

Sixth Series, Vol. XV—No.56

**Thursday, May 11, 1978
Vaisakha 21, 1900(Saka)**

LOK SABHA DEBATES

(Fourth Session)



सत्यमेव जयते

(Vol XV contains Nos. 51—58)

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

Price : Rs. 4.00

CONTENTS

Vol. XV

No. 56—Thursday, May 11, 1978/Vaisakha 21, 1900 (Saka)

COLUMNS

Papers Laid on the Table	1—4
Committee on Petitions—	
(i) Minutes	4
(ii) Fourth Report	4
Committee on Papers Laid on the Table—	
Sixth Report	4
Railway Convention Committee—	
Third Report	4
Committee on Subordinate Legislation—	
Ninth Report	4
Committee of Privileges—	
Extension of time for presentation of Report on the question of privilege against Shrimati Indira Gandhi and others . . .	5—7
Finance Bill, 1978—	
Motion to consider amendment recommended by Rajya Sabha —Amendment rejected—	
Shri H. M. Patel	8—10, 24—27
Shri C. M. Stephen	10—14
Shri G. M. Banatwalla	14—15
Shri T. A. Pai	15—18
Shrimati Pervathi Krishnan	18—19
Shri Vasant Sathe	20—21
Shri Somnath Chatterjee	21—22
Shri A. C. George	22—24

(ii)

Motion of No-Confidence in the Council of Ministers—*Negatived*—

	COLUMNS
Shri Asoka Krishna Dutt	37—46
Shri Jagjivan Ram	46—50
Shri B. Shankaranand	50—53, 54—58
Shri M. N. Govindan Nair	58—63
Shri Ram Vilas Paswan	63—68
Shri Ragavalu Mohanarangam	68—70
Shri Mohd. Shafi Qureshi	70—87
Shri Hukmdeo Narain Yadav	88—91
Shri Vasant Sathe	91—99
Shri Saugata Roy	99—104
Shri Dajiba Desai	104—108
Shri Morarji Desai	108—21
Shri C. M. Stephen	121—36

Members Sworn :

Shrimati Mohsina Kidwai	53
-----------------------------------	----

LOK SABHA DEBATES

1

LOK SABHA

Thursday May 11 1978/Vaisakha
21, 1900 (Saka)

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the Clock

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

CERTIFIED ACCOUNTS OF INDIAN SCHOOL OF MINES, DHANBAD FOR 1975-76

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION, SOCIAL WELFARE AND CULTURE (DR PRATAP CHANDRA CHUNDER) I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Certified Accounts (Hindi** version) of the Indian School of Mines Dhanbad, for the year 1975-76 and the Audit Report thereon [Placed in Library See No LT-2295/78]

URBAN LAND (CEILING AND REGULATION) (4TH AMDT) RULES 1976

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF WORKS AND HOUSING AND SUPPLY AND REHABILITATION (SHRI RAM KINKAR) I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Urban Land (Ceiling and Regulation) (Fourth Amendment) Rules, 1976 (Hindi and English versions) published in Notification No GSR 571 in Gazette of India dated the 29th April, 1978 under sub-section (3) of section 46 of the Urban Land (Ceiling and Regulation) Act 1976 together with an explanatory memorandum [Placed in Library See No LT-2296/78]

2

SECOND REPORT OF JAGMOHAN REDDY COMMISSION WITH GOVERNMENT MEMO AND STATEMENT FOR NOT LAYING HINDI VERSION OF THE REPORT

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI DHANIK LAL MANDAL) On behalf of Shri S D Patil, I beg to lay on the Table —

(1) A copy each of the following papers sub-section (4) of section 3 of the Commissions of Inquiry Act, 1952 —

(i) Second Report dated the 23rd March, 1978 of the P Jagannathan Reddy Commission of Inquiry set up to inquire into certain allegations against Shri Bansi Lal, for Ex-Chief Minister of Haryana and Ex Union Defence Minister

(ii) Memorandum (Hindi and English versions) of the Action taken by the Central Government on the above Report

(2) A statement (Hindi and English versions) explaining reasons for not laying simultaneously the Hindi version of the Report mentioned at (1) (i) above [Placed in Library See No LT-2297/78]

STATEMENTS SHOWING ACTION TAKEN ON ASSURANCES, PROMISE ETC GIVEN DURING VARIOUS SESSIONS OF LOK SABHA

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI

**English version of the Accounts and the Audit Report was laid on the Table on the 8th, May, 1978

LARANG SAI): I beg to lay on the Table—

(1) The following statements (Hindi and English versions) showing the action by the Government on various assurances, promises and undertakings given by the Ministers during the various sessions of Lok Sabha —

(i) Statement No
XXIX-Tenth
Session, 1974

(ii) Statement No
XXI-Twelfth
Session, 1974

(iii) Statement No
IX-Seventeenth
Session, 1976

Fifth Lok
Sabha

(iv) Statement No VI-First
Session, 1977

(v) Statement No IX-Second
Session 1977

(vi) Statement No V-Third
Session, 1977

(vii) Statement No II-Fourth
Session, 1978

(2) A statement (Hindi and English versions showing reasons for delay in the Implementation Report. [Placed in Library. See No LT-2298/78]

EMPLOYEES' P F (AMDT) SCHEME, 1978

SHRI LARANG SAI On behalf of Shri Dr Ram Kirpal Sinha, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the Employees' Provident Funds (Amendment) Scheme, 1978 (Hindi and English versions) published in Notification No GSR 602 in Gazette of India dated the 6th May, 1978 under sub-section (2) of section 7 of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act 1952 [Placed in Library See No LT-2299/78]

NOTIFICATION UNDER CENTRAL EXCISE RULES, 1944

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI ZULFIQARULLAH) I beg to lay on

the Table a copy of Notification No. GSR 273(E) (Hindi and English versions) published in Gazette of India dated the 9th May 1978, issued under the Central Excise Rules, 1944 [Placed in Library See No LT-2300/78]

COMMITTEE ON PETITIONS

(1) MINUTES

श्री हरि बिष्णु कामत (होगाबाद) मैं छठी लोक सभा की याचिका समिति का पत्रलेख ले पञ्जीसवी बैठक में वायेंबाही माराम सभा पटल पर रखता ह ।

(1) FOURTH REPORT

श्री हरि बिष्णु कामत मैं छठी लोक सभा की याचिका समिति का वतुथ प्रतिबदन प्रस्तुत करत

COMMITTEE ON PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

SIXTH REPORT

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA (Delhi Sadar) Sir I beg to present the Sixth Report of the Committee on Papers Laid on the Table

RAILWAY CONVENTION COMMITTEE

THIRD REPORT

SHRI KRISHAN KANT (Chandigarh) I beg to present the Third Report of the Railway Convention Committee on Action Taken by Government on the recommendations contained in their Ninth Report, 1973 on "Social Burdens on Indian Railways"

COMMITTEE ON SUBORDINATE
LEGISLATION

NINTH REPORT

कुमारी ललि बेन बल्लभ चाई पटेल : (मेहतावा)
अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं अधीनस्थ विधान सम्बन्धी
नमिति का नोवा प्रतिवेदन प्रस्तुत करती हूँ

MR SPEAKER: Shri P. K. Deo to
present a petition.—He is not there.

COMMITTEE OF PRIVILEGES

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR PRESENTATION
OF REPORT ON THE QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE
AGAINST SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI AND
OTHERS

SHRI HITENDRA DESAI (Godhra):
I move the following:—

"That this House do extend by six
months the time for presentation of
the Report of the Committee of
Privileges on the question of privi-
leges against Shrimati Indira
Gandhi and others for alleged
obstruction, intimidation and harass-
ment of certain officials who were
collecting information for answers to
certain questions in Lok Sabha on
Maruti Ltd."

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure
of the House to extend the time?

SHRI KANWARLAL GUPTA (Delhi
Sadar): Sir, this is a very important
thing. To permit another six months'
time is not reasonable. I do not know
why the hon. Member has not ex-
plained as to why he wants six months
more. He must give the reasons. There
must be some reasons for the extension
of time by six months. This is a
serious matter. I think the feelings of
the House are that the privilege case
against Mrs. Gandhi should be settled
this way or that way so that the House
may take any action on that. This is
very urgent. I think when I say this
I represent the voice of the House.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes,
yes.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: So,
Sir, may I request you not to adopt
this motion?

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai): Sir,
I have to give my explanation. The
matter is no. so simple as we want it
to be. Certainly it would be possible
for us to place the report of the Com-
mittee without going into the merit of
it. You should remember that this
Committee of Privileges had to deal
in this matter not only with Mrs.
Gandhi but several others. To finish
the whole work it required the whole
of February and even part of March;
when Lok Sabha resumed we had a
lot of meetings. We could start the
work only when the budget session
started. Even then we had 19 sittings.
We had examined 19 witnesses. We
have still many more witnesses to
examine. I can assure the House that
considering the merits of the case,
there should not be—I should not use
that word—impatience of any kind or
an iota of injustice done.

By this time we have voluminous
documents consisting of about 1,000
pages and we have to go through them.
We have to be positive in regard to
our findings. That takes time. During
the session I repeat that we have
had 19 sittings. And we have to ex-
amine many more documents and
many more witnesses. And some of
the witnesses have to be re-examined
so that justice is done to all concerned.
For that reason, this extension of six
months. It does not mean that we shall
take six months' time.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: Why
not you give in next session?

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: No. We shall
try our best as we are trying. An
exigency may develop and that is
why we had asked for six months'
time. It does not mean that we shall
not try to finish it before that. We
will try to finish it before that.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH
(Hoshangabad): Mr. Speaker, Sir. I
am sorry to say my hon. colleague's
plea is unconvincing.

MR. SPEAKER: This is not a debate.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: I suggest that the time be extended only upto the last day of the first week of the next session. That is the time, we are prepared to give. Not more than that.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Kamath, in these matters, they have been doing a very good work. I have gone through their proceedings. They have done their best. It is not a question of delaying it.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: If they are so good and efficient, they can report by the first week of the next session.

MR. SPEAKER: At the same time, if the House pleases, they must be given at least four months' time. They must have some holidays also.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: Three months' months' holidays.

MR. SPEAKER I think four month's time will be sufficient.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes, yes.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: If it so happens, we shall be able to submit it before that. There may be certain exigencies. Because of that we had asked for six month's time.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That this House do extend by four months the time for presentation of the Report of the Committee of Privileges on the question of privilege against Shrimati Indira Gandhi and others for alleged obstruction, intimidation and harassment of certain officials who were collecting information for answers to certain questions in Lok Sabha on Maruti Ltd."

The motion was adopted.

MR. SPEAKER: Now we go to legislative work.

11.07 hrs.

FINANCE BILL, 1978

AMENDMENT RECOMMENDED BY RAJYA SABHA

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI H. M. PATEL): Sir, I beg to move:

"(i) that the following amendment recommended by Rajya Sabha in the Bill to give effect to the financial proposals of the Central Government for the financial year 1978-79, by taken into consideration:

Amendment

Clause 36

That at page 31, lines 1 to 6 be deleted.

(ii) that the recommendation made by Rajya Sabha be rejected."

May I point out to the Hon'ble Members of this House that the suggestion underlying the amendment to the Bill which the Rajya Sabha has recommended to us for consideration is by no means new. Hon'ble Members will recall that similar amendments were moved in this very House at the time of the clause by clause consideration of the Bill. These amendments were extensively discussed and, after due consideration, this Hon'ble House rejected the amendments and passed the Finance Bill. Although it may not, therefore, be necessary for me to offer any detailed comments on the purport and effect of the amendment recommended by the Rajya Sabha, I shall briefly touch upon them.

The amendment seeks to withdraw the Central Excise duties on "Coal" (excluding lignite) and "Coke not elsewhere specified" and "Electricity". In my Budget speech as well as in my subsequent remarks in reply to the debates in this House I had fully spelt out the circumstances in which I had to impose new Central Excise levies on coal and electricity. Briefly stated, the circumstances are that this Government have invested and will

continue to invest massive resources for the development of coal industry and power generation. In respect of coal, about Rs. 750 crores have been invested after nationalisation of the coal mines and a sum of about Rs. 1,650 crores is proposed to be invested in the Five Year Plan (1978-83). In the power sector, the outlay in the current financial year will be over Rs. 2200 crores. Having regard to these massive investments, it was considered that it would be proper that the beneficiaries of these investments should contribute, in a small measure, to the national exchequer by way of Central Excise duty. The excise duty on coal is of a nominal order namely, Rs. 5 per tonne on non-coking coal which constitutes roughly 3/4th of the total coal production in the country and Rs. 7 per tonne on coking coal. The levy on electricity is only 2 paise per Kw. The base for these two levies is wide-spread that I do not expect that the impact of these levies on individual items will be more than marginal. In respect of coal, I have already exempted 1 per cent of the coal produced and cleared from the mines, in consideration of the fact that some coal is absorbed in auxiliary consumption in the collieries. In respect of electricity, I have exempted completely electricity used in auxiliary plants for the purpose of generating electricity. I have also exempted electricity generated by industrial units and other establishments for their own captive consumption. I have also given a uniform reduction of 10 per cent of the duty payable on the current generated, after deducting the auxiliary consumption, thus restricting the levy to 90 per cent. More important than these exemptions, I have exempted completely electricity which is supplied by the State Electricity Boards and others at their agricultural tariffs for use for agricultural purposes. I had also indicated in my speech in this House on the 27th April, 1978 that I propose to consider, in consultation with the concerned Ministries, the question of affording relief, wherever warranted, to power

intensive industries such as, aluminium, with a view to ensuring the availability of essential products at reasonable prices. This process has already been set in motion.

At the operational level, a number of procedural relaxations have been made in respect of electricity, having regard to its peculiar nature, method of production etc. With a view to accommodating the Electricity Boards, I have instructed the Department to permit a period of 60 days credit for the payment of duty due from them. I have also issued instructions that the duty on coal may be collected at the end of the month rather than on a daily basis.

I would also like to emphasise that the amendment recommended by the Rajya Sabha would entail sacrifice of revenue amounting to Rs. 128.20 crores on electricity and Rs. 57.37 crores on coal or, in all, Rs. 185.57 crores. This House will agree that it will not be expedient to allow the budgetary gap to be widened further. Hon'ble Members will appreciate that the abandonment of these measures will have significant impact on the resources for the new Five Year Plan.

I am, therefore, confident that the House will not accept the amendment suggested to us by the Rajya Sabha. So, I move it for consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"(i) That the following amendment recommended by Rajya Sabha in the Bill to give effect to the financial proposals of the Central Government for the financial year 1978-79, be taken into consideration:—

Amendment

Clause 36.

That at page 31, lines 1 to 6 be deleted.

(ii) That the recommendation made by Rajya Sabha be rejected."

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Idukki): Sir, I rise to make a very fervent appeal to the Finance Minister. It is very rarely that bill passed by this House

[Shri C. M. Stephen]

is returned with a recommendation. And nobody would say that the recommendation in this case has been made in a blind manner, in an arbitrary manner. There are many clauses in the Finance Bill which the Opposition in this House opposed and even brought to division, but all those items were not opposed by the Rajya Sabha. There was opposition against the Advertisement Bill. But the Rajya Sabha had approved the measure. There was opposition against the 5 per cent rise on the not otherwise mentioned items. The Rajya Sabha sustained that measure. The Rajya Sabha sustained the position. They have passed this on very very valid grounds I would appeal to the Government to consider that, not with a doggedness or stubbornness and not with an unopen mind but with an open mind. The Finance Minister after moving his Finance Bill. I am sure, has been receiving representations from almost every State producing electricity, against this levy. Now, the principal point I want to make is this. Let us not rub the States to much on the wrong side. Let us not drive them to the point of desperation. The main attack I have against the levy on the electricity is that this is an encroachment on the capacity of the States under Constitution to raise a levy, a levy which will yield substantial results subject only to the consideration of making the power available to the consumers at a reasonable level. Sir, in the Seventh Schedule, Item 53 is regarding taxes on the consumption or sale of electricity and this item is reserved for the State. Why is it that they are not imposing more? It is not because that they do not need the money, not that this will not yield more money, but because they have realised that by imposing a tax on the sale or consumption of electricity they will be increasing the burden to the consumers which will affect the industries in that area, which will effect different economic activities in that area. Therefore, subjecting this to a certain measure of sacrifice, they

forego an area from where they could collect the money, for their own development purposes. When the States have done that, here comes the Centre imposing a levy on the production of electricity. Who use the electricity? There are two aspects. One is that they have exempted the captive units and bigger industries which are producing electricity. They have no liability to pay levy at all. These industries which have captive units, produce electricity. They use the electricity produced by themselves. There is no levy. They are big fish. They are very considerably exempted from this levy. Then there are other industries, small industries, medium industries, industries which cannot afford to have a captive units. They draw electricity just from the Electricity Boards. On that excise levy is imposed. The result is that it would be passed on to the consumers. In the competition the bigger one is discriminated in favour and the others are discriminated against and the entire chain gets burdened and the state is crippled of its capacity to raise revenue from an area which is allowed to them. If the consumption cost is increased as a result of imposition of the levy then the possibility of raising tax under item 53, in exercise of powers thereunder, in the 7th schedule in the state list is wiped out. It is most unfair to the states. On the one side you tell them that they should not overdraw from the banks and you are putting the entire burden on them and increasing their economic difficulties. This will create tension between the state and the centre. I do not think there is any other levy against which there was unanimity of opposition as far as the state governments are concerned. The entire opposition in the House on the one hand, the Rajya Sabha on the other hand, the state governments on the third hand and consumers on the fourth hand, together had come out and said: please relieve us from this levy. But the Central government is stubborn and governments on the third hand and going head to have this draconian

measure. They have this idea in their head and so they are going ahead. They are initiating certain reactions and repercussions which will be disastrous for this country in the matter of centre-state relations, in the area of economic development of the states. I can only say this: do not drive the states to the point of desperation. Do not misuse your power in the union list such a manner as to deprive the states of the use of their power under the state list. That will be end of the federal functioning in this country. This is not merely a financial measure, it is a measure of serious political consequences. For heaven's sake do not stick to that. Why do we have an Upper Chamber after all? It is there to consider certain measures. If we pass some measure in a huff, they may think over the same and recommend to us certain changes. If the recommendation is treated invariably as of no value at all, why should the upper chamber be there? It would be a different case if the Upper Chamber sends out every Bill that you are passing. The Opposition has got the majority in the upper chamber. But not one Bill, except the Banking Commission Repeal Bill, the last Finance Bill, no other Bill had been returned by the Upper Chamber. They are exercising their jurisdiction with considerable discrimination and deliberation and sobriety. So when the Rajya Sabha sends it back, let us not shove it into waste paper basket. Let us give some consideration and weight to what they had to say. Therefore, I would appeal to the Finance Minister not to consider this as a prestige issue at all. If you could carry on non-chalantly with deficit finance of Rs. 1,200 crores, you could certainly allow this also to be absorbed into that cushion. Nothing disastrous will happen. Therefore, with a full sense of responsibility may I at this final stage appeal to the Finance Minister to give second thought to the whole matter and to treat this recommendation of the Rajya Sabha with the fullest respect that it legitimately deserves. With these words, I oppose the

motion of the Finance Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Members who want to speak will be allowed five minutes each because this is a matter which has been debated earlier.

SRI G. M. BANATWALLA (Ponnani): Mr. Speaker, it is heartening to note that the Rajya Sabha had returned the Bill with the recommendation that the duty on electricity and coal should be withdrawn. I am very happy that the Rajya Sabha has risen to the occasion and has made this important recommendation to this House. As you will easily recall, I had moved an amendment here on similar lines asking for the withdrawal of this duty. I had then pleaded with the Government and with the House to accept the amendment. The amendment was pressed, there was division and unfortunately it was lost.

Now, the Rajya Sabha has returned the Bill with the amendment for which it deserves all congratulations. The Lok Sabha has one more opportunity now to give its decision on the matter. On a previous occasion, I had appealed to this House to rise above all party considerations and to consider this national question above party matters. I am sure that the Finance Minister will give due thought to this proposal for duty on electricity and coal, which has been rejected by the Rajya Sabha and of which the Lok Sabha is now seized. I have risen only to reiterate my appeal to the Lok Sabha and to all the Members of this august House not to treat this as a party issue, but to take it above party level and to see that we stand by the nation in its thinking with respect to duty on coal and electricity.

It is hardly necessary for me to reiterate and recapitulate all the arguments that I have already placed before this House. It is an indisputable fact and even the hon. Minister has not disputed it that these

[Shri G. M. Banatwalla]

duties are inflationary in character. The burden will be passed on to the common people and smaller industrialists and as such will result in deterioration of the economic situation as prevalent in the country.

As far as the duty on electricity is concerned, it is well known that the duty is a duty upon the States. When Electricity is generated by the Electricity Boards, the duty is a duty upon the States. It is most unfortunate that this ill-conceived duty has come up in the Finance Bill at a time when the States are asking and pleading for more resources at their disposal. At a time when the Centre-State relations are in a state of tension with respect to more financial powers, it is rather unfortunate that the Government has come forward to tax the States themselves. It is in this view that we must give a cool thought to the duty. The duty is, I must say with all the emphasis at my command, an on-slaught on the economic authority of the States. An appeal has already been made not to rub the States on the wrong side. I am sure that the Government will consider, reconsider to have a policy of constructive cooperation rather than confrontation with the States. It is not merely a matter of the economic authority of the States, but the common people will suffer if any such duty is imposed upon such sensitive items as coal and electricity I must therefore reiterate my humble plea to this House to see to it that this duty is withdrawn.

SHRI T. A. PAI (Udipi). Mr. Speaker, Sir, we oppose both these taxation measures which are preposterous and the reasons given behind them are absolutely short-sighted. Unfortunately when the Budget is presented and the fiscal measures are suggested, it comes on party lines because we have very little chance even to make improvements. Burdened with the problem of raising resources, the Finance Minister would concentrate on one aspect of the problem, even without realising how

exactly it would affect the whole community. What are the reasons given? One reason given is that heavy investments are being made in the coal sector. And, therefore, these resources are necessary. I think we also, in our Government, planned for these investments. But we did not think of raising resources this way. If at all there are some mines, and mining activities will have to be carried on when we go into uneconomic seams of coal, to make it worthwhile coal prices might have to be increased. If the investment is made in the coal industry, it must be realized; but then the CMA must be given authority to raise the price of coal in this country the Central Government should not raise a tax and pretend that they are going to finance this coal-raising, and thus come in the way of the coal prices going up in a direct manner, you do not want to create an impression in the country that the prices are rising. So, you are levying a tax on that— which would hide the fact that the effect is the same. Coal has to play a very important part in the country's economy. We thought of a clean policy. For most of UP and Bihar, soft coke is a substitute fuel for domestic purposes; but that coal is not being produced enough. On the other hand, you are raising taxes on all this. Again, 85 per cent of the coal produced, is used by the public sector Railway alone might have to pay about Rs 19 crores, by way of these taxes. Whom are we fooling? If the public sector is going to raise its resources in order to improve coal mining in this country, this is something we should look into. Again, coal price outside, i.e. the black-market price is almost 100 per cent more; and if only the community would not mind raising the coal price, it would be all right; but it would certainly mind to-day inefficient transportation of coal. You take pride that in this country, last year, the transportation of coal by trucks has gone up by 20 per cent. As I pointed out, you are using valuable diesel to take coal 1500

mile away in this country, and in the name of using coal as a substitute for valuable oil. Something is going wrong. Therefore, I do not see where the cascading effect of this will be felt. If a taxation measure which affects the community were to bring about socio-economic transformation, there could certainly be agreement. Here, it is not going to touch the rich. It is the poorest who are going to be affected. And prices have gone up, generally, by 10 per cent. If you are now showing that some prices have come down, it is because you have imported certain things at a much higher price and you are subsidizing them. And again it will add to your deficit.

As far as power is concerned, CMA and all the public sector units owe standing balances of Rs. 60 crores to Rs. 80 crores, on which CMA has been paying 15- $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent interest to the banks. Why is this inefficiency to be financed by taxation of the people?

Now, even rural electrification will come to a standstill, because with the higher cost, I think most of the people will find it uneconomical to use. You may say it is used for agriculture. But what about all the other industries that are to go into the backward areas? If you go on exempting it, then there would be no taxes. I think it is worthwhile that the electricity boards themselves raise the electricity tariff, based on the most economic working of such boards, and not on the inefficient working—that they are indulging in.

And then, again, Railways—in order to make up this deficit—will be called upon to increase their freight rate. One thing goes after another. And, therefore, both these taxation measures are absolutely unreasonable; and I think it should not be a matter of prestige. All the suggestions that have come from the different parts of the House should be considered. And the Rajya Sabha had a greater opportunity to go into this, and they have pleaded for these exemption. And I would join my voice to it. And

I would certainly like to say that as far as deficit is concerned, the Janata Government does not believe that deficit has any meaning, because the Janata deficit is something different. Even the Prime Minister has made a statement recently that the deficit this year is not going to be as much as was presented in the Budget. When the hopes of the people have been raised, that there is not going to be a deficit, for this Rs. 100 crores or Rs. 200 crores, you can have increased profits from the industry; and you will get it by way of income tax and corporate taxes.

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN (Coimbatore): Sir, at the time of the discussion of the Finance Bill, we emphasize very much before the Finance Minister particularly the duty on electricity and its impact on small-scale industries, rural electrification etc. The State Governments also, particularly of Tamil Nadu and Kerala, have brought it to the notice of the Central Government, but it seems to have fallen into deaf ears. I do not want to repeat the points made already by my colleagues, Shri Stephen and Shri Banatwalla, but I would appeal to the Finance Minister that when you are coming again to get an endorsement of your proposal, asking for a rejection of the considered view of the Rajya Sabha, would you consider this democracy?

Yesterday much play was made of the restoration of democracy, that if there is no democracy in this country you would not be allowed to stand there and speak. Sir, when we talk of democracy, it is not mere words that we want. Democracy does not mean shooting by bullets in Pan'nagar and Bailadilla. Democracy also means that you should heed the voice. It does not mean that you allow the opposition to talk whatever they want and then do whatever you like. Further, this opposition is not only within the Lok Sabha or the Rajya Sabha. There is opposition in the States and there is opposition by

[Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan]

the common people of this country and opposition by the small-scale industries, whom you claim to encourage and support.

The small-scale industries will be hard-hit by the duty on coal and on electricity in no small measure. We have had several representations from them on this point. It is not only a question of unavailability of coal or inefficiency of the coal not reaching the small-scale industries in time. The small-scale industries which are run by electricity are also affected, because they do not get sufficient electricity.

There is a proposal in the plan of the Energy Ministry to have rural electrification. Do you think that the landless labour, the harijans, the poor peasants are going to be able to pay for your electricity when you put this duty even before you electrify the villages?

I am sorry that the Finance Minister comes with an illogical logic before this House. He asks: where do I find the resources? Where are you going to find resources for your deficit? You are prepared to face a deficit of Rs. 1,100 crores and you are asking us about a mere Rs. 149 crores. You are prepared to swallow half a dozen elephants but you want to strain at a fly or mosquito. I think you should hang down your head in shame that you could not give even this small concession to the small-scale sector.

Therefore, in the name of democracy, in the name of restoration of democracy, in the name of the poor people of our country and in the name of the States I would appeal to him that he should pay heed to the advice of Rajya Sabha, that he should pay heed to the voice of the opposition in the Lok Sabha and gracefully withdrawn this provision. We are prepared to give him permission to withdraw this provision.

