

15.42 Hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS'  
BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

## FIFTY-FIFTH REPORT

SHRI A. M. CHELLACHAMI (Tenkasi):  
I beg to move:

"That this House do agree with the Fifty-fifth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 23rd April, 1975."

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is:

"That this House do agree with the Fifty-fifth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 23rd April, 1975."

*The motion was adopted.*

15.45 Hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: MEASURES TO  
REMOVE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL IN-  
JUSTICES TO WOMEN—contd.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before we take Private Members' business and resume discussion on the Resolution of Shri Indrajit Gupta, I should like to go on record with regard to the Order of Business here. A very unusual thing has taken place; these are unusual times and perhaps we also sometimes behave unusually. There are two Resolutions under discussion; it has never happened before. (*Interruption*). It is my duty and the duty of the Chair to point out if any irregularity had been committed so that we save ourselves trouble in the future. It happened this way. The resolution of Shri Indrajit Gupta was under discussion. It is quite in order to say that the discussion on that Resolution should be adjourned. But on that day, we not only decided to adjourn that discussion on that Resolution but we also

suspended the rule in order to see that Shri Indrajit Gupta's Resolution must be taken up the next day; it should not have happened. Another motion was allowed that another resolution should be discussed while the first was under discussion. The result is: we have two resolutions under discussion, a thing that has never happened before.

I would like to say that this will hold for today, but it should not be repeated, even to say that it is not a precedent. If somebody else would say, "That has been a precedent, but this will not be a precedent" time and again, where will we land ourselves? I would like to go on record that this sort of thing should not happen again.

The Prime Minister.

THE PRIME MINISTER, MINISTER OF ATOMIC ENERGY, MINISTER OF ELECTRONICS, MINISTER OF SPACE, MINISTER OF PLANNING AND MINISTER OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI). Sir, I am not intervening as Prime Minister but as a member of the biggest oppressed minority in the world.

An Hon. Member: Minority?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I believe the female population is just a little less than the male population.

Some philosophers, poets and hon. Members of Parliament also have spoken soft words and said good things about women but these are outweighed by those who have maligned women through the ages. Women have been and are the most exploited of any section. If a woman is called 'abla', as she is in our country, it is not because she is weak in herself but because she is so handicapped from birth by customs and social attitudes that she has no chance of developing her innate strength. If Harijans are persecuted who suffers the most? It is their womenfolk.

If there is poverty or shortage, it is the women who go without, in order to be able to feed their children, their husbands and the other menfolk in the family. If there

is war, the heaviest burden falls on women. In the family, the wife is usually the cook and servant, doctor and nurse and teacher. In societies where men go to war, women have looked after the farming, the business and other activities. She has borne the most onerous burdens and shouldered the greatest responsibilities. In affluent societies also, she is exploited. She is often regarded as an object to play with or to decorate and display the husband's wealth and status. She may be surrounded by luxury, but she does not have the opportunity to fully develop her personality and she is largely deprived of the fulfilment that comes from participation and effort.

However, Sir, I have not got up to criticise or complain nor to demand that women should attain high positions, but to assert that in asking for equality of opportunity and a more respected status in society, women are thinking not of themselves but of all mankind. In 1923, Kamal Ata Turk said.

"The lack of success of our social structure is due to the contempt in which we have held our women. Destiny metes out our span of life, but to live is to be active. And if only some of the members of a social organism are active, whilst the others are inactive, that organism becomes paralysed. If a social organism is to work and succeed in life, it must satisfy the required conditions and give itself every chance. If, then, our society needs science and technology, men and women must gain them equally. Who does not know that division of labour dominates life, as it does all fields of endeavour? Within this general division of labour, women must carry out the tasks falling to them, but among these tasks is participation in the general activities essential to the common prosperity and happiness of all."

But he goes on to say and I do not agree with his next sentence:

"Housework is but the least and the least important, of women's duties."

I believe the significance of home-making should not be decried, for the home is the very foundation of society. What sort of home-life a child has, influences the rest of his life, his development and

attitudes. Home-making is important enough to demand the attention of both parents. At the same time, to confine women to the kitchen is harmful to the future of the race. A woman with limited interests and capacity cannot be a good housewife, a good mother or a good companion.

In the early ninth century, there was a synod in Europe to debate whether women were human at all, and now in the 20th century, the world has woken up to consider the role of women in contemporary society! Let us use this year to find out where we have failed so far as laws or their implementation are concerned, to activate existing programmes and, if possible, to initiate new ones for women's health and education, for their employment and better conditions of work. But above all, this is an occasion for re-thinking about problems of human relationships within societies, within nations and also internationally and to change the long entrenched attitudes of mind and behaviour. These attitudes affect the behaviour towards the condition of women and our behaviour to other castes and other races, and finally in the larger scheme of things people's behaviour to those who are generally less developed, whether they are countries or groups.

SHRI SHYAMNANDAN MISHRA (Begusarai): Why not make some specific suggestions in the context of India? You are being much too general.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Certain specific suggestions have been made in this resolution. As part of the celebrations of the International Women's Year, certain programmes have been initiated. When the axe falls on any kind of financial commitment, it is usually on such programmes. I do not know exactly what the Education Minister is going to say in reply to this resolution. But we are trying to coordinate the work done by various voluntary agencies with governmental programmes. Obviously, the work cannot end in a year. It can only be a beginning. I sincerely hope that some good programmes in all regions with regard to health, prevention of disease, literacy and so on will be undertaken. Some have in fact already been initiated, but as I said earlier,

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

the greatest stumbling blok is the mental attitude not only of men but of large numbers of women themselves because they are so conditioned by their families and by society around them. I am sure if my hon. friend, Shyam Babu and other hon. members of the House will make up their mind to change their own attitudes, the attitude of Parliament and the attitude of society, it will be of great help.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think Mr. Indrajit Gupta is yet to adopt an attitude before he changes it.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Alipore)  
May I know through you whether she is supporting my resolution or not?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI I support the spirit of the resolution. As I said, we have started many of these programmes. Exactly what attitude the Minister of Education is taking, I do not know.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER I will also try to make it a women's day. I have three lady members in the list in a row.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): They should be there in the panel of chairmen.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER May be it was an oversight. It would be corrected later on.

