

[श्री शरद यादव]

संविधान का और संशोधन करने वाले विधेयक को पुरःस्थापित करने की अनुमति दी जाय।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India."

The motion was adopted.

श्री शरद यादव : मैं विधेयक को पुरःस्थापित करता हूँ।

CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL*

(Amendment of articles 352, 356 etc.)

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH (Hoshangabad): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India."

The motion was adopted.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: I introduce the Bill.

15.37 hrs.

CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL—contd.

(Amendment of article 51) by Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We now take up further consideration of the following motion:

"That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India, be taken into consideration."

श्री शंकर बेब (बीदर) : माननीय उपाध्यक्ष जी, जय जगत।

मैं माननीय कामथ साहब को, जिन्होंने इस बिल को इन्ट्रोड्यूस किया है, बधाई देना चाहता हूँ : यह ऐसा बिल है, जिसके बारे में न केवल हमारे देश को, बल्कि सारी दुनिया को सोचना पड़ेगा।

उपाध्यक्ष जी, कुछ दिन पहले महान वैज्ञानिक "एलबर्ट आइन्स्टीन" यहाँ आये थे। उन के पास कुछ प्रेस रिपोर्ट्स गये। चूंकि वह महान वैज्ञानिक थे, उन्होंने एटम बम के निर्माण में बहुत कुछ सहयोग दिया था, इसलिए प्रेस रिपोर्ट्स ने उन से पूछा— "महाशय, यह बतलाइये, पहले विश्व युद्ध में हवाई जहाज का एक अस्त्र के रूप में अन्वेषण हुआ, दूसरे विश्व युद्ध में एटम बम एक अस्त्र के रूप में आया, अब यदि तीसरा विश्व युद्ध हो तो उस के अन्दर कौन सा भयंकर अस्त्र पैदा होने वाला है ? "श्री आइन्स्टीन ने कहा— "यदि तीसरा विश्व युद्ध हुआ तो उस में कौन सा अस्त्र होगा, यह तो मैं नहीं बतला सकता, लेकिन यदि चौथा विश्व युद्ध होगा, तो मैं बतला सकता हूँ कि उस समय कंकड़, पत्थर या पाषाण युग के अस्त्रों का प्रयोग होगा।" उन के कहने का तात्पर्य था—यदि तीसरा विश्व युद्ध हुआ तो सब का सत्यानाश हो जाएगा, मानवता बच नहीं सकेगी, सभ्यता, संस्कृति, ह्यूमन सिविलाईजेशन—सब का सत्यानाश हो जाएगा और उस के बाद हम को पाषाण युग की सभ्यता का निर्माण करना पड़ेगा।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज सब से बड़ी समस्या यह है कि हमारा विज्ञान, जो तरक्की कर रहा है, वह मानव की सेवा के लिए बढ़ रहा है, लेकिन साथ साथ मानव को समाप्त करने का कारण भी बनता जा रहा है। ऐसी स्थिति में जब तक सारे विश्व के लोग एक जगह बैठ कर इन अस्त्र-शस्त्रों पर रोक नहीं लगायेंगे, तब तक मानव जाति बच

नहीं सकती है, यदि मानव जाति को बचाना है तो एक वर्ल्ड फ़ेडरल गवर्नमेंट (महासंघीय सरकार) का निर्माण करना होगा। यदि ऐसी वर्ल्ड गवर्नमेंट को हम लायें, तो उस के लिए एक कांस्टीट्यूएंट एसेम्बली का निर्माण कर के उस का पूरा कांस्टीट्यूशन बनाना होगा।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, अब वक्त आ गया है जब कि हम को इस पर सीरियसली विचार करना चाहिये। आप इस बात को जानते हैं कि आप ने स्वयं इस बिल के लिए बहुत कुछ काम किया है। इस सिलसिले में एक बहुत बड़ी संस्था है—“वर्ल्ड कांस्टीट्यूशन एण्ड पार्लियामेंट”। उस संस्था की तरफ से “इंजिन्यूर” आस्ट्रिया में दुनिया के लगभग 150 राष्ट्रों के पब्लिक रिप्रेजेंटेटिव गये थे। अभी 6 महीने पहले उन लोगों ने वहां पर इकट्ठा हो कर वर्ल्ड-कांस्टीट्यूशन तैयार किया, जिस के हर आस्पेक्ट पर वहां चर्चा हुई। किस तरह से पूरे वर्ल्ड की फेडरल गवर्नमेंट को चलाना चाहिए, इस के बारे में विचार-विमर्श के बाद एक संविधान का निर्माण किया गया और उसकी एक नींव रखी गई है। तो आज हम को उस को रेटीफाई करने का वक्त आ गया है। वेस्ट जर्मनी, अमेरिका और केनाडा के अन्दर बहुत सारी नगर-पालिकाओं ने और बहुत सारी नेशन्स ने उसको रेटीफाई किया है। उस कांस्टीट्यूशन को जो दुनिया के सब राष्ट्रों की जनता के प्रतिनिधियों ने बैठ कर पास किया है, उस को बहुत ही ज्यादा सीरियसली ले कर हम को विचार करना पड़ेगा और अगर यह पार्लियामेंट यह तय करती है, अगर भारतीय पार्लियामेंट यह निश्चय करती है कि वर्ल्ड की एक कांस्टीट्यूएंट एसेम्बली हो और उस के अन्दर विचार-विमर्श हो, तो यह एक बहुत बड़ी बात होगी और हम दुनिया को एक रास्ता दिखा सकते हैं। बहुत सारी नेशन्स इस के लिए बहुत ज्यादा सीरियस नहीं हैं और भारत ही

एक ऐसा राष्ट्र है जो इस के लिए कदम बढ़ा कर, इनिशियेटिव ले कर दुनिया को रास्ता दिखा सकता है। जब हम पार्लियामेंट के सेन्ट्रल हाल में घुसते हैं तो यह लिखा पाते हैं :

अर्थ निजः परोवेति गणना लघुचेतसाम् ।
उवारचरितानां तु वसुधेव कुटुम्बकम् ॥

यह जो हमारा मोटो है, यह जो हमारा उद्देश्य है, यह इस से ही पूरा हो सकता है और यह मंत्र अगर कोई दे सकता है तो भारत ही दे सकता है और भारत ही इस काम को कर सकता है। इसलिए मैं यहां अपने मित्रों से अपील करूंगा कि वे इस का समर्थन करें क्योंकि हमेशा से हम शांति का स्लोगन ले कर चले हैं और शांति के लिए जितने प्रयत्न भारत की तरफ से हुए हैं आज तक दुनिया में किसी राष्ट्र ने नहीं किये हैं। जब ऐसे प्रयत्न भारत करता है तो वर्ल्ड की एक कांस्टीट्यूएंट एसेम्बली ही और उस के अन्दर एक वर्ल्ड कांस्टीट्यूशन बनाया जाए और एक वर्ल्ड की फ़ेडरल गवर्नमेंट की नींव रखी जाए। अगर ऐसा होता है तो मैं समझता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान में ही नहीं बल्कि सारे विश्व में एक ऐसा रिकार्ड रहेगा और विश्व को हम यह बता सकेंगे कि ऋषि-मुनि लोग हिन्दुस्तान में विश्व शांति के लिए प्रयत्न करते रहे हैं और करते रहेंगे। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस से अधिक अच्छा और कोई दूसरा काम नहीं हो सकता है। इस दृष्टि से माननीय सदस्य इस चीज को देखें। हमारे जो उपाध्यक्ष महोदय हैं, वे वर्ल्ड कांस्टीट्यूशन एण्ड पार्लियामेंटरी एसोसिएशन के चेयरमैन रह चुके हैं और कई जगहों पर गए हैं और मैं उन के साथ रहा हूँ और मैं गर्व अनुभव करता हूँ कि ऐसे महान् व्यक्ति इस चीज में हमेशा इन्ट्रेस्ट लेते रहे हैं। लोग इस चीज का मजाक उड़ा सकते हैं लेकिन एक दिन ऐसा आएगा जब यह तथ्य वास्तविकता बन कर रहेगा। पाकिस्तान की जब बात उठी थी, तो वह एक डीम सी लगती थी लेकिन वह

[श्री अक्षर देव]

स्वोपन न रह कर वास्तविकता बन गई थीर हिन्दुस्तान, पाकिस्तान और भारत को दो टुकड़ों में बंट गया। इसलिये मैं मावनीय सदस्यों से यह प्रार्थना करूंगा कि इस के बारे में बहुत ही संजीवनी के साथ सोचें और इस को एक उपाहास की वस्तु न बनाएं और बहुत ही गम्भीरतापूर्वक इस के बारे में सोचें। मैं जनता गवर्नमेंट से भी अपील करूंगा कि वह इस के बारे में एक कमेटी बनाएं या इस को सलेक्ट कमेटी में भेजे लेकिन इस बिना में कुछ न कुछ प्रयास अवश्य होना चाहिए। बल्ब की जो बड़ी नेगन्स हैं, वे आज पावर के कारण पागल हो गई हैं। उस को दूर करने का यह एक तरीका है।

पिछले वर्ष जब मैं योरुप गया था, तो मैं वहां पर घोंती और कुर्ते में गया। पश्चिमी देशों के लोगों ने मुझसे पूछा कि क्या आप हिन्दुस्तान के हैं? मैंने कहा, "जी, हां"। तो उन्होंने कहा कि भारत के लोग फिलास्फर होते हैं और उन्होंने कहा कि आप जरूर फिलास्फर होंगे। तो मैं आपको बता देना चाहता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान के बारे में यह आम चर्चा है, यह आम धारणा है बैस्टर्न कंट्रीज के लोगों में कि हिन्दुस्तान के लोग बहुत दूर की सोचते हैं। वे सिर्फ आज की नहीं सोचते हैं बल्कि आने वाले 100 साल, 50 साल में जो काम होने वाला है, उस को सोचते हैं और वं बहुत दूरदर्शी हुआ करते हैं। इसलिए आज हिन्दुस्तान को मार्गदर्शन करना पड़ेगा ताकि पश्चिमी राष्ट्रों में जो बातक अस्त्र-शस्त्र इकट्ठा करने और बनाने का दौर चल रहा है, वह समाप्त हो। पश्चिमी राष्ट्र और अमेरिकन राष्ट्र पागल होकर अस्त्रों के निर्माण में लगे हुए हैं। इन अस्त्रों के बनाने से विश्व में शान्ति नहीं हो सकती है। इसलिए आज के युग में इस देश को ही संसार के राष्ट्रों को रास्ता बिलाना होगा कि यदि विश्व के अन्ध शान्ति स्थापित हो सकती है तो वह हमारे देश के अर्थ बुद्धि—महावीर, बुद्ध और गांधी—

के रास्ते पर ही चल कर हो सकती है। हम विश्व के राष्ट्रों को मार्ग दर्शन करा सकते हैं।

मैं इस अवसर पर जनता सरकार से भी अपील करूंगा कि वह श्री कामथ जैसे राष्ट्रीय व्यक्ति के प्राइवेट बिल को मंजूर करें। मैं श्री कामथ को बधाई देता हूँ कि उन्होंने ऐसा बिल सदन में पेश किया है। मैं श्री कामथ से भी यह अपील करूंगा कि वे सरकार और पार्टी के प्रेशर में आकर इस इस बिल को बिदवा न करें। मैं सरकार से पुनः अपील करूंगा कि जनता सरकार कम से कम एक प्राइवेट मेम्बर के बिल को तो मंजूर करके एक स्वस्थ उदाहरण प्रस्तुत करे। यह एक अच्छा बिल है। यह बिल कामथ जैसे व्यक्ति की तरफ से पेश किया गया है। सरकार को कामथ जैसे व्यक्ति का यह बिल मंजूर करके भावर और सम्मान करना चाहिए।

मैं सरकार से फिर अपील करता हूँ कि विश्व शान्ति के बिना इस देश में कोई नहीं हो सकता है और यह बिल उस दिशा में एक अच्छा कदम है। सरकार इस बिल को मंजूर करके, बुद्धिमता का परिचय दे। यदि कोई एक व्यक्ति भी, इंडीविजुअल भी सरकार के सामने कोई अच्छी बात रखता है तो उसको मानने के लिए सरकार को तैयार रहना चाहिए।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं उपाध्यक्ष महोदय को धन्यवाद देता हूँ कि उन्होंने मुझे बोलने का अवसर दिया।

डा० रामजी सिंह (भागलपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, अभी जिस विधेयक पर सदन में चर्चा चल रही है वह एक ऐतिहासिक विधेयक है और यह एक ऐतिहासिक व्यक्ति के द्वारा सदन में लाया गया है। अभी तक विश्व सरकार बनाने की दिशा में सुझाव और निर्देश ही दिये गये थे लेकिन यह प्रथम बार है कि विश्व सरकार बनाने की दिशा में

एक ठोस कदम उठाया जा रहा है। हमारे बसोबस नेता आचार्य कामध्व ने भारतीय संस्कृति के उद्धारों से यह सिद्ध कर दिया है कि यह कोई पारंपरिक दृष्टि की उपज नहीं है, यह भारतीय चिन्तन द्वारा से उद्भूत हुई कल्पना है। उन्होंने इस संदर्भ में कई शास्त्रों से अपनेको प्रकार के उद्धरण दिये और हमें सिखा दी।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हमारे यहां तो इस संदर्भ में बहुत कुछ कहा गया है। हम सचमुच में राष्ट्र की पूजा करते हैं—

जननी जन्म भूमिश्च स्वर्गादपि गरीयसी।

सारे जहां से भ्रष्टा हिन्दुस्तान हमारा।

विश्व सरकार की बात के लिए भी हमारे यहां के शास्त्रों में कहा गया है—

त्यजदेकं कुलस्यार्थं ग्रामस्यार्थं कुलं त्यजेत्।

जनपदस्यार्थं ग्रामं, भ्रातृभ्यो पृथ्विनाम्॥

हमारी संस्कृति में तो छोटे स्वार्थों को बड़े स्वार्थों के सामने परित्याग किया गया है, बराबर इस संदर्भ में चिन्तन किया गया है। यही कारण है कि हमारे यहां आत्मवत् सर्वभूतेषु एवं श्रद्धा की भावना व्याप्त है। भारत की मिट्टी से ही दार्शनिक क्षेत्र में श्रद्धा के सिद्धान्त का जन्म हुआ। यही भारतवर्ष होगा जहां से विश्व सरकार की नींव भी पड़ेगी। अध्यक्ष महोदय, इस बात को लोग एक स्वप्नवर्सी सिद्धान्त कह कर टाल देते हैं। कहा जाता है कि यह एक यूटोपियन सिद्धान्त है। वस्तुतः हमारे कामध्व साहब ने गांधी जी के उद्धरण दिये। बापू मात्र आदर्शवादी ही नहीं थे वे एक व्यावहारिक आदर्शवादी, प्रैक्टिकल आइडियलिस्ट थे। उन्होंने कहा है :

"Nationalism is not the highest concept; the highest concept is world community."