श्री बसन्त साठे (अकोला) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरी यह धारणा थी कि हमारे जनता पार्टी के वित्त मंत्री और हमारे दूसरे माननीय सदस्य इस बात को जरा व्यापक दृष्टि से देखते। इसमें वाकई कोई पार्टीबाजी का सवाल नहीं आना चाहिये। मुझे याद है कि पिछली लोक सभा में टेक्सटाइल इंडस्ट्री के बारे में एक बिल आया था, और विरोधी पक्ष की ओर से कुछ सुझाव आये थे, तो हमारी पार्टी के कुछ लोगों ने उसका समर्थन किया—श्री पाई स्वयं मंत्री थे; उनको याद होगा—और हमने मंत्री महोदय को उस बात को मानने के लिए बाध्य किया।

मेरी समझ में यह नहीं आया कि क्या सचमुच ये लोग अपने दिल में यह मानते हैं कि इलेक्ट्रिसिटी पर ड्यूटी बढ़ाने से आम लोगों का फायदा होगा। कोयले पर ड्यूटी बढ़ाने से चाहे कितनी छोटी आप बतायें लेकिन उसका जो चैन रीएक्शन होता है, स्नोबॉलिंग इफेक्ट जो होता है और फिर तमाम कीमतें भिन्न भिन्न उद्योग वाले एक बहाना ले कर बढ़ाते जाते हैं कि सरकार ने टैक्स बढ़ा दिया, बिजली का खर्च बढ़ गया, हर उद्योग वाला कहता है कि बिजली का खर्चा बढ़ गया, सरकार ने टैक्स लगाया हम क्या करें, तो इस तरह से जो एक बहाना उनके हाथ में दे देते हैं उसका नुकसान उपभोक्ता को उठाना पड़ता है।

और एक बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आयी, अर्थ मंत्री जी कहते हैं कि इस टैक्स में ऐसी गुंजाइशें रखेंगे कोई व्यक्तिगत उद्योग हो खाम तो उनको एम्प्लेशन देगे, उनकी मैरिट के ऊपर कंसिडरेशन करेंगे। जहाँ आपने इस तरह से लूपहोल छोड़े वहाँ करप्शन की शुरुवात हो गई, क्योंकि आप तय करेंगे कि कौन सा उद्योग ऐसा है कि जिसके लिए एम्प्लेशन देना जरूरी है। और फिर उनके हाथ में खेलेंगे जो बड़े उद्योगों से, ऐसे उद्योगों से मिल कर एम्प्लेशन के लिए अपना केस बनायेंगे। तो मैं आपसे जानना चाहता हूँ कि 150 करोड़ का सवाल है तो जो बड़े पूंजीपतियों के ऊपर जितना सारा एरियर टैक्स का पड़ा हुआ है, 1,000 करोड़ रुपए से ज्यादा, और जो इस देश में मैंने बार बार कहा है, वित्त मंत्री जी स्वयं उन कमेटी के सदस्य थे, 20,000 करोड़ का काला धन इस देश में है, आप क्या कोशिश कर रहे हैं उसको हाथ लगाने के लिए? यह कहने से काम नहीं चलेगा कि आपने क्या किया, आपने क्या किया। हमने जो कुछ किया, 1,000 करोड़ का डेफिसिट कभी नहीं लगाया। . . . (व्यवधान) अगर अध्यक्ष जी, एक माल दलील हर तर्क को यही रहने वाली है कि आपने 30 साल में कुछ नहीं किया इसलिए अब हव झक मारेंगे, तो मैं कहता हूँ कि इस तरह से आप गड्डे में चले जायेंगे। कोई भी समझदारी की बात आप से कहे आप कहते हो कि 30 साल क्या हुआ। . . . (व्यवधान) प्रधान मंत्री जी ने खुद कहा कि 30 साल में 21 साल तो मैं था। तो इससे क्या

मतलब निकलता है। आप दलील यह दीजिए 150 करोड़ रुपये निकालने का दूसरा जरिया हो सकता है। अब 1,000 करोड़ रुपए से ज्यादा का डेफिसिट आपने रखा, पूरी पंचवर्षीय योजना में 2,200 करोड़ का डेफिसिट हुआ उसमें से 1,200 करोड़ का एक ही साल। जब इतनी आप हिम्मत कर सकते हैं और उसको आप कहते हैं कि हम निकाल लेंगे तो यह गरीबों पर बोझ बिजली और कोयले का क्यों डाल रहे हैं? मैं लोकतन्त्र की दृष्टि से, राज्यों की दृष्टि से और मैं उस राज्य से आ रहा हूँ महा-राष्ट्र जहाँ बिजली का उत्पादन उद्योगों के लिए नितांत आवश्यक होता है बम्बई में और दूसरी जगह, मैं अनुरोध करता हूँ कि कृपया इस पर विचार कीजिए और यह बोझ राज्य सरकारों पर और आम जनता पर न डालिए, इतनी समझदारी आप जरूर दिखायेंगे।

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Jadavpur): I request the hon. Finance Minister that, when he has got one more chance to consider this matter, it should be considered. It may be that at that time Government had taken it up as a very serious matter. Now, the other House has given its view. Whether that majority is temporary or not, they have utilised that majority, and it has come back to us. This is a very important matter in the sense that these are imposts which are bound to affect the ordinary people of this country. There is no good denying that. There are so many indirect taxes, so many types of indirect taxes. This is a matter which is bound to hit the common people, the ordinary traders, the small traders etc. At least Mr. Sathe was right in one thing, that this is going to be passed on to the common people. This will hit the small manufacturers who use electricity and coal. Even big ones are not going to bear them themselves. They will pass it on to the common-man. The amount is not very much. Therefore, apart from making a gesture, this is a matter which is going to help the ordinary people. There are various methods of recovering this amount which you are going to lose. Apart from arrears of taxation, obviously there are monopoly houses, there is huge accumulation of black-money. Mr. Sathe can help you in unearthing that money. We are see-

ing the preponderant effect of the blackmoney in the country where the common people of this country are the victims of that. They are untouched. You may say there are difficulties. What are the difficulties in realising the taxes, we do not know. What is the difficulty in re-structuring the income-tax rates in this country in the higher brackets, we do not know. Those are not being done. Restoration of democracy must be accompanied by appreciation or acknowledgement of the situation in this country that these people are below the poverty line and more and more people are going below the poverty line. We have seen by experience that although you have restored democratic rights in this country, the black days of emergency are over, although you have restored the freedom of speech, although you have restored even the judicial independence in this country, the freedom of the press, yet the people are getting frustrated. Why? Because their day to day problems are not being solved. Whether you accept it or not, that is for you. But this has to be understood. Therefore, I am appealing to the hon. Finance Minister and to the Government that please accept in good grace the suggestion that has come from the Rajya Sabha. All the opposition parties here are unanimous on this. I am sure, many members of your party but for the whip would have supported us. Therefore, kindly accept this. (Interruption) Whip is a necessary aberration of democracy in every country. Therefore, let us not ignore the realities of this. But I am requesting the Government to spare the poor people from these imposts and try to give them a feeling that the Government is considerate towards them.

SHRI A. C. GEORGE (Mukandapuram): Mr. Speaker, Sir, in fact, this House will be glad that the hon. Finance Minister is given an opportunity again to give due consideration to the wisdom of the elders' House to which normally he should belong

[Shri A. C. George]

though he is standing the younger Ministers dinner these days.

The Rajya Sabha has given this opportunity to this House because there are certain basic issues involved. This is not even a taxation this is an economic phenomenon of the federal imperialism because in effect, this is a taxation or in fact, this is a tribute asked to be paid to the emperor from the vassals because ultimately, 83 per cent of the energy is produced by the public sector or State Electricity Boards. Already they are in difficulties. They are finding it difficult to expand their activities to the rural areas. And the Finance Minister has taken abundant care to see that at least this financial measure will not be subject to the repressal of the industrial lobby because they have been exempted earlier itself.

This is a callous measure because, by the rural saying, this, in fact, is eating up or consuming the seed. We do it only in frustration and desperation. The power or energy is basically the seed of industrial production. His attempt or his aim at the very seed is trying to consume it.

In the State of Kerala, we are trying our level best to increase the production of electricity and we are even supplying to the neighbouring States. Those States have made a unanimous appeal through their legislature resolutions to the Finance Minister. Not only Kerala but almost all the States have come up with this appeal. But still the Finance Minister is insisting that he will tax it.

Now, if this logic is taken to extreme end, the next step of the Finance Minister will be—normally, light and water go together—to tax even the drinking water supplied by the local authorities. This is what is being led to. May I, therefore, appeal to the hon. Finance Minister to view this not as a party issue because, ultimately, we are hitting the consu-

mer? The big industries have already got an exemption.

In very many measures, we have seen in the budget proposals that the ultimate burden is carried on to the consumer. So, in the interest of the Centre-State relations, in the interest of the consumers and ultimately in the interest of increasing the industrial production in this country, I would request the hon. Finance Minister to give due thought to the appeal or the wisdom shown by the Rajya Sabha. I think, this will cut across party lines and, I hope, this tax measure will be withdrawn. As my hon. friend, Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan said, the House will be agreeable to allowing him to withdraw it.

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI H. M. PATEL): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have listened to the observations made by various hon Members with great attention. It is interesting to see what method they have of appealing to me to accept this amendment. They say, I am utterly callous and they want to appeal to me to accept this reasonable proposition. They call it "monstrous", they say, it is an illogical logic. If this is so, where is the need for any appeal to me? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VASANT SATHE: He is a most honourable man, most respectable, most reasonable and all that. We are willing to pay every encomium to him.

SHRI H. M. PATEL: How lightly they are treating this subject? He has no hesitation, in one moment, saying, I am callous and in another moment, because I point out this to him, saying, I am most honourable, most respectable, etc etc. These gentlemen have no value for the words that they use. They are utterly illogical. Not only that. They are inconsistent.

Mr. Stephen said that the Rajya Sabha was most considerate, that they only asked this levy on electricity

and coal to be rejected. I think, this House is not aware that the Rajya Sabha did want even to remove the other two taxes also, under item 68 and 5 per cent special tax. It was only fortunately or unfortunately that the Rajya Sabha in their wisdom or by pure accident, at that particular moment, did not reject those provisions also in which case otherwise the loss of revenue to me would have been much greater.

Now, the most important point of thing is this. If only all these gentlemen look back to what they had said in regard to the deficit of Rs. 1,050 crores kindly read word for word, everything—they said, what desperate and terrible consequences would follow and, today, the same gentlemen say that an addition of Rs. 187 crores will mean nothing at all, that it will have no other consequences at all (Interruption). If you only accept my judgement, as I have said before, the effect of this levy on electricity and coal will not be such as to cause any serious consequence.

Just as you have accepted my judgement in regard to Rs. 1050 crores as deficit which I can carry, so you can carry of this. I know that from your point of view I have no logic. So, this is perfectly all right

(Interruptions)

Those hon. gentlemen forget everything that they say. They argue only for a moment! It suits them just now to say that in their wisdom the Rajya Sabha has sent this and therefore we should accept this. It suits them now to say: do not consider these measures on party lines but consider them on some other lines. There is no question of considering them either on party lines or on other lines. My request is that the whole question be considered on reasonable lines and I make this suggestion because we have a very major development plan to carry through. If that development plan requires an enormous sum to be raised, 17 per cent development which

we wish to carry out this year, from where these funds have to be raised when the sixth Five Year Plan we had already discussed in this House. What is the amount that has to be raised during those five years? On whom the burden will fall? The burden will fall on the common man and on everybody else. You can say that the burden on the common man should be proportionally as little as possible. Certainly that should be the aim of any plan that we make. But when we desire that the States shall develop development projects of a massive character we have undertaken then I am afraid we have also got to accept the responsibility for making more sacrifices and accepting greater burden on ourselves which cannot just come out of nothing.

Therefore, I do appeal to this House—now I am appealing—that having accepted that it is desirable to develop and not to stand-still, having agreed that certain development projects are worthwhile and should be done, carried through, in that case, resources for those have to be found. As far as those resources are concerned, I have frankly said that because these resources are necessary I am proposing these levies

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Not at the cost of the common man

SHRI H M PATEL: They talked about the Electricity Boards and so on and so forth and even raised the spectre of Centre-State confrontation. There is no question of Centre-State confrontation. There never has been except for those who wish to create that. There may be certain differences of opinions which will always exist wherever there is democracy and wherever there is a free speech, there will be differences of opinions. Even my hon. friend, Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan, who wishes to give me gracious permission to withdraw this—but her graciousness is always there, I know. I can always rely upon that

[Shri H M Patel]

graciousness—I would appeal to her to accept the same point that it would be a desirable thing that if you want development you have to pay a price for it I would like to ask my hon friends opposite that if they were ever led to look through budget after budget and whether they had ever accepted any additional levy, everything was always said to be enormous to be very great burden which cannot be borne, it will break the back

Now I will say something about one point Mr Pai said look at this increase in prices Has he forgotten about one point? Sometimes certain uncomfortable factors tend to be forgotten But when the coal mines were nationalised I remember sitting in the Opposition and hearing Mohankumara Mangalam say that the nationalisation was necessary because private mine owners were planning to increase prices What happened after the nationalisation and what was the increase that was made within a few months? The increase was of the order of 37 per cent and the only increase that I say is that my levy—the utmost it may reach— will be not even 8 per cent I realise these burdens are necessary I quote this only to say this There are occasions when burdens have to be imposed and they have to be borne This is one of those occasions I would make this appeal to you very strongly

12 hrs

MR SPEAKER The question is

(1) That the following amendment recommended by Rajya Sabha in the Bill to give effect to the financial proposals of the Central Government for the financial year 1978-79, be taken into consideration —

Amendment

Clause 36

That at page 31, lines 1 to 6 be deleted."

The Motion was adopted.

MR SPEAKER We shall now take up the amendment recommended by the Rajya Sabha We have had enough discussion about it The question is

Clause 36

That at page 31 lines 1 to 6 be deleted

The Lok Sabha divided

Division No 4]

[12 06 hrs

AYES

Ahmed Hussain Shri
Ahsan Jafri Shri
Alagesan Shri O V
Alluri Shri Subhash Chandia Bose
Austin Dr Henry
Badri Narayan Shri A R
Balakrishnaiah Shri T
Banatwalla, Shri G M
Bairman Shri Palas
Barrow, Shri A E T
Barua Shri Bedabrata
Bhagat Rani Shri
Bhakta Shri Manoranjan
Bhuvanathan Shri G
Burande Shri Gangadhar Appa
Burman Shri Kirti Bikram Deb
Chandiappan, Shri C K
Chatterjee Shri Somnath
Chaudhuri Shri Tridib
Choudhary, Shri K B
Damani Shri S R
Damoi Shri Somjibhai
Dasappa Shri Tu'sidas
Desai, Shri Hitendra
Deshmukh, Shri Sheshrao
Dhondge, Shri Keshavrao
Doley, Shri L K

Gamit, Shri Chhitubhai
 Gawai, Shri D. G.
 George, Shri A. C.
 Gopal, Shri K.
 Hande, Shri V. G.
 Haren Bhumij, Shri
 Jaffer Sharief, Shri C. K.
 Jain, Shri Kacharulal Hemraj
 Jeyalakshmi, Shrimati V.
 Kadannappalli, Shri Ramachandran
 Kalyanasundaram, Shri M
 Karan Singh, Dr.
 Khan, Shri Ismail Hossain
 Kisku, Shri Jadunath
 Kodiyan, Shri P. K.
 Kosalram, Shri K. T.
 Krishnan, Shrimati Parvathi
 Kunhambu, Shri K.
 Lahanu Shidava Kom, Shri
 Lakkappa, Shri K.
 Lakshminarayanan, Shri M. R.
 Laskar, Shri Nihar
 Mallanna, Shri K.
 Meduri, Shri Nageswara Rao
 Murthy, Shri Kusuma Krishna
 Murthy, Shri M. V. Chandrashekhara
 Naidu, Shri P. Rajagopal
 Naik, Shri S. H.
 Nair, Shri B. K.
 Nair, Shri M. N. Govindan
 Nair, Shri N. Sreekantan
 Pai, Shri T. A.
 Parvati Devi, Shrimati
 Patil, Shri U. S.
 Poojary, Shri Janardhana
 Pradhan, Shri Amar Roy
 Pullaiah, Shri Darur
 Qureshi, Shri Mohd. Shaif
 Rajan, Shri K. A.
 Raju, Shri P. V. G.
 Ramamurthy, Shri K.
 Rangnekar, Shrimati Ahilya P.

Rao, Shri M. S. Sanjeevi
 Rao, Shri M. Satyanarayan
 Rao, Shri P. Ankineedu Prasada
 Rao, Shri P. V. Narasimha
 Ravi, Shri Vayalar
 Roy, Shri A. K.
 Roy, Shri Saugata
 Saha, Shri A. K.
 Sathe, Shri Vasant
 Satyanarayana, Shri Dionam Raju
 Sayeed, Shri P. M.
 Seyid Muhammad, Dr. V. A.
 Shankaranand, Shri B.
 Shrangare, Shri T. S.
 Stephen, Shri C. M.
 Sunna Sahib, Shri A.
 Thorat, Shri Bhausahab

NOES

Abdul Lateef, Shri
 Aghan Singh, Shri
 Amat, Shri D.
 Amin, Prof. R. K.
 Ansari, Shri Faqufr Ali
 Anif Beg, Shri
 Bairagi, Shri Jena
 Bal, Shri Pradyumna
 Balak Ram, Shri
 Balbir Singh, Chowdhry
 Baldev Prakash, Dr.
 Barakataki, Shrimati Renuka Devi
 Basappa, Shri Kondaji
 Bharat Bhushan, Shri
 Borole, Shri Yashwant
 Brij Raj Singh, Shri
 Chandan Singh, Shri
 Charan Narzary, Shri
 Chaturbhuj, Shri
 Chaturvedi, Shri Shambhu Nath
 Chaudhary, Shri Motibhai R.
 Chaudhry, Shri Ishwar
 Chauhan, Shri Bega Ram
 Chauhan, Shri Nawab Singh

Chavda, Shri K. S.
 Chowhan, Shri Bharat Singh
 Chunder, Dr Pratap Chandra
 Dandavate, Prof Madhu
 Danwe Shri Pundalik Hari
 Dasgupta, Shri K N
 Dave, Shri Anant
 Deo Shri P K
 Desai Shri Morarji
 Deshmukh, Shri Nanaji
 Deshmukh Shri Ram Prasad
 Dharma Shri Mohan
 Digvijoy Narain Singh Shri
 Durga Chand, Shri
 Dutt, Shri Ashok Krishna
 Fazlur Rehman Shri
 Ganga Bhakt Singh Shri
 Ganga Singh, Shri
 Gattani Shri R D
 Goyal Shri Krishna Kumar
 Guha Shri Samar
 Gulshan Shri Dhanna Singh
 Gupta, Shri Kanwar Lal
 Harikesh Bahadur Shri
 Hazari Shri Ram Sewak
 Heera Bhai Shri
 Hukam Ram Shri
 Jain Shri Nirmal Chandra
 Jasrotia Shri Baldev Singh
 Jeshi Dr Murl Manohar
 Kailash Prakash Shri
 Kasar Shri Amrut
 Kesharwani Shri N P
 Khalsa Shri Basant Singh
 Khan Shri Kunwar Mahmud Ali
 Khan Shri Mahmood Hasan
 Khan, Shri Mohd Shamsul Hasan
 Khurme, Shri Rinchung Khandu
 Kishore Lal, Shri
 Kureel, Shri R L
 Kushwaha, Shri Ram Naresh
 Lal, Shri S S

Mahala, Shri K. L.
 Mahi Lal, Shri
 Malik, Shri Mukhtiar Singh
 Mallick, Shri Rama Chandra
 Mangal Deo, Shri
 Mavalankar, Prof P G
 Meerza Shri Syed Kazim Ali
 Mehta Shri Prasannbhai
 Mhalgi, Shri R K
 Miri, Shri Govind Ram
 Mishra, Shri Janeshwar
 Mohd Hayat Ali, Shri
 Mondal, Dr Bijoy
 Munda Shri Govinda
 Munda Shri Karim
 Murru Father Anthony
 Nathu Singh Shri
 Nathuni Ram, Shri
 Nathwani Shri Narendra P
 Nayar Dr Sushila
 Pandey, Shri Ambika Prasad
 Paraste Shri Dalpat Singh
 Parmar Shri Natwarlal B
 Parthasarathy Shri P
 Parulekar, Shri Bapusaheb
 Paswan, Shri Ram Vilas
 Patel Shri Dharmasmhbhai
 Patel Shri H M
 Patel, Km Maniben Vallabhbai
 Patnaik, Shri Biju
 Patwary, Shri H L
 Peitin, Shri Bakin
 Pradhan, Shri Gananath
 Raghavji, Shri
 Raghu Ramaiiah, Shri K
 Rai, Shri Narmada Prasad
 Rajda, Shri Ratansinh
 Ram, Shri Ramdein
 Ram Dhan, Shri
 Ram Gopal Singh, Chaudhury
 Ram Kishan, Shri
 Ram Murti, Shri

Ramechandran, Shri P.
 Ramji Singh, Dr.
 Ramotwalia, Shri Balwant Singh
 Ranjit Singh, Shri
 Rao, Shri Jagannath
 Rathor, Dr. Bhagwan Dass
 Rodrigues, Shri Rudolph
 Saeed Murtaza, Shri
 Sahoo, Shri Ainthu
 Sai, Shri Larang
 Sai, Shri Narhari Prasad Sukhdeo
 Saini, Shri Manohar Lal
 Saksena, Prof. Shibban Lal
 Saran, Shri Daulat Ram
 Sarangi, Shri R. P.
 Sarkar, Shri S. K.
 Sarsonia, Shri Shiv Narain
 Shah, Shri D. P.
 Shah, Shri Surath Bahadur
 Shakya, Dr. Mahadeepak Singh
 Sharma, Shri Jagannath
 Sharma, Shri Yogya Datt
 Shastri, Shri Bhanu Kumar
 Shastri, Shri Y. P.
 Sheo Narain, Shri
 Shukla, Shri Chumanbhai H.
 Sukander Bakht, Shri
 Singh, Dr. B. N.
 Singha, Shri Sachindralal
 Sinha, Shri H. L. P.
 Sinha, Shri Satyendra Narayan
 Suman, Shri Ramji Lal

Suman, Shri Surendra Jha
 Suraj Bhan, Shri
 Surendra Bikram, Shri
 Surya Narain Singh, Shri
 Swamy, Dr. Subramaniam
 Tan Singh, Shri
 Tej Pratap Singh, Shri
 Tiwary, Shri Madan
 Ugrasen, Shri
 Varma, Shri Ravindra
 Verma, Shri Brijlal
 Verma, Shri Hargovind
 Verma, Shri Mritunjay Prasad
 Verma, Shri R. L. P.
 Verma, Shri Raghunath Singh
 Yadav, Shri Hukmdeo Narain
 Yadav, Shri Jagdambhi Prasad
 Yadav, Shri Ramji Lal
 Yadav, Shri Sharad
 Yadendra Dutt, Shri
 Yuvraj, Shri

MR. SPEAKER: Subject to correction, the result * of the Division is:

Ayes	—	86;
Noes	—	161.

The motion was negatived.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the recommendation made by Rajya Sabha be rejected."

The motion was adopted.

*The following Members also recorded their votes:

AYES: Shri Dajiba Desai, Shri Raga-valu Mohanarangam, Shri Mallikarjun, Shrimati Rashida Haque Chowdhary, Shri S. G. Murugaiyan, Shri M. V. Sudheeran, Shri Nanasaheb Bonde, Shri B. Rachaiah, Shri B. P. Kadam, Shri B. Devarajan, Shri K. Obul Reddy.

NOES: Shri Zulfiqarulla, Shri Purnanarayan Sinha, Shri Chandradeo Prasad, Verma, Shri Lalu Oraon, Shri Vinodbhai B. Sheth, Shri Shiv Ram Rai, Shri Ramanand Tiwary, Shri Sarat Kar, Shri Chhabiram Argal, Shri Subhash Ahuja, Shri Rasheed Masood, Shri Shyamnandan Mishra, Shri Madhu Limaye, Shri M. P. Sinha, Shri Bijoy Singh Nahar, Shrimati Chandravati, Shri Ramapati Singh, Shri Chandra Pal Singh, Shri T. S. Negi, Shri Ram Lal, Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath, Shri Padamcharna Samantashihara, Shri Sribatcha Digal, Shri R. N. Rakesh, Shrimati Rano M. Shalva, Shri Sudhir Ghosal.

Shrimati Rano M. Shetza, Shri Sudhir Ghosal

MR SPEAKER. We now go to the Confidence Motion

जी राज बिनास वास्तव (हाजीपुर) अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा पोट्टा झाक घाईर है कि जब सदन ने दे दिया बिश्वास फाइनल बिल पर तो फिर अविश्वास प्रस्ताव का क्या औचित्य है ? जब एक बार आपने क्वेश्चन तो खत्म किया, और सारी चीज खत्म हो गई, केवल अविश्वास प्रस्ताव बस चल रहा है, और सदन ने बिल बिधेयक पर अपना बिश्वास दे दिया है

MR SPEAKER There is no point of order

Shri Asoke Krishan Dutt

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Chirayinkul) Rule 353—I would like to read the rule

"No allegation of a defamatory or incriminatory nature shall be made by a member against any person unless the member has given previous intimation to the Speaker and also to the Minister concerned .

Kindly note the words

so that the Minister may be able to make an investigation into the matter for the purpose of a reply "

So, the whole purpose of this clause has been to enable the Minister to reply if an allegation is made But that does not debar a member to make any allegation against any person but it is only to enable the Minister to reply to it

Sir, governments are run by human beings and not by animals

MR SPEAKER I do not quite follow what exactly you have in mind

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI There is a proviso which is giving you a power at any time to prohibit a member from making an allegation which I am not questioning But when an hon Member speaks, he may refer to names of

government servants Here the Ministers are sitting and they represent the government and it is their duty to defend their officers because the officers are not here to defend themselves But if the name of a citizen Mr X or Mr Y or Mr. Z or whoever he may be, is mentioned, it does not seem to apply The point is that nobody is to be condemned here in his absence But Governments servants' names can be taken because the Ministers are there to defend them.

Yesterday, when I was speaking, I mentioned the name of the Private Secretary to the Prime Minister, Shri V Shankar But I find that it has been deleted in the debates. It is nothing derogatory to the dignity of the House nor is there any public interest served but I was prohibited The rule is clear It is definitely in the public interest because the office of the Prime Minister is very important It is a very vital institution where if anything goes wrong, it goes wrong in the whole nation It is our duty to mention on the floor of the House what is going on in the Prime Minister's Secretariat mentioning the name and the Prime Minister has to defend him because he is part and parcel of the government

But this clause does not seem to apply to the ordinary citizen of the country because nobody is there to defend him

Yesterday I mentioned the name of Mr Sikander Bakht He could defend himself I referred to a contract awarded against Simon Carves This is only a glaring instance of corruption I am not making any allegations Whenever we mention the name of anybody in the Prime Minister's Secretariat your staff immediately jump on their legs but I have not seen them jump on their legs when Mrs Gandhi's names was mentioned or somebody else's name was mentioned .

AN HON MEMBER Her name was mentioned a thousand times.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: My point is: they are under you and not under the Prime Minister's Secretariat. So, Sir, I want a ruling on this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: I will consider. I was not present. I will look into the matter. I cannot say anything off hand.

Shri Asoke Krishan Dutt.

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (PROP. MADHU DANDAVATE): A ruling was already given yesterday.

MR. SPEAKER: He wants me to revise it. I shall look into it. I do not want to say anything about it.

Now, Mr. Asoke Krishna Dutt.

12.14 hrs.

MOTION OF NO CONFIDENCE IN THE COUNCIL OF MINIS- TERS—contd.

MR. SPEAKER: Now we take up further consideration of the Motion of No-confidence.

Shri Asoke Krishan Dutt.

SHRI ASOKE KRISHNA DUTT (Dum Dum): When I began speaking yesterday, I had the painful necessity of saying that the hon. Leader of the Opposition has failed to make out even a *prima facie* case. It is quite understandable because for the last several months I find that my esteemed friend, Mr. Stephen, has remained indecisive. When his Party split some months ago, he first thought that Mrs. Indira Gandhi was authoritarian and he remained with the Congress. Some time later, however, he again changed sides and went over to the Cong. (I). People may doubt the political integrity behind this move but, of course, Mr. Stephen should be congratulated for his foresight. He immediately became the leader of his group and ultimately the Leader of the Opposition. What were the points that Mr. Stephen made out? He said nothing new. We have been

hearing all this throughout the Budget Session and not a single word was said either by him or anybody in the Opposition except the new developments of two small victories in the U. P. Assembly and one single victory in the U.P. Parliamentary seat. This was the only new thing, all the rest was repetition.

The leader of the Opposition began by saying that in these 13 months of Janata Rule, democratic rights were being eroded. We were losing democratic rights of protests. May I ask the hon. leader of the Opposition through you, Sir, does he in all seriousness believe what he was saying yesterday? Does he not remember what happened during the rule of the Government that went on immediately prior to the Janata Government, particularly during those 19 black months of emergency. Has not the the Janata Government restored individual rights? The leader of the Opposition or all the other members in his party or in the opposition are saying whatever they like inside this House, whatever they like outside the House and they are getting full publicity for that. What was the condition immediately prior to that? Most of the Members who are on this side of the House were in jail. Those who were outside, whenever they wanted to speak, and important meetings were called them immediately on that day. Prior to our meeting Section 144 was declared and all those people were arrested. The judiciary did not have the right of freedom. To-day a very eminent Member of the judiciary, one of the luminaries of the Supreme Court who was appointed during the regime of Mrs. Indira Gandhi frankly confesses that he did not have the courage to say at that time what he wanted to say. This was the condition that they had made and yet he says that democratic norms are being eroded now a days. Whatever speeches, either given on the floor of this august House or in any of the Assemblies of the different States, any critical statement against Mrs. Gandhi or her Government were not published in the

[Shri Asoke Krishna Dutt]

press. All that was published was that so and so also spoke. This was what was published. Is that the position to-day?