SHRI SYED AHMED AGA (Baramulla): It should not have happened.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I say that it would be corrected.

श्रीमती राजा देशपांडे (बम्बई मध्य): यह बहुत खुशी की बात है कि सदियों के बाद यह साल महिलाओं के नाम से मनाया जा रहा है और सोचा जा रहा है कि जिन महिलाओं को हम ने इतना पिछड़ा रखा उन के लिए क्या किया जाय। बहुत खुशी की बात है और मुझे विश्वास है कि इस रेजोल्यूशन के बाद हमारे मिनिस्टर साहब ऐसे कोई सुझाव रखेंगे, सिर्फ यह मानवतावादी प्रस्ताव

पास करने से आप हमारी कोई मदद नहीं करेंगे, यह आप पक्का ध्यान में रखिए, यह रेजोल्यूशन पास करेंगे, हाथ उठाएंगे और बाद में आप सब भूल जाएंगे, तो यह नहीं होना चाहिए और हमारे मिनिस्टर साहब भी ऐसे कोई सुझाव लाएं जिस से हमारी भारतीय महिलाओं की मदद हो। इस रेजोल्यूशन का मैं समर्थन करती हूँ।

औरतों के बारे में हम सोचते हैं कि आज वह बन्धन में है, वह आज पूरी तरह स्वतंत्र नहीं है। लेकिन यह भी उस समय सोचना चाहिए कि औरत इस हालत में कब पहुँची और क्यों पहुँची? क्या कोई ऐसी अवस्था थी या नहीं कि जब औरत पूरी तरह से स्वतंत्र थी? इस समाज की प्रगति में या जब यह समाज बढ़ता गया, एक समय ऐसा था जब औरत पूरी तरह से स्वतंत्र थी और उस को मदद के साथ समान अधिकार भी थे बल्कि मातृसत्ता पद्धति जो हमारे देश में थी उस से यह दिखाई देता है कि उस का स्थान बहुत ऊँचा था। आज भी अगर आप ट्राइबल एरियाज में देखेंगे तो वहाँ औरतों के लिए ऊँचा स्थान है और उन को समान हक बाकी औरतों से भी ज्यादा मिले हैं। लेकिन इस समान अवस्था की औरत गुलाम कैसे बनी वह भी हम को देखना चाहिए। अगर हम महाभारत को सुनें या पढ़ें तो उस में लिखा गया है कि जब धर्म भीष्म के पास जाता है और पूछता है कि यह राजा, राज्य से सब कब पैदा हो गए और ये अपने भाइयों से क्यों लड़ रहे हैं तो भीष्म कहते हैं कि एक अवस्था ऐसी थी कि:

न मे राज्यं न राजा आसीन

न च दण्डो न दण्डिकः॥

15.59 Hrs.

[SHRI DINESHCHANDRA GOSWAMI in the  
chair]

तब राजा नहीं थे, राज्य नहीं था। कोई दण्ड देने वाला भी नहीं था और न कोई दण्ड भुगतने वाला था। जब समाज ऐसी अवस्था में था तब दण्ड यह होता था कि धिक्कार करो। आज धिक्कार करने का कोई मतलब रहा ही नहीं। आप धिक्कार करें, जिस को चोरी करना है वह चोरी करता जायगा लेकिन एक समय ऐसा था कि जब धिक्कार करो, तब भी लोगों को डर लगता था। यह उस समय की बात है कि जब हमारे समाज में जाति और वर्ग कोई नहीं था। कोई एक वर्ग ऐसा नहीं था कि जो दूसरों की जान के ऊपर या दूसरों के श्रमों के ऊपर रहता था और अपना खुद घर में बैठे खाता था। यह नहीं था। उस अवस्था में क्लास और कास्ट नहीं थी। तब औरत पूरी तरह से स्वतंत्र थी। जब यह वर्ग और जाति हमारे देश में आई, इस मानव समाज में आई तब से औरत गुलामी में धकेली गई।

गुलामी में बांधी गई हैं, इस तरह से फ्यूडलिज्म हुआ। मैं कहना चाहती हूँ कि समाजवाद में ही औरतें पूरी तरह से स्वतंत्र हो सकती हैं और होती रहेंगी। हम चाहे कितना भी सोचें, लेकिन इस अवस्था में, भाण्डवलगाही में, कपिटलिज्म में औरतों को कभी भी असली स्वतन्त्रता नहीं मिल सकती, क्योंकि वे उसी समाज की एक भाग हैं जिस में सदियों से उन को लगातार दबाया गया है। एक समय था जब कि परिवार घर की चारदीवारी में सीमित था, लेकिन जैसे-जैसे इण्डस्ट्री बड़ी, इण्डस्ट्री के बढ़ने के बाद जब वर्ग का निर्माण हुआ, तब तक औरतें अपनी स्वतन्त्रता गंवा चुकी थी।

16.00 Hrs

किस हद तक औरतें गुलाम थी, मैं उस का एक उदाहरण देना चाहती हूँ—यह उदाहरण भी महामारत से है। एक शिष्य अपने गुरु के पास शिक्षा ग्रहण करता था, जब उस की शिक्षा पूर्ण हुई और गुरुदक्षिणा का समय आया तो उस ने गुरु से पूछा कि मैं क्या गुरु दक्षिणा दूँ। गुरु ने कहा कि मुझ को पाँच सौ गाय ला कर दो। उस के पास इतनी गायें नहीं थीं। वह वहाँ के राजा के पास गया, राजा ने कहा कि मेरे पास इतना धन नहीं है, तुम मेरी लड़की को ले जाओ। उसकी लड़की को लेकर वह शिष्य दूसरे राजाओं के पास गया। तीन राजाओं से उस लड़की को बच्चे हुए, तब उन राजाओं ने उस शिष्य को लड़की के बदले धन दिया, गायें दी। वह शिष्य उस लड़की को लेकर वापस लौटा, उस के बाप को उस लड़की को लौटा दिया और वह धन और गायें गुरु को दीं। उस समय में एक औरत का गाय जैसा उपयोग होता था, पशुओं जैसा व्यवहार होता था। आज भी औरतें पूरी तरह से स्वतन्त्र नहीं हैं और हम सोच रहे हैं कि उन को किस तरह से मुक्त किया जाय, स्वतन्त्रता दी जाय।