आचार्य किनोक भावे जो गांधी जी के शिष्य हैं, वह "जय जगत" कहते हैं। मुझे

सुची हुई कि हमारे विश्व मंत्री ने संयुक्त राष्ट्र में "जय जगत" का उद्घोष किया था। यह भारतीय परम्परा के अनुरूप है। श्री अरविन्द ने भी "आइडियल आफ ह्यूमन यूनिटी" में विश्व सरकार की कल्पना की है। गुरुदेव रबीन्द्रनाथ ठाकुर के शब्दों में विश्व सरकार के सिद्धांत में तो सोचने की ही कोई बात नहीं है, उधर तो हमें जाना ही चाहिए। स्वयं पंडित जवाहरलाल नेहरू ने जो इस देश के महान प्रधान मंत्री रहे हैं कहा था :

"I have no doubt in my mind that world federation must and will come for there is no other remedy for the world's sickness."

बर्टेंड रसल ने जितनी बातें कहीं उनको बताने का मेरे पास समय नहीं है। विश्व बिख्यात इस दार्शनिक ने कहा है :

"...it seems indubitable that scientific man cannot long survive unless all the major weapons of war and all the means of mass destruction are in the hands of a single authority which, in consequence of its monopoly, would have irresistible power, and, if challenged to war, could wipe out any rebellion within a few days without much damage except to the rebels. This, it seems plain, is an absolutely indispensable condition of the continued existence of a world possessed of scientific skill."

इनको भी आप यूटोपियन कह सकते हैं लेकिन यह कहना कहां तक ठीक है। आप सोक्रेट्स की बात न करें जब उन्होंने कहा—

"I am neither an Athenian nor a Greek but a citizen of the world."

लेकिन आज तो सचमुच में समूचा विश्व ही हमारा परिवार है। स्काट के शब्दों में :

"The world is my country; the human race is my race; the spirit of man is my God and the future of man is my heaven."

[डा० रामजी सिंह]

प्रो० टायनबी की बात भी कहीं गई है। आप कह सकते हैं कि सोनेट्स, टायनबी सब दार्शनिक थे, यूटोपियन थे। लेकिन जवाहरलाल जी को तो आप नहीं कह सकते हैं। डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया ने विश्व सरकार की कल्पना की थी। वह स्वप्न दर्शी नहीं थे। आप इन सब लोगों को छोड़ें, स्वप्नदर्शियों की पंक्ति में आप रहें। लेकिन हेराल्ड मैकमिलन जो इंग्लैंड के डिफेंस मिनिस्टर थे उन्होंने कहा था :

"Hon. members may say, that this is elevating the United Nations, or whatever may be the authority, into something like world government; be it so, it is none the worse for that. In the long run, this is the only way out for mankind."

एटली ने जो विश्व सरकार की बात रखी विश्व के सामने उसको सब लोग जानते हैं। उन्होंने बल्ड पालियामेंट बोसलो में कहा था :

"I would like to see a world government grow out of the U.N. What stood in the way was not only old prejudices and old loyalties but above all fear."

इसी तरह से एमरी रीब्ज ने "विश्व-सरकार" की आवश्यकता को स्वीकार किया है। वस्तुतः यह कहा जा सकता है कि विश्व सरकार की आवश्यकता निर्वादा है। हम प्राणविक युग में पहुंच चुके हैं। आइस्टीन ने कहा है कि अगर चौथा विश्व युद्ध होगा तो उसे हमें पत्थरों से और लाठियों से सड़ना पड़ेगा। विश्व युद्ध का अर्थ है विश्व का नाश। अगर विश्व नाश से आप बचना चाहते हैं तो यह आवश्यक है कि विश्व सरकार की कल्पना ही न हो बल्कि उसको वास्तविकता भी प्रदान की जाये। आज हम देशभक्ति के विषय में कुछ नहीं कहना चाहते। लेकिन देश भक्ति से ज्यादा हमारी निष्ठा होनी चाहिये पृथ्वी में, सम्पूर्ण विश्व में। दूसरे शब्दों में कहा जाये तो कहा जा सकता है कि संकीर्ण देश भक्ति पैरोक्यलिज्म है नैसनलिज्म। इसी तरह से

"Nationalism is a kind of tribalism."

यह जो कबीलापन है इस कबीलापन ने, इस राष्ट्रवाद ने मानवता को कहीं पहुंचाया है? इसने जितना उसको अभिशप्त किया है उतना किसी अन्य सिद्धान्त ने नहीं किया है। इसलिए आवश्यक है कि इस राष्ट्रवाद की जो गत्यात्मकता समाप्त हो गई है आज वह अन्तर्राष्ट्रीयता के सिद्धान्तों में पुष्पित और पल्लवित हो। साम्यवाद का भी सिद्धान्त इंटरनैशनलिज्म पर आधारित है। यह भ्रमल गत बात है कि साम्यवाद की राष्ट्रीयता सिक्कांग की सीमा पर रो उठती है और आज के भ्रमबारों में चीन और वियतनाम के राष्ट्र की सेवाओं में आपस में भूठभेड़ हो रही है। इसलिये यह आवश्यक है कि हमारे सामने एक स्वस्थ अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय सिद्धान्त का जन्म हो जो साम्यवादी अन्तर्विरोधों से ऊपर हो। और इसीलिए हमारे कामच साहब ने कहा है कि यह फेडरेशन है। इस फूलवाड़ी में केवल एक प्रकार के ही फूल नहीं रहेंगे, बल्कि हजारों तरह के फूल रहने चाहिये। और इसीलिये अनेक प्रकार के राज्य, अनेक प्रकार के राष्ट्रों की एक विश्व सरकार होगी। इसीलिये साम्यवाद का विश्व बंधुत्व समाप्त हो गया और आज उसकी अन्तर्राष्ट्रीयता सिक्कांग की सीमा पर समाप्त होती जा रही है, वियतनाम और चीन की सीमा पर समाप्त होती जा रही है। क्योंकि वह राष्ट्रों के स्वातंत्र्य एवं बहिष्कृत्य को पनपाने नहीं देती। आज अगर इस विश्व में अनेक राज्य होंगे तो निश्चित रूप से यह आवश्यक है कि युद्ध होगा।

इसीलिये जब तक यह राज्य और भ्रमल भ्रमल राष्ट्र रहेंगे तो राष्ट्र के लिये जो संकीर्णता का सिद्धान्त है, इसी से हिटलर निकलेगा और इसी से मुसोलिनी का जन्म होगा। इसलिये आवश्यक है कि एक विश्व सरकार की कल्पना हम करें। आज के प्राणविक युग में यह केवल स्वेच्छा का विषय नहीं है, बल्कि अनिवार्य है। अगर हमने विश्व सरकार नहीं बनायी तो विश्व की मानवता समाप्त हो जायगी। यह न केवल मानवता के लिये

आवश्यक है, बल्कि समानता के लिये भी आवश्यक है। जैसा माननीय कामध साहब ने बताया कि आज ही एक विश्व में, एक ही मानव परिवार में जहाँ अमरीका में गगन बुम्बी अट्टालिकायें हैं, जहाँ समृद्धि भी शरमाती है, वहीं दूसरी ओर एशिया और अफ्रीका में अकिंचनता और दरिद्रता रहती है। अगर मानव एक है, मानव परिवार एक है तो इस प्रकार का जो प्राथिक असंतुलन है वह समाप्त होना चाहिये और ऐसा विश्व सरकार की कल्पना में ही होता है।

हम लोगों ने बचपन में एक पुस्तक पढ़ी थी राष्ट्रल सांस्कृत्यायन की "22वीं सदी" और बेंडल विल्की की "वन वर्ल्ड"। ये किताबें बचपन में पढ़ी थीं। लेकिन अब ऐसा लगता है कि राष्ट्रल सांस्कृत्यायन सचमुच में एक स्वप्नदर्शी नहीं है बल्कि यथार्थवादी नेता है। सबसे ज्यादा भय जो है वह कहीं से नहीं है बल्कि सना की कुसियों पर बैठे हुए राष्ट्रवादी राजनीति से निहित स्वार्थ से जो दबे हुए लोग हैं उनसे है और वही इस प्रकार के सत्-संकल्प का विरोध कर सकते हैं जिनको छोटे छोटे घरोंदों में रहने में खुशी लगती है, जो छोटे छोटे राष्ट्र की दीवारों में अपने नेतृत्व को संभाले रहते हैं। वही इस प्रकार के प्रस्ताव का खंडन कर सकते हैं। सचमुच में अगर छोटी संकीर्णता हमारे मन में नहीं आयेगी तो विश्व सरकार की कल्पना का किसी भी दृष्टि से विरोध करने का आज के युग में कोई औचित्य नहीं है।

हमारे कानून मंत्री जी बड़े विद्वान और सोम्य हैं। मुझे विश्वास है कि वह इसकी सार्थकता को समझेंगे। वह समझेंगे कि इसकी क्या आवश्यकता है। माननीय कामध ने फंडामेंटल राइट्स में इसको शामिल करने के लिये नहीं कहा, बल्कि डायरेक्टिव प्रिंसिपल्स और स्टेट पीलिसी में कहा है। आर्टिकल 39 में कहा गया है:

"The State shall in particular direct its policy towards securing—"

अबि बहुत पीछे हैं। हमने पंचायत के लिये प्रावधान किया, राइट-टू-वर्क किया। उसके लिये प्रयत्नशील भी हैं। यह आवश्यक है कि हमारे संविधान के निर्देशक तत्वों में इसका प्रावधान हो जायगा तो भले ही जनता सरकार इसकी ओर न चले, लेकिन आगे आने वाली संतति इस दिशा में बढ़ने के लिये अवश्य प्रोत्साहित होगी।

संविधान के निर्देशक तत्वों की धारा 51 इस प्रकार है:—

The State shall endeavour to—

(a) promote international peace and security;

(b) maintain just and honourable relations between nations;

(c) foster respect for international law and treaty obligations in the dealings of organised peoples with one another; and

(d) encourage settlement of international disputes by arbitration.

16.00hrs.