Yesterday, Hitendra Bhai Desai was quoting from the paper 'Surya'. I think it should be named 'Suraliya'. Whatever it is, it publishes what ever it likes. It publishes half truths and defamatory allegations against anybody and everybody. I ask the leader of the Opposition through you, could anybody have dared to have published like this during that period of emergency criticising Mrs. Indira Gandhi, in the manner that this paper criticises the Government to-day? Yet somebody like the hon. Hitendra Bhai Desai—when he was quoting from 'Surya' yesterday I felt that with the solemnity that he was doing it, as though he was quoting from the scriptures. He must have had reasons for this. In this paper, it is not Sanjay oovacha, but he might say Sanjay's better half was saying this. It is therefore better than the scriptures.

I will ask Hitendra Bhai Desai, does his own party colleague Shri Saugata Roy (I do not find him in the House to-day) agree with him? This very same paper from which Shri Hitendra Bhai Desai was quoting yesterday had said that Shri Saugata Roy had been carrying on a racket of selling bogus law degrees from Calcutta University and that he was taking advantage of that. He has brought a Privilege Motion against that. Here Shri Hitendra Bhai Desai comes and quotes from the same paper. I do not know the latest alignment on that side. I do not know whether Shri Hitendra Bhai Desai and Shri Saugata Roy are still in the same party.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Chirayinkil): I am on a point of order.

My point of order is now the hon. member, in the name of quoting the newspaper, made a derogatory remark against the hon. member of this House. Of course, if you allow this, I can also quote from anybody in this House.

SHRI ASOKE KRISHNA DUTT: I can lay it on the Table.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Does he own the responsibility?

MR. SPEAKER: He does not say that. He says that that paper has been publishing all sorts of news. He has said that.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: I request your ruling. Can any Member quote from any newspaper, any document, any derogatory remarks against anybody? I request your ruling on that.

MR. SPEAKER: If he quotes approvingly certainly it is wrong to do so without the permission of the House and it cannot be done. But if he quotes disapprovingly there is nothing wrong about it. If he quotes that approvingly that the allegation is true then of course it comes within the mischief of the rule. But if he quotes it as a paper, an unreliable paper, because earlier also they have published and so on.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: He never said that.

MR. SPEAKER: His whole tenor is like that. He said Mr. Desai is quoting it.

SHRI ASOKE KRISHNA DUTT: Thank you very much. What I said was that I did not believe what this paper has said. I think it has made false allegations both against Mr. Saugata Roy and also against our leader, against whom Mr. Hitendra Desai was quoting yesterday. This paper consists of only falsehood and they ought to be aware themselves—Shri Hitendra Desai ought to have verified from his own party Member Shri Saugata Roy about the authenticity of this paper, about the correctness of this paper.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Jadavpur): Don't give it importance.

AN HON. MEMBER: Ignore it.

SHRI ASOKE KRISHNA DUTT: Yesterday the hon. Leader of the

Opposition was very much elated that they have won two assembly seats in U.P.

SHRI A. C. GEORGE (Mukandapuram): He is still holding on to that paper. It is in his hands.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR (Gandhinagar): Though disapprovingly!

AN HON. MEMBER Now he has thrown it out.

SHRI ASOKE KRISHNA DUTT. Yesterday the Leader of the opposition was very much elated that they have won two assembly seats in U.P. and one Parliamentary seat in U.P. He in his speech said that there is a complete polarisation. The North was on one side and the South was on one side and they had made a great dent in the north by winning one parliamentary seat. May I ask him to recapitulate his memory about what happened in the last few months? He was talking about Karnataka and Andhra. I admit that we have lost the assembly elections in Karnataka and Andhra but have we not tremendously improved our position in the last one year? In Andhra during last parliamentary elections one year ago we had only one seat. In Karnataka—you know more than anybody else Sir,—we had only two seats and in the Assembly elections in Karnataka we bagged 59 seats and not two like them. In Andhra, we got 60 seats. What a tremendous increase! We have tremendously improved our position both in Karnataka and in Andhra. This shows that the South is also realising what a menace we had during the period of emergency over here. Much was said by the Leader of the Opposition and other Members also—every other speaker from the opposition spoke about atrocities against harijans. This harijan problem is a very serious and grave problem in this country and everyone of us is ashamed of it. This has been going on for centuries and this is a matter which should cut

across party lines and this matter should be dealt with at the national level. Yet we find,—we strongly suspect,—that some of those who always try to raise the issue over here are deliberately creating a new situation whereby the elements favouring communalism and casteism take advantage.

Sir, I will give you one instance about what happened in Banaras very recently. Our Defence Minister, Babu Jagjivan Ram had been to Banaras very recently. The manner in which he was insulted there was not only a great shame to the people who publicly insulted him but it had shamed every one of us.

May I ask the Leader of the Opposition as to who was presiding over that function? The function was presided over by a very close relative of Mr. Stephen's counterpart in the Rajya Sabha, his own brother and the whole meeting was organised by the people belonging to the Congress (I), they deliberately created this situation; they deliberately insulted him so that anger might rise and they could take advantage of it. So Sir, I would like to urge upon the Government, the Prime Minister and the Home Minister, particularly, that wherever these atrocities occur, they should not only be curbed forthwith but a thorough enquiry should also be made into it as to who are fomenting this. They are saying R.S.S.

I strongly suspect, that a coterie who has become politically frustrated is trying now to create a communal situation, the situation of casteism, whereby they can take advantage of that disastrous situation. Certain people are suffering from that and these people want to make political use of that and make that community to suffer even more for their own purpose. Sir, the Leader of the Opposition yesterday spoke.

MR. SPEAKER: Your time is up.

SHRI ASOKE KRISHNA DUTT:
Sir, yesterday, I spoke for only one minute.

MR. SPEAKER: I have got the record that you spoke for two minutes

SHRI ASOKE KRISHNA DUTT:
Even then I want five minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: No.

SHRI ASHOKE KRISHNA DUTT:
Sir the hon. Leader of, the Opposition was criticising the Foreign Policy of this Government and, yesterday throughout the debate one speaker after another from that side went on saying that this government has nothing new in regard to foreign policy; that we are following their foreign policy. I would particularly point out what was raised by the Leader of the Opposition. He was talking about Nepal, what has been done with regard to Nepal? The political treaty with Nepal and the trade agreement with them had been treated separately. Nepal is a landlocked country for a long time they demanded trade treaty with this Government and that is what they have done and it is perfectly reasonable and in order. It was what a neighbour like India should have done years ago. It was only because of the bullying tactics of the former Government that Nepal was kept suppressed like that.

Sir, our relationships with our immediate neighbours like Nepal, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka and even with Pakistan have improved and yet, the Leader of the Opposition criticised the Prime Minister about his statement regarding Sikkim.

MR. SPEAKER: Your time is up.

SHRI ASOKE KRISHNA DUTT:
I will take only two minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: No. There is a large number of speakers.

SHRI ASOKE KRISHNA DUTT:
Sir, I was interrupted all the time.

MR. SPEAKER: That does not matter.

SHRI ASOKE KRISHNA DUTT:
About Sikkim, what the Prime Minister said is perfectly correct. Sikkim is an integral part of India. The people of Sikkim wanted to come to India. This could have been done in a fair, proper and regular way. But the bullying tactics that was adopted by Mrs. Gandhi's Government had been criticised by everybody. The Prime Minister was correct to say that the procedure was wrong. We are proud for that courageous and bold statement.

I would conclude by saying that the Opposition was trying to criticise what was going on before the Shah Commission. The Leader of the Opposition said that this is vindictiveness blood-thirsty hound or something like that. He said that yesterday. I say that what the Shah Commission is doing is a great benefit to the country. Nobody would have known what happened during the 19 months. Some got puzzled.

MR. SPEAKER: Now you cannot go on like that. You must conclude.

SHRI ASOKE KRISHNA DUTT:
I will conclude by saying that all that was being done before the Shah Commission was exposing what went on during the 19 months. Many people did not know anything. I have heard many of my friends opposite, old friends, whom I know for the last 25,30 or 35 years. They are saying, "Oh, you were in jail" and they never knew all these things. How would they have known during that time? They were completely in the dark and they were completely gagged. For instance Mr. Pai was completely gagged for 19 months. Then, Shah Commission gave him an opportunity to come and tell the truth. I think that Shah Commission is not doing anything in a vindictive spirit; it is doing a great service to the country so that, in

future, a single individual or a single family or a small coterie will not have the opportunity of exploiting this great country of ours.

I think that the Opposition has completely failed to make out a case for no-confidence against this Government. And I think it should be rejected outright.

MR. SPEAKER Before I call the next speaker, it may be desirable to dispense with the lunch hour.

SOME HON'BLE MEMBERS No.

MR. SPEAKER I thought the Prime Minister has to speak in the Rajya Sabha at 5 O'clock. Then lunch hour need not be dispensed with.

रक्षा बली (श्री जगजीवन राम) : स्पीकर साहब कई सदस्यों ने यह पूछा कि यह भविष्यवाणी का प्रस्ताव कैसे ? मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि श्री स्टीवन को भी स्वयं मालूम नहीं है कि इस भविष्यवाणी के प्रस्ताव की आवश्यकता थी क्या और इसके लिए यह अवसर था क्या ? इसलिए कोई मुद्दा खड़ा करने से बे प्रसमर्थ रहे। कई सदस्यों ने स्वयं मान लिया कि इस प्रस्ताव के बारे में वे बहुत सीरियस नहीं हैं। लेकिन शायद उन जगह की परम्परा है कि हर साल एक भविष्यवाणी का प्रस्ताव लाना चाहिये सरकार के खिलाफ। उस परम्परा को निमाना नामद बिरोधी पक्ष के नेता ने अपनी एक धामक कर्तव्य समझा। इसलिए यह प्रस्ताव लाना उन्होंने आवश्यक समझा। यही बात अवसर की है। सुखे हुये नाले में बोझ भी पानी या जाग, तो उसके बूते से बाहर हो जाता है उस पानी को सभाल रखना। यही अवसर रहा। 1977 के क्रान्तिकारी परिवर्तन के पश्चात् राजस्थान में चुनाव हुये, उस नाले को पानी नसीब नहीं हुआ। हरियाणा में चुनाव हुये, वही हालत रही। उत्तर प्रदेश में चुनाव हुये, मुख्य मंत्री बड़ा पर चून कर भाये, पानी की बूब नाले में नहीं टपक सकी। बिहार में चुनाव हुये, वही हालत रही, कठ सुखे का सूखा रह गया, बाबाब निकलने की गुंजाइश नहीं हुई। अवसर मिलता कैसे ? अवसर मिला गया। उत्तर प्रदेश में दो चुनाव विधान सभा के हुये और एक चुनाव लोक सभा का हुआ। इनकी जीत हुई, लेकिन इनको ठंडे दिल से सोचना चाहिये, इतराते से कोई लाभ होने वाला नहीं है। ठंडे दिल से सोचना चाहिये कि यह बोट उनको मिला है क्या और क्या इसे बे टिका कर रख सकेंगे ? इन्हे लगा कि अवसर यही भाया है, सुखे हुये कंठ में बोझ गीसापन भाया है और इन्होंने समझा कि इस का लाभ उठा लो लेकिन जैसा मैंने पहले कहा कि मुद्दा इसके पास कुछ नहीं

था। एक ही मुद्दा है कि जनता पार्टी एक नहीं हो सकी है। इस बात को वे भूल जाते हैं कि जनता पार्टी का उदय विश्व के राजनीतिक दलों के इतिहास में एक अविनश्यक समय है। क्या यह बता सकते हैं कि इतिहास में कभी भी किसी राजनीतिक दल ने अपने औपचारिक प्राधान्य होने से पहले ही, उसने एक 92 वर्ष की गठित राजनीतिक पार्टी को उलट दिया हो। कभी विश्व के इतिहास में यह नजोर पेश कर सकेंगे कि कोई राजनीतिक दल जिसका औपचारिक तरीके से गठन न हुआ हो। तीस बरस से गठित सरकार को उलट दिया हो। जनता पार्टी ने यह उस वक्त किया जब जनता पार्टी का औपचारिक गठन नहीं हुआ था। अगर मेरे मित्र स्ट्रिफन साहब भूलें नहीं हैं तो चुनाव मार्च 1977 में हुआ था। जनता पार्टी का गठन पहली मई 1977 को हुआ था। पैदाइश के पहले मिले जुले उन राजनीतिक दलों का जमाव जो पिछले कई एक दशकों से प्राप्त में लड़ते रहे हैं, जो पिछले कई एक दशकों से एक दूसरे का परास्त करने में अपनी शक्ति लगाते रहे हैं अपना एक साथ होकर धापका उछाड़ फेंकने की शक्ति उसने धा जागूरी ? क्या आपने कभी इस पर सोचा है ? आप कह रहे हैं कि जनता पार्टी का इंटिग्रेशन नहीं हुआ है। मैं भी कहता हूँ कि नहीं हुआ है। शायद श्री वैकटासुबैया ने कोट किया था मेरी ही उक्ति से। क्या इसमें कोई आश्चर्य की बात है अगर एक साल के भीतर हम सम्पूर्ण रूप से एक नहीं हो सके तो ? आप तो तीस बरस से यह कह रहे थे, 92 बरस से यह कह रहे थे और अब भी आप हुदय पर अपनी हाथ रख कर कहें कि क्या किसी भी काल में आप एक ? आप हमको मत भूल जाएं। आप गलत समझ रहे हैं। मैं आपकी बता रहा हूँ कि आप भी जो कर रहे थे वह एक राजनीतिक पार्टी के लिए करना लाजिमी था। हमारे यहाँ जो हो रहा है वह भी लाजिमी है। लेकिन आप जिन बात की कल्पना कर रहे हैं वह प्रभान की शान्ति की कल्पना है। आपकी सत्ता जब तक जीवित सत्ता थी तब तक विचारों का टकराव वहाँ भी होता रहा। जनता पार्टी की एक जीवित सत्ता है। जब तक सोचने वाले लोग यहाँ रहेंगे विचारों का टकराव होगा। उससे आप यह न समझ लें कि आपकी लाश होने वाला है। अगर आपने ऐसी आशा बांधी है तो आपके हुदय के लिए मुझे चिन्ता है और आपको भारी निराशा होगी। मैं सबसे हमारे पास में और इसलिए मैं कि यहाँ सोचने वाले लोग हैं। चुनाव के पूर्व मैंने कहा था कि आपने तो सोचने का काम एक ही व्यक्ति के सुपुर्न कर दिया है।

एक मामूली सत्त्व धरती भी।

श्री जगजीवन राम हितेन्द्र भार्गव ने कुछ सोचने का काम किया था। सात का साथ नहीं दिया, पर बहुत की बातों को प्रामाणिक मान लिया। इससे ज्यादा टिप्पणी की आवश्यकता नहीं है। हितेन्द्र भार्गव की उम्र ऐसी हो गई है।

[श्री जयजीवन राम]

ऐसा अगर उन्होंने किया तो उसमें कोई धर मंगलिय नहीं है।

हरिजनों और दूसरे कमजोर वर्गों के ऊपर होने वाले अत्याचारों और भ्रष्टाचारों की बात भी कही गई है। ठीके मिल से लोगों को छाप इस समस्या पर। क्या यह भारतीय समाज में एक नई समस्या खड़ी हुई है? क्या कांग्रेस के शासन में जो बटनाए गाजीपुर में हुई थीं बांदा में हुई थीं, और कितने स्थानों पर हुई थी, उन्हें छाप धन गये? इन वर्गों में ऊपर होने वाले अत्याचार की ये बटनाए किसी राजनीतिक समस्या का ही नहीं सम्पूर्ण भारतीय समाज का सिर झुका देने के लिए काफी थी।

कुछ ऐसी समस्याएँ हैं जो राष्ट्रीय समस्याएँ हैं और जो समस्याएँ छाप जब शासन में थे, जहाँ थी, वे समस्याएँ छाप भी नहीं हैं। हम छापको उठाहना बेकार के या आपके ऊपर उछाल करके सोचें कि समस्या का समाधान हो जाएगा, या छाप हमारे ऊपर उछाल कर वह दें कि समाधान हो जाएगा तो इससे समस्या का समाधान होने वाला नहीं है। कुछ समस्याएँ राष्ट्रीय समस्याएँ होती हैं और उनके समाधान के लिए राष्ट्रीय प्रयत्न की आवश्यकता होती है। क्या छाप राष्ट्र से भ्रमण है? क्या आपने अभी तक यह नहीं सोचा है कि इस राष्ट्रीय प्रयत्न में हमको भी शामिल होना है? हम सामाजिक कोष्ठ पर, इस समस्या पर हमें एक राष्ट्रीय दृष्टिकोण से पहुँचना पड़ेगा।

इसमें कोई संदेह नहीं है कि जब कोई उत्पीड़ित समाज अपने उत्पीड़न का भ्रम करने के लिए ब्रह्मा होता है, कोई शोषित समाज अपने शोषण का भ्रम करने के लिए ब्रह्मा होता है तो निहित स्वार्थ ऐसा प्रयत्न करना है कि उनका भ्रम न हो। यह निहित स्वार्थ इस प्रयत्न में उत्पीड़न और शोषण को बढ़ावा देता है कि ब्रह्मा उत्पीड़न करने से शोषित वर्ग की कल्पना खरब हो जाए। यह समाज के लिए सुलझा है कि जनता पार्टी के उत्तेजन पैदा कर दो है कि समाज के सबसे पीछे समुदाय भी भाग अपने की मुक्त करने का प्रयत्न कर रहे हैं। क्या यह राष्ट्रीय हित का तकाबा नहीं है कि छाप भी उसमें हाथ बटावें? यह बर्नीय समस्या नहीं है। कुछ राष्ट्रीय प्रश्न होते हैं जिनमें हमको और आपको दोनों की साथ देना पड़ता है। अब ये प्रश्न बाहेर हरिजनों का हो या विधायियों का हो।

क्या आपके जमाने में युनिवर्सिटीज गन्द नहीं होती थी। युनिवर्सिटीयों का बन्द होना, विद्याधियों का पढ़ाई छोड़ करके आन्दोलन के काम में लग जाना, हमारे और आपके लिए, दोनों के लिए चिन्ता की बात है। यह बड़ी पीढ़ी है जिसके ऊपर राष्ट्र की जिम्मेदारी धाने वाली है। क्या इसके लिए हमें और आपको, दोनों की चिन्ता नहीं करनी है। क्या हमें और आपको यह

नहीं सोचना है कि यह पीढ़ी, जिसको देश का राजनीतिक नेतृत्व करना है, समाज का नेतृत्व करना है, धार्मिक व्यवस्था का नेतृत्व करना है, देश के सभी नेतृत्व जिसके कर्तों पर धाने वाले हैं, यह धाम क्यों क्यों है? क्या कुछ पीढ़ी की की खाई हम दोनों के बीच में है? यह बात हमको और आपको दोनों की साझी पड़ेगी क्योंकि यह देश का प्रश्न नहीं है राष्ट्रीय प्रश्न है और राष्ट्रीय प्रश्न के समाधान में हमों के हित को नीचे धका कर धाने बढ़ना होता है बर्नीय हित से ऊपर उठना पड़ता है। मैं आपसे यही कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह आपके लिए भी चिन्ता की बात है और हमारे लिए भी चिन्ता की बात है।

ठीक इसी तरह से आपने अधिकारी की बात कही। ठीक है। इसे यदि मैं टाउनन बाहूँ तो कह सकता हूँ कि 19 महीने से बड़े ध, भ्रष्टाचार निग्रह के बाय भूषण धाया। लेकिन समस्या का इतना सरल समाधान करना ठीक नहीं होगा। हमारे यहाँ सामाजिक और धार्मिक व्यवस्थाएँ जो परम्पराओं से चली आ रही हैं उनमें धामूल परिवर्तन की आवश्यकता है। हमें सोचना होगा कि क्या हम निहित स्वार्थों को बरकरार रखना चाहते हैं या जिनको उनसे परेशानी है, उस पर हमारी की मिटाना चाहते हैं? समाज और देश के सभी प्रमुख लोगों का यह काम हो जाता है कि यह या प्रतिबोलीता धायी है इसक बरण को हम तेज करे और पुरानी परम्पराओं की मिटाने में सहयोगी बनें। इस बात को भी मत भ्रमण कि जनता पार्टी जब यह प्रयत्न कर रही है कि भारतीय समाज को परम्परागत समाज से निकाल कर, धार्मिक समाज से मे धावें देविज्ञानन सोसायटी की मोड़में सोमायटी से परिर्वातित कर दें। तो निहित स्वार्थ वालों का हमसे नापराज ला, नाबुल होना अवश्यम्भावी है। मैं नहीं समझत। कि छाप का पिछले कई एक दमक से प्रगतिशील राजनीतिक संस्था होने का दावा करते रहे हैं और मुझे कहने में विचकिचाहट भी नहीं है कि आपके कई एक प्रस्ताव प्रगतिशील रहे हैं, हालाँकि उस पर कावन्धन करने में आपके बरण उतनी ही तेजी से नहीं चल पाये थे। छाप के उम्मीद की जाएगी कि आपकी धाराय निहित स्वार्थों की धाराय में नहीं मिलेगी जो प्रगतिशील समाज का निर्माण करना चाहते हैं उनकी धाराय में मिलेगी। अभी भी आपसे कुछ धारा है।

एक मानवीय व्यवस्था बेकार है यह।

श्री जयजीवन राम इसलिए उम्मीद है कि छाप खंडित होते जा रहे हैं। और एक खंडित व्यक्तित्व से क्या धारा की जा सकती है उसनी ही धारा हम भी आपसे करते हैं। अब हम आपकी तरफ वेबें स्टीपन की या हिलेन बाई की तरफ देखें। डॉ० कर्ण सिंह नहीं हैं, उन्होंने अपने व्यक्तित्व निहित स्वार्थों को बल्लेसार किया है। ब्रह्मा होता स्टीपन भी, छाप की उनके साथ चलते। मैं आपके लिए सुझावना रखता हूँ

इसलिए कि जनता पार्टी देश में एक स्वस्थ प्रजा-
तन्त्र व्यवस्था को नष्ट करने का प्रयास कर रही है, और
प्रजातन्त्र की परम्परा को स्वस्थ बनाने के लिए
एक स्वस्थ विरोध पक्ष की आवश्यकता होती है।
इसलिए मैंने मुझसे कहा है कि जिसमें आप
स्वस्थ विरोध पक्ष बन सकें। विरोध पक्ष का काम
प्रजातन्त्र में विचार के विनिमय से देश का कल्याण
करना होता है। विचार का विनिमय राष्ट्रीय हित
को सर्वोपरि रख कर करना पड़ता है। राज-
नीति के इस साधारण तथ्य को समझाने के लिये
मैंने कहा रहा हूँ, बल्कि विचार की सम्प्रीकता को
कुछ सुधन बनाने के लिए कहा रहा हूँ।
आपने और सत्ताशक्त पक्ष में विवाद हो, लेकिन
स्वस्थ विचार हो। और आप स्वयं अपने हृदय
में स्वस्थ हो जायें कि आप स्वस्थ विचार उठा
रहे हैं। कल से आज तक मुझे लगा आपके हृदय
में स्वयं विश्वास नहीं है कि आप स्वस्थ विचार
उठा रहे हैं।

श्री सुरत बहादुर शाह (बेरी) : ईश्वर इनकी
आत्मा को शांति दे।

श्री कमलजीवन राव : जहाँ तक मैंने उनकी
आत्मा को समझा है उनकी आत्मा स्वयं में प्रभाव
है।

श्री काबिलेन बल (जौनपुर) : इसलिए प्रभाव
इनको शांति दे।

श्री कौशल राव (बैरकपुर) : और जनता पार्टी
को धन्यवाद दे।

श्री कमलजीवन राव : दोनों को।

श्री कुल० लाल नारायण राव (करीमनगर) :
प्रमोदमैट ऐकसेटेंड।

श्री कमलजीवन राव : मेरा प्रमोदमैट बही है।
मैं ज्यादा समय नहीं लेना चाहता। आपने
स्वयं जिस वक्त इस प्रतिश्ठा प्रस्ताव को लेना
आपको परोखा नहीं था वैसे होने के वक्त कि
दिवेन्द्र साहू श्री आपके साथ खड़े हो सकेंगे।
और सच में ऐसा होगा या न। कर्न सिंह बड़े हुये
तो भावा ही बड़े हुये।

एक मामलीय सवाल : नहीं बड़े हुये थे।

श्री कमलजीवन राव : ठीक है, नहीं बड़े हुये थे।
लेकिन कभी कभी आपसक नहीं होता है कि सही
मुरा ही कौनों को धाकवित करे। कभी कभी
गलत मुरा ही धाकवित कर लेते हैं। इसलिए
वह धाकवित हो गये, बड़े हो गये, प्रतिश्ठा
का प्रस्ताव आ गया।

जिसकी बातें आपने उठाई हैं, मैं उनको दोह-
राना नहीं चाहता, और न सक्ता बनाव देना
चाहता हूँ। कहीं सब बातें हैं, जो सच की वक्त

के अवसर पर, और और की वक्त के अवसर
पर, दोहराई गई हैं, और सबको ने उनका बनाव
दिया है। मैं उन बातों को दोहराना नहीं
चाहता।

लेकिन मैं आपको सिर्फ इतना स्मरण कराना
चाहता हूँ कि डेमोक्रेसी में, प्रजातन्त्र में, विरोधी
पक्ष का भी उत्तरदायित्व होता है। उस उत्तर-
दायित्व के प्रति आप जागरूक हैं, मैं ऐसा विश्वास
करके बसता हूँ। मैं आपके उत्तरदायित्व के प्रति
आपको जागरूक कराऊँ, ऐसी बृष्टता मैं नहीं
करना। आप कर सकते हैं। विरोधी पक्ष को
यह सुधीता पड़ता है कि हमेशा कोशिश करे कि
सरकार वालों के काम रूँट दे। लेकिन मैं ऐसी
बृष्टता नहीं करना कि आपके कान रूँट। मगर
आप ऐसे सुझाव दें, जिससे देश का कल्याण और
साम हो सके। धासोचना के लिए धासोचना
करना प्रजातन्त्र के लिए उपयोगी नहीं होता है।
प्रजातन्त्र का सक्ता है कि निर्माण के लिए
धासोचना की जाये, और यही धासा मैं आपसे
करता हूँ।

आप स्वयं यह मान कर बने हैं कि आपके
प्रतिश्ठा-प्रस्ताव में कोई मुरा नहीं है। एक कदम
आगे बढ़े और कहें कि सच में मुझे के इस प्रतिश्ठा
प्रस्ताव को मैं आपसे लेता हूँ।

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND
(Chikkodi): Mr Speaker, I rise to
support the No Confidence motion
moved by my leader on this side. I
was really disappointed to hear
Babuji to-day on the issue. We ex-
pected something much more from
him mouth... (Interruptions) that
is, the kind of opinions which he is
expressing outside Parliament on
some occasions. May I ask the Prime
Minister, who is present here, to put
his hand on his heart and say whe-
ther all is well with his Government?
How can I say that the Government
which is disunited, which has got
distrust against each other, which has
no confidence in each other and
which, in spite of the dinner diplo-
macy that he played, is united? What
picture are a they giving to the
country? Are they united? They are
scared to see each other's face, both
within this House and outside. What
hope and confidence can this Govern-
ment give to the country?

I remember that when there was a
debate going on in this House and
criticisms were being showered on the

[Shri B. Shankaranand]

Home Minister, there was a demand—not from this side, but from the other—"Why not a Harijan Minister be made the Home Minister?". And I remember the Prime Minister got up and said: "I was also the Home Minister. I know how to rule the country." And he defended Home Minister. But I want to tell the respected Babuji: "Whatever amount of praise you may shower on the Janata Government and the Janata Party's performances they are not going to make you the Home Minister or Prime Minister of this country. That is certain." I am making a little more plain speaking. I know you are all against a harijan leader becoming the Prime Minister and that is why I am repeating... (Interruptions) All of you are opposed to Babuji becoming the Prime Minister or the Home Minister. That is the reason why I am mentioning this... (Interruptions) We were listening patiently when you were all talking.