क्या एक औरत की स्वतन्त्रता केवल इतनी सी बात में है कि वह आर्थिक दृष्टि से पूरी तरह से स्वतन्त्र हो? आप उस की शिक्षा की व्यवस्था करें, आप उस को फैमिली प्लानिंग सिखायें या उस को बहुत सारे कन्चरल चीजें दिखायायें, लेकिन जब तक वह अपने पैरों पर खड़ी नहीं रहती है तब तक वह पूरी तरह से स्वतन्त्र नहीं हो सकती। इसलिये मैं सदन से यह कहूँगी.....

• श्री श्यामनन्दन मिश्र : इस संसद् भवन में आप क्या आजादी चाहती हैं।



औरतों को देशपाण्डे : क्या आप सुनिये। मैं इन को बतलाना चाहती हूँ कि हम किस अवस्था में थे और आप ने हम को किस तरह से बांध कर रखा है। सिर्फ हमारी प्राइम मिनिस्टर एक औरत है, इस से हमारे देश की पूरी औरतों को स्वतन्त्रता नहीं हो सकती है। जब आप इस प्रस्ताव पर विचार कर रहे हैं तो कुछ ठोस कदम उठाने के बारे में सोचें। हम को ईक्वल अपार्चुनिटीज चाहिये। मैं आप से पूछना चाहती हूँ—क्या हम को ईक्वल अपार्चुनिटीज मिलती हैं। 27 साल की आजादी के बाद भी फार्मस्यूटिकल इण्डस्ट्री में—अगर कोई औरत शादी कर लेती थी तो उस को कहा जाता था कि तुम जीव से रिजाइन कर के भाग जाओ। हम लोग इस के लिये बम्बई में लड़े। आप सब लोग उस समय भी इस सदन में बैठते थे, क्या आप से उस वक्त कुछ सोचा था, किसी ने कुछ नहीं कहा था। हम लोग 30 हजार औरतों का जुलूम निकाल कर लड़े—लेकिन आप लोगों ने कभी नहीं सोचा कि इस तरह का जुलूम औरतों पर होता है।

ईक्वल अपार्चुनिटीज का हमारा मतलब यह है कि हम को हर जगह नौकरी मिलनी चाहिये। इस के लिये जो रुकावट है उन को दूर कीजिये। यह काम सिर्फ समाजवाद में ही हो सकता है। आप देखिये मुझे रुमाजिया में एक से भिन्नार में भाष लेने का मौका मिला, जहाँ हर जगह की, हर देश की औरतें आई थी। हम ने वहाँ देखा कि जो औरतें समाजवादी मुक्तों में रहती हैं, सोसलिस्ट देशों की जो औरतें थीं, उन को हर जगह काम करने के अवसर मिलते थे, लेकिन जो कैपिटलिस्ट मुक्त हैं, पाण्डे-बलसाही देश हैं वहाँ ऐसी सुविधायें नहीं मिलतीं। अभी भी प्रांस और

इंग्लैंड में इक्वलिटी नहीं है। इसलिये मैं कहूंगी कि इस सदन में ऐसा कोई सुझाव रखें कि जिस से हमारी औरतों की शिक्षा भी मिले, ट्रेनिंग भी मिले। हमारे यहाँ ट्रेनिंग सेन्टर्स हैं, बोकोशनल ट्रेनिंग सेन्टर्स हैं, लेकिन सब कामज पर हैं। एजुकेशन मिनिस्टर साहब और प्रधान मंत्री जी कृपा कर मेरी बात को सुनें। मैं जाक्स के बारे में कह रही हूँ—हमारे यहाँ ट्रेनिंग सेन्टर्स हैं, लेकिन सब कामज पर हैं, महाराष्ट्र में वे कैकशन नहीं कर रहे हैं, मैं चाहती हूँ कि ट्रेनिंग का इन्तजाम सही तरीके से हो ताकि उन को आगे बढ़ने का मौका मिले।

दूसरी बात—बहुत-सी जगहों पर औरतें पब्लिक सैक्टर्स में काम कर रही हैं। इस में शक नहीं है कि हमारे देश में काफी प्रगति हुई है—औरतें बहुत बड़ी संख्या में टीचर्स के रूप में काम कर रही हैं, गवर्नमेंट सविस में हैं—यह बहुत अच्छी बात है। लेकिन ऐसी कई इण्डस्ट्रीज हैं जहाँ उन को जगह नहीं मिलती है, खास कर ट्रेडीशनल इण्डस्ट्रीज में, जैसे टेक्सटाइल, जूट, फार्मस्यूटिकल, कैमिकल, इन्जीनियरिंग, ऐसी और भी बहुत सी इण्डस्ट्रीज हैं जहाँ से औरतों को नौकरी से निकाल दिया गया है। टेक्सटाइल इण्डस्ट्री में—मैं बम्बई शहर के बारे में बतला रही हूँ—जहाँ पहले 40 हजार औरतें काम करती थीं, अब शायद पांच हजार भी नहीं बची हैं। क्या आप ऐसा रिकमेंड नहीं कर सकते कि हर एक इण्डस्ट्री में औरतों को नौकरियाँ दी जायें। टेक्सटाइल इण्डस्ट्री में 20 परसेन्ट औरतें रहनी ही चाहिये। कैमिकल, फार्मस्यूटिकल इण्डस्ट्रीज में 20 से 25 परसेन्ट औरतें रहनी ही चाहिये। यदि आप हम को पूरी तरह से स्वतन्त्र करना चाहते हैं तो आप इस बात को ध्यान में रखिये कि काफ़ी दृष्टि से