परन्तु संविधान की यह धारा वेग है—स्पष्ट नहीं है। माननीय सदस्य, श्री कामध ने इसमें जो उपधारा जोड़ने के लिए अपने विधेयक को सदन में रखा है, वह सरकार को नीति-निर्धारण के सम्बन्ध में एक स्पष्ट दिशा देगी। इस लिए विधि-वेत्ता कानून मंत्री इस विधेयक पर गम्भीरता से विचार करें। अगर सरकार इस विधेयक को स्वीकार कर लेती है, तो यह केवल भारत को ही नहीं बल्कि विश्व की जनता सरकार का अवदान होगा कि उसने विश्व-सरकार बनाने की दिशा में एक सार्थक, स्पष्ट और ठोस कार्यक्रम प्रस्तुत किया है।

यदि दुर्भाग्यवश सरकार ने इस विधेयक को स्वीकार न किया, अथवा इसका विरोध किया,—विश्व-सरकार तो बनेगी ही; वह आज बने या कल बने,—तो आने वाली संतति हमें कर्त्तकित करेगी कि हमने एक ऐसे सङ्घर्ष का विरोध किया, जो भारतीय

[डा० रामजी सिंह]

संस्कृति और विश्व-मानवता में समिहित है। इसलिए किसी भी व्यक्ति को इस प्रस्ताव का विरोध करने का कलंक नहीं लेना चाहिए।

लोग कहते हैं कि केवल प्रस्ताव पास कर देने से विश्व-सरकार नहीं बन जायेगी। नहीं, उसके लिए आवश्यक कार्यक्रम तैयार करना होगा। संविधान के निर्देशक तत्वों में श्री कामब द्वारा प्रस्तावित उपधारा को जोड़ने से विश्व-सरकार के लिए अनुकूल वातावरण बनेगा, और यह राष्ट्र तथा सम्पूर्ण विश्व यह सोचेंगा कि भारतवर्ष ने, जो जगद्गुरु कहलाता है, विश्व को एक भ्रवदान दिया है।

आप जानते हैं कि सामान्य जनता को विज्ञान-निर्देश देने का वायित्व इस महान् सदन पर है। इस लिए अगर हम इस विधेयक को स्वीकार कर लेते हैं, तो जनता भी सूकीर्ण राष्ट्रीयता के दायरे से निकल कर भागे बढ़ेगी। हो सकता है कि तब हम पहले चरण में क्षेत्रीय राष्ट्रों को मिलायें; दूसरे चरण में हम अन्य पग उठा सकते हैं। इस लिए सामान्य जनता को इस सदन द्वारा इस विधेयक को स्वीकार करने से काफ़ी मदद मिलेगी।

सब से बड़ी बात यह है कि विरोध कहाँ होता है मनोविज्ञान का विद्यार्थी होने के नाते मैं समझता हूँ कि ऐसे सवप्रयास के प्रति हमारा विरोध तब होता है, जब हमारे हृदय में पूर्वाग्रह रहते हैं लोग कहते हैं कि बात है तो बिन्दुल ठीक, लेकिन—वे अपनी बात के साथ "लेकिन" लगा देते हैं—लेकिन यह व्यावहारिक नहीं है। तो फिर कौन सा कार्यक्रम व्यावहारिक है? जितनी जति मानवता को राष्ट्रवाद ने पहुँचाई है, मैं समझता हूँ कि उतनी जति किसी अन्य सिद्धान्त ने नहीं पहुँचाई है। हमारे जो पूर्वाग्रह और पूर्बनिष्ठायें हैं, विन्तन की हमारी जो गलत दिशा है, हमें उनसे ऊपर उठना होगा।

राज्य का निर्माण किस प्रकार हुआ ? कहा जाता है कि सोशल कंट्रैक्ट थ्योरी के अनु-सार राज्य का निर्माण हुआ। हाव्ज के शब्दों में

मैन इन दि स्टेट काउन्सेलर इज सीनेक, वूटिस, डेबिलिस वूड काउन्सेलर विस तरह से मिडल ईस्ट में राष्ट्र एक दूसरे के साथ झगड़ते हैं, जिस तरह कोरिया, वियतनाम और अन्य क्षेत्रों में राष्ट्र झगड़ते हैं, उसे रोक कर हमें हाव्ज के शब्दों में कहना चाहिए कि वीथ नेसनलिस्टिक प्रोसिडर इन दि स्टेट काउन्सेलर थार सीनेक, वूटिस, डेबिलिस वूड साइड ।

इस लिए आज आवश्यकता है एक न्यू सोशल कंट्रैक्ट की, एक अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय प्रसंविदा की, जो विश्व-सरकार की कल्पना का जन्माधार है। हाव्ज, लाक और रूतो के सिद्धान्त केवल राष्ट्रवाद तक सीमित थे। श्री कामब के शब्दों में अब हमें एक अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय प्रसंविदा को प्रस्थापित करना है।

मैं विधि मंत्री से यह निवेदन करूंगा कि और कुछ हो या न हो, लेकिन जनता सरकार इस विधेयक के विरोध करने का कलंक और अपयश न ले। मैं उनसे आग्रह करूंगा कि वह इस विधेयक को अपना समर्थन दें।

SHRI P. K. DEO (Kalahandi): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I do not think any persuasion would be required to wholly support this piece of legislation. It suggests amendment to the Directive Principles of the Constitution and if we do not have the requisite strength today, I beg to move that this Bill be circulated for eliciting public opinion by a certain date, say by the first day of the next session.

Coming to the merits of the Bill, I would like to say that the advancement of science and technology in the 20th century has strunk the world and nationalborder are gradually withering away. It takes hardly few hours for a man to girdle the earth in the space. The globe is much smaller than what was conceived a few years back.

After scanning the space, after landing in the moon and after collecting the data and photographs from the various planets, so far as our

knowledge goes, probably the small planet of ours, which we call earth, and probably the mankind are the choicest creation of God. To preserve this human race and this pretty planet should be the endeavour of every thinking man.

The world is a beautiful tapestry interwoven by various cultures, peoples of various colours, linguistic variations, and theocratic beliefs and various political persuasions, which make the world a beautiful whole. At the same time, the issue is whether we can grasp the nature and dimensions of the emerging threats to our well being, whether we can create an integrated global economy, a workable world order and whether we can reorder global priorities so that the quality of life will improve rather than deteriorate. This is a very big question mark and when nations, more particularly, the big powers, vie with each other in the arm race, for the stock-piling of lethal weapons, for nuclear intercontinental ballistic missiles and all dangerous gadgets of mass annihilation, the future to me seems to be very dark. All talks of SALT or disarmament, or nuclear non-proliferation treaty seem to me just to hoodwink the other people, the poor nations. There should be some consistency between the precept and practice of the big powers.

In this connection, I would like to quote from a very eminent author, Lester R. Brown's book, World Without Borders:

"The nation-state with its sacred borders brings with it a concept of territorial discrimination which is increasingly in conflict with both the emerging social values of modern man and the circumstances in which he finds himself. It says, for instance, that we can institutionalise the transfer of resources from rich to poor within national societies but not among societies. The poor on the other side of a national border are somehow less needful or less deserving than those inside the border. If we consider

ourselves as members of a human family, can we continue to justify territorial discrimination any more than religious or racial discrimination?"

16.10 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

We live in an age where problems are increasing world wide—the world food problem, threat of world inflation, world population problem, world environmental crisis, the world monetary crisis, etc. etc.

If you analyse the various developments of the concept of nation, you will find that plots of land have been divided and sub-divided generations back due to some historical circumstances. They are considered even to-day, in the present concept, as sacrosanct, for whose preservation; in this century we have seen two world wars causing colossal loss of human lives, where human beings were treated as guinea pigs.

The widening economic gap in a shrinking world will exert great stress on the international and political fibre of the world.

The confrontation is between the rich and the poor at a global level. It is not temporary or an accidental thing. It is too much deep rooted. The concept of social justice of the poor nations is fully justified. The days of colonial rule are over. The last vestiges will go in no time which we find either in tip of Africa or in Rhodesia. The United Nations were seized of this problem and to shrink the disparities, to give more opportunities for growth to these developing and under-developed nation, they started UNCTAD. But so far as the performance of the UNCTAD is concerned, I can say that all the moves so far have been a futile exercise. But the emergence of the gap between the poor and the affluent State is a historical fact and that has to go if the world has to survive as a whole. The only solution in this regard is the world Government where we eschew national, cultural, linguistic,

(Shri P. K. Deo)

religious and colour prejudices. The entire perspective has to be changed and the outlook has to be geared in that way. So the proposal, the legislation that is before us to have a Constituent Assembly, I feel, is a correct thing. All instruments of mass annihilation have to be eliminated. Even at the ripe old age of 90, respected leader Shri Rajagopalacharya made his first foreign visit to the United States and persuaded John F. Kennedy not to go on with the production of nuclear weapons. Mahesh Yogi in his own way of transcendental meditation, with a spiritual approach, tries to have the world Government. Here is another Yogi—Shri H. V. Kamath. I call him yogi because he practises yoga every day. Another yogi has come forward with this legislation and I think it is quite consistent in the present context. I fully endorse the views expressed by my learned colleague Dr. Ramji Singh and Shri Shankar Dev. So I request the Law Minister that he should not scotch this Bill. He should give an opportunity for the circulation of the Bill to elicit public opinion not only in this country, but even throughout the world also. I am sure we will get tremendous response towards this Bill.

SHRI GODEY MURAHARI (Vijayawada): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I wanted you to be in the Chair, because, it is one of the rare occasions when a Deputy Speaker would like to speak. I have believed in a world government for the last 30 years or so and I have worked towards the realisation of this ideal.

It was Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia who first inspired me to take certain concrete steps towards the realisation of a world constitution. It was under his guidance, Sir, that I had first become one of the office bearers of the World Constitution and Parliament Association which recently at a Constituent Assembly held in Paris adopted a model constitution for a World Federal Government.

If is another matter, Sir, whether nations accept this idea, or not, because, even now national chauvinism and the desire to keep one's own is prevalent and predominant amongst nations. And, I do not think it is an easy task for any Government to come forward and say that it stands for a particular kind of a constitution. Nevertheless, a non-official effort was made and a draft constitution prepared. And it is now, Sir, time, I think, that Government should also think of adopting a world Constitution whether it is by improving the constitution that has already been drafted or by amending it or by adopting a new Constitution. But the ideal of a World Government is the one thing that I think humanity today needs. But for a World Government, I see nothing but destruction in the world. On the one hand with neutron bombs being manufactured and all kinds of nuclear weapons being stockpiled and no sign of any total disarmament, it is inescapable that we should move towards a World Government, because, only a world authority, which has a part of the sovereignty of every nation, can perhaps bring about an order in which there shall be no armament and in which there shall be no bombs and other kinds of weapons of warfare.

As long as we believe in national frontiers, as long as the world believes in amassing wealth for each nation, as long as the world wants to live at the expense of other nations, as long as one nation tries to exploit the other nation. I suppose, the preparations of war will go on; and there is no end to it. However much we might talk about disarmament, however much we might want to ban nuclear weapons, this is not going to produce any effect, because national chauvinism is supreme and every nation wants to thrive at the cost of the other.

Therefore, unless there is an attempt made to bring about some kind of a world authority, a world

Government, where every nation surrenders part of the sovereignty to such authority, which authority can really impose its will upon the people of the World, I don't see any future for mankind.

And therefore it is that people like me have always believed that the nations that really believe in peace should now make an effort through their Governments to bring forward such a World Government.

That is why, Sir, I came forward to speak on this Bill and I support Mr. Kamath's Bill. I know there have been groups all over the world who are working for the formation of a world Government. There are various groups which are striving to produce some kind of a World Constitution.

But, all these will mean nothing unless the nations agree to come forward and contribute to this effort.

So long as Governments do not take initiative, it is not going to fructify and that is why, I think, Mr. Kamath has done well to bring forward this kind of a Bill which envisages that the Government take the initiative or make some efforts towards the realisation of this goal.

Being a Deputy-Speaker—I do not know—I should not request the Government either to accept or not to accept this Bill. But, I can say that I fully support the effort that Shri Kamath is making today and, I hope, the House will unanimously support his effort and there will not be any dissensions on this because, I know there are several systems which cannot accept the idea of a world Government; there are certain political systems which, in the world of today, do call for a world order but of their own conception. Take for example the Communist movement. Communist movement also talks of a world State and, perhaps, division of the State as well, as an ultimate goal. Of course, they have their own economic system and social system which come in, I suppose, in the way of a

proper negotiation with the other systems in the world today. I think that even among the Communist movements, I see a drift towards co-existence with the other systems.

Perhaps, a few years back, nobody could have thought that the Communist movement would say that they are prepared to co-exist with the other systems. But, that development did take place and, therefore, today—I do not see any difficulty where different systems that exist in the world today can cooperate to form and bring about a world authority. It is another matter as to what the World Authority would do because, to solve the economic problems, to solve the differences in the economic disparities amongst the nations, I suppose, the world authority will have to contend with all these ideas—the communist idea on the one hand and the democratic socialist and welfare ideas on the other which would perhaps have a dialogue on the world authority and, finally, come to some kind of a consensus which would be the solution for the world's ills.

That is why I think that if we want peace in this world, if we want that nations should not go to war against each other, if we want that we should not fight for national frontiers and territorial adjustments and things like that, the prime idea is to give the people their economic well being that they need. I think this world authority will take up all these systems and come to some kind of a dialogue and then come to a consensus. That is why I think the only solution for the world of the future is the formation of a World Government and therefore, although the idea may be scoffed at today. I know many people will scoff at it by saying 'Oh, it is a utopian idea; you talk of the World Government. You cannot have adjustments within the States. Now you talk of the World Government'. But, I think, the solution to all problems within the

[Shri Godey Murahari]

States and within the regions is only through the World Government.

As long as you have the national frontiers, as long as you have regional imbalances and as long as you have regionalism, there is no solution to the problems of the world. That is why, the one and only solution is to create a world authority which can impartially go into the various problems which will not be inhibited by national chauvinism and which will not be inhibited by territorial boundaries and which can look at all the problems of the world and come to some kind of a lasting solution. That is why, Sir, I support Mr. Kamath's Bill and I thank you very much for having come and presided over here at my special request.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI SAMARENDRA KUNDU): Mr. Speaker, Sir, our esteemed colleague, the Law Minister, Shri Shanti Bhushan, will be replying to the debate. I just want to say a few words on this topic.