(Interruptions)

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: When Shri Patnaik spoke, he described us as sycophant and so on and we kept quiet. But now we find that these friends cannot tolerate even the slightest criticism. Then how can we function here? The wildest allegations were made against us and we kept quiet.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Members may kindly note that freedom of speech does not mean merely exercising it ourselves. We must protect the freedom of speech of others also.

SHRI A. C. GEORGE: Sir, Babuji referred to the physical deformity of Dr. Karan Singh, which was hitting below the belt. It was very unfair. Still, we kept quiet... (Interruptions)

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: They have got a majority inside the House. But can they honestly tell us that they hold the same majority outside this House, as they did in 1977? Their

majority is dwindling and the result is being seen in the UP by-elections. You cannot forget that.

May I ask the Prime Minister one simple question? I will ask the same question of other responsible members of the Government. Whom have you served during the one year of your regime? Are the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes happy with you? Are they feeling secure under your administration? Can you honestly tell us that you have done justice to them? Are the minorities feeling secure at your hands? Are the workers, the farmer, or the labourers happy? Whom have you satisfied? Do not forget that when there was a discussion here on the atrocities committed on harijans, even members of the Janata Party asked you to quit. It has gone on record... (Interruptions)

What do we see in the country today? Laws are being flouted and decencies are being violated in the name of freedom. One is left to wonder whether the Government remains inefficient in the name of the freedom of expression. There are instances of strikes and labour growing increasingly restive. Go slow and work stoppages are becoming not infrequent, making the life of the common man even more difficult. Already the common man is harassed by rising prices, contemptuous traders, inadequate transport, inefficient and ruthless administrative officers, frequent breakdown of electricity and water supply etc.

Is there any part of the country now living in peace? Right from Kutch to Assam, Kashmir to Kanyakumari, is there any part of the country which is peaceful and progressive?

AN HON. MEMBER: Karnataka.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: The people of this country are now on the side of disunity and not unity. I am

very sorry that this no confidence motion is being taken very lightly. I warn this Government that a no confidence motion is never treated lightly either by the opposition or the ruling party.

MR. SPEAKER: You may continue after lunch.

13 hrs.

The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch till Fourteen of the Clock.

The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch at five minutes past Fourteen of the Clock

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

MEMBER SWORN

Shrimati Mohsina Kidwai (Azamgarh)—

MOTION OF NO CONFIDENCE IN THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS— Contd.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Shankaranand to continue his speech.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): Sir, I want to make a submission. Today, in the List of Business, there is nothing but this No-Confidence Motion and the House is expected to continue till 6 O'Clock. May I request you that the time may be adjusted accordingly? We want to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: It is not possible. The Prime Minister has to go to the other House.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: A little time may be given to us.

MR. SPEAKER: No please; it is not possible.

SHRI A. K. ROY (Dhanbad): My submission is that Unattached members should be given some time.

MR. SPEAKER: One of the Unattached members has already spoken.

Practically, we have given time to two Independent members.

Shri Shankaranand to continue.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: Sir, I was just telling this House that if you look to the countryside, what we see is complete deterioration of law and order. There are robberies, dacoities, atrocities, crimes, all these things, increasing every day. Not only this House but the President of this country has also expressed his concern. This is what the President of India said when he was addressing at the All-India Institute of Medical Sciences. I quote:

"I would like to express my distress at the state of health of the country. Whether it is people being killed in Hyderabad, Amritsar or elsewhere, this is a concrete illness which is more than what institutes like this can cure."

He, further, said:

"I wonder where we are going. I myself do not know and I happen to be the President. I want Mr Raj Narain to convey my grief to other members of the Cabinet."

I do not know whether he has conveyed it to the Prime Minister and his Cabinet colleagues. It is reported:

"The President said that he was appealing as a helpless spectator to all political parties to think carefully before they do anything, because, if the seeds we sow today are poisonous, we will have to reap them tomorrow and what future can we offer to the younger generation."

Again, I quote:

"In the meanwhile, the secretary of the National Federation of Indian Women in a statement expressed concern at the breakdown in law and order in various parts of the country and, particularly, the news of molestation of women in Madhya Pradesh and Tamil Nadu."

[Shri B. Shankaranand]

It said: a Government which could not protect its women should resign immediately. May I ask the Prime Minister who is a Gandhian, who values the values of life, whether he is really happy with the team that he is having? Do they repose confidence in him as the Prime Minister? We are really very sorry that the Prime Minister of this country is being described by the Press as being no longer the Prime Minister but a convenor. It is a shame to this country, not only to the Janata Party. We know Mr. Morarjibhai is an ablest administrator, is a truthful leader. But I do not know what has happened to his party and his capacity.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is due to a wrong company.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND. The whole problem is that of his Ministers and not the Opposition Party. It shows that the Janata Party is punishing him with that company. He has his own problems, the problem of Mr. Charan Singh, the problem of Mr. Raj Narain, the problem of Mr. George Fernandes, the problem of Mr. Jagjivan Ram, the problem of Mr. Shyamnandan Mishra, everybody, everyone, each Minister is creating a headache for him.

SHRI M. SATYANARAYAN RAO (Karimnagar): The problem of Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: I do not know about it. It is a pity. He has no time to apply his mind to the problems of his country. I do not know whether the Janata Party or the Government has understood the problems of Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu. The marxists of this country are fattening themselves on the pasture of the Janata Party. I do not know whether they know it. They are praising the Janata Party. They do not want to talk anything else because they know that the Janata Party are committing the mistakes and they want to grow stronger by their mistakes. That is

the reason why they are praising the Janata Party, not for love but for their own gains. But I do not know whether Mr. Morarji knows the tricks of the Marxist Party. That is how their leader yesterday spoke. Mr. Samar Mukherjee, said: we are not concerned with the No Confidence Motion. But still he chartered one, two, three, four or so many things against the Janata Party. That is their wonderful strategy.

I have very little time at my disposal and I have to tell so many things. Mr. Morarji Desai and the Janata friends on the other side think that only Mr. Stephen, the Leader of the Congress I and Mr. Hitendra Desai the Congress Leader have brought this No Confidence Motion. How can they forget that first their own people have brought this and expressed their no confidence in them? I quote Mr. Biju Patnaik first. You listen to what he has said. It is reported in *The Times of India*, dated 11th May, 1978. The headline is: "Trinity must pack up or quit: Biju". I quote. "The trinity—Mr. Morarji Desai, Mr. Charan Singh and Mr. Jagjivan Ram—must either make up their differences or quit. If neither happens, the Janata Party will break up." "This was how the Steel and Mines Minister, Mr. Biju Patnaik, one of the stalwarts of the Janata Party who had been a leading light of the Congress reacted to the party's defeat in the by-elections in Uttar Pradesh". I quote Mr. Biju Patnaik. He says: "It is surprising that in spite of the open fighting among the constituents of the Janata Party in U.P., its candidate could poll the votes he did." They said that Janata Party could get so many votes. Your own Cabinet Minister is saying this.

The next is Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee's threat one month ago. The External Affairs Minister, Shri A. B. Vajpayee, has said that "things are not going well; if the Government does not perform well, if we do not correct ourselves, within three months I will resign". He is waiting for another two months,

AN HON. MEMBER: Dr. Subramaniam Swamy is also waiting.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: Dr. Subramaniam Swamy is different.

Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee himself has said that things are not going well and if they failed to correct themselves, he will resign. Is it not an expression of no-confidence?

The next is Mr. Madhu Limaye's attack on his own Party. This is what has appeared in *Navasakti*, a Marathi daily. I quote,

(Quoted in Marathi)

He was addressing in Sunderbhai Hall in Bombay. He says, 'I have given up my silence...Yesterday only the Janata Party completed one year.' He further says, 'The people are restless after the one year rule of Janata Party in the country; people are restless, people are not happy.' He further says, 'People are not interested in who becomes the Minister; people are interested in how they are being ruled and what they are getting.' He has stated in this speech that the Janata Government is not performing well, it has not done what it promised when it came to power; this sort of thing between Janata Party and Government will not go on. That is the main gist of it. Is it not expression of no-confidence?

The next is Mr. Charan Singh's letter of resignation. The Home Minister, a leader of the Janata, himself has expressed no-confidence in you. I will quote. It is reported in the *Hindu* dated the 30th April, 1978:

"He makes this point in his letter of resignation from the Janata Parliamentary Board and the National Executive. The letter concludes thus:

'A party whose leadership is not inspired by truth, justice or public interest can never deliver the goods or render any service to the people. You may treat this letter as my resignation from the

National Executive of the Janata Party and the Parliamentary Board."

Is this not expression of no-confidence?

Many Harijan Janata MPs spoke in the House an atrocities. Have they not expressed no-confidence in this Government when they spoke? They have said that the Government should quit.

Shri Jagjivan Ram himself has said today that there is no cohesion in his Party. He does not know that nobody trusts him. He believes that everybody trusts him. That is the fun. J.P. himself has expressed no confidence in this Government. It is reported in the *Sunday Statesman* dated 7th May that, about the Janata Party, Mr. Narayan said:

"It is again said to note that the ruling party is behaving like a loose federation of so many smaller parties. In fact, it is very difficult for me to say what the Janata ideology is. And worse, there is a big gap in what they say and what they do."

The great person who was responsible for the creation of this Party which came to power himself says he has no faith in this Party and this Government. What else do you want? Members on that side say 'Oh, Mr. Stephen has brought this motion only for the sake of politics'. Don't deceive yourselves. If you smile here, that everything is well with the Party and the Government, you are exercising self-deception and your self-deception is going to ruin this country. For that, we are concerned, and for that, we have brought this No Confidence Motion.

So, I support this No Confidence Motion.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR (Trivandrum): Mr. Speaker, Sir, you were very closely following the debate on this motion and I believe you will agree that there is much truth in

[Shri M. N. Govindan Nair]

what each spoke about the other. Now, the ruling Party—the Janata Party—was accusing the Congress and Congress(I) of excesses during the Emergency and the Leader of the Opposition put forward a number of charges against the ruling Party. So, the picture that emerges from this is that the country and the people were caught between the devil and the deep sea. The escape from the frying pan of the Emergency, they plunged into the fire of the Janata rule.

I was very much pained to hear the speech of the Hon. Minister Shri Jagjivan Ram. The complacent manner in which he spoke and the way in which he retorted all do credit to him as a good Parliamentarian. But, I ask 'what was the performance of the Janata Party?'. More than a thousand lives of Harijans have been lost in one year, by murder. Hundreds of women were raped and overall lakh of people were dispossessed of the land they had. Then, untouchability has been evoked and a ban was imposed on Harijans walking along roads. Are all these matters of no concern? Well, Sir, for this, there was jubilation on the part of the Opposition; And they were hoping that this is an opportunity for a come-back of Indira. Coming back of Indira Gandhi is no solution to the problem because, for all that has happened, they are also to share the blame. What happened in Hyderabad? What happened in Andhra? What happened in Varanasi? Their hands are also not clean. Therefore, the only solution, according to me, as far as this section of the people are concerned, is Gandhiji. Before he took up the leadership of the freedom struggle against racial discrimination, Gandhiji organised a non-violent revolt. That is the way for the Harijans, the Scheduled Castes and the oppressed sections in this country to rise up in militant revolt for resistance. Of course, there are 140–150 million Scheduled Caste people in this country of which, I believe, at least 100 million

people are able-bodied men and women. If 100 people at the rate of one from a million come forward and launch a peaceful resistance, this problem will be solved. There is no other solution. Again, during this one year, more than 400 workers have been murdered, have been fired and have been killed.. (Interruptions)

SHRI B. RACHAIAH (Chamrajnagar): They have no patience to hear. . .

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: I am not going into all those details. (Interruptions)

MR SPEAKER: Is a running commentary necessary at all?

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Not only that, I do not understand this comment also because I do not know Hindi. Why should he interrupt... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Kindly resume your seat.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Kindly talk in a language which I understand, if you want me to understand. Otherwise, you sit quiet.

Now, 300 workers were killed by police firing during this one year. For them also there is only one solution. Trade unions are an organized force in this country. The trade union rights were got after many a heroic struggle by the workers costing many lives. So, I would appeal to them to take up the cause of the right of the workers to agitate till this kind of killing ends.

Now, on your shoulders Mr. Speaker rests the responsibility of safeguarding the sovereignty of this House. I request you to ponder over what has happened during this one year in this House. Are we a debating society or are we a sovereign body? We raised the question of Belchi. What was the answer? All over the country, attack on the Harijans...

SHRI YADVENDRA DUTT (Jaunpur): What happened in Tamil Nadu in 1968?

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: We raised the question of Kanpur. But

what was the result? Bailadilla. There, not only the workers were shot dead but over a thousand huts were burnt and all their properties destroyed...

SHRI A. C. GEORGE: Shri Biju Patnaik's work.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: We spoke about and discussed in this House about Sambhal. What was the reply? Hyderabad. We spoke about Pantnagar. What was the next answer? Agra...

AN HON. MEMBER: You raised Agra...

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: I am quoting all this because on all these issues, most of the Members from all sides spoke against these incidents. I considered it a mandate of this House that this kind of atrocities was stopped. Was there a government here to heed to this? You say there is a government. Yes, there is. When the bell tolls, I am quite sure all the members will come in, and "Oh", at that time there is unity. Now, is there a Cabinet? The Prime Minister is in one direction, the Home Minister from the Intensive Care ward of the Medical Hospital in another direction. I am not going into all these things. It is their affair. But I appeal to you to safeguard the sovereignty of this House. I appeal to you to see that the will of this House is implemented by a government here...

THE MINISTER OF STEEL AND MINES (SHRI BIJU PATNAIK): It is always implemented.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: I know that you are a champion who wants to foster parliamentary democracy in this country. But make it meaningful. But if you restrict democracy and democratic rights only to parliamentarians, only to political parties and leaders and leave the ordinary people outside the pale of democracy, parliamentary democracy in this country will be doomed...

AN HON. MEMBER: A limited company.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: There is another thing. We speak about equality and all that, economic equality and all that. I have no time to go into all those things. But the other day I was astounded to hear the atrocious distortion of our Prime Minister about Gandhian economics, in defence of the monopoly capital. I will not go into all those things because there is no time. But I appeal to you that if you want this parliamentary democracy in this country to survive, then let this right enshrined in this constitution for the entire people of this country not merely remain on paper but in actual life they should be able to enjoy.

We raised the question of the basic right to work. In Pantnagar we requested you to withdraw the PAC from there. We requested you to recognize the union there. We requested you to negotiate with them and settle the matter there. We requested you to extend the judicial inquiry so that the doings of the Vice-Chancellor may be brought within the ambit. Many days have passed. Is it that the government has not taken note of it. There was a general demand from the people, from many members here and outside this House, that a judicial inquiry should be instituted into the firing in Agra. Well there also it is a basic right.

What is the meaning of your laughing. You should be ashamed.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS (SHRI SHEO NARAIN): You should be ashamed for the repetition.

SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR: Fifty years ago in my State we had to lead struggles for permission for the Scheduled Caste people to work along roads near the temple. I do not know whether he remembers about Vaikom Satyagrah. Even today, in 1978, are we to repeat it after independence?

[Shri M. N. Govindan Nair]

Now, in my humble submission, I make four demands—

1. Immediate judicial enquiry regarding the frings and happenings at Agra.

2. Withdrawal of PAC from the Pantnagar University, bringing the activities of the Vice Chancellor under judicial enquiry.

3. Recognition of the Union and negotiated settlement of the issue thereby.

If that is done (Interruptions) by the end of this month, I am not giving an ultimatum or anything, from the agony of my heart I say that I will go on hunger strike before the Prime Minister.

श्री राय बिलास पावनाथ (हाजीपुर) अध्यक्ष महोदय, आज सुबह ही मैंने अपना प्लाइट आफ आर्रेर उठाते हुये कहा था कि अब एक बार कार्गिलें बिल पर आपने अपनी शक्ति प्रदर्शित कर ली, जिस से आपको मात्र 64 मत मिले, उसके बंद फिर नो-कॉन्फिडेंस-मोशन का कोई भीपर्य नहीं रह जाता है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, जबसे इस देश में पार्लियामेण्टी सिस्टम शुरू हुई है, यह 19वां नो-कॉन्फिडेंस मोशन है। मुझे बड़े प्रफेसन के साथ कहना पड़ रहा है कि कम जब स्टीफन साहब ने बड़े जोर से इस मोशन को मूव किया, तो मैं समझता हूँ कि उनके विचार में यह बात रही होगी कि अब पहले इस तरह का मोशन मूव होगा या और सरकार नहीं चाहती थी कि उस पर बहुत हो, और तरह-तरह की प्रतिक्रिया उस पर की जाती थी, साथ ही स्थिति इस बार भी खड़ी, लेकिन जब प्रधान मंत्री जी ने कह दिया कि मैं एक मिनेट भी धरप-मुत मे नहीं रहना चाहता हूँ, इस लिए इस पर तुल्य बहुत शुरू हो जाय—उस समय बिरोधी बल के लोगों के पीछे देखने लायक थे, वे कतरा रहे थे, कोई ऐसा प्लाइट खींच रहे थे जिससे किसी तरह से इसका समय बड़ जाये। वह अपने आप से इस बात का खोतक है कि आप इसके लिए हँसा नहीं थे, आप चाहते थे कि किसी तरह से यह टल जाय।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस समय से एक नया प्रश्न भी हूँ—जब पहली बार इस सदन में 1963 में इमिग्रेशन प्रस्ताव आया, उसे भी कुलसभा की भावे से, उस समय की सरकार के जो कार्यक्रम थे, उनकी कमिटी को सामने रखने के लिए उन्होंने

यह प्रस्ताव देना किया था। उस समय बीच के समय की कुछ हुआ था उस के साथ ऐसे में एक विपक्षी भी स्थिति पैदा हो गई थी—उस स्थिति की तरफ ज्ञान बांटाव करने के लिए उन्होंने उस अवस्थात प्रस्ताव को रखा था। वही तरह से 1975 में इमिग्रेशन प्रस्ताव आया था, उस समय भी भारी तरह समूचे देश में इस तरह का आतावरण पैदा बना था, जिसमें जूरीशिपरी को तल्ल-मल्ल किया जा रहा है। मेरे कहने का तात्पर्य यह है कि किसी भी नो-कॉन्फिडेंस-मोशन की एक यर्बादा होती है, लेकिन जिस हुलके डेव के इस अवस्थात के प्रस्ताव को देना किया है—मैं समझता हूँ उसका कोई भीपर्य नहीं था।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, हमने भी नो-कॉन्फिडेंस-मोशन के सम्बन्ध में पढ़ा था कि यह क्या होता है और उसकी क्या यर्बादा होती है। लेकिन जब पहली बार हमारे सामने इस पार्लियामेंट में यह मोशन आया, तो हमें बड़ी निरुत्साही हुई। इसके सम्बन्ध में यहाँ कोई इन्टरेस्ट देखने को नहीं मिला, साथ तो फिर भी कुछ लोग यहाँ बैठे हुये हैं, लेकिन कम तो सबन किस्म का लाली सा रहा। इस प्रस्ताव के नाम पर बिरोध पक्ष लेकर बिना रहना चाहिये—इसमें कोई तन्वेह नहीं है, लेकिन जो भूमिका इस प्रस्ताव के सम्बन्ध में आपकी निभानी चाहिये थी, वह आपने नहीं निभाई—यह बात मैं बड़े प्रफेसन के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, उप-प्रश्न में जो जीतने की बात है, तो उप-प्रश्न में हमेशा जगता आपोकी-जन की बिताती है। हमेशा से हम यह देख रहे हैं। जिस समय नवाहरलास ने हुक जैसे स्थान थे, उस समय भी आप देखिये कि उप-प्रश्न में डा० राय नमोहर कोमिंडास फायदावादा से चुन कर भाये हैं और भावाये कुलसभा की उप-प्रश्न में आपोकीजन की तरफ से जीत कर भाये हैं। आपने उत्तर प्रवेश में प्रश्न प्रश्नो में क्या कहा कि एक स्थिति के चुने जाने से कोई सरकार बचलती नहीं है और आपकी नेता यहाँ जा कर आपके पसारती हैं कि आपोकीजन के नाम पर हमें कोट दीजिए और इससे कोई सरकार गिरने वाली नहीं है। जनता ने एक बगल आपकी बिता बिता तो जीता की बगलीवन राज जी ने कहा कि आप एक बम इतरा रहे हैं। मैं यह कहना हूँ कि इससे कोई सही जर्जमेंट नहीं निकलेगा।

मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप ने 0 वी० का नाम लेते हैं। अब आप ने 0 वी० का नाम लेते हैं और कभी ने 0 वी० को बन्द करते हैं। मैं आपको बताता चाहता हूँ कि आप की हमारे जैसे लोग ने 0 वी० की पूजाते हैं। ने 0 वी० के बारे में राष्ट्र काय की विनकर ने बिता था।

यह देख अधिकार पुकार रहा यह स्थिति देख का जाता है संप्रदाय का प्रष्टा जय प्रकाश भारत का भाव बिताता है।

उस व्यवस्था के सम्बन्ध में यह भी कहा गया है :

कहते हैं उसको जयप्रकाश
जो नहीं मरण में डरना है
धर्म को बसते देख कुण्ड में
स्वयं कूट जो पटना है ।

श्रीर आप उसको जेल में बन्द करते थे। आपका बर्ष नहीं थागी जो धारा धारा जे० पी० का नाम लेते हैं। मैं आपका कहना है कि धारा लागू की गैलिक धारिका नहीं है कि धारा उनका नाम ले। आप तो सत्य गांधी की बात करत थे। आप कहते थे, 'मजदूरी गांधी, मजदूरी गांधी'। श्री नारायण बस तिवारी जब उत्तर प्रदेश में मजदूरी से पीड़ित हुये यहाँ डा० जगन्नाथ मिश्र जब मुख्य मंत्री थे, तो क्या होता था। मैं हरिजनता की बात पर भी आऊँगा, क्योंकि धारा उनके बारे में बहुत हल्ला करते हैं, कि धारा के जमाने में क्या हुआ। डा० जगन्नाथ मिश्र, बिहार के मुख्य मंत्री मैं श्रीर इस तरह से सब प्रालो में कहीं मिश्र, कहीं तिवारी श्रीर कहीं विपक्षी मुख्य मंत्री हुआ करते थे। जब जनता पार्टी की हून्मन धारि तो यह पत्रिका बार है कि सब जगह पर प्रत्य-मार्थका श्रीर पिछड़ी हुई बातों के नामों द्वारा शोषण चला रहा है। पहले इनका मुख्य मंत्री नहीं होता था। जब मजदूरी गांधी बातें थे तो पता नहीं उनका क्या स्टेटमन्ट होता था। जब वे जाने थे तो श्री नारायण दल निवारने एरोडोम की तरफ दौड़ते थे। उनका पाप छाने के लिए। हमारे यहाँ जब डा० जगन्नाथ मिश्र मुख्य मंत्री थे श्रीर जब हम लोग जेल में बन्द थे, तो जब मजदूरी गांधी पटना जाते थे तो वे उनका पाप छाने के लिए जाते थे श्रीर मजदूरी धारिबंद होता था कि 'तुम जेल जियो जगन्नाथ 10 वर्ष छक राज करो।' यह पेपर में बात धारि है श्रीर वेपर्स की कॉस्टम पढ़ी हुई है। आप फाइल निकालिये श्रीर देखिये। उनमें यह लिखा है कि सत्य गांधी जब बिहार गये तो उन्होंने डा० जगन्नाथ मिश्र को धारिबंद दिया कि 10 वर्ष छक राज करो। उनका यह पता नहीं था कि दो लाख बाढ़ के जेल में रहते लेकिन 10 वर्ष राज करने का धारिबंद उन्होंने डा० जगन्नाथ मिश्र को दिया। इनलिप में यह कहना चाहता है कि धारिके यहाँ व्यक्ति पूजा है। मैं श्रीर ज्यादा इस बारे में नहीं कहना चाहता क्योंकि यह छोटा मंह, बड़ी बात हो जागी लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारी जो मूल्यवत् प्रजापति मंत्री हैं, उन्होंने क्या किया। धारा कोई ऐसा देश है जहाँ इतना बड़ा धारिबंदी चलती रहती है श्रीर वह धारिकी न मांगे। अमेरिका में इनसन ने धारिकी मांगी लेकिन हमारे यहाँ इतना बड़ा व्यक्ति इतना बड़ा काइम कर श्रीर उसके ही नाम पर एक पार्टी बनाई जाए, कोई बिना तो धारा जिन्दा रह सकते हैं लेकिन सब बिना तक जिन्दा रहने वाले नहीं हैं एक व्यक्ति की पुर्ण है कर।

आप योजना की बात करत हैं। मेरे पास योजनाओं की पूरी लिस्ट है जो योजनाएँ धारिके बनाई हैं। उन योजनाओं का ही यह नतीजा है कि 1951 में जिस टाटा के पास 116 करोड़ रुपया था, वह धारा 1,000 करोड़ रुपये का मासिक बना हुआ है। जिस बिरला के पास 1951 में 159 करोड़ रुपया थे, वह धारा का योजनाओं के कारण धारा 1,200 करोड़ रुपये का मासिक बन गया है श्रीर जिस मफतुल खान की धारिके 13 करोड़ रुपया थी वह 1975-76 में 284 करोड़ का मासिक बन गया है, जिस माटिन बने के पास 11 करोड़ रुपया थे, पता नहीं धारा उनके पास कितना ज्यादा करोड़ रुपया हो गये हैं। इस तरह से मेरे पास जाये वहाँ परिवार हैं उनके मरकारी धारिके हैं। मेरे हमारे श्रीर ज्यादा नहीं जाना चाहता लेकिन यह धारिकी योजनाओं का फल है। धारिके उल्टी विद्या बनाई श्रीर धारा कन्सिडर रहे। बड़ी कमा कि खेती की तरफ ध्यान दो श्रीर कभी किसी धारिकी चीज पर। इस देश में करोड़ों एकड़ जमीन फालिज है श्रीर उस समय धारिके नेना कहने थे कि जमाना में खेती करो, छतों पर खेती करो। इस तरह की योजना धारिके बनाई श्रीर नहीं विद्या में धारा नहीं गये श्रीर जब हमारी सरकार गयी विद्या में जा रही है तो धारा कहते हैं कि जलत विद्या में हम जा रहे हैं। उल्टी दुष्टि है धारिकी, तो हम लोग क्या करें। सिन्थुप्लात गांधी का देश है धारिकी गांधी में बनना है। हम लोग गांधी की तरफ ध्यान देना चाहते हैं, तो धारा कहते हैं कि जलत काम है। हम लोग कहते हैं कि श्रीर इन्डस्ट्री के जिम्मे उनका काम रहे कि छोटी इन्डस्ट्री पर उसका इम्पैक्ट न पड़े, छोटी इन्डस्ट्री उनमें प्रभावित न हो। छोटी इन्डस्ट्री के काम-काज में बाधा नहीं होगी। धारिकी नीति उल्टी है जा धारिकी मुबारक है।

प्रधन मन्त्री, धारिका की बात कहते हैं। इनमें ज्यादा धारिका क्या होगा। आप लोगों ने पढ़ा होगा कि हमारे बिहार के एक एम० एम० एम० एम० धी नवल किशोर जी। उनकी धारा बानो का तो छोड़ दीवार, उन्होंने पटना का रेलवे स्टेशन धारिकी मार्ग मैदान सिक्की रथ दिगा धारिकी दोना के नाम पर रेलगाड़ी उठा लिया। मैं तो धारिके जेल मंत्री जी में कहना कि वे पटना जखान के बारे में डककथरी बनायें। प्रधन मन्त्री, यह सब एक एम० एम० एम० एम० का काम था। (व्यवधान) मैं तो कहता हूँ कि जनता गवर्नमेंट में गबन में धारिके के बाव एक ही गलती की। जनता गवर्नमेंट की चाहिये था कि इन्दिरा गांधी श्रीर मजदूरी गांधी को धारिकी धारा में से कुछ लोगों की भीमा में बन्द कर देती जिसमें धारिकी पता चल जाता कि भीमा क्या होता है। जनता सरकार ने धारिकी इन्टी टट दी श्रीर धारा उनका इतना मायाज कायदा उठा रहे हैं।

प्रधन मन्त्री, सा एण्ड धारिकी का प्रसन्न उठाया जाता है श्रीर कहा जाता है कि खराब है।

[श्री राम विलास पासवान]

हिन्दुस्तान में सा एण्ड धार्डर को खराब है? मैंने उस दिन भी कहा था कि सा एण्ड धार्डर को खराब करने के लिए एक धादमी काफी होता है।

एक ही उल्लू काफी था बर्बाद गुलिस्ता को करने

हर हास पर उल्लू बैठा है भ्रजाम गुलिस्ता क्या होगा ?