हमें सब से पहले स्वनन्त्रता मिलनी चाहिये।

दूसरी बात जैसे हमारे यहाँ महिलायें टीचर्स हैं, उन को रमोई घर से थोड़ी छुट्टी मिलनी चाहिये। आप चाहते हैं कि हम को नये नये काम सीखना चाहिये। लेकिन किस तरह से सीखें। आप बम्बई शहर में ही चल कर देखिये—आधा दिन औरतो का रमोई घर में ही निकल जाता है। हमारे पैट्रोलियम मिनिस्टर यहाँ बैठे हैं पहले जब बरुआ जी यहाँ पर थे, मैंने तब भी उन से कहा था और आज मालवीय जी ने कह रही हैं। आप गैस को डिब्बे में भर कर बेचते हैं, जो पहले वैगट जानी थी उस का दाम आप क्यों नहीं बढ़ाते, नाकि वे दो घन्टे में अपना काम खत्म कर सकें और बाकी समय बचा कर बाहर जाकर कुछ काम कर सकें, कुछ मोख सकें। लेकिन पैट्रोलियम मिनिस्टर इस बात पर मनने के लिये तैयार नहीं हैं, दाम कम होने-वाला नहीं है। हमारी महिलाओं का थोड़ी मुविधा दीजिये उन का नौकरी करने का अधिकार दीजिये हमारे बच्चों का थोड़ा स्थान दीजिये।

जहाँ तक बच्चों का सम्बन्ध है—आप देखिये, जहाँ महिलाये काम करती हैं, उन के बच्चों के लिये कोई क्रीश की व्यवस्था नहीं है। चाहे लेबर खाते में काम करती हों, कहीं भी उन के बच्चों की देखभाल की व्यवस्था नहीं है। यहाँ तक कि बीबी उद्योग में बहुत सी महिलाये काम करती हैं, वहाँ उन के बच्चे तम्बाकू के ढरों में ही पड़े रहते हैं, उन के लिये किसी क्रीश की व्यवस्था नहीं है। गवर्न-मेण्ट आफिसियल में बहुत सी महिलाये काम करती हैं, उनके बच्चों के लिये

कोई क्रीश की मुविधा नहीं है। इस लिये हम लोग ब्रेसिकली यह माग करना चाहते हैं कि अगर असली मायनो में हम को स्वनन्त्र होता है तो उस के पहले आर्थिक दृष्टि में हम को स्वतन्त्र बनाने की कोशिश की जाय।

इस के लिये मैं एक माग जरूर रखूँगी कि औरतो को हर एक इंडस्ट्री में, आप एक परमेण्ट रखिये जिस के मतान्वित उन को हर एक इंडस्ट्री में नौकरी दी जाय। एक्सेक्युटिव मिनिस्टर यहाँ बैठे हुए हैं वह मरी बात को जरा सुनें। और जो इंडस्ट्रीज आज नेशनलाइज्ड हो गई हैं उन में तो ऐसा करना सरकार के लिए बहुत ही जरूरी है।

आप यह रिजोल्यूशन सिर्फ पास ही न कीजिये और यह न समाप्तिये कि दिसम्बर 1974 तक यह खत्म हो जाय, वरन्कि यह शुरूवात रहे।

श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी मैन्स ईयर्स तो हजारों सालों में हो रहे हैं।

श्रीमती रोजा देशपांडे मेरा यह निवेदन है कि इस प्रस्ताव को पास कर के कुछ असली ठोस कदम उठाये जायें। वस मझे यही कहना है।

MR CHAIRMAN Actually two hours and 40 minutes were allotted for this discussion but even before the first speaker started today we had already taken 2 hours and 32 minutes and still I have a large number of requests from speakers

THE MINISTER OF WORKS AND HOUSING AND PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH) At least two Ministers have to intervene before the final reply. There are also a number of Members desiring to speak. May I suggest that we extend the time, so that the debate may conclude at 5.30

SHRI BHAGWAT JHA AZAD (Bhagalpur) Not only ladies, but some good-looking men should also be allowed. Then we are prepared to sit.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am told the Minister will take 20 minutes and there is another Minister to intervene, apart from a number of lady speakers and a number of good-looking males also.

AN HON. MEMBER: Including yourself.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So, may I request the Members to confine their speeches to five or seven minutes and not more. You can speak a lot in five minutes. Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan.

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN (Coimbatore): We have got two fortunate things. The first fortunate thing is that today at last in Parliament we are having an opportunity to participate in the International Women's Year. The other very fortunate thing is that it is quite historic that it is a bachelor who has come forward with the resolution on this subject. I must thank our bachelor colleague for being so concerned about the women of our country and for coming forward with this resolution.

Unfortunately, we find that the term "International Women's Year" is becoming a very hackneyed term and, I think, we should get away from it. We have to do something in concrete terms. Today, as we look back after 27 years of Independence, what we see is that our Government, our people, have failed even in implementing the Directive Principles of the Constitution. Whatever is mentioned in the Resolution here is nothing new. It is something to which our Government, our people, have committed themselves to.

Now, I would like to remind the hon. Minister, because, I think, he needs to be reminded, of the Directive Principles of the Constitution. Article 39 says:

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

- (a) that the citizens, men and women equally, have the right to an adequate means of livelihood;

x x x x x

- (d) that there is equal pay for equal work for both men and women;

- (e) that the health and strength of workers, men and women, and the tender age of children are not abused and that citizens are not forced by economic necessity to enter avocations unsuited to their age or strength;"

If we review what has been done in the last 27 years, we find we are nowhere nearer to implementing the Directive Principles, nearer to what the position was at the time when these were first drawn up. There are very noble words in the Directive principles. But all that is talked about is sheer sanctimonious humbuggery.