I feel so happy to associate myself in this debate because, for many years, it has been our life's dream if there could be a world without frontiers and if I could travel as a free man without all sorts of restrictions i.e. visas, etc. from one and of the world to the other. The concept of one world, as Mr. Kamath has said, is not new to us. *Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam*. The world is a family. That is the concept of ours given in the old scriptures right from the Vedic age. Various sages have pronounced it a number of times. I also agree with the hon. Deputy Speaker who decided to participate in this debate; that most of the problems of the world would not be solved if there is no world authority which would be really effective in solving some of the problems. That has been our view all along. We have seen the United Nations in the crawling stage; the UN as a body is trying to get up

and start walking. Our effort, our idea is to strengthen this world body, to make this world body an effective organisation so that it would have some teeth to bite and it is indeed a happy thing to note that today the United Nations represents 149 nation states and 2,000 million people. Mr. Kamath had represented the Government of India in the last General Assembly session.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH (Hoshangabad): You were also there.

SHRI SAMARENDRA KUNDU: I was also there. I returned with the feeling that the body of the United Nations was gaining in strength day by day and year by year.

MR. SPEAKER: From a body of notions it has become a body of nations.

SHRI SAMARENDRA KUNDU: Our Speaker has said correctly. Our vision is taking some shape through it. There are various problems to be sorted out before we could agree to provide a shape to the concept of a federal government. There are many burning problems which divide the world today: the problem of colonialism and imperialism is still there. The problem of disarmament threatens our life. 400 million dollars are spent every year in mad armament race. More than one billion dollars is spent on armament race daily and at the same time the world is divided between the haves and the have-nots. There are regions in the world where people have 9000 dollars per capita income while in some regions they do not have even 60-70 dollars per capita income. Our country's per capita income is about 150 dollars. There are parts in Southern Africa where five per cent of the white people are ruling over 95 per cent of black people and all sorts of tortures are perpetrated on the black people. Mr. Kamath's noble idea of a federal Government is supported by every body in this side and most of the persons on the opposite side also; we

have tried to have the concept of one world realised and still trying for it. For that the appropriate course would be to create the necessary conditions. Are we really convinced that the concept of nationalism is not dominant now? Are we really convinced that the nation states are prepared to give up their national sovereignty? Therefore, let us create the necessary climate through our action so that the small countries, those that are every year emerging free, the nation states gradually shed their concept of national sovereignty so that we can move towards some sort of international brotherhood or international community or some sort of world federation as Mr. Kamath is thinking. Therefore what I feel is this, we must see how this Assembly of Nations can be transferred into a Parliament of man, representing the collective conscience and will of humanity. Having said that...

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH:
Your senior Minister had said so.

SHRI SAMARENDRA KUNDU: As my friend Mr. Kamath rightly said, we had taken this posture; we had taken this point of view in United Nations; and my Senior Minister had also said this in the United Nations while he participated in presenting the Government of India's point of view.

Now we should concentrate to see that we pave the way so that in our life time we can have a world without boundaries or some sort of a federal world, which Mr. Kamath is thinking. For that, the first thing we should do is, we must strive to have a new international economic order. If there are countries where the economic disparities are quite large, and people are discriminated on the basis of colour and creed, we cannot work effectively for an international community without frontiers or some sort of a federal Government where we would Surrender all the sovereign powers and authority to that world Federal Organisation.

Similarly, as I said, the next point is whether we can strike a harmonious balance between international interdependence and national sovereignty. It is very important. If we do not, through our actions and deeds, try to strike a harmonious balance between international interdependence and national sovereignty, then perhaps, the vision which Mr. Kamath is thinking of may not be achieved. Therefore, the Janata Government, as Mr. Kamath is very much aware, is taking all the steps if I am to say so far creating condition, for this one by one. The Janata Government has started to build up very close, friendly relations with immediate neighbours and others. The Janata Government wants to strengthen the nonalignment movement. The Janata Government is also quite active in seeing that a new international economic order is achieved. We are also trying to see that world is not discriminated on the basis of colour, religion or creed. Therefore, we should take a very pragmatic approach to this problem. I sincerely thank Mr. Kamath for bringing this Bill; his vision and our vision are the same, his vision and the vision of the millions of people of India are the same. "Vasudavai Kudumbakam", which he said, that is what we have been thinking and saying for many many years. That is what he wants to achieve and we also want to achieve it. If that is the objective, I think, the time has come when we have to take a correct line of action and as I said, the Janata Government is taking a correct line of action. We should create such conditions so that we can really achieve our objective. I love his ideas and appreciate his ideas.

I thank him once again for having brought forward this Bill. With these words, I conclude my speech.

SHRI JAGANNATH RAO (Berhampur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I welcome the Bill brought forward by my

[Shri Jagannath Rao]

friend, Mr. Kamath. It is not that Mr. Kamath hopes that the world Government will come into existence tomorrow or day after. But the concept is worth considering. We are living in a world which is threatened by nuclear armaments everyday and unless we think...

MR. SPEAKER: That itself may drive to a world Government.

SHRI JAGANNATH RAO: When the nuclear explosions take place, no Government will exist and the whole world will be annihilated. Therefore, the super powers talk of disarmament and limitation of strategic arms but still they are going on stockpiling nuclear weapons. The other day France exploded a neutron bomb in the Pacific. That is why the stand taken by our Prime Minister is very correct that unless you yourself restrict the manufacture of these nuclear weapons, you cannot ask others to sign the Treaty of Non-proliferation. Therefore, we are living in a world where nuclear weapons are looming large and every country wants to build up its stockpile of nuclear weapons. Unless we think in terms of international peace, and international living, the world cannot exist.

Sir, today the world is shrinking. We can cross the seven seas and the five continents in a day. We can reach any part of the world. Secondly, peace is indivisible. There cannot be peace in one part and war in another part. Any spark in any part of the world will engulf the whole world. So also prosperity. Prosperity cannot be confined to a few lucky nations and poverty to the rest of the world. Therefore, every country which is prosperous should think of prosperity of other weaker countries, poor countries, share their prosperity with them so that every country can live in peace and contentment. I will quote another instance. Now, industrialisation has taken place all over the country. There is ad-

vancement in science and technology. Can it be said that any country is able to produce any product by itself? No country is self-sufficient. One country may not have the raw material. Another country may have only the managerial skill. The third country may have the technological skill and the fourth country may have the marketing techniques. Therefore, Lester Brown in his book, "World without Borders" said that even production is internationalised. Take, for instance, Japan, It takes iron ore from India. It manufactures steel. The technology is from the United States. The managerial skill is from another country. Marketing techniques are from the fourth country. Selling and packing is from another country. The man-power is from a sixth country. Therefore, even production of any product is internationalised. No country can say it is self-sufficient. If it is self-sufficient in raw material, it has not got the other components to produce that product. Therefore, the world is now shrinking. Every country should think in terms of other countries in the world so that they are members of the same family. Another instance I would quote is the high seas. They are the common heritage of mankind. This doctrine was propounded by the delegate of Malta in the United Nations in 1967 that high seas are the common heritage of mankind. But every country wants to grab the seas. The super powers, irrespective of ideology, want to have control of the high seas and the wealth, the hidden treasure on the sea-bed. We do not want to give any share even to the land-locked countries. We say that land-locked countries have no right to the treasures. Therefore, if we have to consider all these aspects, if we want to live in peace, if we want to live in a world without war, we can settle our disputes or differences by mutual consultations and mutual agreements. We can hope to live in peace and it is our country, India, alone which is competent to move in that direction.

MR. SPEAKER: In addition to the high seas, we can have openskies.

SHRI JAGANNATH RAO: Yes, open skies also. Now, in international law of the sea conference they have come to a consensus. Though there is a difference of opinion about the constitution of the sea bed authority, on other aspects they have come more or less to an agreement that high seas are the common heritage of mankind. This doctrine was propounded by Mr. Pablo of Malta in 1967 in the United Nations. The other countries have practically accepted it except that there is a slight difference about the constitution of the international sea bed authority, as how to do it and who should have the control. Otherwise, they have accepted. So there is a growing awareness in the minds of other countries also that they should have to live in peace and they have to share their riches with the poor countries. Now, a discussion is going on between North and South, between the rich and the poor countries. But so far nothing has come out. These countries should build a new social order where every country is in a position to maintain itself. Unless we think in larger terms of the human family, the family of the human race as one, there is no future for the world. Therefore, this bill has focussed the attention, not only of our Parliament, our Government and our country, but of the whole world. They should think in terms of the world order, new world economic order, and the new world family, as it is. The United Nations is there; but in the UN, only discussions took place.

MR. SPEAKER: I understand 2 hours have been allotted to this bill. The time allotted will be over by 4.40 p.m. Is it the pleasure of the House that the time be extended?

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: by 2 hours.

MR. SPEAKER: It can be done only upto 6 o'clock to-day. It will

656 LS—13.

not be possible to extend it by 2 hours. For the time being, it is extended till 6 p.m. There is a bill to be introduced. Today, it will be extended upto 5 minutes to 6 p.m.

SHRI JAGANNATH RAO: As a first step, I would suggest that the UN Charter be amended and the power of the veto given to the five nations be taken away. Every country should have equal status in the U.N. As long as the veto power remains with the 5 countries, there cannot be any hope for the UN. UN is the family of nations; but nothing comes out of it. I was myself a delegate to the UN. But who can it bring it about? Only India can do it. India has the moral strength and stature to bring about this and to highlight this concept to the nations of the world, and see that it is accepted by them. I think that after persuasion, other countries will come round, except those 5 countries. By and large, all the countries will realize the need and necessity to think in terms of a world family, a world order and a world government as such. It is a loose federation, where every country is sovereign. It may be democratic or otherwise. Disputes amongst the nations can be solved by mutual consultations; and the countries should share their joys and sorrows. They should share prosperity, knowledge, science and technology with other countries, so that the world can live in peace; and it will be a world of which we can be proud of.

श्री हुकम देव नारायण बाबू : (मधु-
बनी) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, जो विधेयक माननीय
श्री कामत के द्वारा सदन में विचार करने के
लिए प्रस्तुत किया गया है, उस पर बहुत से
विद्वान माननीय सदस्यों ने अपनी राय
जाहिर की है। हमारे विद्वान साथी, डा०
राम जी सिंह, ने इस विषय पर कई विद्वानों
के विचार अपने भाषण में रखे हैं।

मैं एक प्रश्न यह उठाना चाहता हूँ
कि क्या यह पग उठाना क्यों जरूरी है।

[श्री कृष्ण देव शारदाय याचन]

इस की आवश्यकता तो बहुत पहले से महसूस की जा रही है । हमारे देश में " बहुवैव कुटुम्बकम् " की कल्पना की गई थी उससे भी बढ़ कर हिन्दू धर्मशास्त्रों में कहा गया कि सम्पूर्ण जगत ही ब्रह्म है—सब में ब्रह्म है । जब सब में ब्रह्म है, तो फिर इस ब्रह्म में ये अलग अलग विभेद कहाँ से चले आये—मासिक मानव का विभेद, प्राणत का विभेद, राष्ट्र का विभेद । आज ये सारे विभेद दुनिया में विचारमान हैं । कहने की बात तो चाहे वो रही हो लेकिन दुनिया के अन्दर यह भी तार्किक सत्य है कि कहा गया कुछ व्यवहार में रहा कुछ । चाहे वह दुनिया के कोई भी सिद्धांत रहे हों, जो कहने वाला रहा है, दर्शन देने वाला रहा है, जब वह दर्शन देने वाला धिदा हो गया तो उस के मानने वाले स्वयं उस के दर्शन को कई टुकड़ों में बांट कर छोटे छोटे घरोद्वे वाले बनते रहे हैं । वही चीज राष्ट्रवाद में भी रही है ।

मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज दुनिया में इस बात की आवश्यकता क्यों है ? केवल एक हथियार वाला सवाल नहीं है । बीसवीं शताब्दी के अन्त तक अग्न हथियार बनाने वालों ने स्वेच्छा से इस हथियार को समाप्त नहीं किया तो बीसवीं शताब्दी के अन्त में हथियार प्रयोग से हथियार भी नष्ट होगा और हथियार बनाने वाले भी तमाम नष्ट हो जाएंगे । हथियार भी जाएंगे और हथियार बनाने वाले भी जाएंगे । बीसवीं शताब्दी के अन्त तक दुनिया की यह दुर्दशा होने वाली है इसलिए कि जो हथियार बनते चले जा रहे हैं आखिर कहीं न कहीं इन का प्रयोग होगा ही । ये कितने दिनों तक उन हथियारों को अपने खजाने में, अपने गोदामों में जमा कर के रखेंगे ? आखिर इस हथियार से उन में एक न एक दिन युद्ध की उन्मत्तता आएगी ही और उस युद्ध की उन्मत्तता में वे उस हथियार का प्रयोग करेंगे ही चाहे एक हिरोशिमा

और नागासाकी के बसले सम्पूर्ण विश्व ही हिरोशिमा और नागासाकी क्यों न बन जाय। इसलिए आज लोग यह कल्पना कर रहे हैं कि अग्न मानवता को बचाना है, हथियारों पर प्रतिबन्ध लगाना है और हथियारों की विषमता को रोकना है तो उस के लिए जरूरी है कि विश्व का कोई संगठन हो ।