देश में एक ही धादमी सा एण्ड धार्डर को खराब करने के लिए काफी है। जब इंदिरा गांधी सजय गांधी से लेकर आप सब लोग कमर कम कर खड़े हो गए हैं कि इस देश में सा एण्ड धार्डर की सिफागन उत्पन्न की जाए हरिजनों पर जल्म डायें जायें तो इनको कैसे रोखा जा सकता है। अभी एक गांधी मुझ से कह रहे थे कि बनारस में कांग्रेस के लोगों ने ही रामायण को जला दिया और जब उसके नजदीक पहुंचे तो कह दिया कि हरिजन न इनको जलाया है। इन्होंने कहा कि यह मामला वेपर में धाया है। आप चाहते हैं कि देश में ऐसा वातावरण फैले, हिंसा फैले कि आप हरिजनों के कंधों पर रख कर बहुत चलाना चाहते हैं। कल हमारे साथी ने बताया कि तमिलनाडु में 1965 में 42 हरिजनों को जिव्हा जला दिया गया। यह मामला कभी धक्का में नहीं आया। जब धनु-सूचित जाति और धनुसूचित जन जाति कमिश्नर ने धपनी रिपोर्ट पेश की तब यह मामला सामने आया। आप बहुत बेमकी की दुहाई देते हैं। आप यहां हरिजनों की बहुत बात करते हैं। आपको शर्म नहीं आती कि आपने टाइम केपबूल गांधी था। उस समय आप भूल गए कि डा० अम्बेडकर जी इस संविधान के निर्माता हैं, उनका नाम तो हम केपबूल में रख दें। किसी का नाम याद रहा हा या न रहा हो लेकिन उनका नाम तो आपका याद रहना चाहिए था। आप केवल धासू बहाने के लिए हरिजनों का नाम लेते हैं।

अध्यक्ष महाशय, कोई भी घटना घटती है तो वह किसी के बम की बात नहीं है। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी या हमारे होम मिनिस्टर हमारे लिए बाहर पहरा नहीं दे सकते हैं। अब कोई धादमी सदन के बाहर हम को मार दे तो ये लोग क्या कर सकते हैं, कानूनी कार्यवाही ही कर सकते हैं। आपके जमाने में जब हरिजनों पर घटना घटी तो आपने क्या कदम उठाये थे और जनता पार्टी की सरकार क्या कदम उठा रही है, इनको हमें देखना है। आपके जमाने में शेरपुर में घटना घटी तो बहुत हल्ला करने पर आपने दो-दो हजार रुपया दिया था। आज हरिजनों पर कहीं भी किसी प्रकार का जुल्म होता है तो तुरन्त सरकार की तरफ से पांच पांच हजार रुपया दिया जाता है। इसकी तुरन्त घोषणा कर दी जाती है। आप केवल हरिजनों के कंधों पर रख कर बहुत चलाना जानते हैं इनके लिए कुछ करना नहीं जानते।

अध्यक्ष महाशय, कहा जाता है कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी डायरेक्टर आफ बोर्ड हैं। लेकिन मैं कहता हूँ कि हम अपने प्रधान मंत्री जी को डिरेक्टर नहीं बनाया चाहते हैं। हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी, हमारी टीम के केप्टेन हैं और वे टीम के केप्टेन की तरह काम कर रहे हैं।

मैं विदेश नीति के सम्बन्ध में भी कुछ कहना चाहता था लेकिन समय नहीं है, इसलिए समाप्त कर रहा हूँ।

SHRI RAGAVALU MOHANARAN-GAM (Chengalpattu) Mr Speaker, Sir, I am very glad to-day that you have given me this opportunity to speak on the motion of no-confidence tabled by the Leader of the Opposition Shri Stephen

One of the Janata Party Members while speaking on this motion said that they can't understand why no-confidence motion is being tabled like this in the last thirteen months' Janata rule?

Mr Speaker, Sir, in the Tamilnadu Assembly, within six months a no-confidence motion was moved and that was supported by the Janata Party Members on the floor of the House. If that is the case, I do not understand why the Members of the Janata Party are creating so many complications whenever they speak on the no-confidence motion. I do not want to go into details of what has happened in the last thirteen months' Janata rule. I would of course like to point out only two or three major points. Due to constraint of time limit, I would only ask first of all as to why, as Mr. Stephen just now pointed out, they have increased by 2 paise per k.w. of power. It was discussed already by the Leader of the Opposition Shri Stephen and so I am not going to touch that point.

But, with regard to the procurement price of paddy, I would like to say that it was Rs 75 whereas the price for wheat has been increased to Rs 112. We had been asking for the past six months for a rise in the procurement price of paddy. With the

coming into power of the Janata Government, I thought they would definitely increase the procurement price of the paddy. But, for the past one and half years or so, the same has not been increased at all whereas the price of wheat is unnecessarily and deliberately being increased. It may be for the simple reason that in Southern States, we consume only paddy but in North they consume wheat.

It is no exaggeration if I point out one thing. During the recent natural calamities in the Tamilnadu and Andhra Pradesh, they were not given proper assistance by the Centre. They had given Rs. 37 crores for Tamilnadu—not as a grant but as a part of the plan allocation. We had been suffering very much in Tamilnadu. Our party is ruling the Tamilnadu for more than one year or so but still we are not getting proper assistance from the Central Government.

I will now come to the language issue. I do not know why our top leaders speaks in Hindi. This morning exactly at about 12 noon or so Shri Jagjivan Ram stood up to speak. I thought he would speak in English. He has been a Minister for the past thirty years or so and I thought he would speak in English. But he spoke in Hindi. My mother-tongue is Telugu. I can understand Telugu. I could have understood properly if he had spoken in English—international language. I do not want to use ear-phone to listen to the translation because that is not perfectly all right.

The main thing I want to stress is the language issue. As regards procurement price of paddy or any other thing at any time we can solve that problem. I lay stress on the language issue only. Thirty years have gone by. Mr. Speaker, I am not a citizen of Tamilnadu—I am a citizen of India; according to Indian Constitution, Dual citizenship is not allowed. I have been coming to Parliament all the way from Madras. I hear the leaders

speaking in Hindi and not in other Indian languages. I would not be surprised even if Mr. Morarji Deesai, while replying to the debate, speaks in Hindi. That is all that is going on here. I want that advantages and disadvantages should be equally distributed. I know Tamil language. Our forefathers spoke Tamil quoted even scripture in Tamil. Even if Mr. Ramachandran wants to speak in Tamil I would definitely ask him to speak only in English. I am not having such a mean mentality. The English language is a force through which we can express our ideas in this House. Why should I unnecessarily speak in a language which is followed only by a handful of Members. Mr. Dubey who has passed his B.A. (Hons.) in the year 1934 from the London University speaks in Hindi. Our Prime Minister speaks in Hindi. Almost all the Ministers who know English only speak in Hindi. I hope all the Ministers and Members who know English will start speaking in English and thereby make other Members understand as to what they speak.

Mr. Speaker, it is not the intention of my party to topple or just make the Janata Party get down from power but it is our intention to point out the defects and ask them to rectify the same. Whenever there is a change for me to point out the defects I try to point out the defects but now in the name of No Confidence Motion I was given an opportunity to point out the defects and so I have done it. I hope the Janata Government would definitely rectify those defects. With these words I conclude my speech.

श्री मोहनदास करमचंद कर्जी (अनन्तनाथ) :
स्वीकार सहज. आप ने आपनी बर्जी के मुताबिक एक सेक्टर मोशन भूष करने की इजाजत दी है। लेकिन कल से ऐसा चल रहा है कि यहाँ पर दो नो-कॉन्फिडेंस मोशन चल रहे हैं। एक हमारी तरफ से जो एक बिम्बा हुक्मत के खिलाफ है जो बाई फक्शन कर रही है, उनके खिलाफ नो-कॉन्फिडेंस है, दूसरी तरफ से उनका नो-कॉन्फिडेंस है एक ऐसी मूवमेंट के खिलाफ जो बाज मौजूद नहीं है, मोनो-नॉक्सिड कर रहे हैं।

[श्री मोहम्मद नबी कुरेशी]

इबिरा गांधी की गवर्नमेंट के साथ। आप यह देखें जो तत्कालीन इनके बड़े-बड़े म्हालाइट्स न की हैं उसमें सिवाय इसके कि पिछली गवर्नमेंट ने क्या किया, क्या नहीं किया, और कोई मबाब नजर नहीं आता। कल हमारे दोस्त श्याम बाबू ने कहा हिज्बे मुखासिफ प्रापीरीशन की तत्कालीन में दम नहीं है। हम यह मानते हैं। हमें इसका यम नहीं है कि हम में दम नहीं है। लेकिन कमाल तो इस बात का है कि आपका दौर में आज तक जीने हैं, हमें तो यही ताज्जुब हाता है कि जीने कैम हैं ?

मोरारजी देसाई का मैं बहुत गहतरम करना हूँ, बहुत बज्रम है। उन्होंने रखा है कि अगर हुकुमत यमनी करे तो आपका हक हाता है कि मैंने कान खींचे। मैं उनका बान नक पहुंचना नहीं चाहता क्योंकि वह बहुत बज्रम है, मैं उनके दरवाजे नक भी पहुंचना नहीं चाहता क्योंकि वह मैं नहीं चाहता, लेकिन भूमें अफमाम है, जब भी उनमें पूछा कि आपने क्या किया तो वह हमेशा यह कहते हैं कि हमन बहुत कुछ किया, लोगों की उबाने हमने खोल दी है। लोगों की जबान आपने खोल दी है मोरारजी साई, लेकिन आपने बान बन्द कर लिय है। हमें तो अफसोस इस बात का है कि लाग जितनी ज्वादा आवाज से आपका एकारन है उनमें ही ज्वादा आपके कान बन्द हो चके हैं। गोटि सिमिटर जो आपके हैं उनके छोटें तरीके पर कान बन्द हुए हैं आप तो नडी कुर्मी पर हैं, आपके बान तो खुले हाते बाणिंग थे, आपको तो बात सुननी चाहिए थी और चाहिये थी।

मैंने मानम है कि जो यह अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव है यह प्रापोजीशन का पाम एक बहून बडा हथियार होता है। इनका इस्तमाल मही तरीके से करना चाहिए। मैं इस बात में जाना नहीं चाहता, हरिजन के मामले में, मुस्लिम के मामले में य जल्म होने रहे हैं और अगर यह आपकी पामिसी जारी रही तो ये जल्म होते रहेंगे। लेकिन आपका एक बात की चेतावनी मैं देना चाहता हूँ कि आज हिन्दुस्तान का गरीब और दबा हुआ इमान जाग उठा है। दुनिया की कोई ताकत उसे शब मुला नहीं सकती न आप मुला सकते हैं, न हम मुला मकन है। नीस बालीस करोड आदमी आज हिन्दुस्तान में गेमे हैं जो गुर्बन के नेबेन के नीचे हैं, जो गरीबी की रेखा के नीचे हैं। तीस बालीस करोड इमानों को हमन हमेशा मज्बूबाग दिखाया। मेरी बजीरे आजम माहब में यहाँ विनती है कि अगर आपने हमें लो गों के लिए कुछ नहीं किया तो यकीन रखिए कि जिस तरीके से जनता ने गुस्ते में आकर हमें हटा दिया था, जनता का गुस्सा आपके ऊपर भी उतर सकता है और आपको भी हटाया जा सकता है। आज पामियामेंट के हाथ से मुआमला है, कल क्या होगा मालम नहीं। आपने अपनी पामिसी की बजह से मामला सडको और बाजारों पर पहुंचा दिया है। मैं

एक ही बात आपसे कहना और एक ही बात काफ़ी है आपको इस बात के लिए कि आप २५ टुकुम से इस्तीफा दे और वह यह कि जनता का विश्वास आपसे उठ चुका है। लोगों का एक एतकाब जल्म हो चुका है। तीस आज ममसते हैं कि यहाँ पर कोई हुकुमत नहीं है। खुद आपकी अपनी पार्टी बाने जब भी कभी बोलना चाहते हैं मबाई से अपने दिम पर हाथ रख कर उस वक़्त उनके दिम से सक्की आवाज निकलती है और ममसता है कि यही एक बडा बज्र है जिसकी बिना पर हमें यह अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव आपके खिलाफ लाना पडा। मुझे आपका एकराम है। आप हिन्दुस्तान के प्रधान मंत्री हैं। हिन्दुस्तान की मरहदों की रिफाजन करना बाने हमारे नोजवान दिन-रात रिफाजिय की पहाडिया पर, बफानी चाँटडा पर यह बज्र कर हिन्दुस्तान की मरहदों की रिफाजन करना है कि यह हमारा मुल्क है, यह हमारी धरती माना है। आपने उनको भी नहीं बकसा है कुछ बयानात आपने गेमे दिये हैं जिनसे मुल्क के अन्दर और बाहर आपने शकक पैदा कर दिये हैं। लेकिन आपने एक ज़ुमना बज्र कर उनका विश्वास शक्य कर दिया है। आपने कहा कि हमन मिक्कम को इम्मामन रीर-इखलासी तरावे में गनेम किया है। अशारा मझे बताइये कि ज़ा मिपाही बज्र पर मोबर है और भारत की मरहदों की रिफाजन कर रहे हैं, क्या अब वह उमी तरह पूर यकीन के साथ हमारी मरहदों की रिफाजन करेगा। क्या आपन उनके दिम में यह बज्र नहीं डाल दिया है कि हमने इस टेगरी पर कब्जा कर रखा है और वह एक प्रावृपाइड इनाका का डिफेंड कर रहा है ? आपने इस किम्म के अवालात मुल्क में फैलाये हैं। इस बिना पर भी आपको हट जाना चाहिए।

15 hrs

बाहर के मुल्का में जो खुद-गनमादी, सेल्फ-रेमायेम, का एटमासिफर हिन्दुस्तान में बनाया था आपने उसकी भी टुकड़े टुकड़े कर दिये हैं, उसको भी पाग-पाग कर दिया है। आपको पते मात टन सुरेनियम के लिए धमरीका के मामले भिन्नानियो की तरह अपनी सोली फैलाती पडती है। (व्यवधान) आपने साईम और टेकनासोजी का गला घोट कर यह माबित करना चाहा है कि हिन्दुस्तान चार हवाय बरस पीछे चला गया है। आज बाहर की दुनिया में हमारा मजाक उड रहा है।

मुझे अफसोस है कि बिदेश मंत्री यहाँ पर नहीं हैं। लेकिन हमें मालूम है कि राम की कडाऊ को भरन में अपने तक पर रखा था। उसकी एक परम्परा है। हम उस पर कब्जा करने हैं, हम उसकी इस्तेमाल करते हैं। लेकिन हमें यह मालूम नहीं था कि आप धमरीका में एक गेसा राजदूत भेजेंगे, जो बिसेस लिमिबक

कार्टर के पांव से पड़ कर उसकी चप्पल का नाप लेया। किसे मालूम था कि हजारों बरसों के बाद हिन्दुस्तान में एक ऐसी हुकूमत आयेगी, जो भारत को खड़ाक का सबक भूस कर एक ऐसे शक्ति से, जो हिन्दुस्तान का राजदूत बन कर वहाँ पर गया है, जो हिन्दुस्तान की इज्जत और आदर का राजदूत बन कर गया है, अगर वह आज सिलियन कार्टर के पांव चाट सकता है, तो कन वह कार्टर के पांव चाट सकता है, किसी बड़े से बड़े सरमायादार मुल्क के लीडर के पांव चाट सकता है। आपने बाहरी मुल्को में हिन्दुस्तान की इज्जत को कम कर दिया है।

कन किसी सदस्य ने कहा कि हिन्दुस्तान का होम मिनिस्टर एम्परेर नहीं है। अगर हिन्दुस्तान का होम मिनिस्टर एम्परेर नहीं है, अगर वह एम्परेर बनन का स्वाद ज़रूर देख रहा है। मुझे अफसान इस बात का है कि जब भी उनमें बात की जाती है कि आप हिन्दुस्तान की ला एट आर्डर मशीनरी का पूरा खयाल रखिये, तो बट कहते हैं कि इसमें मेरा ताल्लुक नहीं है, हममें ला स्टेट्स का ताल्लुक है। लेकिन जब स्टेट्स की मिनिस्ट्रीज़ का डिमिम करने, या उन पर हमला करने, का मोका आता है, जो कि कानूनी तौर पर जायज़ है, तो उस वक़्त वह हिन्दुस्तान के होम मिनिस्टर है। लेकिन जब गरीब मजदूरों और आत्मियता का मारा जाना है, तो उस वक़्त वह कहते हैं कि यह मामला मेरा नहीं है, यह तो स्टेट्स का मामला है। मिमट-सिमटा कर वह दिल्ली के होम मिनिस्टर रहते हैं। लेकिन जब दिल्ली में कोई खराबी हा जाती है, तो वह कहते हैं कि यह मेरा मामला नहीं है, यह तो दिल्ली प्रजागन का मामला है। तो एक ही हाम रह जाता है, और वह उनका अपना घर है, जिसके वह मिनिस्टर हैं। अगर आप ममझते हैं कि आपका होम मिनिस्टर सिर्फ आपने ही होम का मिनिस्टर है, तो आप क्यों नहीं उनको मिनिस्टर बर्रर पोर्टफोलियो बना देते ? क्यों हमारी उम्मीद ऐसी शक्ति पर लगा रखी है, जिसमें आज तक मजलूमों, गरीबों और बड़े हुए सबके के लोगों को टियर गैस, लाठी-चार्ज और गोलीपों से जबाब दिया है ? इस बात पर भी आपको इस्तीफा देना चाहिये।

खेत हो या खानदान हो, कालेज हो या यूनिवर्सिटी हो, दफतर हो या कारखाना हो, सबक हो या कृषा हो, हर जगह हा-नाकार मचा हुआ है। आज कानून की छजिया उड़ाई जा रही हैं, कानून का मज़ाक उड़ाया जा रहा है। मैं इस छोटी बात में नहीं जाऊंगा कि आप ने इतने इज्जतों को मारा और इतने मजलूमों को गोली से उड़ा दिया। लेकिन आप कल्लूज की "राजतरंगिणी" को पढ़िये। काश्मीर के लोगों को पहली बका हक़ मिला था एक राजा बुनने का। उन्होंने एक राजा बुन लिया, लेकिन राजा की व्यास सभी बुझा करदी थी,

जब बहा पर हर रोज़ एक बलि होती थी। एक हसान की बलि दी जाती थी। आप अपना एक मान और तीन महीने का धर्सा ले सीजिये। आप बिल्कुन उसी हिमाब से एक नहीं, बल्कि दो-दो इन्सानों की बलि रोज़ ले रहे हैं। अगर कोई कमी होम मिनिस्ट्री की तरफ से हुई है, तो उनको रेलवे मिनिस्ट्री न पूरा कर दिया है, क्योंकि हर हफ़्त और हर रोज़ कोई न कोई घुबंटना हाती है, जिसमें लोग मरते रहते हैं। आखिर आप दुश्मन क्यों बनना चाहते हैं ? हमें आपमें बड़ी उम्मीद और तबक्कु है कि आप इंग्लैंड में जम्हूरी निज़ाम और जम्हूरी क़ानून का मजबूत बनायेंगे। और हम हममें भी आपका माप द सकते हैं।

रेल मंत्री (प्रो० मधु बंबलते) अब मे बहा एक्स्प्रेट 26 जन 1975 को हुआ।

श्री मोहम्मद शफी कुरैशी फिर वही बात ! स्पाकर साहब, यह ऐसी बात है, यही दलील हिन्दुस्तान के होम मिनिस्टर देते हैं कि 1965 में 600 इंग्लिश माने गये थे, आज तो 100 ही मारे हैं। 100 की और गुंजाइश है मारने की। इस किस्म की बात आप करते हैं। मैं कहना हूँ कि आपको जब हुकूमत मिली है तो आप अपने आपका हुकूमत करने के काबिल साबित करें। पिछली हुकूमत की नुस्तान-बौनी करने से आपको कुछ नहीं मिलेगा। आपने जब हुकूमत सभाली आपन कानूनी हुकूमत का ऐलान किया।

इसमें सबसे ज्यादा आप यह कहते हैं कि आप इमाफ करण। यहाँ कानून क मंत्री बैठे हैं। आपने कहा कि हर एक आदमी के साथ इमाफ करण। लेकिन इमाफ आपने क्या किया ? क्या यह हकीकत नहीं है कि मुस्लिम को मिनिस्टर बनाया ? उनके जा गुनाह थे उन पर परखा डाल कर आपने उन बिश्वास को तोड़ दिया है जो आप लोग मे कायम करना चाहते थे कि आप इस मुल्क में इमाफ की और कानून की हुकूमत लायेंगे। मेरे पास होम मिनिस्ट्री का एक जवाब आया है एक मंत्री के बारे में, मैं उनका नाम नहीं लेना चाहता, उनके खिलाफ एम्बिडमेंट का एक केस था। मैंने प्रधान मंत्री को भी लिखा था। लेकिन उसका जवाब क्या है :

"These cases have been dragging on for the last 13 years. The Delhi Administration were advised that in case the infringement of the law was only of a technical nature and there was no evidence to show that the individual against whom prosecution was instituted had personally benefited, there would be justification for withdrawal of these cases."

[बी मोहम्मद सफी कुरेशी]

केवल अवसर से घड़े हैं, एवरेस्ट अवसर में होती है लेकिन अवसर की एक तरह छोड़ कर जो क्यानात बहा पर नवाबों के हुए हैं उसकी जांच कीजिए करता है ? किसी एक्जिमिटेडन और वह कैसा करता है कि इस मंत्री को मुबारक करार दिया जाये या न करार दिया जाये । आपने कामन की प्रणितियाँ उठा दी हैं । आपने गरीब धारमों के विचार में यह यकीन पैदा कर दिया है कि आपका कामन आपके मंत्री के लिए नहीं है जो मुबारक साबित हुआ है, आपका कामन बेबसा और बेबसों के लिए है । इसमें मैं कहता हूँ धारा यह भी एक बहुत बड़ी ब्रह्म है कि आपकी दुश्मन के खिलाफ यह धर्मधर्म का प्रस्ताव बिलम्ब ठकबर्जाव है । इसमें बौद्ध दा राय नहा हा मकानों कि आप इन्फाफ पसन्द नहा । धारमों कामन मंत्री के लिए धर्म धर्म गरीब के लिए धर्म है ।

दमो बाद मुझ धर्मधर्म है कन कुछ सोचा न सो मिनार दा है यहा पर नो धर्मधर्म है एक माहब न यह कन मुझ ता वह धर्म हुए धर्म धारमों है मंत्री मन्त्र ज्ञानी गान्ध न कहा कि एक गांध धर्म रहा था । मैं तो कहता हूँ कि इस मन्त्र म गांध माह धर्मधर्म है जो जनता का माह है जो गांध है जिसकी न मन्त्र है न शकल है । हा यह ज्ञान बात है कि उमने पीछे पीछे गरीब धर्मधर्म धर्मधर्म धर्मधर्म धर्मधर्म मन्त्रधर्म जनता चमती है । लेकिन इस गांध व धर्म धर्मधर्म न वह धर्मधर्म धर्मधर्म बहा होता ता वह कुछ समझ सकता था । (धर्मधर्म)

बी एच० एल० पटवारी (मन्त्रधर्म)
वह साह नहीं है गोर है । गाय क पीछ धर्मधर्म धर्मधर्म माह रबो वह गोर है ।

बी मोहम्मद सफी कुरेशी मंत्री एक ही धर्मधर्मधर्म है कि पटवारी साहब जब बोला कर ता खड़े हा जाया करे यही पता नहीं लगता कि वह खड़े हैं या बैठे हैं । जनता कामन का धर्म है ।

बी एच० एल० पटवारी यह देखिए इधर गांधी क्या कर रही हैं गाय क्या कर रही हैं ?

बी मोहम्मद सफी कुरेशी मैंने होम मिनस्ट्री और रेलवे मिनस्ट्री के मुताबिक बोला सा इबारा ही किया लेकिन धारा जब हम धर्मधर्म धर्मधर्म मिनस्ट्री की कार्यकारी देखते हैं कि धर्मधर्म धर्मधर्म मिनस्ट्री किस तरीके से काम करती है तो मुझे अफसोस होता है कि कोई भी मिनस्ट्री अपना काम पूरे तरीके से नहीं कर रही है । लोगों का एतमाव गवर्नमेंट से खत्म होता जा रहा है । अब एमपी मिनस्ट्री के जो मिनस्ट्री हैं उन्होंने किसी से शिकायत की है कि जब वह कैबिनेट की मीटिंग में बैठते हैं तो क्योंकि तमाम बातें

वहाँ हिन्दी में होती हैं इसलिए वह नहीं समझ पाते कि वहाँ पर क्या फैसले होते हैं । वह कहते हैं कि जो जोधने की कमी है जिसकी बहा से सीमेंट के, फिटिंगहाइर के और दूसरी चीजों के कारखाने धारा बैठ गये हैं, वह नहीं जानते कि हुकूमत उसने क्या करना चाहती है । क्योंकि वह धर्मधर्म में धर्मधर्म गये हैं । वह हाथ मारी मिनस्ट्री का है ।

मैं इनमें नहीं आऊंगा कि जनता पार्टी एक पार्टी है या दूसरी है । जनता पार्टी धर्मधर्म धर्मधर्म है ता नो लेकिन मन्त्र नहीं धर्मधर्म धर्मधर्म । इन मन्त्रों व माह मैं इस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करता हूँ और इस हुकूमत से इतिहास करता हूँ मोहम्मद धर्मधर्म इन मन्त्रों का इतिहास बहुत धर्मधर्म धर्मधर्म कर रहा है । धर्मधर्म धर्मधर्म । धर्मधर्म धर्मधर्म धर्मधर्म की वा ।

شری محمد شفیع قریشی (المنت)

(انگ) سیدکر صاحب - اب نے ایلوی مرضی نے مطابق ادک سلیشر مرشدی صوة کرتے کی احبار دی ہے - لیکن کل سے ایسا لگ رہا ہے یہاں پر دو نوکونسیڈینس حل رہے ہیں - ایک ہماری طرف سے دو ایک رندہ حکومت کے خلاف ہے - جو واقعی لیکش کر رہی ہے - اس کے خلاف نوکونسیڈینس ہے - دوسری طرف ان کا نوکونسیڈینس ہے - ایک ایسی گورنمنٹ کے خلاف - و آج موجود نہیں ہے - شیڈیوایکسلنگ کر رہے ہیں اندرا گاندھی کی گورنمنٹ کے ساتھ مگر آپ یہ دیکھیں جو تقریریں ان کے بڑے بڑے سٹالوائز نے کی ہیں ان میں سوائے اسکے کہ پچھلی گورنمنٹ نے کیا کیا - کیا نہیں کیا - اور کوئی مواد نظر نہیں آتا - کل ہمارے دوست شام بابو نے کہا کہ جلد مخالف اپوزیشن کی تقریروں میں دم نہیں ہے - ہم یہ مانتے ہیں مہیں اس کا دم نہیں ہے کہ ہم میں

دم نہیں ہے - لیکن کمال تو اس بات کا ہے کہ آپ کے دور میں آج تک چھتے ہوں - ہمیں تو یہی تعجب ہوتا ہے کہ چھتے کسے ہوں -

شری سراجی دیسائی کا میں بہت احترام کرتا ہوں بہت بزرگ ہوں - انہوں نے کہا ہے کہ اگر حکومت غلطی کرے تو آپ کا حق ہوتا ہے کہ وہ مہرے کان کھینچے - میں ان کے کان تک نہیں پہنچتا چاہتا - کیونکہ وہ بھی نہیں چاہتا - لیکن مجھے افسوس ہے کہ جب بھی ان سے پوچھا کہ آپ نے کیا کیا وہ ہمیشہ یہ کہتے ہیں - کہ ہم نے بہت کچھ کیا - لوگوں کی زبانیں ہم نے کھول دی ہیں - لوگوں کی زبانیں آپ نے کھول دی ہیں سراجی بھائی - لیکن اچھے کان بند کر لئے ہیں - ہمیں تو افسوس اس بات کا ہے کہ لوگ جنملی زیادہ آؤں گے آپ کو پکارتے ہیں - اتنے ہی زیادہ آپ کے کان بند ہو چکے ہیں - چوتھے منسٹر جو آپ کے ہیں اتنے چوتھے طریقے پر کان بند ہوئے ہیں - آپ تو بڑی کرسی پر ہیں - آپ کے تو کان کپٹے ہوئے چاہئے تھے - آپ کو تو بات سلی سلی چاہئے تھی - اور چاہئے بھی -