In this Resolution, we are demanding the implementation of the Directive Principles. Really, concrete beginning has to be made in this direction in this year, International Women's year. If the United Nations adopted this Resolution, it was not just for the fun of it. It was because they wanted that countries like ours should be seized of it where one-third of the working population in the world today are women. They should be enabled to come forward and the rest of the women should also be enabled to come forward to rouse the conscience of women and men and to change their mentality. I am not one of those who would cry and weep about the oppression of women. If women are oppressed today, it is because of the mentality of women and men.

Women have played their part in achieving the freedom of the country and in seeing to it that these Directive Principles of the Constitution were framed. Therefore, women have also got to come forward today to rouse the conscience of women and men, particularly, change the mentality of men, in order to see that the Government and the Parliament is faced to see that these Directive Principles enshrined in the Constitution are achieved and implemented.

This is what we have to aim at. I find the hon. Education Minister smiling in a benign manner. I know, he will come forward and say that crores of rupees have been given for social welfare. What is social welfare? There is nothing social about it nor welfare about it. It is not to be seen in any concrete form. Say, for example, taking shape in more places for girls in schools and colleges. We are not seeing any change in the employment oppor-

tunities for women in this country. There are so many jobs for which you read advertisements, day after day—the monopoly press is making money on the advertisements—including those of the public sector, and where you find that only men are to apply, not women. Why? These jobs are not for women.

In the socialist countries, we see women working in all fields, participating in everything. Our country is supposed to have socialistic pattern of society, socialism, whatever you may call it. This is the most abused term when it is talked of by the ruling party. You do not find that women are being given equal opportunities. In the Soviet Union, even girls of 18 years' age are operating cranes weighing tonnes and tonnes. They are taking part in building operations. Can you conceive of it here? Not at all. Here, we are told, 'You are a woman. Can you do this?'. Why not? This is the attitude that has to be changed in our country. It is no good talking in very generalised terms unless and until we have some thing concrete before us, such as, a legislation on equal pay for equal work.

You are in great haste over and over again, in one State after another State, trying to implement one of the Directive Principles of the Constitution, that is, Prohibition. You fail in it. You give rise to bootlegging. All kinds of things happen. But no concrete effort is being made to implement Directive Principles affecting women.

Even for the ratification of the Convention of the ILO on equal work, the trade union movement in this country had to conduct a sustained battle. Today, we are nowhere nearer to achieving it yet. What about a legislation on equal pay for equal work? A few days ago, I gave a Question on that. I have been told, "It is under consideration." It is not yet even under "active consideration." It is a shameful thing that even in Governmental agricultural farms, there is discrimination in respect of wages to men and women. When you pride yourself and say that you have got a woman Prime Minister, when you pride yourself and say that you have got such talented persons, like, Dr. Sarojini Mahishi in the Cabinet, when you pride yourself

and say that you have got a woman Chief Minister, yet in Government Agricultural Farms, in State Agricultural Farms, you find discrimination in wages paid to men and women. Instead of having a legislation that agricultural workers should get a minimum wage and that it should be an equal wage for both men and women, you find discrimination in wages to men and women even in State Agricultural Farms. I was horrified when a woman leader of one of the Women's organisation in this country told me that she employs women labour in her farm because she has to pay them a lesser wage and, therefore, she earns more.

This is the mentality. That has to be changed in our country. It is not a question of law alone. You have got a law on dowry. It is not being implemented because the attitude of society is not changing. I for one do not like that attitude. I do not subscribe to that attitude. It is for all of us together as social revolutionaries to come forward so that we achieve what has been achieved in the Soviet Union where 49 per cent of the persons working in industry are women, where 85 per cent of those working in the health services are women, where 73 per cent of those working in the field of education and culture are women—the hon. Education Minister should take note of that—and where 49 per cent of those working in the field of science and auxiliary scientific services are women. That is why in the Soviet Union, you could have a woman like Valentina Tereshkov going into space. Here, we are still having women in primitive conditions of oppression, in feudal conditions of oppression, and they are being given a discriminatory treatment everywhere, in industry and in other fields also.

Still more, there are conditions in this country where women are being driven out of employment in the textile industry, in the jute industry and in other industries on the plea that women handle sophisticated machinery, sophisticated instruments. Do you think we do not have potential Valentine, Tereshkovs? We have got hundreds of them because ours is a country where women, like, Sarojini Naidu took a lead in the fight for freedom, and equalled men.

[Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan]

Today, if we are to pay homage to those women, homage to the martyrs of our national liberation movement, we can only pay homage in concrete terms by accepting this Resolution and by concretely doing something much more than having the programmes that the Prime Minister referred to. Those programmes are only high-sounding ideas, Symposiums, Seminars and the like. Nothing more than that. I ask: What is there concrete that you are going to do so that women can take place, side by side with men, in our society as a whole. That cannot be done unless we make a beginning by having a concrete programme of having a legislation on equal pay for equal work, unless we have a legislation which will ensure that women will have equality of opportunity in employment, unless we have a legislation that will ensure that women in employment will be safeguarded and will be given vocational training, maternity benefits and so on.

Sir, you have been rather liberal to me in giving me this much time. I do not want to deprive other Members of an opportunity to speak on this very important Resolution. So, I conclude by saying that human conscience in our country can never reconcile itself with the fact that women are subjected to various kinds of discrimination, that human conscience has got to prevail and all discrimination, all discriminatory practices and all discriminatory attitudes whether on the part of women or on the part of men have got to be eradicated once for all. If our country with its glorious heritage and glorious culture is to march forward towards the glorious future that is awaiting it, it cannot be achieved if women are cut out from achieving the glorious future of the country.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shrimati Savitri Shyam. Before she starts, I want to inform the House that she has given notice of an amendment to this Resolution. Strictly speaking, the amendment ought to have been given earlier. This being a very important occasion, I would like to know from the House whether they have any objection to her moving it now . . .