आज दुनिया के अन्दर तकनीकी विषमता है । जो यूरोप वाले देश के हैं उन के अन्दर जो तकनीकी विशेषज्ञता है वह तकनीकी विशेषज्ञता पिछड़े हुए मुल्कों में नहीं है । आज अमेरिका एक मिनट में जो सामान तैयार करता है उसी सामान को पैदा करने में हिन्दुस्तान को बीस मिनट से भी ज्यादा लगता है । यह हिन्दुस्तान और अमेरिका के बीच में सामानों के उत्पादन में अन्तर है । आप चाहे आज हिन्दुस्तान को नें, चीन को लें, रूस को लें या दूसरे देशों को लें जो तकनीकी विशेषज्ञता है वह दुनिया में एक तरफ ज्यादा इकट्ठी होती जा रही है और दुनिया के पिछड़े हुए देशों में तकनीकी विशेषज्ञता का अभाव है इसलिए दौलत भी जहाँ तकनीकी विशेषज्ञता है वहाँ जमा होती जा रही है और जहाँ तकनीकी विशेषज्ञता नहीं है वहाँ गरीबी बढ़ती जा रही है । दुनिया के बाजार में उन का शोषण होता चला जा रहा है । इसलिए अग्न इस को भी नियंत्रित करना है तो इस का भी उपाय होना चाहिए कि दुनिया के अन्दर सभी मानव को समान तकनीकी विशेषज्ञता मिले । कोई भी वैज्ञानिक दुनिया के किसी भी कोने में अपनी बुद्धि से कोई नया आविष्कार करता है तो उस आविष्कार पर केवल एक मानव का हक नहीं है, किसी एक देश का हक नहीं बल्कि सम्पूर्ण विश्व का उस पर समान अधिकार होना चाहिए और सभी को समान लाभ उस का मिलना चाहिए । कोई उस को गुप्त नहीं रख सकता है । इसलिए उस के लिए भी जरूरी है कि कोई ऐसा

विश्व संगठन हो किन्तु के अन्दर वह तकनीकी ज्ञान निरन्तरित हो ।

इतना ही नहीं दुनिया के अन्दर की प्रायः रंग की विषमता है उस को समाप्त करने के लिए भी इस की आवश्यकता है । दुनिया के अन्दर जो अपने को सभ्य देश कहने वाले हैं चाहे वह अमेरिका हो या और दूसरे देश हों, अमेरिका में भी नीग्रो लोग जिस बवतार हालत में रखे गए हैं, शायद हिन्दुस्तान के अन्दर जो हरिजन हैं उस से भी अमेरिका के नीग्रो की हलात खराब है । चाहे वह इंग्लैंड वाले अपनी सभ्यता का रंग धरते हों अपनी सभ्यता और संस्कृति पर गर्व करते हों लेकिन वह भी अफ्रीका में काले लोग हैं उन को समान अधिकार नहीं दे पा रहे हैं । इसलिए यह जो चमड़ी की विषमता है रंग की विषमता है विश्व में उस के लिए भी एक विश्व संगठन होना चाहिए जहाँ इस रंग की विषमता का अन्त किया जाय ।

हम लोग इतना ही नहीं मानते डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया ने जो विश्व सरकार की कल्पना की थी उन की छत्रछाया में राजनीति करने वाले लोग हमेशा इस बात की मांग करते रहे हैं कि विश्व सरकारों का संघ नहीं हम तो चाहते हैं कि दुनिया में बालिग मताधिकार के आधार पर चुने हुए प्रतिनिधियों के द्वारा विश्व की सरकार बने . . . (व्यवधान)

SHRI RAGAVALU MOHANARAN-GAM (Chengalpattu): Sir, on a point of clarification. While appreciating the speeches of our hon. Members in regard to Shri Kamath's Bill, I want to know, as a matter of curiosity, what would be the official language of the world, when there is only one Government.

MR. SPEAKER: That would be decided in due course.

श्री कृष्ण रेव वाराणस वावच : हम तो यह जानते हैं कि विश्व की सरकारों का संघ

नहीं होगा चाहिए । विश्व की सरकारों के संघ से विश्व के मानव का कल्याण नहीं होगा । दुनिया में सभी सरकारें मानव से एक हैं । सभी सरकारों के खिलाफ हुर देश की जनता विद्रोह करती है और हुर देश की सरकार का प्रापस में गठबन्धन रहता है । जनता और सरकार के बीच में दुनिया में सभी बराह टक्कर है इसलिये विश्व सरकार संघ की कल्पना करते हैं उसमें विश्व की सरकारों के प्रतिनिधि जहाँ बैठेंगे वे अपनी जड़ता के आधार पर उचित अधिकार देने वाले नहीं हैं । चाहे अमेरिका की सरकार हो, चाहे इंग्लैंड की सरकार हो अगर हिन्दुस्तान की जनता पर शोषण हो रहा हो, तो मानव अधिकार के नाम पर भले ही आवाज उठाये लेकिन अमेरिका के अन्दर और इंग्लैंड के अन्दर जो जनता का शोषण वहाँ की सरकार द्वारा होता है, उस के लिये वे आवाज नहीं उठा सकते हैं । इस लिये विश्व सरकार संघ नहीं, विश्व की सरकारों का संघ नहीं, बल्कि दुनिया के बालिग मताधिकार के आधार पर चुने हुए प्रतिनिधियों की विश्व सरकार हो । प्रायः जब हम इस दर्शन को कहेंगे तो न तो अमेरिका मानेगा, न रूस मानेगा । इस लिये नहीं मानेगा कि प्रायः अगर चीन और हिन्दुस्तान को मिला दिया जाय, तो उस की आवादी दुनिया की आवादी के प्राधे से अधिक है और विश्व की सरकार में चीन और हिन्दुस्तान के चुने हुए प्रतिनिधियों का बहुमत होगा । इस लिये यदि बालिग मताधिकार के आधार पर प्रायः विश्व सरकार की कल्पना करेंगे और बनाना चाहेंगे तो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ—रूस और अमेरिका कभी भी इस दर्शन को नहीं मानेंगे । चाहे साम्यवाद के नाम पर हो, चाहे पूंजीवाद के नाम पर हो, दुनिया में अपने खेमे बना कर दोनों ने दुनिया को लूटने का काम किया है । एक ने दुनिया की वीरत को साम्यवाद के नाम पर और दूसरे ने पूंजीवाद के नाम पर इकट्ठा किया है । हमारे साथ न तो रूस कोई रियायत करना

[श्री हुकम देव नारायण यादव]

चाहता है और न अमरीका कोई रियायत करना चाहता है। दोनों ही तकनीकी विशेषज्ञता और दौलत को इकट्ठा कर के दुनिया में शोषण करते हैं। इस लिये विश्व की सम्पत्ति विश्व की है। दुनिया की सम्पत्ति दुनिया की सम्पत्ति मानी जाय, चाहे वह अमरीका की सम्पत्ति हो या रूस की सम्पत्ति हो। दुनिया की सारी सम्पत्ति का बटवारा दुनिया के मानव पर हो, तभी जो दुनिया में पिछड़े हुए देश हैं, उन को लाभ मिल सकेगा।

इसी प्रकार से विश्व नागरिकता भी होनी चाहिये। आज जो हमारे ऊपर प्रतिबन्ध है कि यहाँ नहीं जा सकते, वहाँ नहीं जा सकते, उस के लिये पासपोर्ट लेना पड़ता है। उस पासपोर्ट की प्रथा को समाप्त करना चाहिये। डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया ने सही मायनों में विश्व सरकार की कल्पना की थी चाहे रसेल का सिद्धान्त हो या श्री किसी का सिद्धान्त हो, यदि सही मायने में आप विश्व के मानव का कल्याण चाहते हैं, सही मायने में पिछड़े देशों का कल्याण चाहते हैं और दुनिया की दौलत का बराबर बटवारा करना चाहते हैं तथा हथियारों का, रंगभेद का और अन्य विषमताओं का अंत करना चाहते हैं, अगर इस कल्पना को साकार करना चाहते हैं तो विश्व सरकार की स्थापना करनी होगी। इस दर्शन का मनवाने के लिये हमारे सरकार जितना अधिक से अधिक प्रयत्न कर सकती है, करे। अभी बीच में श्री कामत का जो मध्यम रास्ता है, उस को भी अगर दुनिया के लोग मान लें तो प्राये वाली बड़ी बात का पाने के लिये इस छोटे रास्ते से ही शुभारम्भ किया जाये।

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR (Gandhinagar): May I say at the outset that this is one more feather in Mr. Kamath's cap? He has already earned our congratulations and gratitude for having brought this Bill.

It is said that it is an utopian idea or idealism to talk about a World

Government. but may I say in all humility that all legislations at some time or other had started with utopianism and idealism? It is only when public opinion accepted this idealism as some kind of reality that they have become part and parcel of legislative enactments. Therefore, the Law Minister, Shanti Bhushanji, cannot say—I hope he will not say—that it is an utopian ideal and we do not want it. If he puts forward that argument, may I say then that the entire chapter IV of our Constitution is utopian and nothing else? Acharya Kripalanj and others have said that it is nothing but a combination of pious hopes and aspirations. So, if one more pious hope and aspiration can be added to this Chapter on Directive Principles of State Policy, I do not know why we should be chary about it.

16.54 hrs.

[SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN in the Chair.]

While talking on this subject, I want to read out briefly what three eminent people of modern times have said about the necessity of world co-operation. I start with Victor Hugo. The House knows that Victor Hugo was a French poet and novelist, who had lived through several desperate French experiments tried by different parties with different forms of government. He said in 1885.:

"I represent a party which does not yet exist."

And what is that party? "civilization". "This party will make the twentieth century. There will issue from it the United States of Europe and then the United States of the World."

What a prophetic sentence he uttered in 1885! Then, what has Mahatma Gandhi said? He was particularly very sharp when he was very pithy.

"I would not like to live in this world if it is not to be one world."

Gandhiji was once asked before Independence by a British journalist: "Why do you fight for India's independence?" He said: "The answer is simple. To make one world safe and a reality". We wanted India's freedom so that one world become a reality and one world become a safe world.

Then, again what the great Poet. Rabindrunath Tagore said:

"We must know that as the realization of the unity of the material world gives us power, so the realization of the great spiritual unity of man alone can give us peace."

If the idea of world cooperation is strengthened by the views of people like Victor Hugo, Mahatma Gandhi, Gurudev Rabindranath Tagore— one can quote many such outstanding literateurs and authors throughout the world—let us not say that it is only idealism and utopianism. We want that utopianism because recent Governments and good governments are governed by ethical principles in the conduct of government.

Mr. H. V. Kamath has very rightly mentioned in the aims and objects of his Bill:

"The time is opportune, may ripe, for all good men and good governments of the world to get together". He is one such good man and the Janata Government is one such good Government. If that combination can help. I would like the combination to come forward not as Article 51(a) but Article 51 (a) (b) (c) (d) and (e). I do not want to take time to read this Article but you will see that Mr. Kamath's suggestion under this Bill under (e) is merely a logical culmination of what preceds in A, b, c, and d of Article 51 of the Directive Principles of State Policy. So, it is a good thing to have this kind of a Bill coming as it does in 1978. I am sure, Mr. Kamath also knows that it was a British historian, Arnold Toynbee, who in his latest book, devoted a whole chapter on "World embracing

patriotism". We are no longer having patriotism which is just bordering our own national frontiers. If John F. Kennedy, that youthful and ever vigilant US President talked of crossing the new frontiers, then we can say that we want to cross those frontiers, national borders, national securities and we want to have one world. If that is so, and while talking of good men and good governments, I am reminded of Edmund Burke's off-quoted dictum: "The good must unite, when the bad combine." When the bad are combined through armaments and through destructive weapons, the good must unite with ideas and ideas. When the good unite then they can only do so with such ideas as that of one world. Many of us have read Wendol Wilkie's book 'One World' published in 1941. We know what happened in 1945, before the birth of the United Nations in 1945, how arious Charters beginning with the Atlantic Charter and many other declarations including the "Four Freedoms" uninciated by Franklin D. Roosevelt brought the idea of one world and one community.

17 hrs.

I am never tired of quoting my teacher, my guru, Harold Laski, who said in his book "A Grammar of Politics"; "Either we create one world by a deliberate plan or we court disaster. It is a grim alternative". Therefore, if science and technology, education, communication and mass media have brought us all together, then, may I ask, how can we all afford now to linger on or limp? The one world community must take sape. After all the world has shrunk. We have reached the moon. can't we, therefore, reach all nations and all people together by creating constitution of the one world? If we can do that. I am quite sure that the United Nation's system is going to be such a one world's special mission and agency. There is going to be a special session of the U.N. General Assembly

[Prof. P. G. Mavalankar]

from 23rd May to 26th June, 1978 in New York. I do not want to take time in giving details of that special session on disarmament. It only shows how the State Governments, the national Governments and the whole world are trying through various forms, agencies and platforms to do what we are talking in terms of support to Mr. Kamath's Bill.