مجھے معلوم ہے کہ جو یہ اوشراہ کا پرستار وہ اہوریشہ کے پاس ایک

بہت ہوا متہیار ہوتا ہے - اس کا استعمال صحیح طریقے سے کرنا چاہئے - میں اس بات میں جانا نہیں چاہتا ہوں جن کے معاملے میں مسلم کے معاملہ میں یہ ظلم ہونے رہے ہیں - اور اگر یہ آپکی پالیسی جاری رہی تو یہ ظلم ہوتے رہیں گے - لیکن آپ کو ایک بات کی چھتلاؤں میں دیکھا چاہتا ہوں کہ آج ہندوستان کا دبا ہوا غریب اور دبا ہوا انسان جاگ چکا ہے دنیا کی کوئر طاقت اب اسے مٹا نہیں سکتی - نہ آپ سا سکتے ہیں - اور نہ ہم انہیں سا سکتے ہیں - تیس چالیس کروڑ آدمی آج ہندوستان میں ایسے ہیں جو غریب کے لیول سے نیچے ہیں - جو غریبی کی دیکھا گئے نیچے ہیں - تیس - چالیس کروڑ انسانوں کو ہم نے ہمیشہ سب سے باغ دکھایا - مہری وزیراعظم صاحب سے یہ بلتی ہے کہ اگر آپ نے ان لوگوں کے لئے کچھ نہیں کیا تو ہمیں دکھائے کہ جس طریقے سے چلتا ہے فصد میں آکر ہمیں ملتا دیا تھا - چلتا کا فصد آپ کے اوپر بھی آو سکتا ہے - اور آپ کو بھی ملتا جا سکتا ہے - آج پارلیمنٹ کے ہاتھ میں معاملہ ہے - کل کیا ہوا - یہ معلوم نہیں آپ نے اپنی پالیسی کی وجہ سے یہ معاملہ سوکوں اور بازاروں تک پہنچا دیا ہے - میں آپ کی بات آپ سے کہوں گا اور ایک ہی بات کلی ہے - آپ تو اس

[شہری معتمد شفای قریشی]

بات کے لئے کہ آپ اس حکومت سے استعفیٰ دیں اور وہ یہ جلدنا کا وشواہش آپ سے اٹھ چکا ہے - لوگوں کا اعتقاد ختم ہو چکا ہے - لوگ آج سمجھتے ہیں کہ یہاں کوئی حکومت نہیں ہے - خرد آہکی اہلی پارٹی والے جب بھی بولنا چاہتے ہیں سچی سے اپنے دل پر ہاتھ رکھ کر اس وقت ان کے دل سے سچی آواز نکلتی ہے - اور میں سمجھتا ہوں کہ یہی ایک بڑی وجہ ہے کہ جسکی بنا پر ہمیں یہ وشواہش کا پرستار آپ کے خلاف لانا پڑا -

مجھے آپ کا احترام ہے کہ آپ ہندوستان کے پردھان منتری ہیں - ہندوستان کی سرحدوں کی حفاظت کرنے والے ہمارے نوجوان دن رات ہمالیہ کی پہاڑیوں پر برفانی چوٹیوں پر یہ کہہ کر ہندوستان کی سرحدوں کی حفاظت کرتے ہیں کہ یہ ہمارا ملک ہے - یہ ہماری دھرتی مانا ہے - آپ نے ان کو بھی نہیں بخشا کچھ بیانات آپ نے ایسے دیئے ہیں - جس سے ملک کے اندر اور باہر آپ نے شرک پیدا کر دیئے ہیں - لیکن آپ نے ایک جملہ کہہ کر ان کا وشواہش ختم کر دیا ہے - آپ نے کہا کہ ہم نے سک کو امرول فہر اخلاقی طریقے سے انیکس کیا ہے - خدا را مجھے بتائے کہ جو سہاوی وہاں پر

سچوت ہیں اور بھارت کی سرحدوں کی حفاظت کر رہے ہیں کہا اب وہ اسی طرح پورے یقین کے ساتھ ہماری سرحدوں کی حفاظت کرے گا - کہا آپ نے ان کے دل میں یہ وہم نہیں ڈال دیا ہے کہ ہم نے اس علاقہ پر قبضہ کر رکھا ہے اور وہ ایک اکرپائینڈ تھری ٹری کو ڈیڈینڈ کر رہا ہے - آپ نے اس قسم کے خیالات ملک میں پھیلائے ہیں اس بنا پر بھی آپ کو ہٹ جانا چاہئے -

باہر کے ملکوں میں جو خود اعتمادی، سیلف ریلیئنس کا ایمو سنہر ہندوستان میں بلایا تھا - آپ نے اس کے بھی ٹکڑے ٹکڑے کر دیئے ہیں - ان کو بھی پاش پاش کر دیا ہے - آپ کو ہونے سات تین یوریلہا کے لئے امریکہ کے سامنے ہیکاریوں کی طرح ایلی جھولی پھیلانی پڑتی ہے - (انگریشن) آپ نے سائپلس اور ٹھیکولوجی کا گلا گھونٹ کر یہ ثابت کرنا چاہا ہے کہ ہندوستان ۳۰۰۰ برس پہلے چلا گیا ہے آج باہر کی دنیا میں ہمارا مزاق اڑ رہا ہے -

مجھے افسوس ہے کہ ہدیشی منتری یہاں پر نہیں ہیں - لیکن ہمیں معلوم ہے کہ رام کی کھڑوں کو بھرت نے اپنے تخت پر رکھا تھا ان کی ایک پر پڑا ہے - ہمیں ان پر فخر ہے ہم اس کی عزت کرتے ہیں - لیکن ہمیں یہ معلوم نہیں تھا کہ آپ

امریکہ میں ایک ایسا راج دوت
 ہندوستان کے جو مسٹر لہاجین کارٹر کے
 پاؤں میں پڑ کر اس کی چھل کا
 ناپ لیا - کسی معلوم تھا کہ ہٹلر
 برسوں کے بعد ہندوستان میں ایک
 ایسی حکومت آئے گی جو ہٹلر کی
 کپڑوں کا سبق دہول کر ایک ایسے
 شخص سے جو ہندوستان کا راج دوت
 بن کر وہاں گیا ہے - جو ہندوستان
 کی عزت اور آبرو کا راج دوت بن کر
 گیا ہے - اگر وہ آج وہ لہاجین کارٹر کے
 پاؤں چات سکتا ہے تو کل وہ کارٹر
 نے پاؤں چات سکتا ہے - کسی بڑے
 سے بڑے سرمائے دار ملک کے لیڈر کے
 پاؤں چات سکتا ہے آپ نے باہری
 ملکوں میں ہندوستان کی عزت کو
 کم کر دیا ہے - کل کسی سندھ نے
 کہا کہ ہندوستان کا گڑہ ملتری ایمپور
 میں ہے اگر ہندوستان کا ہوم ملتری
 ایمپور نہیں ہے مگر وہ ایمپور بننے کا
 خواب ضرور دیکھ رہا ہے - مجھے
 افسوس اس بات کا ہے کہ جب ہی
 اس سے بات کی جاتی ہے کہ آپ
 ہندوستان کی لائڈ مشینوں کا خیال
 رکھے تو وہ کہتے ہیں کہ اس سے میرا
 تعلق نہیں ہے - اس سے تو سمیت کا
 تعلق ہے - لیکن جب سٹیمس کی
 ملٹریز کو تسمس کرنے یا ان پر
 زیادتی کرنے کا موقع مل جاتا ہے
 جو کہ قانونی طور پر جائز ہے تو اس
 وقت وہ ہندوستان کے ہوم مسٹر
 ہیں - لیکن جب فریبوں، مظلوموں،

اور اقلیتوں کو مارا جاتا ہے تو اس
 وقت وہ کہتے ہیں کہ یہ میرا معاملہ
 نہیں ہے یہ تو سمیت کا معاملہ ہے -
 ست سٹا کر وہ دلی کے ہوم مسٹر
 رہے ہیں لیکن جب دلی میں کوئی
 خدائی ہو جاتی ہے تو وہ کہتے ہیں
 کہ یہ میرا معاملہ نہیں ہے یہ دلی
 پرنسپل کا معاملہ ہے - تو ایک ہی
 ہوم وہ جاتا ہے اور وہ ہے ان کا گھر -
 جس کے وہ مسٹر ہیں اگر آپ
 سمجھتے ہیں کہ آپ کا ہوم مسٹر اپنے
 ہی ہوم کا مسٹر ہے تو آپ کہیں نہیں
 ان کو مسٹر بھیر پورٹ فولیہ بنا
 دیتے - کہوں ہماری امید ایک ایسے
 شخص پر لگا رکھی ہے جس نے آج
 تک مظلوموں اور غریبوں اور دیے ہوئے
 طبقے کے لوگوں کو تھکر گھسے لائے
 چارج اور گولیوں سے جواب دیا ہے -
 اس بات پر ہی آپ کو استعفا دینا
 چاہئے -

کہتے ہیں یا کہیں ہوں کالج
 ہو یا پرنسپل ہو دفتر ہو یا
 کارخانہ سوک ہو یا کوچہ ہو ہر
 طرف ہا ہا کار مچا ہوا ہے - آج قانون
 کی دھجھیاں اڑائی جا رہی ہیں -
 قانون کا مذاق اڑایا جا رہا ہے - میں
 اس بات میں نہیں چاؤنگا کہ آپ نے
 اتنے ہری چٹوں کو مارا اور اتنے مظلوموں
 کو دلی سے آزاد دیا - لیکن آج آپ
 کلہن کی راج تونگی کو پوچھتے -
 کشمیر کے لوگوں کو پہلی دفعہ حق

[شری محمد شفیق قریبی]

۱۰ تھا راجہ چلے گا - انہوں نے ایک راجہ چن لیا - لیکن راجہ کی یہاں تب ہی بچھا کرتی تھی جب وہاں پر ہر روز ایک بلی ہوتی تھی - ایک انسان کی بلی دی جاتی تھی - آپ اپنا ایک سال تین مہینے کا عرصہ لے لیتے - آپ نے بالکل اسی حساب سے ایک نہیں بلکہ دو دو انسانوں کی بلی ہر روز لے رہے ہیں - اگر کوئی کمی ہوم منسٹری کی طرف سے ہوتی ہے تو اسے ڈیلوے منسٹری نے پورا کر دیا ہے - کیونکہ ہر ہفتے اور ہر روز کوئی نا کوئی درگمٹا ہوتی ہے جس میں لوگ مرتے رہتے ہیں - آخر آپ لوگوں کے دشمن کہوں بلنا چاہتے ہیں - ہمیں آپ سے بڑی امیدیں اور توقع ہے کہ آپ اس ملک میں جمہوری نظام اور جمہوری قدروں کو مضبوط بنالینگے - اور ہم اس میں آپ کا ساتھ دے سکتے ہیں -

ریل ملٹری پرنٹسرس مدو دندوتے :

سب سے بڑا ایکسپنڈیٹ ۲۶ جون ۱۹۷۵ کو ہوا -

شری محمد شفیق قریبی :

وہی بات - سیکر صاحب یہ ایسی بات ہے یہ دلیل هندوستان کے ہوم منسٹر دیتے ہیں - کہ ۱۹۶۵ میں ۶۰۰ ہریجن مارے گئے تھے - آج تو

۴۰۰ ہی مارے گئے ہیں - ۲۰۰ کی اور گلیچاڑ مارنے کی - اس قسم کی بات آپ کرتے ہیں - میں کہتا ہوں کہ جب آپ کو حکومت ملی ہے تو آپ اپنے آپ کو حکومت کرنے کے قابل ٹاہیں کریں - پچھلی حکومت کی نقطہ چینی کرنے سے آپ کو کچھ نہیں ملے گا - آپ نے جب حکومت سنبھالی آپ نے قانونی حکومت کا اعلان کیا -

اس میں سب سے زیادہ آپ یہ کہتے ہیں کہ پ انصاف پسند کریں گے - یہاں قانون کے ملٹری بیٹھے ہیں - آپ نے کہا کہ ہر ایک آدمی کے ساتھ انصاف کریں گے - لیکن انصاف آپ نے کیا کیا - کیا یہ حقیقت نہیں ہے کہ ملازم کو منسٹر بنایا - ان کے جو گناہ تھے ان پر پردا ڈال کر آپ نے اس وشواہ کو توڑ دیا ہے جو آپ لوگوں میں قائم کرنا چاہتے تھے کہ آپ اس ملک میں انصاف کی اور قانون کی حکومت لائیں گے - مدرے پاس ہوم منسٹری کا ایک جواب آیا ہے - ایک ملٹری کے بارے میں - میں ان کا نام نہیں لیتا چاہتا - ان کے خلاف ایمپلائمنٹ کا ایک کیس تھا - میں نے پردھان منسٹری کو بھی لکھا تھا - لیکن اس کا جواب کیا ہے -

"These cases have been dragging on for the last 13 years. The Delhi

Administration were advised that in case the infringement was the only of a technical nature and there was no evidence to show that the individual against whom prosecution was instituted had personally benefited, there would be justification for withdrawal of these cases.'

کیسز عدالت میں پڑے ہیں - ایجوکیٹڈ عدالت میں ہوتی ہے لیکن عدالت کو ایک طرف چھوڑ کر جو بیانات وہاں پر گواہوں کے ہوئے ہیں - اس کی جانچ کون کرتا ہے - دلی ایڈمنسٹریشن اور وہ فیصلہ کرتا ہے کہ اس ملحد کو مجرم قرار دیا جائے یا نہ قرار دیا جائے - آپ نے نانوں کی دھچھان اڑا دی ہیں - آپ نے فریب آدمی کے دماغ میں یہ یقین پیدا کر دیا ہے کہ آپ کا قانون آپ کے ملحد کے لئے نہیں ہے - جو مجرم ثابت ہوا ہے - آپ کا قانون بے بسوں اور بے کسوں کے لئے ہے - اس لئے میں کہتا ہوں کہ آج یہ بھی ایک بہت بڑی وجہ ہے کہ آپ کی حکومت کے خلاف یہ ارشواں کا پرستاؤ بالکل حق بجانب ہے - اس میں کوئی دیر رائے نہیں ہو سکتی کہ آپ انصاف پسند نہیں - آپ کا قانون ملحد کے لئے الگ اور فریب کے لئے الگ ہے -

اس کے بعد مجھے انسپس ہے کہ کل کچھ لوگوں نے ایسی مثالیں دی ہیں یہاں پر جو شرمناک ہیں - ایک صاحب نے یہ کہا - مجھے تو

کہتے ہوئے شرم آتی ہے - مرلی ملوہر جوشی صاحب نے کہا کہ ایک سائڈ کھوم رہا تھا - میں تو کہتا ہوں کہ اس ملک میں ایک ہی سائڈ ٹھوسٹا ہے جو چلتا کا سائڈ ہے - جو بھڑھکا ہے - جس کی نہ صورت ہے اور نہ شکل ہے ہاں یہ بات ضرور ہے کہ اس کے پدچھے پیر ہے فریب عوام بھوکا عوام اور پیداسا عوام اور مظلوم چلتا چلتی ہے - لیکن اس سائڈ کے اور حصے نہ پڑے ہوئے دماغ ہوتا تو وہ کچھ سمجھ سکتا تھا -

شری ایچ - ایل - پٹواری : وہ

سائڈ نہیں ہے شہر ہے - گاڑے کے پدچھے کھونے والو یاد رکھو وہ شہر ہے -

شری محمد شفیع قریشی : ملحدی

ایک ہی درخواست ہے کہ پٹواری صاحب جب بولا کریں تو کھڑے ہو جایا کریں - یہی پتہ نہیں لگتا کہ وہ کھڑے ہیں یا بیٹھے ہیں - چلتا کالڈی شہر ہے -

شری پٹواری : یہ دیکھئے اندرا

گاندھی کہا کر رہی ہے - کٹے کہا کر رہی ہے -

شری محمد شفیع قریشی : میں

نے ہم منسگری اور دیلوے منسگری کے متعلق تھوڑا سا اشارہ ہی کیا لیکن آج ہم الگ الگ منسگری کی

तरफ पूंजी का केन्द्रीयकरण होगा और दूसरी तरफ रोग भूखे रहेंगे। लेकिन आज जो देश में समस्याएँ हैं, उनको पैदा करने वाला कौन है? हम तो उन समस्याओं का निराकरण करने के लिए आये हैं। आपकी तरफ से राय के साथ साथ उस राय का निदान भी मुझसे जाना चाहिए। आप केवल रोग का बखान कर रहे हैं। मैं पूछना हूँ क्या हिन्दुस्तान की समस्त रोग पर ही बहस करती रहेगी या कभी निदान पर भी यहाँ पर बहस होगी? इतने दिनों तक यहाँ पर रोग का बखान किया गया कि हिन्दुस्तान में गरीबी है, अक्षयता है, बकासी है, बेरोजगारी है, बेरोजगारी क्या कभी आपकी ओर से यहाँ पर निदान के मुद्दाव भी दिये गये? क्या आपकी तरफ से कभी कोई मुद्दाव दिया गया है कि जनता पार्टी ने यह गलत दिशा पकड़ ली है जिसके कारण समस्या बढ़ती जा रही है और उसका यह निराकरण हो सकता है? आने कहा कि आज छात्र प्रभुता है, विधायिका है, प्रभुता है लेकिन उसके लिए कौन जिम्मेदार है? आज हिन्दुस्तान में जो छात्र प्रभुता है वह प्रभुता प्रभुता के विनाश नहीं है, वह छात्र प्रभुता व्यवस्था के विनाश है।

15-14 hrs.

[MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

मैंने एक अलग चीज है, व्यवस्था प्रभुता की है। हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर जो प्रभुता व्यवस्था है, उस व्यवस्था के प्रति छात्रों में प्रभुता है। वह कौन सी व्यवस्था है? जिसने छात्र हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर लगातार हर योजना में 50 लाख लोगों को बाध बनाने का काम किया गया, हिन्दुस्तान के करोड़ों लोगों को गरीबी की रेखा के नीचे धकेलने का काम किया गया—उसी कारण आज प्रभुता है। हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर प्रभुता केवल भोग की व्यवस्था बना कर रखी है, एक नरक भोग और विनाशिता की वस्तु को टुकड़ा करने जाते हैं और दूसरी तरफ त्याग का उपदेश देने का काम करते हैं। यही प्रभुता का कारण है। क्या इसकी दूर करने के लिये आपके समय में कभी कोई उपाय किया गया या अभी भी उस छात्र प्रभुता को दूर करने के लिये आपने कोई मुद्दाव जनता पार्टी के सामने रखा है?

इस प्रतिश्ठा प्रभुता की रखने समय विदेशी कम्पनियों की चर्चा भी गई। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर जो विदेशी कम्पनियाँ हैं, क्या वे विदेशी कम्पनियाँ आज हिन्दुस्तान में पैदा हो गई हैं? आज हिन्दुस्तान में लगभग 477 विदेशी कम्पनियाँ हैं, मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ—क्या इन विदेशी कम्पनियों की पिछले 13 दिनों में जनता पार्टी ने कार्यक्रम दिये हैं या वे विदेशी कम्पनियाँ पहले से, आपके इमाने से,

हिन्दुस्तान में चली आ रही हैं? उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह कौन सी विचारणा है—पिछले तीन मासों में जिन तरह से इस देश को बनाया गया—जहाँ अमरीका जैसे पूँजीवादी देश में 10 प्रतिशत बड़े लोग 27 प्रतिशत राष्ट्रीय आय का लेते हैं और हिन्दुस्तान में, जो गरीब देश है, वहाँ 10 प्रतिशत आदमी 16.5 प्रतिशत राष्ट्रीय आय लेते हैं? आपके द्वारा जो योजनाएँ बनाई गई—यह उसका परिणाम है कि हिन्दुस्तान का 10 प्रतिशत आदमी राष्ट्रीय आय का 37 प्रतिशत अपने ऊपर लेता है और बाकी जो बचता है, यदि उसका बँटवारा कर तो फिर हिन्दुस्तान के पिछले कारोबारी शासन का इतिहास यह बनता है कि 10 प्रतिशत लोगों की राष्ट्रीय आमदनी 2,341 रुपये 4 पैसे रही है और अब मैं नीचे के तबके के आदमियों की आमदनी केवल 117 रुपये रही है। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ—यह कहा का न्याय है कि हिन्दुस्तान के 10 प्रतिशत लोगों की आमदनी 2400 रुपये रहे और अब मैं नीचे के तबके के आदमियों की आमदनी 117 रुपये रहे। यह विमानता किमन पैदा की, किमन हम विमानता का जन्म दिया, हम सामाजिक विषमता का जन्म करने के लिये आपके समय में क्या किया गया?

आज भी हरिजन और दक्षिण भारत में जाती है तो हरिजनों को पिछड़ी जा जा नाम लेती है, आरक्षण की बात करती है, लेकिन जब उत्तर भारत में जाती है तो हिजा का सम्मान करती है, चाहे जगन्नाथ मिश्र हो, निवारी हो, पारक हो, पाटे हो, गुब्बारा हो, जो हो उनका सम्मान करती है और वहाँ आरक्षण की चर्चा नहीं करती है बल्कि आरक्षण के सामाजिक आधार का विचार करती है। मैं था जाना की लेकर ही 1915 हिन्दुस्तान का शासन किया, यही उत्तर है। स्वयं है।

आज बिहार के अन्दर कौसी ठाकुर की सरकार है, जनता पार्टी की सरकार है—बहा बेलछी का नाम लेकर चिल्ला रहे हैं। मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ—बर्गरी ठाकुर की सरकार ने आरक्षण की हरिजन पर प्रत्याचार दिया तो मात दिन के अन्दर उस काम की समाप्ति के अन्दर भेज दिया, बाजेंसो फाइन कर दो और मेहनत में ट्रायल कर दिया। जहाँ कभी भी हरिजनों पर प्रत्याचार हुआ है, प्रत्याचारियों के विनाश करवा सको प्रत्याचारी की जा रही है। उस सरकार ने घोषणा की है कि—यदि कभी भी हरिजनों पर प्रत्याचार होगा, तो वहाँ सामूहिक जमाना किया जाएगा। लेकिन उसी बिहार से जब इनका शासन था, तब क्या हुआ? पिछड़ी जातियों और हरिजनों के बेटों, जिनकी छाती चौड़ी थी, निकल कर बाहर आये, तो उस सरकार ने शाहबाद से पटना के बीच में 200 से 300 के लगभग हरिजनों के बेटों की मकसमादर के नाम पर गोली से उड़ा दिया। यह सब किस्से,

[श्री हुकम देव नापायण यादव]

राज्य में हुआ था, क्या उस वक़्त इनके बिना आपने धाराब उठाई थी? सच्चाई से आपको कोई मतलब नहीं है, तथ्यों से आपको कोई मतलब नहीं है, आपका मतलब तो केवल हम बात से है कि आप मानस से धमक हो चुके हैं, किसी तरह से आपको कुर्सी चाहिए।

सुरदास जी ने कहा था—जब कृष्ण के जाने से गोपियों को बियोग हुआ तो वे कड़ती हैं—

निमि दिन बरमत नयन हमारे,
सदा रहत पावन ऋतु हम वै, जब ते श्याम निधारे,
कबुकि नहीं सूखत मज्जारे, उर बिच बहत पनारे।
जब ते श्याम निधारे।

आपकी कुर्सी छिन गई। अब श्रीमती इंदिरा नेहरू गांधी वह पक्ति गाती फिरती हैं। जब से यह कुर्सी छिन गई है, तो यह मामला लगा हुआ है। मैं यह निवेदन करता कि मत्ता की राजनीति बहुत दिनों तक चली है आपकी। अब आप सच्चाई के साथ, ईमानदारी के साथ, न्याय के साथ मानवता के साथ विरोधी पक्ष के सभी कर्तव्यों का निर्वहन कीजिए। मैं तो यह कहूँ कि जिस तरह से मदन के नेता के खिलाफ, सरकार के खिलाफ अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव धाना है, तो मदन को यह भी देखना चाहिए कि विरोधी पक्ष से बैठ कर अगर आप मही विरोधी पक्ष के नेता के कर्तव्यों का निर्वहन नहीं करत हैं, तो मदन को यह भी कहना चाहिए कि मदन का विश्वास विरोधी पक्ष के नेता में नहीं है और आप उस नायक नहीं हैं। इसलिए आपको विरोधी पक्ष के नेता की कुर्सी छोड़ देनी चाहिए।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस प्रस्ताव का विरोध करता हूँ।

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola):
Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the motion of no-confidence not in a spirit of trying to denigrate the Government because by bringing this no-confidence everyone knows that the Government is not going to fall. So, the spirit in which we have got this no-confidence is to perform the duty as representatives of the people to invite the attention of the Government to the reality of the situation in the country, that the confidence which the people had reposed just a year back in this Government, is getting shaken day by day. No person in his honest senses will disagree that the general situation in the country is such that the people are

feeling disturbed, disenchanted, disillusioned about many things that are happening in the Janata Government.

First and foremost, let us take a correct perspective of what happened. When the Janata Party was elected, it is agreed, I believe, that the Congress was defeated and the Janata Party placed in power on what was called, a negative vote. The anger of the people registered against the Congress Government for its commissions and omissions or alleged commissions and omissions which the people believed in those days and, therefore, they punished the Congress Government and the Congress Party. I remember the words of a kisan when I went recently to Karnal during the election. He said:

माहब, ये सुमरे कौन होने हैं मजा देने वाले इन्दिरा गांधी को। हम ने उन का गजा दी है, जनता ने सजा दी है इन्दिरा गांधी को कि सब से बड़ी गद्दी से उतार कर जमीन पर उतार दिया। इस से बड़ी सजा क्या हो सकती है जो हमने दी है। ये कौन होते हैं मजा देने वाले।

He said, "Did we elect these people to persecute Mrs. Indira Gandhi? We elected them in the hope that they will look to our problems, solve our economic problems. But what has happened". This is what he said.

हमारा गद्दा बेतो में सूख रहा है। उसका खम नहीं मिल रहा है। गल्ले का दाम इतना और गन्ने का दाम 6 रुपये और उस पर भी मिल जाने नहीं लेते हैं। सरकार के कान में जें तक नहीं रेगती है। इसको कोई देखने की हीयार नहीं है। क्या हमने अपने किसान के बेटे को इसलिए बुना था कि कोई देखे नहीं। वह गृह मंत्री बन गया है। उसे हमारी तरफ देखने की पुरस्न नहीं है।

All the energies are on one-point programme: how to persecute Mrs Indira Gandhi? They have caught themselves, unfortunately, in their own hypnotism. They created a ghost. And now they are possessed by the ghost themselves. They do not know how to get out of it. All energies are spent on that one issue. Not an iota of evidence during all the period has come out. But in a hurry,

the Home Minister announced, because of the pressure of certain friends from the Janata Party who wanted him to go out for blood, that there was a serious charge and that he was going to arrest her. Arrest he did. But you know what happened. It boomeranged on them.

I had hoped that when the Janata Party got elected as the American people did to Nixon, they would forget Mrs. Indira Gandhi, not a word to mention about her from the next day. If you had done that, you would have seen that, probably, this country also would have forgotten Mrs. Indira Gandhi. But no, Sir I thank the Janata Government for what they did. There has been more publicity of Mrs. Indira Gandhi during their regime than during the entire Emergency.

I am amazed. Is the Janata Government looking to the price issue? What is happening? Every day, we are told by the Finance Minister and the Prime Minister as well that the prices are stabilised. Are they? Go and ask your wives. Milk prices have gone up; water rate in Delhi has gone up; electricity charges have gone up; soap has disappeared from the market; you do not get even Vanaspathi ghee. Ask an auto-rickshaw man. He has to buy Rs. 75 worth tyre in the black-market for Rs. 175. What do the common people say? Ask them. Then, you will know. They are feeling already the pinch of price rise. You want to close your eyes to reality. Which section of the people have you benefited, let me know? Kisans? You talk so much of kisans. You say that you are going to invest more for them. Are kisans getting remunerative prices for their commodities? You talked of Rs. 130 for wheat. Ultimately, what have you given? Only Rs. 112. You talked of protecting the interests of sugarcane growers, jute growers and cotton growers. I ask:

which kisan is getting a remunerative price? Can any kisan get up and say that he is getting a remunerative price? Take the case of paddy producers. Are they getting a remunerative price? Take the case of labour. Is the working-class today happy and satisfied? Let any labour man put his hands on his heart and say, yes, the working-class of this country is happy.

