhattacharyya, Shri S. P.
Deb, Shri Dasaratha
Deshpande, Shrimati Roza
Dutta, Shri Biren
Goswami, Shrimati Bibha Ghosh
Gupta, Shri Indrajit
Halder, Shri Krishna Chandra
Hazra, Shri Manoranjan
Nayak.

recorded their votes:—

The following members also
NOES: Shri N. Sreekantan Nair,

Jha, Shri Bhogendra
Kathamuthu, Shri M.
Krishnan, Shri M. K.
Krishnan, Shrimati Parvathi
Manjhi, Shri Bhola
Manoharan, Shri K.
Mavalankar, Shri P. G.
Mayathevar, Shri K.
Modak, Shri Bijoy
Mohammad Ismail, Shri
Mukerjee, Shri H. N.
Mukherjee, Shri Samar
Mukherjee, Shri Saroj
Muruganantham, Shri S. A.
Pajanor, Shri Aravinda Bala
Panda, Shri D. K.
Reddy, Shri B. N.
Roy, Dr. Saradish
Saha, Shri Ajit Kumar
Saha, Shri Gadadhar
Sen, Dr. Ranen
Shastri, Shri Ramavatar
Somasundaram, Shri S. D.

MR. SPEAKER: The result* of the
division is: Ayes 180; Noes 34.

The motion was adopted.

13.22 hrs.

The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch
till Half Past Fourteen of the Clock.
The Lok Sabha re-assembled after
Lunch at Half Past Fourteen of the
Clock.

14.30 hrs.

[SHRI P. PARTHASARATHY in the Chair]

PRESENTATION OF PETITION

Shri N. K. P. Salve (Betul): Sir,
I beg to present a petition signed by
Shrimati Vasanthi A. Pai, President,
Federation for the Welfare of the

L. Peje, P. Antony Reddi and Baksi
and Shri K. M. 'Madhukar'.