I would end by only saying that world opinion, world morality, world consciousness, a kind of world or global attitude, are needed to face this common problem and common challenge, because, unless we face challenges in a common way, in an imaginative way, we will not be able to go ahead. When we want one world, we are not talking of an uniform world or a regimented world. If I again quote Kennedy, he wanted to make the world safe for diversity. And when we want diversity, it is in terms of unity or one world government.

So, I conclude by saying that one world will contribute to healthier growth and richer gains and, also, efforts are going afoot in the United States of America, in the United Kingdom, in the Soviet Union and in other countries and, in India if we do that, I am quite sure that by adopting this Bill, we shall have carried one good step in the right direction and, I hope, we will do it without any dissenting voice.

SHRI SHYAMAPRASANNA BHATTACHARYA (Uluberia): Madam Chairman, I am very happy to support the Bill moved by Mr. Kamath, one of our founding fathers of the Constitution. I cannot go up to the heavenly heights of this Bill. But I support the basic spirit of the Bill underlying anti-imperialism, anti-war, ending exploitation of man by man and developing cultural science, not for destruction of humanity but for the good of man.

Einstein discovered the theory of relativity, of turning matter into

energy. When America utilized this scientific development by dropping an atom bomb on Hiroshima, Einstein said, "If I were born as a seaman, not as a scientist, perhaps, it would have been better." This is the feeling of the biggest scientist as to how these scientific discoveries are being misused by the imperialist powers.

A few days ago, President Carter came to India. Our country is a poor country and our Prime Minister is also a representative of the poor people. But he refused to sign the Non-proliferation treaty. He said boldly to Mr. Carter, "You must first destroy your atomic power and then ask us to sign the Non-proliferation treaty." This is a feeling which is growing throughout the world. The purpose of the Bill of Mr. Kamath will be achieved but still we are to develop much more in the movement of humanity. In France, America, England and in other countries, the forces of peace are growing and the war-mongers cannot face the people boldly. They prepare destructive weapons but the people are against it. It will create a spirit of broader movement against war and humanity will be freed from the danger of destruction in future.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister.

THE MINISTER OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI SHRANTI BHUSHAN): Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the hon. mover of the Bill, Shri Kamath and all other eloquent Members who have let support to this Bill, including the hon. Deputy Speaker who was also provoked.

श्री यमुना प्रसाद सास्त्री (रीवा) : सजापति महोदय, मेरा एक भयवत्वा का प्रश्न है। अभी जब अख्यत्र महोदय सदन में अध्यक्षता कर रहे थे तो उस समय इस विधेयक पर समय बढ़ाने की बात कही गयी थी।

अब जब मंत्री जी जवाब दे रहे हैं तो हम लोगों को इस पर बोलने का कैसे समय मिल पायेगा।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Excuse me. Mr. Shastri, will you please resume your seat? There is time for Shri Kamath's reply. We have already consulted the Minister as to the amount of time he will require and Mr. Kamath as to the amount of time he will require. So, there is enough time for both of them to complete their speeches before we take up next Bill.

श्री यमुना प्रसाद शास्त्री : मेरा कहना यही तो है कि अगर यह माना जा रहा है कि मंत्री जी के बाद श्री कामथ बोलेंगे तो हम लोगों को बोलने का समय कैसे मिलेगा। इसीलिये तो दो घंटे का समय इस बिल के लिए बढ़ाया गया था।

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am in the hands of the House, Mr. Shastri. The time has already been increased by the decision of the House and, therefore, I have to go by that decision.

AN HON. MEMBER: For the time being, it is upto 6.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 5-6. The Minister may continue.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA (Delhi Sadar): Mr. Chairman, by 5.50 it should be over; everything will be over.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have already stated about it. You need not take the time of the House. There is no need for you to take the time of the House. Mr. Shastri, will you resume our seat? The Minister will continue.

श्री यमुना प्रसाद शास्त्री : इस विषय पर हमको भी कहना है। इसीलिए यहाँ पर समय बढ़ाने की बात उठी थी और अध्यक्ष महोदय ने कहा था कि यह बिल 6 बजे तक चलेगा।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Shastri, will you please resume your seat? I think you did not follow what I said. The time has been extended till five minutes to six and with that thing in mind I enquired from the Minister and Mr. Kamath how long would they take and in accordance with that I called upon the Minister.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH (Hoshangabad): I have a submission to make.

MR. CHAIRMAN: At five minutes to six, that is what the Speaker told.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: You check the records when the Speaker was in the Chair. He said and everybody heard and you were also there in the House; you would also have heard it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I was in the House.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: He said that the time, as we all asked for, was extended by 2 hours. He said: for today, it will be upto six.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Five to six.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: No, no, upto six. Please see the records. If I am wrong, I will take the punishment.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Two Members should not talk at the same time.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: Today, it is upto six. You see the records. Please have the records checked up, because Members are anxious to speak on this important Bill. Why do you stop them?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, you can give some of your time. Naturally, I have no objection.

(Interruptions)

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: This is the practice of the House. I had talked to the Speaker.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are a large number of Private Members Bills before us and . . . (Interruptions).

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: It is up to six o'clock today; it is not 5.55 at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, initially he had said that, but later he made it clear....

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: Let us see the record. (Interruptions).

SHRI SHANTI BHUSHAN: Madam, you are perfectly right because the Hon. Speaker first said 'All right, it is Six for the time being' but, thereafter, later on he said that because the other Bill also has to be moved, it will be five minutes to six.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So, the Minister may continue.

SHRI SHANTI BHUSHAN: Madam, I was trying to congratulate....

MR. CHAIRMAN I think you have succeeded in congratulating.

SHRI SHANTI BHUSHAN: I have succeeded, but I wanted to add something. The Hon. mover and the other eloquent speakers have highlighted this very important problem which is facing not only India but the whole world. The gloomy prospect of the destruction of the whole world is also facing the entire man-kind and it is for that reason that I have, with utmost humility, chosen to congratulate the Honourable Mover of the Bill and the other eloquent speakers.

At first I had thought that perhaps it would be for the External Affairs Minister to reply to this debate, but I can quite appreciate the predicament of the External Affairs Minister that if the goal set out by the Hon. Mover is actually realised, what will happen to the External Affairs Minister because there would be no External Affairs so far as India is concerned. (Interruptions)

Now, Madam, at first, when I looked at the Bill and read the contents of the Bill, at that moment I omitted, to notice as to who the Mover was and I thought, after reading the Bill, that while the objective was very laudable, perhaps we were very distant from that dream,—from that golden dream—and that, perhaps, that objective possibly could not be realised, what to say of our own life-time, but for many more life-times, and so on. But, thereafter, I happened to look at the name of the Hon. Mover of the Bill and I started entertaining doubts about my own thinking because I remembered that it was the same Shri Kamath who had pointed out and who had highlighted the various inadequacies in our Constitution, when, during the Constituent Assembly debate, he had pointed out the deficiencies which existed in the provisions dealing with Emergency and various safeguards and so on. He had forecast that there were certain dangers implicit in the scheme of things which was being discussed before the Constituent Assembly and at that time people were sceptical—they perhaps scoffed—and they said that such a situation could never come to pass. It shows Mr. Kamath has a very uncanny foresight. He is able to see the future. I do not know whether he has taken some special schooling in that art for being able to see the future, or perhaps he has been born with this art or this science, whatever it is, whether it is an art or a science. But the fact remains that he somehow has the capacity to foresee the future. He was able to foresee it then and, then, at another time, he had also wanted that a certain entry relating to inter-planetary travel should also be introduced in the Constitution. That was another occasion when people said 'Mr. Kamath dreams of inter-planetary travel. How, possibly, can inter-planetary travel be a thing of reality? But in our own life-time we have also seen inter-planetary travel—well, something which perhaps would be realised soon by human-beings.

Man has already stepped on the moon and so on. Therefore, this is a kind of pointer to the fact that Shri Kamath is able to see the future.

THE MINISTER OF STEEL AND MINES (SHRI BIJU PATNAIK): A decendent of H. G. Wells.

SHRI SHANTI BHUSHAN: Therefore, I started entertaining doubts about our own ideas and I thought, perhaps it might become a reality in our own life-time and certainly in the life time of Shri Kamath.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: It should in your life-time.

SHRI SHANTI BHUSHAN: But when we say that, if we also look at the conditions which prevail in this world, what to say of this world even in our own country, we find the humanity, mankind even in our own country still continues to be divided in so many ways, on linguistic considerations, on caste considerations, on regional considerations, on the consideration of rich and the poor and on various other considerations. Still thirty years after independence society in this country it continues to be so divided. But, at the same time, one has got to concede that the objective, as set out here is the only escape for humanity in this world and it has got to be accepted by every human-being as the ultimate vision of the glorious future.

17.17 hrs.

[**SHRI DHIRENDRA NATH BASU** in the chair]

In this connection, Shri Kamath has referred to the ancient Indian philosophy which is *वसुधैव कुटुम्बकम्*।

and has also referred to the prophetic words of Mahatma Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru, Sri Aurobindo, Einstein and so on and he finally referred to the glorious speech made by our External Affairs Minister at the General Assembly of the United Nations very recently in that connection. Incidentally he also said that the External Affairs Minister had brought glory to

Hindi because for the first time, he introduced Hindi at the General Assembly of the United Nations. I would like to mention and inform the hon. Members of the House that while it was left to the External Affairs Minister to introduce Hindi at the General Assembly of the United Nations, Hindi had been introduced at the United Nations by—and I would like to utilise this occasion to pay tribute to the memory of that brilliant officer of the Foreign Service—Saad Hashmi, a Muslim. It was left to a Muslim of this country to do that in a Committee of the United Nations a few months before that. When I was at the United Nations attending the Law of the Sea Conference, not in the General Assembly, but one of the Committees of the United Nations, he made the first speech in Hindi and it was simultaneously translated in all the languages of the world. It was, therefore, a pioneering effort, a glorious effort, on his part and I would like to pay my tribute to that brilliant officer for that pioneering effort. He was a very distinguished member of the Foreign Service. Unfortunately, he is no more. He was quite young, but shortly thereafter he came back to India, had a heart attack and died.

I would perhaps be failing in my duty, if I do not say this now. I do not want to be misunderstood. So far as this Bill is concerned, while I have already said that the objectives are very laudable, at present, as would be realised, we are living in a different atmosphere, in a different world today. The spirit of nationalism, national sovereignty etc. is yet very much of a reality. The people of every country still have a pride in their national sovereignty and so on. I would, therefore, like to invite the hon. mover's attention and the attention of the hon. Members of this House to perhaps what I might describe a technical aspect of the matter.

So far as the directive principles are concerned, the House is aware as to what the purpose of the directive

[Shri Shanti Bhushan]
principles, which is set out in Article 37 of the Constitution itself is; it provides:

"The provisions contained in this Part...."

And this Part deals with directive principles,

"...shall not be enforceable by any court, but the principles therein laid down are nevertheless, fundamental in the governance of the country and it shall be the duty of the State to apply these principles in making laws."

Now the principle which the hon. Mover wants to have added in Article 51, which is one of the Directive Principles, there are already four principles there. The four principles are slightly of a different qualitative effect I would invite the hon. Mover's attention to them. So far as the four principles contained in Article 51 are concerned they are quite consistent with the national sovereignty, because they say:

"51. The State shall endeavour to—

(a) promote international peace and security;

(b) maintain just and honourable relations between nations;

(c) foster respect for international law and treaty obligations in the dealings of organised peoples with one another; and

(d) encourage settlement of international disputes by arbitration.

Neither of them contemplate any surrender of any part of the sovereignty of India. But as soon as we introduce the concept of world federal Government however laudable that concept might be, howsoever of necessity that object might be, so far if we are trying to introduce that concept of Directive Principles in the present Constitution, when the glorious preamble which is still regarded as glorious, the accepted policy of the people of this country which is enshrined in the preamble of the Con-

stitution, I am quitting the controversial side because even before the controversial 42nd Amendment, this preamble was—

WE, THE PEOPLE OF INDIA, having solemnly resolved to constitute India into a SOVEREIGN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC.

Of course the words SOCIALIST and SECULAR have been added by the 42nd Amendment, so it declares—solemnly resolved to constitute into a SOVEREIGN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC.