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE): You had denied bonus to the workers and we have restored it.

SHRI VASANT SATHE Mr. Minister, are your workers happy? They have already declared that they will be going on strike. Then you will blame us. Are the students in this country happy? What the trade unions have decided, including your trade union? They have decided to boycott the Bhoothlingam Commission. Are they happy? Are the students in this country happy? Have you solved the problems of unemployment or done anything for them? Tell me which section of the population today is happy? Can anybody say with confidence that since the Janata Government came into power, yes, he is happy and there is progress in a particular section?

Yesterday, Shri Biju Patnaik, called the Leader of the Opposition Syconphant. Let me tell him what he had to say. On the 16th of October, 1976, in a written statement to the Press, he said:

"The Bharatiya Lok Dal leader, Mr. Biju Patnaik, said here today that extraordinary powers awarded by the Government had brought in distinctive gains."

While describing the distinctive gains, he further said:

"Highlighting the gains of Emergency, Mr. Patnaik said that nearly Rs. 2000 crores of floating money had been brought to account, trade

[Shri Vasant Sathe]

balances had improved to Rs. 1100 crores in spite of steep rise in international oil prices the buffer food-stocks had risen to an all-time high quantity worth \$2.5 billion, smuggling curbed, galloping inflation arrested and rupee made stronger day by day. In addition, general discipline had been enforced and thousands of inept officials removed."

Then the climax comes. He described the 20-point economic programme as a "health socio-economic programmes which has been floated and backed by unusual Government instance on its implementation." Who is a sycophant? Who would be the greater sycophant than this and yet today he is one of your most honoured Cabinet Ministers.

Then comes the great Mr. Kanwar Lal Gupta to be criticised. Here is a gentleman who attacks the credibility of others. Here is a gentleman who resigned Jan Sangh in 1954 and contested as an Independent. In, 1962, and lost his deposit. Then he came back in 1966, and again stood in 1967 against Dr. Bhai Mahavir as an Independent when he had lost his deposit. Here is a man of credibility. He has never changed the side. He is blaming others. Do not point one finger on others. You are simultaneously pointing three fingers on yourself. Prof. Madhu Dandavate, please do not get away. The leader with whom I came is sitting behind your back. Here is a gentleman, when his brother who is the President of the Wholesale Traders Association was charged by no less a person than the Defence Minister, Shri Jagjivan Ram for adulterating dal. This gentleman did not have a word to say against. . Why? Because that President happens to be his real brother. What an integrity! Therefore, why are you talking of integrity? I want to say. .

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA (Delhi Sadar): Sir, on a point of personal explanation.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: He may do it later.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: On a point of order.

जो बाबा श्री साठे ने मेरे खिलाफ लगाया है वह बिल्कुल बेबुनियाद है जो मेरे भाई के बारे में प्राप्त है। मैं उस समय भी सदन का सदस्य था, मैं उनमें कहा था माननीय जगजीवनराम जी उस समय कांग्रेस में थे, और उन्होंने कुछ बात कही थी। उस समय भी मैंने यह कहा था कि मेरा भाई के साथ कोई ताल्लुक नहीं है, और उनके बाद भी कांग्रेस सरकार ने मेरे भाई के खिलाफ कोई कार्यवाही नहीं की क्योंकि उनके पास कोई मैटीरियल नहीं था। . (स्वबधात)

मैंने कभी भी जनसभ नहीं छोड़ा, यह मैं साफ कर देना चाहता हूँ। और मैं किसी पार्टी का सदस्य नहीं रहा सिवाय जनसभ के और जनता पार्टी के।

THE MINISTER OF STEEL AND MINES (SHRI BIJU PATNAIK): Mr Sathe made an allegation here. It needs to be corrected because the record must be set right. I will take only half a minute.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: I am not yielding. You have made a press statement. (Interruptions)

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK: Please read the whole lot.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: I do not want to read whole lot.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK: What does the whole lot say? It says that some good things may have been done by this kind of dictatorship but if cannot carry on. Mr. Sathe, read the last sentence, the last paragraph. I have said that did not believed that Mrs Indira Gandhi would be a dictator. but she had proved me wrong, not only proved me wrong but she tried to be and she continues to be. Therefore, the sychophancy lies there, not with Biju Patnaik. The sychophancy lies there, not here.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Then comes the darling of the Janata Party,

the External Affairs Minister, the most popular person, with whose coming the foreign policy of this country has never been so good as it is today! But then why did this sweet External Affairs Minister have to commit this faux pas the other day by talking about some secret agreement, about which leave alone the Minister of Pakistan, leave alone the then Foreign Minister of Pakistan, Mr. Agha Sahi, leave alone the ex-Prime Minister of our country, even the present Prime Minister of your Party does not know anything, does not know what that secret document is. That is what he is alleged to have said.

But what I am told is, 'Yes, there was a secret agreement'. That secret agreement was between Shri A. B. Vajpayee and Mr. Zia when he met him. Before Mr. Bhutto was sentenced, it is said—he can contradict if he likes—that Mr. Zia pleaded with Mr. Vajpayee, 'Please make some statement about this secret agreement so that Mr. Bhutto will stand condemned and my hands will be strengthened! He thought he could hit two birds with one stone. With that temptation, he came out with the story of a secret agreement—and that document, he has not been able to disclose. If he has courage, he can show it even now.

There is only one thing more, about these Commission. I do not want to name anybody, but what is the minimum elementary test of a person who will be the head of a Commission? The test is, at least impartiality. A person who is the head of a Commission must be known and must appear to the people to be an impartial person. Do you know of a case where a person, who has already declared himself against, and opposed to, a particular person, openly and publicly, and against Emergency, was made the judge in the past? Can you get justice from such a person? Do you know of a person who has been impeached....

1123 LS-4

जी एच० एन० सदस्यो : क्या इन को बनावेंगे?
(जवाबनाम)

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Do you know of a person who has been impeached by 200 Members of Parliament against his integrity with an open charge....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Your time is over.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: There is no other person from our side.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You have taken already over 20 minutes.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Now, you never heard this thing: if there is a particular charge against a particular accused, did you ever hear of a case of mixing and hob-nobbing with the accused publicly and openly? Here is a photograph of such a person. This is the 'On-looker' with Morarji Bhai's big photograph on the front page.

I am not on the point of what Morarji Bhai had said or did. Let us not go into how many crimes were committed how many persons were killed, who did what etc., but you should settle down at least now to the task of leading the country and to the economic problem. Or else, you will slip into the grip of that self-hypnosis from which the man in the Intensive Care Unit is suffering. It is dangerous: that is what I wanted to say. Whenever he goes to the Intensive Care Unit or to a hospital, something very staggering comes out. When he went there last time his resignation and an open charge against the leadership of partiality and untruth came out. Now again he has gone there: I do not know what is going to come out.

I am afraid, the way you are going, you are leading this country and your party towards instability. For Heaven's sake we want you: please continue till your term is over. We are not in a hurry to dislodge you, but if you are in a hurry to sink, what can I do?

[Shri Vasant Sathe]

Therefore with these words I support the No Confidence Motion as a warning to the Government. Wake up at least now.

SHRI SAUGATA ROY (Barrack-pore): As has been said earlier, we do not bring this no-confidence motion to bring down the Janata Government. In fact, we have brought this no-confidence motion to bring this government to its senses not to bring it down, but to bring it to its senses which is sadly lacking in this motley crowd that goes in the name of a government

To-day, Sir, I had the privilege of hearing Babuji speaking on the no-confidence motion and this is the first time that I hear Babuji speaking on the no-confidence motion. But I know from some other friends that Babuji has always been called to defend no-confidence motions whether government remains the same or it changes. He also spoke for the emergency resolution when it was moved in this Parliament and to-day the fact that they have made him to speak means that like Mrs Indira Gandhi in 1975 this Janata Government does not place its trust on him. That is why they have made him speak on the no-confidence motion.

I have great respect for Babuji. He has been in the Congress for such a long time, even before I was born and, when he left the Congress and formed the Congress for Democracy shortly known as CFD, we felt that the atmosphere in the country has changed. Because of our umbilical ties with the Congress we could not be as courageous as he was but we appreciated it as a gesture. Then, in May 1978 we found the famous photograph of Babuji raising his hands with the other leaders to merge his CFD into the Janata Party. Then, a friend came and told me what the meaning of CFD actually was. It was not for defending the Congress not for defending democracy but CFD stood for Chemicals, Fertilisers and Defence and since these

portfolios are taken over by Babuji and his people it is called CFD... (Interruptions)

I speak for those in the Congress who have inherited a great legacy, and that is the legacy of Mahatma Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru and in the light of the appeal in the motion our hopes were raised that there would be some vibration in the hearts of the people in the Janata Party who share this legacy though to-day they may be wrong rubbing shoulders with the murderers of Gandhiji in order to remain in power. We have to say this because to-day I have got a statement from Damodaran Nair who is going on a fast for atoning for Prime Minister, Morarji Desai's sins. This Damodaran Nair was sacked from his job in Gandh Smriti. For what? Because he said that it was the RSS which murdered Mahatma Gandhi and for that he was thrown out of his job.

As I said earlier, when the Janata Party was voted to power people voted for it, for two reasons. People were unhappy with the happenings during the emergency. It is not that they had any great expectations from the Janata Party. It had only two expectations. One was that the Janata Party had come into power in the wake of Jayaprakash Narayan's Nav Nirman agitation. So, it will have some moral values. No. 2—It expected the Janata Party will become a cohesive party in a difficult national situation—that is to stay on together when Morarji Bhai were to become the Prime Minister. People thought that the country will have great morals and Morarji Bhai showed it by sticking to his own old panacea of prohibition as a cure for all the ills of the country. And then bang, came this statement from our friend there, Dr. Subramaniam Swamy, that 12 out of 19 Ministers in the Janata Party are alcoholics. I do not know how far the pollution has spread. But Morarji Bhai is very moral.

Then Sir, I do not agree when he spoke that the merger of Sikkim was wrong. He said, he personally felt that the annexure of Sikkim was wrong. That was how he demoralised our troops fighting on the frontiers. But, may I ask Morarji Bhai what happened in Sikkim after the General Elections? The Congress Party was voted to power in Sikkim and in 1977 after the Janata Party came to power the whole Congress Party became the Janata Party in Sikkim. But Morarji Bhai with all his morality—did he protest that people elected on Congress ticket should not be allowed to defect. This has happened not only in Sikkim but in Tripura also the Congress Party did become the Janata Party. In Andhra, Congressmen who pledged to serve three generations of Nehru-Gandhi have become Janata men. None of this Morarji Bhai's morality came to the fore then and only now they are bringing in the anti-defection Bill. When they knew that the popularity of the Janata Party was on the downhill and when nobody would go to them, they are bringing in the anti-defection Bill. So complete the defection before that. This is for morality... And about unity less said the better.

Somebody was saying that there was an empress in India and there are no emperors in India. But Shri Morarji Desai reminds me of an emperor. He reminds me of Shah Jahan imprisoned in the fort of Agra looking at Taj Mahal. He reminds me of Shri Morarji Desai sitting here in the throne and Janata Party fighting among themselves on the floor of the U.P. Assembly. He reminds me that Shri Devi Lal brings a bus load of Haryana legislators to prove his support. He reminds me of similar things—M.L.As from Madhya Pradesh wanted resignation of Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee and Shri L. K. Advani and he watches and he stays on as Prime Minister. He looks to me a another emperor of by gone times. That is why I was saying that this government is no govern-

ment. This is rule by abdication. You have abdicated your authority. There is no administration existing in large parts of the country. Why has it happened? Why is it that the Janata Party which was voted to power on the wave of such popular upsurge have become so unpopular in such a short time. You are stewing in your juice. You practised the politics of populism. You raised great hopes in the minds of the people, while you had no capacity to fulfil those hopes. That is why you had to fire at workers in Pantnagar, in Balladilla in Agra, to keep them peceified. Whoever has practised this populism, met a certain fate. I am sure the same fate will fall to the Janata Party.

Look at Andhra. In seven days after a new government was formed it had to call out army in Hyderabad to quell that. I say if political health of the country has to be restored, this language of populism must be given up. Responsibility must take over while populism must end. The politics of names must be ended once for all.

I shall not be very long. But here is one Hero of Janata Party who waxed eloquence about the unity in the Janata Party. I have brought with me the *Times of India* of to-day. Its editorial says 'in calling upon the Janata Government trinity, Mr. Morarji Desai, Mr. Charan Singh and Mr. Jagjivan Ram to make up their differences or quit, Mr. Biju Patnaik has clearly spoken only for himself.' So, there is an emperor Shah Jahan and mind you in Biju Patnaik you have Aurangzeb who wants to throw out Shah Jahan. Here Shri Patnaik comes and says this Balladilla iron ore export to Japan has gone down. That is why they had to retrench people. I have got figures from Vizag Port. It has been seen that the export of Iron Ore tonnes in the year 1977-78. And you go on retrenching workers and when these retrenched workers protest you

[Shri Saugata Roy]

fire on them. This is the way you run the Government.

Last but not the least I took your permission to-day to do one very unpleasant task. I have to mention two names. It was said that in the times of emergency a caucus ruled the country. The caucus centred round the Prime Ministers: Secretariat. The caucus consisted of Shri R. K. Dhawan and Sanjay Gandhi. A new caucus is rising in the country to-day. What does this issue of Blitz say about Tehran—connection of Shri Kanti Bhai Desai? Prime Minister's plane on way from Moscow made an unscheduled halt at Tehran and why did one passenger get down there? What did Shri Kanti Bhai do at Tehran? It is not for castigating the Prime Minister. I have every respect for him. It is a question of the country. It is not the question of the Prime Minister of the country. The whole honour of the country goes down ...

(Interruptions)

What is happening with Shri V. Shankar in 'the Prime Ministers Secretariat'?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Saugata Roy, there is a point of order.

SHRI K. S. CHAVDA (Patan): Mr. Deputy Speaker, I want to draw your attention to Rule 353. Can an hon. member make an allegation of a defamatory nature to a person who is not in a position to defend here? We can understand an allegation against a Government servant. The Minister can reply here. But a private person cannot reply here. My point of order is this: This should not be allowed.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Saugata Roy has written to the Speaker that he would refer to Mr. Kanti Desai and Mr. Shankar.

SHRI SAUGATA ROY: What about the 100 Mps charge on polyester filament yarn import? What about these?

It is in the interest of the country that the Prime Minister should seriously go into these charges. It is not my purpose to find fault with the Prime Minister. The other day my friend Mr. Vayalar Ravi mentioned about a raid on ashram in Kerala in which Shankar was involved. But today V. Shankar is controlling all the important appointments. It was at his behest that J.R.D. Tata was removed from Air India. It was at his behest that Dr. Shankaran was made the Director General of Health Services superseding ten other people. It is at his behest that all the top appointments in the country are made. I say this. I say that a new caucus should not emerge in this country. If there was a caucus before we have been the sufferers. We do not want in the political health of this country a new caucus to emerge. We want this Government to stay. We want them to rule for 5 years. But let them mend their fences. Let them repair their houses. Let them stop giving press statements. Let them rule in the interests of lakhs and lakhs of downtrodden people, in the interest of Harijans who are butch red. Even today one Harijan leader has been shot dead at Bareilly. In the interest of them, let the Government rule with firmness, rule with dignity, rule with honesty and rule with sincerity and justice. And that way only the country will survive.

SHRI DAJIBA DESAI (Kolhapur): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, this is a good opportunity that I am getting to speak at the flag and of the discussion on the No-confidence Motion.

15.58 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

I can speak basing my views on the speeches made by other hon. Members. I would like to recall the period one year back when the Janata Party was voted to power.

MR. SPEAKER: You have only 5 minutes.

SHRI DAJIBA DESAI: I want 15 minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Prime Minister has to reply. He has to go to the other House.

SHRI DAJIBA DESAI: Mr. Saugata Roy was given 15 minutes.

I should not be penalised.

The Janata Party came to power with the slogan of total revolution. But I could not see any action being taken on the basis of total revolution. I have listened to the speeches from both sides. In the last three or four Lok Sabhas there were discussions on no-confidence motions. The Congress Ministers opposed the no-confidence motions and defended themselves in the same language which I hear today. The Ministers are the same; the language is the same and they are advising the opposition in the same language.

So, I was thinking about it whether there was any difference between the Opposition and the Ruling Party.

16 hrs.

In fact, I have come to the conclusion after one year's of experience that there is no difference—no basic difference—between the policies of the Janata Party and the Congress. There may be differences of opinion in some administrative problems or something like that. Actually the people who wanted a total revolution with the coming into power, they are following the policies of *status quo*.

For example, when we were discussing the Plan we could hear the same speeches from both the parties. There were certain conclusions to which the Planning Commission came. But, what is the remedy? The First, Second, Third, Fourth and even the Fifth Plan came to the same conclusion namely,

rise in inequality, rise in unemployment, rise in poverty. The provision made in the Draft Plan is again the same with only increased allocation in the Sixth Plan.

The Janata Government is yielding power on the slogan of total revolution. Now it is coming to the position of *status quo*. To our surprise and to our disillusionment, the Janata Government started the programme of *Samaj Parivarthan*—social revolution—but there is no revolution. On the contrary the problems have become national problems. Atrocity on Harijans is a national problem; poverty is a national problem; law and order is a national problem. We have been facing these problems for the last thirty years and no solutions were found by the previous ruler. Again there are no solutions offered by the new ruler.

Perhaps I might say that this is the basic point why I am inclined to support the no-confidence motion. I am not supporting the no-confidence motion on the grounds which Mr. Stephen and State had stated. I support this motion perhaps because there is actually no difference. We were opposing the Congress Government. Now the time has come when we have to oppose the Janata Government.

There are certain problems to the ruling party. When we look to the present position, the Members of the Ruling Party here give slogans in one voice; they speak in one voice but with different hearts. Outside they speak with different voices. There are certain people like that.

This is not exactly democracy.

SHRI H. L. PATWARI: This is democracy.

SHRI DAJIBA DESAI: This is chaos. This Government, in a chaotic condition, cannot rule properly this country. Shri Saugata Roy had expressed that they should rule with

[Shri Dajiba Desai]

honesty, justice etc. Can he expect justice; can he expect honesty and can he expect sincerity? There are various programmes before the country—there is law and order problem here. As stated by some of the Members here, we are here to discuss the law and order problem because this is a state subject. Law and order problem is after all a problem which the ruling Janata Party has to face.

The ruling party must have one political approach in every State. In one State they support the backward classes; in another State they support the scheduled castes and yet in another State one section of the party supports the higher class, whereas the other section of the party supports backward classes. If the party tries to divide or bifurcate the various sections or various communities on caste lines it will not be possible for them to implement any positive decision.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, take the question of education. The previous ruling party based its education policy on Kothari Commission. The Janata Party has also based its education policy on Kothari Commission. The previous Government relied on the Agricultural Prices Commission the Janata Government is also doing the same thing. So, my point is that the Janata Party is trying to continue the economic policies of the Indira Gandhi Government. Indira Gandhi came out with a 20-point programme. The Janata Party has come out with a minimum need-based programme of 7 points. The points are the same. Only difference is that they declared that they will implement them vigorously. They could not implement it vigorously. Then where lies any difference.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am warning this Janata Government. The Janata Party started with a slogan of total revolution. For that they must have a socialist approach. Some people in the Janata Party are eloquent about it but they succumb to the

majority in the Janata Party. If they accept socialism then they will have to change the entire structure of planning. Inequality cannot be abolished by giving some alms to the poor and guaranteeing good profit to the industrialists. Plan has ensured a fair return to industrialists but at the same time there is no guarantee of remunerative prices or need-based wages to the agricultural labour or the working class. The present No Confidence Motion is a warning to the Janata Government. They will have to change everything. I am expressing this warning on behalf of my party.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI MORARJI DESAI): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have been patiently hearing all that has been said by the Leader of the Opposition and all others who have spoken in support of the No Confidence Motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

I thought I would benefit by what he said and that it would help Government in rectifying mistakes which required to be rectified. The Opposition has a right of moving No Confidence Motions—whether they do it responsibly or irresponsibly it is their business. It is not for me to judge. It is not for me to object to it. That is why I welcomed it immediately and said, let it be discussed immediately. But then I heard nothing now I have been hearing all these things ever since this Government assumed office.

The same things are being repeated over and over again from the very beginning. I can prove it by records if they want to have any proof. It is there if anybody wants to see the record. But I do not want to take the time of the House in recounting these things all over again. Only two new arguments were advanced, two new charges, if I may say so. It is good that they have come out with these

charges so that the people may know what the truth is. The two new charges are that my Principal Secretary is running the whole show. There was a caucus before and there is a caucus now and that my son is doing something like this. Now, there cannot be a more fantastic statement than whatever has been said in this connection. The Principal Secretary has nothing to do with the selection of officers. The appointment of officers emanates from the Ministries concerned and the decision is made by three persons, namely the Minister concerned, the Home Minister and the Prime Minister. This is not a new practice. This practice has been there since 1947. And there is no question of my Principal Secretary trying to influence me in any way. If he tries to interfere, he will not remain in my office even for a day. I would, therefore, be obliged to the hon. Members if they can give me one instance where he has influenced my decision and got one man in who should not have got in. I shall be very thankful for it.

AN HON. MEMBER: He could influence.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: Whom did he influence? That was the old style. This is not the style now. Even the Prime Minister does not influence other Ministers. They are free to make the recommendations that they want. And I have never suggested any name to the Ministers. Therefore, what is the use of saying this kind of thing? And then a case was made about my son making an unscheduled flight at Tehran. I do not know what is unscheduled flight....

AN HON. MEMBER: Halt.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: It was the plane which stopped over at Tehran. It was not done for him. When I had gone earlier, there was also unscheduled halt then. It was not for him. What is the meaning of saying that he made an unscheduled flight? He

went to London from Moscow via Tehran. If he had come here and then gone there, it would have cost him more money. It was not the Government money that was spent on him. I have made it clear so many times before whenever somebody asked me about it. Then it was asked why he went there. This was in September last. He went there at his own expense to sever the last connection of business he had acquired in 1970. He used to go there before every year with the full knowledge and permission of the Reserve Bank of India. He wanted to get out of it so that there is no connection left with any business whatsoever. He had severed all other connections with business here in 1964, but this had remained. He thought that it was necessary that he should get out even from this so that nobody could raise a finger. But what can one say of people who always want to see something wrong in everything which they want to imagine?

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Why is Chaudhuri Charan Singh wanting to try him?

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: It is between him and me.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: It is a matter of national concern, a Minister writing to you that he wants to try such and such person... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: That is a different matter altogether. The Home Minister can say and I can also tell him. That shows the freedom with which we work among ourselves; it does not mean anything else.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: It is a public matter.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: If anything *prima facie* is established, I would be the first man to prosecute him.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: The Home

Minister says that there is *prima facie* case.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: He has not said that; That is all wrong. He has never said so; that is a lie if anybody says so.

SHRI A. C. GEORGE: What does he say?

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: I am not going to tell you and oblige you in this matter. My hon. friends depend upon Blitz--God help them--a paper which has always been a tissue of lies... (Interruptions)

SHRI SAUGATA ROY: It was a question raised in Parliament.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: I have known Blitz for the last thirty years and I always treated it with contempt. I do not want to take notice of yellow papers; nor do I want to take notice of those who deal in yellow journalism. I can only sympathise with them for their want of prudence. But if they don't have it, who am I to give them prudence? I do not want to offer any advice in this matter. But this shows on whom the opposition depends to show that there is no confidence in this government. What have they come to? I thought that they would change by years' experience and give up their old methods. But I find that they are still fond of them. I cannot help them. Who am I to say that they should not do so? But if they feel that by this method they will be able to break the Janata Party, they are very much mistaken. I agree and I would not say that there is nothing wrong with us. I will be the last man to say so; no party can claim that there is no difference anywhere, in any party. Show me any party, even in England, even in America, even in Germany wherever you go, you will find differences. There were no open differences during the last few years in their party. But I was told of the inner differences that were there. I do not want to speak

about them; I am not like them. I do not believe in resorting to such methods to condemn anybody. But these are matters where if they were careful, I do not think they would have done what they have done here. I cannot compliment them on their performance. What have we done, they ask. Is this not a great change, the change that has taken place? The change is so remarkable that the world knows it. If there is no full satisfaction, I can understand. I cannot say that there is full satisfaction nor can I say that full satisfaction can be given in a year in every matter. But there is nothing of which we have to be ashamed nor is there anything that we have not done which we could have done or that we have failed in doing it. There is no item on which anybody can say that.

They cited many things. They cited prices. Are not prices more this March than what they were in March last? If they deny the figures what am I to do? We do not claim that they have one down. If they have to go down they have to be stable first. And if after ten years record of inflation every year, barring six months of Emergency, we have halted rise in prices, is that not some achievement?

But why should they admit it? They, they have to condemn themselves which they are not yet prepared to do. Yes, I know, there are several hon. Members on the other side who had quietly suffered all kinds of things during the Emergency and even before. They have now begun to admit, some in public and some in private, that Emergency was wrong and should not have been there.

They say now that there is no change. Is this a small change that everybody is free to say what he likes throughout the country? Is it not the greatest change from the times when we tried to point out the

shortcomings of the Government but were taken away in the darkness of night, whisked away somewhere without letting anybody know where we were taken? Thousands of them were taken away and crowds were brought here in lorries and trucks, Government military trucks to prove that people had confidence in them.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the Kisan rally?

(Interruptions)

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: How can I give any sense of shame to people who do not know what shame is? (Interruptions) How can I give it? It is not possible for me to give any sense of proportion when there is none? How am I to do it?

It is my misfortune that I have to reply to this debate. It is no pleasure for me to have to say these things. I am not happy but I have to reply to it; otherwise, things will go by default. The change you see is that can go about without let or hindrance, they can say whatever they like.

SHRI A. C. GEORGE: May I just say one sentence? The fearlessness had led to one thing in the United States. I may just quote a few lines from 'India Abroad'. An advertisement has appeared in it and it is this:

"SERVICES—We deliver rupees in India. Competitive rates—fast action. Any amount, at any place. Transaction thru banks. Easiest way of doing it—everything done by telephone. Personalized services, satisfaction guaranteed. H. Parikh (Financial Consultant) Orient Express, Journal Square, Jersey City."

An advertisement has come that they will make compensatory payment. That is where the fearlessness had led to. This is published in the United States. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: You have mentioned that.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: These are legacies which we have received from my hon. friend and it is that legacy which is making it difficult for this Government to get over everything and make faster progress. (Interruptions)

SHRI A. C. GEORGE: Since he mentioned about fearlessness, I mentioned that. An advertisement is put that rupees will be paid in India for dollars in 'India Abroad', a magazine published in the United States and so many Indians read it.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: They are sorry that we are undoing the wrongs that they heaped upon us people. We have not yet been able to remove all wrongs completely and that is our misfortune. But the wrongs are so many that they cannot be removed quickly. What we could do quickly, we have already done and you see the result of it.

There is complete freedom of press, so much so that what we say may not be published but what they say is published with big headlines. I can prove it by production of those news papers, if they want to see.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: That is why the yellow press is there.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: It is not the yellow press. yellow press is a very small part of it. A large part of it is not yellow press. Then, on the media who is getting publicity? It is given to everybody. If at all, they get more publicity than they deserved at any time. Was opposition ever heard on media before? Yet they say there is no change. It has been done for the first time in this country, that in the elections the Opposition had the facility of speaking on the radio as much as the ruling party. For the first time this is done.

We are also trying to see that media become independent and do

[Shri Morarji Desai]

not remain subservient to Government. But it requires careful consideration. We had appointed a committee. The report has come. We will soon take a decision. But to say that we have done nothing, has no meaning.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Media has been captured by one organization.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: By whom has it been captured? The agencies were merged into one in the past regime. There was one 'Samachar' only; and all were bundled into it, and made to do what they liked. All that has been separated and they are made independent. And we don't interfere with them in any manner whatsoever. Not only that. I have told the Press: 'If you want to have your own arrangement, you must have it. I don't want to nominate anybody on the Press Council. You should look after the Press yourselves and regulate it yourselves. If any law is violated, certainly Government will step in. But that is only when law is violated; and the action can be taken in a court of law. But for that, we will not interfere in any manner whatever.' I have never asked any Editor or Correspondent to see me, unless he wanted to come and see me. And there also, I have never said, "You should do this or should not do that". I only say, "You better ascertain the facts and write as you like." We don't want to interfere with the freedom of the Press in any manner.