SHRI K. RAGHURAMAIAH: I have already spoken to the leaders of the parties

and they have agreed. They have no objection.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the House has no objection, and particularly because the amendment has been given notice of by a lady member, I cannot stand in the way. She may move her amendment and continue her speech.

SHRIMATI SAVITRI SHYAM (Aonla): I move:

That in the Resolution,—

- (i) after "at removing" insert "as far as possible"
- (ii) omit "particularly in the field of marriage and divorce laws, dowry customs, maternity and child welfare in the rural areas, unequal pay for equal work, educational and employment opportunities, vocational training and facilities for working mothers" (4)

श्री जनेश्वर मिश्र (इलहाबाद) : यह जो संशोधन है इससे महिला की तरफ से महिलाओं के साथ अन्याय होगा। कोई भी ऐसा संशोधन नहीं आना चाहिये जो मूल प्रस्ताव के नैगेशन में जाए।

MR. CHAIRMAN: She has only moved the Resolution. It does not mean that it has been accepted by the House.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE (Betul): They could have asked a male member to move this amendment. (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: She had given notice of an amendment. The House agreed that she could move that amendment. And she has moved it. It does not mean that it has been passed. The debate will continue. We shall see how things develop at the end.

श्री राम रतन शर्मा (वांदा) : इसको मूव करने के पहले रघुरामैया साहब ने जब बात की थी तब हम इस निष्कर्ष पर पहुंचे थे कि उनको इस लेट स्टज पर एमेंडमेंट मूव करने की स्वीकृति

दे दें। हम समझते थे कि इस एमेंडमेंट में कोई ऐसी चीज नहीं होगी जो अच्छी न हो। लेकिन इस एमेंडमेंट के बाद तो इस प्रस्ताव में कुछ रह ही नहीं गया है।

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can raise this when I put the amendment to the vote of the House, not at this stage. Now the amendment has been moved. We should not enter into a debate on this at this stage.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR (Ahmedabad): How can we speak at the time of voting? When you put the amendment to the vote, we have only to say 'aye' or 'no'; we cannot speak at that point. The Minister gave us to understand . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: You should not drag the Chair here. If there is any understanding between the members and the Minister, you can talk to the Minister.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: I want the Minister to clarify as to how it comes from a private member and not from the Government.

SHRI K. RAGHURAMAIAH: I have only said that, so far as moving the amendment is concerned, the leaders on the Opposition have no objection. I have not committed you to any voting on it, this way or that way. As to the reason why the hon. lady Member is moving this amendment, she will explain, and I am sure the Minister also will clarify.

श्रीमती सावित्री श्याम (आंवला) : सभापति महोदय, मैं श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्त की बड़ी आभारी हूँ कि उन्होंने कई राष्ट्रीय और अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय विषयों में व्यवस्त रहने के बाद भी एक प्रस्ताव लाकर इस सदन, सरकार और समाज का ध्यान इस और आकर्षित किया है कि स्त्रियों के साथ अब तक जो अन्याय होता रहा है और उनके साथ जो असमानता बरती जा रही है, उसको इस अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय महिला वर्ष में दूर किया जाये। मैंने अपने इस संशोधन

में कोई नई बात नहीं कही है। मूवर महोदय ने अपने प्रस्ताव में काफी डिटेल्स दी हैं, जैसे मैरिज, ईक्वलस पे फार ईक्वल वर्क और एम्प्लायमेंट आदि। इन डिटेल्स के बारे में अलग से डिस्कशन किया जा सकता है और अलग-अलग कानून बनाये जा सकते हैं।

हमारे देश में हिन्दू, मुसलमान, सिख, ईसाई और पारसी आदि कई जातियाँ हैं और उनके अलग-अलग परसनल लाज हैं। जब तक उन सब के लिये एक यूनिफार्म ला न हो तब तक इस प्रस्ताव को उसकी वर्तमान हालत में स्वीकार करने से बहुत सी कानूनी कठिनाइयाँ और पेचीदगियाँ पैदा हो जायेंगी। जब तक सब परसनल लाज को खत्म नहीं किया जाता है, तब तक मैरिज और डाइवर्स आदि के सम्बन्ध में इस प्रस्ताव को पास करने का कोई अर्थ नहीं होगा। इसलिए मैंने अपना यह कर्तव्य समझता कि इस प्रस्ताव में, जिसकी भावना से मैं पूरी तरह सहमत हूँ, ऐसा संशोधन किया जाये, जिससे यह सब के लिये एकसैठेवल हो जाये।

स्टेट्स आफ वीमन कमेटी के साथ दौरा करते हुए, मुझे सभी क्षेत्रों की महिलाओं को देखने और उनसे बात करने का अवसर मिला। हमने देखा कि जो महिलाएं सर्विसेज में प्रतियोगिता के आधार पर आती हैं उनको छोड़कर सभी क्षेत्रों में उनके साथ असमानता का व्यवहार किया जाता है। खेतों, चाय के बगीचों, बीड़ी उद्योग और हार्टिकल्चर आदि में काम करने वाली स्त्रियों को पुरुषों के बराबर वेतन नहीं मिलता है। यह नितान्त आवश्यक है कि इस अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय महिला वर्ष में ईक्वल पे फार ईक्वल वर्क की व्यवस्था अवश्य की जाये। इसको किस तरह