So, the concept of India being Sovereign Democratic Republic, is that India shall have sovereignty. No part of its sovereignty so long as this Constitution governs the people would be alienable or could be surrendered by the Government which has to function within the Constitution, which has to further the principles of the Constitution, which is pledged not to act against the established concepts of the Constitution and, therefore, the question might arise, the hon. member would, perhaps, think about it, that so long as this concept is there, so long as the conditions have not arisen, can India surrender and can they all surrender their national sovereignty? Would it be possible to introduce within this very Constitution, the concept of world Federal Government which clearly contemplates the surrender of part of the sovereignty of this country so that the text which I chose to describe has a technical aspect of the question, which I would be falling in my duty if I do not call attention to and that is why I have said—while the objectives are very laudable, while the glorious vision of the future which has been painted by this Artist, old acknowledged artist, is a very attractive picture to which all of us would like to subscribe, with all earnestness and sincerity at our command, the whole question is, this will have to be done. This concept of a world federal Government one world will have to be introduced by the sovereign peoples of the whole world. So far as India is concerned,

while the Indian people have constituted themselves into a sovereign entity, so long as the situation does not emerge, conditions are not created in which the people because the Government, of course, is not sovereign, Government can only function within the parameters established by the Constitution which has been given to the country by the people of the country— But so far as people are concerned, people are sovereign. Not only the people of this country are sovereign, the people of the whole world are sovereign. And, therefore, so far as the people of the country are concerned, this objective which has been spelt out by Shri Kamath will have to be translated into action by the people of India acting in unison, acting in co-operation with the people of the other countries of the world. So it is a very laudable objective. But I am afraid that there are certain difficulties and the reason being, that the concept of national sovereignty is still a very strong concept. But what are the conditions to-day? This concept of world Government can be, as I stated earlier, translated into action by the willing consent of the people of this world. There are countries with different kinds of polities and so on. It is not enough that if there is a world Government, because the world Government can be various kinds, but India would not like to subscribe merely to the concept of some kind of a world Government unless that world Government or world federal Government is established on terms of equality, on honourable terms, on just terms, on fair terms which gives a just deal to all the people of the entire world irrespective of their colour, caste, creed, etc. Until then the mere ideal of a world Government would not be enough.

17.25 hrs.

[SHRI RAM MURTI—in the chair]

The World Government has to be established. It is essential. In fact, it is inevitable and that is the only solution for preventing the catastrophe which is facing the entire humanity. While all that is there, that world Government will have to be established

on honourable terms, on terms of equality for all the people of the world. Favourable conditions have to be created. Those conditions have to be created in which that world order can be established.

Sir, the world is also divided into different kinds of concepts. We know of the West and the East; we know of North and South. There is dialogue between the West and the East. There are also dialogues between the North and the South. There are developing countries; there are developed countries; there is the Group of 77 and so on and so forth. There are still so many different concepts so that still those relations between the different countries are emerging. Negotiations are taking place. Talks are going on. And the whole question is this. Whenever a very good thing has to be done, even then, its timing has also to be seen, and this is very important, if that good thing has to succeed in its very laudable objective.

May I here just give the illustration of two hard-boiled negotiators? I can give a crude example of a buyer and a seller. They are two stiff bargainers; they do not give out their mind, because they have their sight on the ultimate negotiations, in the ultimate conclusion of a most favourable deal. Neither of them would declare publicly upto what price he would go. The buyer does not want to declare prematurely that he is anxious to buy. The seller also does not want to declare prematurely that he is anxious to sell. The grim spectacle is this. The person who is in great need of selling away his house says, no, no, I am not anxious to sell away the house; if a proper price comes then I can think about the offer and not otherwise; I have another house and so on and so forth. So far as the buyer is concerned, although he is in absolute need of the house immediately, he says, no, no; I am quite comfortable; I am living somewhere else with a friend of mine, so that I am quite comfortable and I am not in great need of a house and so on and

[Shri Shanti Bhusan]

so forth. So, neither of them is prepared to declare prematurely their intention. Why? Because, each one of them has his sight on the ultimate terms on which the settlement is to be arrived at. Neither of them wants to give his ground so far as the ultimate objective is concerned.

Now, if the world Government or World Federal Government of a World Order has to be successfully established, it has to be established on honourable terms, terms which are just and fair to everybody. Then in that case it will have to be borne in mind that we are like those hard-boiled negotiators; we should know our interests; we should uphold our self-respect and our pride; we should not act in a manner so that we lead ourselves open to exploitation by other countries. This is an idea which has to emerge from different countries.

Now, the constitution of a country is the most solemn document to which that country subscribes. If a certain idea is prematurely introduced in this most solemn document to which a country subscribes to, namely, the world Government, I have a certain apprehension that perhaps that may amount to trying to work for the defeat of the objective. Because, the objective is not merely the establishment of a world government on any terms. No. That is not the objective. The objective is the establishment of a World Government on absolutely just, fair and honourable terms. So, we should not take any steps or any action which might even to the slightest extent defeat that very laudable objective, namely, establishment of a just and fair world Government. If, therefore, a premature commitment about the acceptance of a certain idea, even before some effort has been made by the other countries is made, obviously, the contract, the agreement on the World Government cannot be established by a unilateral action. It needs multi-lateral action. Therefore, for this multi-lateral action, there has to be a certain stage and as far as the people of this country—I am not

saying Government because the Government, as I said earlier, has to function within the parameters established by the people in the Constitution itself and so, the Government cannot travel outside it—is concerned, 'yes, the people are sovereign'. And therefore the people can alter these parameters and people can rise above those parameters. Therefore, the people can establish and create conditions in which simultaneously there is some kind of an emergence of this from all the countries of the world. That is possible when the situation is ripe. Without that commitment, without that sort of commitment being made prematurely, there would, certainly, be a time when a method could be found by the people of the different countries to negotiate and arrive at an honourable and just solution. This is a very serious problem which is facing the whole world and this is something honourable, just and fair from it would emerge. I have not the slightest doubt about it.

Now, Sir, one of the hon. Members also referred to the progress which is taking place in the world in spite of various failings. The United Nations, is, to a very great extent, a deliberative body and not really that kind of body which can enforce even the collective will of the people of the world and so on. In various fields progress is undoubtedly taking place. So, it is not that we are living in a static world. The hon. Member referred to the problem of Law of the Sea. Now, I am happy to say that so far as the concept of a common heritage of mankind is concerned, it has been accepted by all the countries of the world at the Law of the Sea Conference, it has been accepted, universally accepted—that so far as very valuable reserves which are lying in the deep sea bed are concerned, minerals, copper, manganese etc., are the huge wealth existing in the seabed which cannot be imagined or calculated. It is a huge wealth. It is a very happy augury that all the countries of the world together have accepted the common heritage principle irrespective of the fact whether some

countries are land-locked or not. Even the landlocked countries which do not have any shore, which do not have any coastline, they have been regarded as the rightful partners to this common heritage of mankind.

It is another thing as to what regime should be established for the people of the world, what should be the common heritage and how they should be made to participate by getting an honourable and a fair treatment in all the benefits that are arising from out of these resources lying in the deep sea-bed. For that purpose, these conferences, talks and discussions are going on still and, some day, there could be some success in all these deliberations so that the world is undoubtedly moving towards the realisation on the part of every country that the future is bleak, not merely for small countries, not merely for the poor countries, not merely for the black countries but the future is also bleak for the entire mankind. The world is becoming increasingly interdependent and, therefore, that realisation is there. And it is a happy augury and I have not the slightest doubt particularly, since the mover of the Bill happens to be Shri Kamath. And, perhaps, in our own life-time, this idea will take concrete shape and the situation will emerge in which it will be honourable even for India to take a lead for the Indian people in that direction. But, a premature lead sometimes is a self-defeating step.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH:
This is only a step now.

SHRI SHANTI BHUSHAN: The question is whether that step can be profitable or that step can be a constitutional one. So far as the Directive Principles in Article 51 are concerned, they are quite consistent. India being a sovereign nation.

But, so far as this new principle is concerned, so long as India subscribes to the principle and so long as its Constitution subscribes to the principle of the national sovereignty, would it be possible for the Government to

work towards the surrender of any part of its sovereignty? This is a technical aspect of the matter. I know that whenever there is progress, whenever revolution takes place, then there are some such inconsistencies and anomalies which must arise and which do arise. But, those are the anomalies which can be brushed away. Therefore, I would like—I would request—the hon. Mover also to ponder over this. I know he has already done a great service to highlight this very important aspect. It is important not merely for India but also for the whole world, for the entire humanity. He has highlighted it in his inimitable style already. He has rendered a great service. (*Interruptions*). I would request the hon. Mover to ponder over these aspects also because there are stages. First stage is to highlight the problems of the people of the country; the people will discuss and they will move in those directions. They will induce the people of the other countries also to move in that direction. Perhaps, then the time will come when a more concrete step would also be in order. It might be profitable and might not be self-defeating. It would not have the kind of risks of facing the technical objections etc., etc. which this Bill must have today.

With these words, Sir, I appeal to the hon. Mover to very kindly not press his Bill at this time on this occasion.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH:
Mr. Chairman, Sir, six weeks ago, on the 10th of March, to be precise, the Minister for Law, Justice and Company Affairs made a similar speech supporting almost in toto my Bill seeking to amend the Constitution with regard to Article 352, one of the emergency provisions of the Constitution. He then made a similar appeal saying that a Bill, a more comprehensive Bill would be brought. On the whole, it seems a long incubation period, a long gestation period.

SHRI SHANTI BHUSHAN: It is being done now.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH:
That is perhaps coming. And, to-day also he has made a similar appeal, in all humility—he need not have used these words ‘humility’ and all that; we are good friends, he has appealed to me to withdraw the Bill having supported it almost *in toto*, I cannot follow, I cannot comprehend, with the meagre intelligence that God has endowed me with, the logic of his argument. When all our heritage points to one objective, one goal, from ancient times to the present-day of Mahatma Gandhi, Jawaharlal Nehru and Shri Aurobindo and even as late as in 1977, Shri Morarji Desai and Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee, shall we live or continue to live, with a life in our soul and prove false to our heritage and go on saying that we don't want to lead the world now. I would only ask you to take a step. Last time also I said the same thing, namely, ‘one step was enough for me’, as Mahatma Gandhi used to pray:

One step enough en me,
The night is dar.
I do not see the distant scene,
One step enough for me”.

I want the hon. Minister to have the courage, not merely stage a command performance here, and say ‘yes, I do accept’. And if he does accept this Bill, let him not stand on false prestige that this is a Private Member's Bill and say this is the difficulty, that is the hurdle, and on some pretext, empty pretext, appears asounding brass and tinkling cymbal. I would not use the strong word ‘hypocrisy’ but it borders on that. Don't say, we do accept the principle of this World Government, World Union and all that. But, these are the difficulties.

The only reason that is advanced against the Bill, is Sovereignty, that our sovereignty will be in danger. Are we living to-day in the 20th century with the 19th century ideas of sovereignty? For instance, when we signed the Law of the Sea, we accept the limitation of territorial

waters. Suppose we were totally sovereign. We should have made it 100 to 200 miles. We had to accept limitations. It is a curtailment of your sovereignty. I do not want to waste the time of the House by citing a number of instances.

Mahatma Gandhi said that when the whole world was bloodshot with violence, we would stand for non-violence, Shri Morarji Desai, our Prime Minister, said recently ‘let the whole world manufacture atomic or nuclear weapons, but we shall not go in for that.’ That is the spirit which is needed to-day. That needs courage—not merely a petti-fogging, I will not say, lawyer's spirit. What is needed is statesmanship, visionary quality and courage and the will to lead. I do not want them to lead the world to-day; they should take a step forward. I do not wish to take the time of the House. But, here is what Shri Morarji Desai said when he welcomed the British Prime Minister, the Honourable James Callaghan. This is the latest speech. Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee also made a speech on October 4, 1977. I was present. This is what the Prime Minister, welcoming the British Prime Minister, said on the 9th of January, in the Central Hall here. What did he say? I quote:

“We took over from you the parliamentary structure with some necessary modifications, mostly due to the fact that we are multi-religious, multi-linguistic nation. In our case, Tennyson's dream of a Parliament of Man, a Federation of the World, became realised.”

I suppose this is the correct version of his speech. I would like to read one excerpt from what Mahatma Gandhi said in his speech delivered on 9th March 1936. Before that, I would quote what Jawaharlal Nehru said in his speech in the Constituent Assembly—I was present on that occasion—on August 14, 1947, a great speech ‘trust with destiny’ speech. I quote: What did he say:

"And so we have to labour and work hard, to give reality to our dreams. Those dreams are for India but they are also for the world, for all the nations and people are too closely knit together today for anyone of them to imagine that it can live apart.

"Peace has been said to be indivisible; so is freedom, so is prosperity now, and so also is disaster in this One World that can no longer be split into isolated fragments."

In the printed debates it is put in capital letters, One World.

Earlier in Lahore, delivering the Presidential address from the Congress gaddi, in 1929, Pandit Nehru said:

"Having attained our freedom I have no doubt that India will welcome all attempts world cooperation and federation,

He said so, fifty years ago, in 1929 and we are here working to take one small step.

"...Having attained our freedom I have no doubt that India will welcome all attempts at world cooperation and federation and will even agree to give up part of her own independence to a larger group of which she is an equal member."

I ask the Law Minister to mark the words; he was perhaps at school in 1929.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Idukki):
Do not quote Nehru.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH:
I quote whatever is good there is good in everybody; even in you. "I welcome all attempts at world cooperation and will agree even to give up part of our independence to a larger group of which our country is an equal member," that is what he said. He was prepared a surrender, voluntarily, a part of our sovereignty, it comes to that. What is my objective today.

in this Bill? No surrender of sovereignty. At the moment, what do I want the Government to say and do? My hon. friend Shri Mavalankar rightly said that the articles comprised in the Chapter on Directive Principles are regarded as pious hopes, a long string of pious hopes and aspirations, if not latitudes, but let us say, hopes and aspirations. They are not binding. The hon. Minister rightly said that they are not enforceable in a court of law; they cannot be binding on the Government. The State shall endeavour to....' That is how the article begins. If man does not endeavour, what is he for? Does he deserve to be regarded as man at all? If a man does not endeavour in some direction or other, good, bad or indifferent, some endeavour in the direction of making money, some in the direction of acquiring knowledge and some in the direction of acquiring power, but if he does not endeavour, he is dead; he is not alive; there will be stagnation if he does not endeavour. That is why I have asked the State i.e. the Government to endeavour to collaborate. The earlier portions of the article are:

"The State shall endeavour to

- (a) promote international peace and security;
- (b) maintain just and honourable relations between nations;.."