Take the Opposition. Is the Opposition now in the same cramped state in which it was before? The Leader of the Opposition has been recognized fully. And it was for the first time in history that the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker were elected unanimously in this House.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: The credit goes to the House.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: I agree that credit goes to the House. The Opposition would have been willing to

do that even before; but it was never consulted. Not only that it was defamed in every possible way. We don't believe in retaliation. Not only that, The President has also been elected unanimously. (Interruptions) I don't say that the credit is not due to you, I say that credit goes to all.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Dr. G. S. Dhullon was elected unanimously.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: The Speaker was not elected unanimously—not in the real sense. Therefore, to say that nothing has happened, is only denying facts. I can say nothing more than that.

Look at food supplies. There is more food available to-day. And those whom I met in Bombay and in other cities have said that whenever they wanted things, they get them. Formerly all those things were not available. There is now more production. Industry is doing better. It has not done enough, I am quite sure. But it takes time. A year or 13 months is not enough to change everything and bring Heaven in this country. We have never promised that. We don't do it.

There is Education. It requires to be changed; but we cannot change it by ourselves, as they were doing. We want to taken the educationists with us in this matter. Therefore we are discussing education with those who are concerned with it and trying to come to a consensus in the same manner as we are doing in this House on many matters. That is why it takes time. The Constitutional Amendment should have been done much earlier. But we did not want it without taking the opposition with us, as much as possible. We have been able to come to a large measure of agreement even in the anti-Defections Bill; it is delayed because we wanted to consult the Opposition so that it has a smooth

passage and it becomes more effective. I must say I was very happy this morning when in our discussions we could come to agreed conclusions and reached a consensus. That is why we have to have patience in this matter.

If my hon. friends think we can wash out every wrong thing they did in thirteen months, then I would like to say that we have washed out some; other things still remain to be washed out. That takes a little time; but it will not take more than a year more to wash out the remaining dirt.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Do not wash them in public.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: That is left to you. If you want me to do it, I do not know whether you will be able to stand up to it. This, I know; but it is not my business to expose anybody. I have never done it and I would not do it. If you come to me privately, I will tell you what I know, on condition that you do not publish it. But this is not the way to do it.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about your secrets?

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: I have no secrets. If I have, let anybody find them. But, somehow, over the years I was close with many of them. So, I know what they really are. That is how the world is. I do not find fault with them. We all have feet of clay; everybody has some failing or the other. Who am I to find fault with them? But they want us to be saints whereas they want to remain what they were. I think that is not the way to increase our capacity or make the Government more effective.

Let there be responsible dignified criticism. Criticism can be made, provided it is made with dignity. When they go on shouting at those who speak from here, they do not see anything wrong in it; they say that is their right. But when some people

from here have a dig at them, all of them get up and ask "what is going on?" This is not the way to meet arguments (*Interruptions*) What does the hon. Member think he is doing? He is demonstrating how he interrupts all the while. I have not interfered with anybody; I have not interrupted anybody. This is not the way to do it. But they pop up and down all the while, because that seems to be the only exercise they know. If it had been really an exercise in dignity with cogent arguments, I would have been very thankful to them.

As I said before, I welcome this no-confidence motion, because I am glad that it brings the two factions together. Those who have factions are now talking about factions? In my party where are the factions? Yes, there are differences of views as my colleague, Shri Jagjivan Ram, said, it is an unprecedented thing in history that five parties, differing from one another but all believing in democracy, fighting against one another for 30 years, criticising one another, come together voluntarily without any pressure from anybody, except the pressure of the people, who wanted democracy to be saved. Therefore, we came together and emerged practically as a new party, which was not fully formed constitutionally in the normal sense, wins the Lok Sabha elections in a striking manner, which opens the eyes of the world, but not the eyes of my hon. friends. Those who have eyes, but do not see—what can I tell them? I can lead a blind man, but I cannot lead a person who can see, but does not want to see. What can I do to them?

And then it was also said by Jagjivanramji that we are working together. It does not mean that all our hearts have come together. Therefore, there are bound to be some differences, differences of opinions and views. That is not healthy in my views, I do agree, but it is not an unusual phenomenon. It is natural. If it did not happen, it

[Shri Morarji Desai]

would have been unnatural. We would not have lasted. It is because of this that it will be cemented.

And I want their factions also to be cemented. I want a strong opposition. I do not want a weak opposition. It is the business of the opposition to show the faults of the Government, and also try to see that they get the mandate of the people to replace the Government in a constitutional manner. It is their right. That is what democracy means. And that is why I want that they should recognise this.

I believe what is happening is natural in the conditions in which we have come together, but that also will settle down. We will not oblige you. Don't think that you are likely to come here soon. But if you behave like this, you will never come here again.

I only want that they should be dignified in what they say, that they must have more regard for facts and truth, rather than only eagerness to attack and make us feel. That way nobody feels anything. I wish they had said something which would have made me think. I do not know what reply to give because there is nothing on which I can say anything to them, there is nothing which requires any telling. But my hon. friends go on saying what they like. Let them do so. After all, it is they who have to pick up wisdom, not I. I am trying to pick up such wisdom from them, as is therein them. Everybody can have wisdom I cannot say that there is anybody without any wisdom whatsoever. I can never say that. I am trying to learn from them. I do not want them to learn from me if they do not want to.

On the one side they give me a compliment that I am a Gandhian. On the other side, they depict me as a fool or a convenor. That is not the way.

They bring here cases of oppression, terrorism of oppression of Harijans,

law and order problems, but these are not problems which only relate to us, they relate to all. I do not want to go on with this argument. This has been happening. And we have got to stop it. We are not able to stop it much, I agree, but this is also a legacy that we have got, and it is not created only by those people; these are also inherent in the conditions of the country. I do not want to blame anybody for these things, but these are things which we have got to stop. Formerly these incidents were not published. The Harijans, the tribals and the backward classes had no courage to fight it or speak about it. I am very happy that they are able to fight and speak out today, and that is why when my colleagues here on this side speak very strongly about it, I have patience with them, I appreciate their feelings.

But, do my hon. friends want to spoil the atmosphere further and not make it better? If they are interested in improving the situation and making this country great for the benefit of all of us, this is not the way to go about it. That is all that I can plead with them.

I have nothing to advise them. This is no sermon. It is my business as Leader of the House to advise them if necessary, but I know that advice must not be given to anybody who does not want it. One who does that would be stupid. That I learnt when I was young, not now. If they say many things and I have got to reply to them, they consider it a sermon. God help them again. Do they expect that I must not say anything which I must say to refute what they are saying in a wrong manner? If I say that, how does it become a sermon. If I say that I want the opposition to be strong, would I be giving a sermon? I say that the opposition will be strong only if it becomes dignified and disciplined in the House because it goes out from the House outside and I was simply very unhappy when I was told in one argument that this House does not represent the conditions in the

country. The people out side represent them. Are we not representatives? Is it not derogatory to the Parliament and its authority? This House represents the best in the country, whatever they may be.

SHRI MOHD. SHAFI QURESHI:
Nobody said this.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: It was said here. I will show it from the record. That is not right. It has been said from the front benches opposite. It has not been said from the back benches.

SHRI MOHD. SHAFI QURESHI:
Whom is he referring to?

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: I can tell you but I do not want to name people. It is not said by one but by two. If they did not say it and if they say, they did not say it, I accept it. I have no difficulty about it. But let them see afterwards what they have said in a hurry without knowing what they are saying. That also is a malady from which we are suffering here. I hope, we do not suffer from that malady as a result of this no-confidence motion.

I am thankful to the hon. Leader of the Opposition for making an exhibition once again of what weaknesses they are suffering from. If they want to press the no-confidence motion, they are free to do so. But that will not add to the dignity in any way. That is all I have to say. Thank you.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Idukki):
Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am really disappointed that in rising to reply, there is nothing in the speech made by the Prime Minister which I have got to reply to. He said only one thing that the people who have eyes do not care to see, cannot see. After listening through two days speeches of the Prime Minister does not see anything that has been said which is to be taken note of, I only repeat what Christ said once: "Those who have eyes to see, let them see; those

who have two ears to hear, let them hear."

The Prime Minister, unfortunately, does not have the ears to hear what was being said here.

A question was repeatedly asked: why this no-confidence motion was brought forward. Many of the no-confidence motions were discussed in the past. Many Members in this House are witness to that. There is one thing absolutely distinct as far as this motion and the speeches on this motion are concerned. With the exception of one or two speeches, it will kindly be noted that the motion sought to rest not on corruption charges and mudslinging but on national issues. Not that there are no corruption allegation to be made; there are quite a number. I do not want to make any allegation but I have got with me a letter from Shri Shibban Lal Saksena who sent this to me where he said:

"I have been deeply distressed and pained at the corruption of some of the Ministers in the Central Cabinet. I have already given you a chargesheet containing hundred-and-one specific charges against..." (I do not want to mention name; it is here.) "And another chargesheet against another Minister..." (I do not want to mention. That is there in the letter.)

I have got the corruption charges with me. I could just read out those charges and could have started mudslinging process. But, I believe, the Parliament of India, if one can avoid it, must not be used for that purpose. National issues must be raised; national issues must be projected. National issues were projected here.

In the course of the budget discussion, every demand was discussed and a sum-total of impression has been formed and a sum-total of impression has been reflected in this House.

What is it that you heard from here? Congress (I), Congress,

[Shri C. M. Stephen]

P.W.P., Communist Party of India A.I.A.D.M.K., C.P.M., Muslim League, everyone of the parties which spoke from here said, performance is miserable; take warning; you are failing the country. Many members from your Benches said, this is a warning, take the warning. Prof. Mavalankar who so verily spoke, partly for you and partly for this side, while defending you, said, take care, the going are not good. This is the consensus that has developed.

There are two grounds on which I put through my No-Confidence motion. Generally, the No-Confidence motion comes up for three purposes. One is, there is a possibility of capturing power and the No-Confidence motion comes to unseat the Ministry. It is not for that purpose. Second is, when there is a specific issue, that has got to be projected and, sometimes, the No-Confidence motion comes—this happened when the Railway strike was there. It is not for that purpose. There are many issues which have got to be projected. The third is, when the opposition feels that the Government are failing the country miserably and, therefore, in the interest of the country it is time that the Government think of either performing or quitting, the Opposition is bound to give this warning. And it is for that purpose that I put through the No-Confidence motion.

Analysing the grounds on which I put the No-Confidence motion, with respect to the first one, that you are failing the country, there is a consensus. Then, what should follow? There is a difference of opinion there. According to me, I find that no mending is possible and, therefore, I say, it is time that you quit. The C.P.M. differs from me. They made a most blistering attack on you. Mr. Samar Mukherjee said, "Mend. We give you more time. Otherwise, you will be thrown out." These are the two positions taken. Even Mr. Bijju Patnaik took up the position about the election, saying that it was the

token cut—an erosion of credibility; we accept that. That he conceded. As far as we are concerned, some friends believe that you should mend and, therefore, allow you to carry on or get thrown out and, I believe, it is impossible for you to mend and, therefore, get out before you are thrown out. Excepting for this, there is no difference of opinion.

As far as the basic issues are concerned, there is absolutely no difference of opinion at all. They say, they will mend and there can be a difference of opinion and all that. Difference of opinion there must be in every party.

Let us look at the Congress. We were told, "How was your Congress?" Many of my leaders who spoke, who got me in the Congress, tell me, "How was your Congress?" It is they who brought me up to the Congress. I sat at their feet and learnt what the Congress message was. It is very strange that they tell me, "What about your Congress?" It is your Congress, Babu Ji; it is not my Congress. Let us not think the other way. What was this Congress? This Congress before Independence was a mass movement. There were different ideas, different ideologies. When it came to the question of implementation, how programmes must be taken up. Sharp differences developed. From out of the womb of the Congress, the Swatantra Party emerged; from out of the womb of the Communist Party the Socialist Party emerged; from out of its womb, the B.L.D. emerged and I do not know whether it will be correct to say, to a certain extent, from its womb the Jana Sangh also emerged. (Interruptions) I stand corrected. That is why I do not know. Out of these wombs, different parties emerged. They emerged, consolidated and crystallised on different specific ideas and ideologies. Now they say merely because these crystallised organisations came together and they put a khadi shawl around that and said: this is a single party. Therefore,

cohesion there can be. You are assuming a position which is absolutely not possible or practicable.

If the Indian National Congress completely cohesive, completely strong, could not, at the stage of implementation of a programme, carry on as one party but had to be split up, then the different organisations crystallised as iron clad organisations coming together at the moment of implementing a programme will necessarily have to fall out. Otherwise, every one of you is a hypocrite; you are not sincere people standing firm with the faith you have, with the political conviction you have. It is just my reading. Therefore, I feel it is a vain exercise. If you want to carry on that exercise, by all means you carry on that exercise. But, in the interest of the country, I feel a better progress will not be possible. That is the difference I pointed out.

In 1977, when you won the elections and the results were that you are here today, in 1977, it was a cohesive party, strong and powerful and determined to do something. Within one year, difference have developed. I am not interested in your differences at all. I am not calculating on my future on the discussion that may take place among you. I am calculating on my inherent strength and in my capacity to muster people for implementation of my programmes. I will be a political fool if I think that by your disintegration I must fix up my future. Not at all. But I could see that in the nature of things this disintegration is unavoidable and to the extent of its being unavoidable, the country will suffer. That is the position I am taking.

Now, Sir, you are repeatedly saying that we did not mend matters during emergency. Well there are four types of people, as far as emergency is concerned. When you call one another names let us understand those people. There is a set of people who valiantly opposed the emergency from the start. Hats off to them. I salute them. There

is a set of people who put the cause of emergency as necessary for the nation, who argued in this House and remained arguing until the elections were declared. Then there is a third class of people who protested against emergency, went to jails made an escape out of it and started negotiations and scuttled the whole movement. I knew this class of people. They are the persons on whom the cap will fit. He understands what I mean. Then there is a fourth class of people who even after the elections—during the elections, they were defending the emergency—finding out that the power had passed on to somebody jumped to the other wagon and came back saying: down with the emergency and you are accepting those people. Then there is a fifth class of people whom I represent who believed and continue to believe that emergency was rightly declared. (Interruptions) You may say thousand times shames. Here in my hand is the first speech I made in this House, after the elections when the President's Address was discussed. I said, "I for one fought for the elections on the question of emergency. I wanted a verdict of the people on the basis of emergency. All of us in Kerala campaigned on the basis of emergency" and so on and finally said: "this was the issue which we had honestly put forward in my constituency. In our pamphlets and speeches, we said: do you approve of the emergency as you know it or not and they have upheld the proposition and they approved the emergency." This is the position I took in my very first speech after the elections. You may accept or you may not accept it. What I am saying is that there are four or five types of people. Who is more honourable? I say those persons who opposed emergency from the very start, I differ from them. But I acclaim them as honourable men and accept them as honourable men. We pleaded for the Emergency believing that it was correct and were holding on to that position and are still saying that it was rightly declared. Would you condemn me for the reason that I did not change my

[Shri C. M. Stephen]

opinion? And would you prefer the person who argued for Emergency till the elections and who remained in my party upto the elections, who were the high priests of Emergency in the Ministry, who wanted to command you and whom you hugged and kissed in order that you may get some election results somewhere? Who is honourable? The person who said, 'I have got the right to believe' and who believed that the Emergency was rightly declared, who held on to it whatever be the attacks and criticisms who said not once but twice, who is saying even now for the third time that Emergency was rightly declared, or the other person? Would you condemn me as a dishonourable man and would you prefer to call the other man as an honourable man? Would you say that anybody who came here and argued for Emergency held on to it, goaded us to the impression and also told us that the Emergency was good, played our leader and made us accept the Resolution and then when the crucial time came, jumped off

SHRI KRISHAN KANT (Chandigarh): I want to know from him whether at the same situation develops today, he would like Emergency to be promulgated in this country.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: I am only saying this. Let nobody say anything against anybody at all.

Mr. Biju Patnaik made a valiant speech. All I have to say is that those who are in the glasshouses should not throw stones at others. There are many people there who can come out, hold their heads high and attack, but not Mr. Biju Patnaik; Mr. Biju Patnaik is not among them, because we know his antecedents. He speaks about sycophancy. We says he knows intimately how Nehru functioned, how Indiraji functioned. We know. I saw how, in Bhubaneswar session of the Congress, the sycophancy was functioning, I saw the sycophancy the maximum, how the sycophancy fruited in an unparalleled manner when

without being a Minister, he was given a room in the South Block to run this country, to carry on the defence of this country.

Well, Sir, there is a book...

PROF MADHU DANDAVATE: In Indiraji's raj, even those who were Ministers were not given room.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Here is a book by Shri C. G. K. Reddy on Baroda Dynamite Conspiracy; here he says:

"Further discussions between the representatives of the conclave of mid-December and the Government representatives were stalled by Om Mehta. This gave birth to the infamous 'My Dear Om' letter addressed by Biju Patnaik in the New Year of 1977. This letter crowned the shame that the opposition leaders who were outside the jail perpetrated on themselves and caused consternation and demoralization to those who were either in jail and still uncompromising."

श्री राजी लाल सुबन (किरोजबाद) : श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी ने श्री बीजू पटनायक को पक्ष लिखा था। क्या आप को पता है और जानकारी है कि उनके व्यक्तित्व सम्बन्ध क्या है ?

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: All I am saying is this. Let nobody try to play up the valorous posture. The question was asked....

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK: The record must be set right. He has named me. He was reading from a book, from a newspaper chap, whatever it is, I do not know. He may be very big for him, but I do not know him. He may have done a good job for him, I do not know...

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: You do not know George Fernandes!

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK: Whether he came with George Fernandes or for George Fernandes, I do not know... (Interruptions)

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: I am not yielding.

MR. SPEAKER: He is not yielding. I will give you an opportunity later.

17 hrs.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Mr. Krishna Kant asked me a question, whether, if such a situation arose today, we would like Emergency to be declared. I put the question back to him, because the Constitution amendment proposals have come up. The question is whether, in the case of an internal emergency, emergency must be declared or not. The present Article says 'internal disturbances' and in place of that you want to put in the new words 'armed rebellion'. That means an internal affair. Supposing the Naxalite people go up in a sort of a rebellion in an area, you can construe it as armed rebellion: if, in a working class area the people take up arms, you can take it as armed rebellion. The question is whether you are prepared to say there will be declaration of Emergency only if there is external aggression and war or fear of external aggression and war or would you still say we should provide for a contingency in which internal Emergency can be declared? The very fact that you want to provide for it shows that in your view there can be a situation in which internal developments can happen which would justify the declaration of emergency. The difference is only this—whether the assessment of the situation as at the time of the declaration of Emergency was correct or not, whether your assessment or our assessment is correct. Different opinions are possible. However, once it is declared, all the other consequences follow. Nobody had anything to say about the period beyond this 19 month period. All that was said was about the 19 month period. There was no allegation that there was no freedom or democracy before the Emergency was declared: there was

absolutely no allegation. The allegation is only in respect of the 19 month period. Therefore, the moment Emergency is withdrawn, automatically *status quo ante* will have to be restored. And the Emergency was withdrawn: the Emergency was withdrawn the moment people's verdict came through the Election. (Interruptions). Before the Government was handed over to you, Emergency was withdrawn. (Interruptions).

My point is, if you wanted to bring back the conditions which were obtaining during Emergency, you were faced with the necessity of declaring a fresh Emergency. That declaration you did not make. If a new declaration did not come, then *status quo ante* and democracy automatically stood restored. It is nothing of your boon: that is what I am saying. The people declared themselves against Emergency and that verdict was accepted. The Emergency was cancelled and you were ushered into power—which you did not hope for before the Emergency. If you wanted to restore the happenings of the 19 months period, you would have had to declared Emergency again. Therefore, the essence of what you are saying is only this, that you did not declare a fresh Emergency. This is all that you are saying: nothing more than that. In the absence of Emergency, nothing else was possible and your omission to declare a fresh Emergency is something you want to claim credit for. Are the conditions in this country such as would justify the declaration of a new Emergency? That is the simple question I have got to ask you. (Interruptions).

I had the most painful moment in my life today when I listened to Babuji. I must confess to an attitude of instinctive reverence on my part towards Babuji more than any other leader. It is the unkindest cut of all that the Janata Party chose to field Babuji in this No Confidence Motion discussion: it was the unkindest cut of all. Babuji talked about the removal of the 92 year-old Congress.

[Shri C. M. Stephen]

Babuji was my President. The whole period, Babuji was in power; the whole period, he was in the Parliamentary Board; he was in the political affairs Committee; he was in the Cabinet; he was in the Election Committee, there was no superior organisation of the Party in which he was not involved. He guided us; he advised us; his opinion was orders for us. But now, what does he say? We are not prepared to unlearn the moment he is prepared to unlearn. You taught us certain lessons which have become a part of us. We remain firm there. We cannot unlearn the moment you decide to unlearn. Then, Babuji, you moved the motion for approval of emergency. That speech is before me. Would you withdraw a single sentence of the speech you made. You stand by it or not? You justified the emergency. Babuji says that he stands by everything he said while he put forward the resolution for approval of emergency. Then, what is the difference between you and me? The only difference is that we stand where we did whereas somebody else chose to leave from where he did. This is the only difference.

Now, Sir, when he speaks of the Indian National Congress as an organization of 92 years, an organization which brought him up and which he brought up and under whose banner he moulded many a political leader and worker in this country—they are in thousands who look to him...

SHRI NATHU SINGH (Dausa): Mr. Speaker, Sir...

(Interruptions)

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: I know what had happened since the Allahabad judgement. I know what had happened before the resolution by the Party was passed. I remember what happened between Babuji and me when the resolution was drafted. I know the position, from time to time. These things cannot be rubbed off in a single stroke. Therefore, inner

party discussions were there, not with Indira Gandhi only but all of us and many of us were involved. Babuji was involved, Shri Chavan was involved, I was involved and many of us were involved. ...

AN HON. MEMBER: Even Mr. Bahuguna.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: We sat together and drew up a resolution and it was that resolution which was passed by the parliamentary party. Subsequently, step by step Babuji advised us and I, more than to any other leader, went to Babuji for his advice and guidance—this is a secret which I want to make public....

AN HON. MEMBER: What about Hemvati Nandan Bahuguna?

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: And here, Babuji comes and accuses me for bringing forward a no-confidence motion. Babuji, did I say anything disparaging about you in my speech? I raised only national issues when I put my points across. Those national issues have echoes everywhere. Well, it was said somewhere—he too serves a purpose who only stands up and cheers. There are people who can do that. It is his good fortune that he is always on that side and never on this side whichever Party may come and whichever Party may go. It is out of conviction that he is always on that side and he can always reply to a no-confidence motion.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am very sorry, after such a long period of time I have got to impart this tone in my speech with regard to my most revered Babuji. A situation for that should not have been created. We can understand the compulsions of the situation but, please, for heaven's sake, don't rub on the wrong side of our heart. Don't wound us by declarations which are all right against your foes but not against us. This is all I have to say as far as Babuji's speech is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is a moment for introspection in the country. The Fathers of the Constitution contemplated that an emergency may become necessary. May be there may be difference of opinion and in judgement. I have got before me Mr. Justice Mathew's report where he says:

"Be that as it may, there can be no gainsaying the fact that violence threatened the democratic set up in Bihar. Violence was very much in the air at all levels—individual, social and political.

It is axiomatic that civilised life becomes impossible if political violence were to take the place of legal, parliamentary and constitutional processes. ...No democratic system can accept the use of physical violence as an instrument of politics.

The incidents of violence in Bihar including the incidents of explosion at Samastipur were a grave warning to the nation and all people had to give very serious thought as to what action should be taken at the national and political levels to put an end to violence to safeguard democracy and ensure national security."

This is the finding of the Commission. May be you withheld this Commission's report. May be you have a soft corner for a Commission's report coming from somebody else. But this is a Commission's report from a sitting Judge of the Supreme Court whose integrity nobody has so far questioned. This is the impression he has gathered as a result of evidence.

The question is: whether under such circumstances an emergency could have been declared justifiably. Misuse there was. Nobody denies it. In the implementation of emergency there was a misuse. Behind the

curtain of emergency certain crimes were committed, which must be condemned. There is no doubt about it. But, on the question as to whether there could be emergency, the test is, what is your attitude? If you want still to provide for internal emergency, then, the cat is out of the bag. Faced with a similar situation you will also declare an emergency. If that is your attitude, then, what right have you to criticise somebody who, in his best judgment, thought that emergency was called for and emergency was declared?

Therefore, the sum total of the entire debate is this. This debate is not without purpose. As was pointed out by me at the very start, this debate was for the purpose of projecting what people in the country have started feeling. There is an erosion of faith. I am repeatedly saying this. Take note of it. And mend it if you can. But I don't believe you can. Therefore I say: Get out before you are thrown out.

This is all that I have got to say. Try as much as you can to mend it by all means but not by the mimicry such as Mr. Biju Patnaik performed here. That is not the answer.

Sir, I am concluding. The sum total of my charge against this Government is this. Through this discussion a picture has emerged. The interests of the country are at stake. You may take some money somewhere, there may be some corruption somewhere, I am not bothered about it. But, if the fabric of the country is threatened, if the basic...

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Balia): Excuse me for interrupting you. Mr. Stephen, you were never bothered about corruption. You were never bothered about civil rights and democracy. You know about it. But I would like to know one thing from you. Can there be anything more despicable than your performance this evening that you are justifying

[Shri Chandra Shekar]

all the evils of the emergency? Can there be anything more serious than that? I know, you and your colleagues have no consideration for any values. I have been saying this for the last 10 years. I am not surprised at your behaviour and your performance this evening. But I am surprised at the behaviour and performance of some sober people in that side. When their leader is speaking in terms of all praise for emergency, they think that he is doing something very great and doing very great service to the nation. Well, do it if it serves you any purpose..

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: I will repeat it again. I say, Number one: First the question is whether one can held that the declaration of emergency was justified, as per the provisions of the Constitution. My answer is yes.

Second, the question is, whether in the implementation of emergency there were excesses. My answer is, yes, and they deserve to be condemned.

Number three. The question is whether in the conditions obtaining in emergency certain persons committed crimes which cannot be pardoned. I say, yes. They deserve to be punished.

These are the three propositions which I have put forth.

Number four. The question is whether under this emergency positive gains were achieved in the country or not. I say, yes.

So, this is the definite position that I am taking. And I am taking this position, representing the people. This was the proposition I put forth in my election and I won. This was the only issue that was put forth. Anybody who comes from Kerala and other areas will say that this was the issue that was put forth. True, Sir, the North did not accept it. But the

South did. And now what? 'All the by-elections have been fought on the misdeeds of Mrs. Indira Gandhi. The people have rejected that. Therefore a new thinking is coming. That is all I have got to say.

If you say that the acceptance of emergency is bad morally, what justification have you to take in your fold persons who were the high priests of emergency, who justified the emergency and won the election on that basis? What moral sense have you? You have accepted those people. After having done that, what moral right have you to point the finger of accusation at us? Look to your people among you, they are the villains and not I.

I have the honesty to say, the declaration of emergency was justified. I said it. I say it. I will continue to say it. There is no doubt about that. One sentence more and I have done.

The totality of the opinion in this House emerging as a result of the discussion is that the performance of this Government has been unsatisfactory. Faith of the people has been eroded. The people are giving a warning. A large number of Members in this House feel that your performance is miserable. If you accept it as a matter of fact, accept this impeachment and get out. If not, to that extent, you will not be respecting the views of the people.

With these words, Sir, I press this motion for acceptance of the House.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Chirayinkil): Sir, I am on a point of clarification. One minute, Sir, We are also a party to the no-confidence motion. We have taken part in the debate. But a situation has now come when Mr. Stephen replied to an important question put to him by Shri Chandra Sekhar and now we come to a point of saying whether this motion justifies emergency or not.

AN HON. MEMBER: That was not the question. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (*Contai*): That is the main question. All their speeches have been directed in justification of emergency. Those who have suffered—1,36,000 under MISA and DIR. (*Interruptions*)...suffered in 19 months of internal emergency. The whole country was made captive; the whole country was made prisoner. And this man is justifying the emergency; if you have got the courage, then throw out the empress of emergency; throw out the crown prince of emergency. (*Interruptions*). It is good that the cat is now out of the bag. This is what you are intending to do. You are trying to bring about a totalitarian regime in this country. You are preparing the ground for that. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: We were a party to the emergency and the

rule at that time; we are not denying that fact. But, we are not taking any position to justify the emergency. It is not the purpose of this motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Now I shall put the motion to the vote of the House. The question is:

"That this House expresses its want of confidence in the Council of Ministers".

The motion was negatived.

MR. SPEAKER: Now, the House stands adjourned to meet at 11 A.M. tomorrow.

17.19 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, May 12, 1978/Vaisakha 22, 1900 (Saka).