## [श्रीमति सावित्री श्याम]

से कानून की शक्ति दी जाये, इस पर समाज-कल्याण मंत्री विचार करें।

जहाँ तक कानून का सम्बन्ध है, उनकी कोई कमी नहीं है। आज़ादी से पहले भी और उसके बाद भी बहुत कानून बने। हमारे नेताओं पर रूस की क्रांति और लेनिन तथा महात्मा गांधी के महिलाओं के बारे में विचारों की बहुत गहरी छाप थी, जिनका कहना था कि मानवता के नाते पसनेलिटो के नाते स्त्रियाँ और पुरुषों का बराबर का अधिकार मिलना चाहिए। यही कारण था कि जब हमारा संविधान बना तो उसमें आर्टिकल 14, 15 और 16 आदि ईक्वलिटो के सम्बन्ध में रखे गये। आर्टिकल 15 (3) में कहा गया है कि स्त्रियाँ और बच्चा व लिये कानून में विशेष व्यवस्था की जा सकती है। यह बड़े दुख की बात है कि अब तक इस बात की अवहेलना की जाती रही है कि जब स्त्रियाँ पुरुषों के बराबर काम करती हैं तो फिर उनको बराबर वेतन क्यों नहीं दिया जाता है। हमने तो यह भी देखा है कि कुछ इंडस्ट्रीज में स्त्रियों की आउट-पुट पुरुषों से बहुत ज्यादा है। लेकिन हम देखते हैं कि टैक्स्टाइल और इजीनियरिंग आदि आर्गनाइज्ड सेक्टर में माडर्नाइजेशन और स्पेशलाइजेशन के नाम पर स्त्रियों का बराबर रिट्रैचमेंट होता रहा है। जैसा कि श्रीमती पार्वती कृष्णन ने बताया है टैक्स्टाइल में 1961 में स्त्रियों की संख्या 20 हजार थी, जबकि 1971 में वह घटकर 5 हजार रह गई है। दूसरे उद्योगों में भी स्त्रियों की संख्या में कमी होती रही है।

जहाँ तक मेरी अमैडमैंड का सम्बन्ध है, उसका उद्देश्य यह नहीं है कि मूल प्रस्ताव को इग्नोर किया जाये।

मे प्रस्ताव की भावना से 100 फीसदी सहमता है। मैंने यह अमैडमैंड इसलिए रखा है ताकि सरकार को इसे स्वीकार करने में किसी कठिनाई का सामना न करना पड़े।

इस चर्चा में डाउरी का जिक्र किया गया है। डाउरी खत्म होने के बजाय बढ़ती चली जा रही है। दहेज बेलक मनी को छिपाने का एक माध्यम बन गया है। हमारी कमेटी ने कहा है कि इसको काम्प्लेक्स और फॉर्म बना दिया जाये। डा० सरोजिनी महिषी ने 4, 5 दिन पहले एक प्रश्न के उत्तर में बताया था कि यह एकट 1961 में पास हुआ, लेकिन उसके मातहत आज तक कोई गिरफ्तारी नहीं हुई है। इसका कारण यह है कि हमने इस कानून को सीरियसली नहीं लिया है।

मैं 20 अप्रैल के अखबार में पढ़ कि एक पिता ने अपनी बेटी के विवाह लिय बड़े आदमियाँ से 10 हजार रुपये इकट्टे किये। इसमें लड़की को बहुत दुख हुआ और उसने सुसाइड कर लिया, और वह पैसा उसके फ्युनरल पर खर्च किया गया। इसलिए यह आवश्यक है कि दहेज आदि जो कुरीतियाँ हमारे समाज के लिए अभिशाप बनी हुई हैं, उनका हटाया जाये। डाउरी एकट में अमैडमैंट कर के इसको काम्प्लेक्स और फॉर्म बनाना चाहिए। मैं तो प्रीजेंटेशन के भी खिलाफ हूँ। जितना बेलक-मनी उसके द्वारा छिपाया जाता है, उतना और किसी ढंग से नहीं छिपाया जाता है।

जब हिन्दू सक्सेशन एक्ट 1956 में पास हुआ, पंडित जी ने कहा था— अगर मैं ब्राह्म मिनिस्टर रहा तो महिलाओं को प्रोपर्टी में अधिकार जरूर दिलाकर रहूँगा। लेकिन आज स्थिति क्या है? हिन्दू सक्सेशन एक्ट में बहिन को अपने

भाई के बराबर हक प्राप्त नहीं है। चकि वह प्रापर्टी में डिवीजन नहीं माग सकती है, इसलिए न वह उसको एलीमिनेट कर सकती है और न ही सैल कर सकती है। क्या इसको प्रापर्टी में अधिकार कहा जा सकता है? पुरुषों की तरफ से कहा जाता है कि यह मेरी सैल्फ गव्नायर्ड प्रापर्टी है, यह मेरा कमाया हुआ धन है, इस पर मेरा अधिकार है। जब कोई डाइवोर्स या सैपरेशन होता है तो वह स्त्री को मेन्टीनेन्स देने से भी धरगता है। लेकिन वास्तविकता यह है कि जो पैसा इकट्ठा हुआ है, वह स्त्री और पुरुष दोनों के सहयोग से इकट्ठा हुआ है। स्त्री ने घर का काम कर के, बच्चों का पालन और कम खर्च कर के पसा बचाने में सहायता दी है। इसलिए उस धन पर केवल पुरुष का अधिकार कैसे हो सकता है? इसलिए यह व्यवस्था होनी चाहिये कि एक परिवार के पास जो धन जमा है चाहे वह बैंक में हो और चाहे किसी अन्य रूप में, उस पर स्त्री और पुरुष दोनों का बराबर अधिकार होना चाहिये और डाइवोर्स या सैपरेशन के समय दोनों में बराबर बटवारा होना चाहिये।

यह एक बहुत बड़ा विषय है। इसके अन्दर इनने से काम नहीं चलने वाला है। मैंने यह प्रस्ताव दिया है। यह भावना की बात है, मैं अब भी कहती हूँ कि मैं भावना से सहमत होकर इस तरह का प्रस्ताव सार्द हूँ जिसमें कि यह रिजेक्ट न हो क्योंकि मैं इस भावना से बिल्कुल सहमत हूँ। अनेकों ऐक्ट जो बने हुए हैं आज्ञादी के पहले के या आज्ञा दी के बाद के उनका अध्ययन किया जाय तो लाजिमी लगता है कि सभी में संशोधन करने की आज आवश्यकता है।