I will not read the other two also. The last one I want to add now by way of this Bill is:

"The State shall endeavour to collaborate with other nations for the early formation of a World Constituent Assembly to draft the Constitution for a World Federal Government."

That is the very humble objective of this Bill. So long as the State does not want to endeavour in this direction, what are all the empty promises, empty statements that have been made by the Minister just now viz., that he stands for it, it is good, it is a good idea. I do not want him to

[Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath]

give a lead, I want him to endeavour. He does not want to endeavour! He wants to sit quite sit pretty on that. That is perhaps what he wants to do in the coming years, at least as far as I can see.

∴

SHRI SHANTI BHUSHAN: People would endeavour.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: With you or without you? With you if possible and without you if necessary. People will endeavour in their own direction.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Chirayinkil): How much time is given for the hon. Member? Do not make the other hon. Member lose his chance of moving his Bill. Of course, this Bill is very important. The whole world is watching it. But the other hon. Member should get his chance to move his Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He has still got six minutes.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: As we all know, the annual world expenditure on armies and armaments today has already reached a staggering figure of 400 billion dollars and about four hundred thousand scientists and engineers are engaged in research to find still more deadly weapons.

AN HON. MEMBER: Including neutron bombs.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: Yes, I agree. That is why I want to find, we want to find a way out. (*Interruption*). You can suggest another way. I am prepared to accept it.

Therefore, I would suggest, I would request and I would appeal to the Minister and his colleagues, senior colleagues, all of us here, this side and that side, right, left and centre, yes, I said, I make no distinction, I appeal to all, all Members, let us train our sights, let us train our minds on to a higher plane and to a higher ideal, to a new international

economic order, to which the Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs, Shri Samarendra Kundu, my good old friend and party colleague has referred already. But, Sir, a new international economic order is not possible, in my humble judgement, with a new international political and Constitutional order; they go together; they are interlinked, and one is not possible without the other. Therefore, we should think of the international political order also simultaneously with the international economic order. That is why, the External Affairs Minister in the United Nations, spoke of both; he did not say 'economic order' alone, but 'political order' also in his speech at the United Nations. Let us, therefore, strive to seek, to find, and not to yield. I have one sporting offer to make and that is if the Minister is responsive,—he is attentive I know,—but if he is responsive—I know the chords of his heart, of his inner being, but the is here to speak on behalf of Government. Perhaps personally, outside, he may hold a different view. I have, therefore, a sporting offer to make because under the rules it would have to be moved formally today. The Bill could be held in abeyance, or, informally, if the Chair permits me, a motion can be moved for circulation of the Bill for eliciting public opinion in the country. If that is acceptable to the Government, that would be an honourable solution for dealing with this Bill. And in the mean time, we could, on our own, send it to foreign countries also to get the opinions of those countries, of those governments, right from Peking to Moscow, to Paris, to London and to Washington. (*Interruptions*). To Africa and Asia. If this is not acceptable to the Government, I am sorry I cannot withdraw this Bill, as it will go against my conscience. I cannot live with a lie in my soul, and I am prepared to face the consequences of the decision I am taking, and it is one of the few great

issues in which I have lived and moved and had my being for the last 30 years or more.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kamath, your time is over now.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: My time is not over, Sir. It is now five minutes to six.

SHRI SHANTI BHUSHAN: I would again appeal to the hon. Member not to press this Bill. As the hon. Member himself has heard me, I have expressed the fullest agreement to each word that he has said. I have only expressed certain difficulties that perhaps today is not the right stage. The hon. Member could still be there so that I would again and again appeal to him with folded hands not to press it.

(Interruptions)

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: I appreciate his appeal, but I am sorry my inner voice does not permit me to withdraw the Bill.

SHRI SHANTI BHUSHAN: May I make one more suggestion with your permission? Let the Bill remain in abeyance with no further action so that it may remain as it is.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: Does it mean that it will be in deep freeze, or what does it mean? In cold storage?

MR. CHAIRMAN: In that case the motion will have to be moved by some one.

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN (Cannanore): Mr. Chairman, I have one submission to make. Since the subject matter of the Bill is so very important that it needs greater consideration if the Minister agrees, why not we send this Bill for circulation?

(Interruptions)

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: He should not stand on false prestige.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: May I request you to decide the fate

of the Bill this way or that way, so that my Bill may be taken? Otherwise, the time will be over.

SHRI PABITRA MOHAN PRADHAN (Deogarh): This is a very important Bill. The Government's mood is known and the hon. Members's mood is known. As it has not been fully discussed, I appeal to both of them that the time should be extended so that other Members can express their opinion.

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: Mr. Chairman, the mover of the motion will agree if I formally move that this bill be circulated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no motion.

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: I move it. I am strictly within the rules of procedure to do it. I can move that the bill of Shri Kamath be circulated.

SHRI P. K. DEO: It can be moved that the bill be circulated to elicit public opinion, by the first day of the next session. (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no motion before the House.

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: This is the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If it is the will of the House, it is all right.

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: I will give it to you, Sir.

SHRI PABITRA MOHAN PRADHAN: I move for more time being given to the bill, for us to have a fuller discussion on it, because it is an important bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Minister, what is your opinion?

SHRI SHANTI BHUSHAN: There is a motion for extension of the time for the debate. Let time be extended.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: There is no question of extension of time. (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: One by one, please.

SHRI SHANTI BHUSHAN: I am very sorry. With great respect to whatever has been said, I don't find myself in a position to agree to any motion for circulation.

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: How can he say that he does not agree?

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: Let the House decide it. (Interruptions)

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK: May I submit that if the House agrees, this may be postponed to some other convenient date for a fuller discussion?

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: On a point of order, Sir.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: I may be allowed to introduce my bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You will be able to do it only when this bill is disposed of.

18.0 hrs.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK: I am sure that the House will agree that the bill be taken up for further discussion on some other day. (Interruptions)

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: My point of order is.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member has replied. The time is over now. There is no question of that.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: I move that the time be extended by another ten minutes.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: If you accept Mr. Chandrappan's motion.... (Interruptions)**

MR. CHAIRMAN: The time allotted is only upto 6 o' clock.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND LABOUR (SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA): The

Speaker has said that the other business should be taken up at 6 p.m. Therefore, the House should proceed to take up the further business listed in the Order paper.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I put the motion? to vote? (Interruptions)

SHRI K. GOPAL (Karur): I am on a point of order. The Speaker has specifically ruled that this discussion should be finished and a decision taken to-day itself. Why extension of time? Please decide whether the motion of Mr. Chandrappan is accepted by the House. Later on, Mr. Kamath's bill can be considered.

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA: The Speaker had said that the other business should be taken up at 6 p.m. Discussion under rule 184 should be taken up now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What has Mr. Kamath to say? May I put this to vote?

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: If you want to extend the time.... (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: The time allotted is only upto 6 p.m. The time is over.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: You allow me to introduce my bill. That is the practice, Sir. (Interruptions) I move that the rule be waived. I should be allowed to move my bill.

सभापति महोदय : अभी पहला बिल खत्म नहीं हुआ है। आप का बिल कैसे आ सकता है ?

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : रूल को वेव कर के ऐसा हो सकता है। पहले भी ऐसी प्रैक्टिस रही है। आप मुझे एक मिनट के लिए बोलने दीजिए, ताकि यह बिल लेप्स न हो जाये। पहले भी ऐसा होता रहा है कि पहला बिल जारी रहता है, और दूसरे बिल को मूव करने दिया जाता है।

सभापति महोदय : यह नहीं हो सकता है ।

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: We have to dispose of Mr. Kamath's bill.

SHRI HARI VISHNU KAMATH: Unless and until his bill disposed of, one way or the other, or postponed to the next day—along with Mr. Gupta's bill, of course by 15 days, the debate may be adjourned.—Because it is already 6 o'clock—you cannot take the vote now. The House has not decided earlier. The House should have decided, before 6 p.m., to sit beyond 6 p.m. I am not a stickler for rules; but if the Chairman and the Minister are sticklers for rules, I would suggest that the only way is to have a motion adopted by the House to the effect that the debate be adjourned to the next day—along with Mr. Gupta's bill. His bill will also come along with mine.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK: There is a motion moved by the hon. Member.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: We have already taken more time. I requested the Chairman earlier, when 20 minutes were there, to go before it was 6 p.m., to look at the time and say how much time he was allowing. The Chairman said that at 5 minutes to 6 p.m., he will stop it. He knew that Mr. Kamath will go on speaking. It was the duty of the Chairman. It is such an important bill. There is a motion of Mr. Chandrappan. I say that the motion moved by Mr. Chandrappan should be put to vote.

SHRI C. K. CHANDRAPPAN: With your permission I move.... (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs. (*Interruptions*) I have called Mr. Ravindra Varma.

SHRI RAVINDRA VARMA: Mr. Chairman, the time allotted for Private Members' Business expires at 6 p.m. It has expired at 6 p.m. Now

the suggestion is that since neither the discussion on the bill, nor the motion of Mr. Pabitra Mohan Pradhan has concluded, the time can be extended and the bill taken up on the next day allotted for the Private Members' Business. In the meanwhile, the question of my hon. friend, Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta's Bill arose. There have been precedents in the past of an hon. Member being allowed to move it, and then the discussion being taken up later. We have, therefore, no objection to this procedure.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: Sir, with your permission,...

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: We do not want it. You cannot set up dangerous precedents. How can it happen? When a Bill is pending..... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI P. K. DEO: A Bill is allotted for two days. This is the first day. So, it will come up again, and will not lapse.

सभापति महोदय : गप्ता जी, टाइम हो गया इसलिए जब तक रूल सस्पेंड न किया जाय तब तक प्राप का मोशन नहीं लिया जा सकता ।

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : तो मैं यही मोशन कर रहा हूँ कि रूल सस्पेंड कर के मुझे एक मिनट का मौका दिया जाय । बर्मा जी ने कहा है कि उन्हें कोई एतराज नहीं है । अभी दो बार इसी सेशन में ऐसा हुआ है । अगर उन को एतराज नहीं है तो प्राप मुझे सब करने दीजिए ।

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, that cannot be done. We have to take up the other item on the agenda.

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : सभापति जी, पहले दो बार ऐसा हुआ है । वो प्रेसिडेंट हैं ऐसे ।

सभापति महोदय : डिप्टी स्पीकर इस फेवर में नहीं थे कि रूल सस्पेंड किया जाय

[समाप्ति महोदय]

श्रीर स्पीकर भी इस केबर में नहीं थे। इसलिए मेरी मजबूरी है कि रूल सस्पेंड नहीं किया जा सकता।

Now Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri will place on the Table the report of the Committee on Public Undertakings.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: Sir, you put the motion to the House. Let the House decide it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs has not moved any motion. So, the question does not arise. Now Shri Chaudhuri.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: Sir, at 6 O'Clock we have a special business. There cannot be any other discussion, except the discussion on the law and order situation. Under the rules it cannot be done.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: No other business can be taken up between 6 and 8 p.m. You should have done it before.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand that the Speaker has already allowed it. He has given him permission.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC UNDERTAKINGS

SIXTH REPORT AND MINUTES

SHRI TRIDIB CHAUDHURI (Berpampur): I beg to present the Sixth Report of the Committee on Public Undertakings on Galloping Rise in Foreign Tours and costs thereof undertaken by the officials of the Public Undertakings and minutes thereto.

18.10 hrs.

MOTION RE: LAW AND ORDER SITUATION IN THE COUNTRY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Stephen.

SHRI SHAMBU NATH CHATURVEDI (Agra): When an item is not

concluded, it automatically goes to the next day, and Mr. Kanwarlal Gupta...

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Idukki): That item is over.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let Mr. Stephen speak.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA (Delhi Sadar): You have done great injustice to me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, I have not done. Mr. Speaker was not in favour of suspending the rules.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: I rise to move the motion standing in my name. I wish the motion was framed the way it was published in the Bulletin of April 17th. I am very clear in my mind, and I hope that this motion reflects a national consensus, irrespective of party differences. In the Bulletin dated 17th April the motion read like this:

"That this House is deeply concerned and takes serious note of the fast deteriorating law and order situation throughout the country, resulting in large-scale loss of life and injuries to the citizens through lathi-charges and police firings."

MR. CHAIRMAN: There are only two hours. How much time will you take?

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola): It should be extended by one hour.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Maximum 20 minutes, if nobody interrupts me.

Against this motion you will find a galaxy of names. Besides myself....

SHRI RAM DHAN (Lalganj): On a point of order. He has read another motion.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: I have only moved the motion standing in my name. I have already said it. I am not moving any other motion.