श्री सैयद अहमद आमा सभापति महादय, डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब ने इस बात का आबगमाडट कहा उसको मैं ओवरलक करने के लिए नयार नहीं हूँ। बात यह है कि मैं खोम्ब हूँ हिल पीपुल कानफ्रेंस का उस कांग्रेस का, जिसमें प्रीडम मिनिस्टर माहिबा बोली जा अभी यहाँ से उठकर चली गई और मुझको यहाँ मजबूरन रुकना पडा क्योंकि मैं चन्द जमले डमरे पहले अर्ज कर चुका था।

मैं इन्द्राजीत गुप्ता के कारगुदात की तारीफ करता हूँ और उनकी तकरीर की भी तारीफ करता हूँ। आज हमारे समाज में तीन तबके हैं। एक निचला तबका है जिसको अवाम कहते हैं या प्रोलिटेरियट कहते हैं। वह तबका मेहनत करता है, मजदूरी करता है, खेती में काम करता है। और एक तबका वह है जिसे ऊँचा तबका कहते हैं। उसमें मगरबियत बहुत है। उन्हें किसी की फिक्र नहीं है। वह सैल्फ सेंटर्ड हैं और उस क्लास को बिलाग करने हैं जो एक्सप्लायटर हैं। एक तबका जो रहता है वह दरमियानी तबका है। हमेशा इसी दरमियानी तबके से लीडरशिप उभरी है। उस दरमियानी तबके के लिए कह रहा था एजूकेशन मिनिस्टर से, कि उन्होंने जो अपने स्कूलों के दरवाजे लडकियों के लिए बन्द कर दिये हैं, को-एजूकेशन के लिए वे तैयार नहीं हैं यह एक बहुत बड़ा जुल्म उनके साथ है। क्योंकि अगर वह लडकियों को पढ़ने का मौका देगे, वह पढेगी तो तमाम जुल्म के खिलाफ बाबेला करेगी जो उन पर होते हैं और अवाम की रहबरी करेगी। अगर एक कान्वेंट स्कूल में या एक प्रइवेट स्कूल में को-एजूकेशन हो सकती है तो मेरी समझ में नहीं आता है कि उनको क्यों हेसिटेशन होती है, वे क्यों इससे धरगते



## [श्री सय्यद अहमद भागा]

हैं? इन स्कूलों के दरवाजे लड़कियों के लिए क्यों नहीं खोलने? यह बात में इसलिए कह रहा हूँ कि इसी तबके की लड़कियों पर बेअदालत जुल्म है। ये हो बुरे रस्मात की शिकार हैं, तहमान की शिकार हैं, यही कदामल पसन्दा की शिकार है और इन्हीं को बेगार और बेअमल किया जाता है। इसी तबके में यह रस्म है कि लड़की का जब व्याहृत जाना है तब उसको गोद में लेकर डोली में रखा जाता है। यानी वह भी एक बण्डल है और उसका भी यह अहमाश कराया जाता है कि तुम एक बण्डल हो। वह यही समझती है कि मैं भी एक बण्डल हूँ और मेरा काम सिवाय गलाम्मी के और कोई नहीं है। यह एक एटीट्यूड है। हावानीन की बात तो अलग है, यह एक एटीट्यूड भी है। एक जमाना ऐसा था हमारे मुल्क में, जिस जमाने में लड़की को बर्तों में रखा जाता था। अब ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिए। जब हमने आर्यभट्ट फजा में भेजा है तब ऊट के सबारों के जमाने की नहीं लौट सकते। यह उस जमाने की बात है जब ऊट पर सबारी की जाती थी। सब वह जमाना। फिर लौट कर आए ऐसी बात सोचना गलत होगा। मुझे याद आता है आज में सौ वर्ष पहले कश्मीर में लड़की थी उसका नाम मोनकेमरी था। सौ वर्ष पहले उसने यह स्वादिष्ट की थी कि वह चांद पर जाएगी। उसने बड़ी कोशिश की, बड़ी लगन से चांद की पुकारती रही मांकह कर के वह जाना चाहती थी लेकिन वह बेचारी नहीं गई। पर आज वह जमाना आ गया है जब हमने आर्यभट्ट को स्पेस में भेज दिया और एक वक्त आया कि जब हम

चांद पर भी जाएंगे। तो वह तो नहीं जा सकती, मगर उसके स्वाद को हम पूरा करेंगे।

मबाल यह है कि आज भी जब शादी होती है उसके साथ जो डाबरी दी जाती है वह एक कबोलियत की कीमत होती है कि तुम इसको कबूल करो और इसकी कीमत हम तुमको देने हैं इसको कबूल करने के लिए। यह एक बहुत बड़ा जुल्म है कि इसलिए यह डाबरी दी जाय कि यह लड़की कबूल होगी और बहा रहेगी। इसमें बड़ कर और कोई जुल्म नहीं हो सकता है। एक लड़की की शादी हुई उसमें मुई-घागा नहीं दिया तो कुछ दिनों के बाद उसमें यह कहा गया कि यह तो मुई-घागा भी अपने साथ नहीं ला सकी। फिर उसका जो हर्षमिलियेशन हुआ सिर्फ इस कारण कि वह मुई-घागा नहीं ला सकी यह कितने बड़े जुल्म की बात है। कश्मीर की एक और लड़की का हाल मुनिग सबके लिए खाना पका, मछली बनी, उसकी मास ने एक कच्ची मछली के टुकड़े को उसकी थाली में रख दिया। वह गौर से देखने लगी कि मैं इस कच्ची मछली का कैसे खाऊंगी तो उसकी मास ने कहा तू इसको कैसे नहीं निगल सकती? मैं तुझको कैसे निगल गई? मैं तो तुझे बिना डाबरी के निगल गई। तू इस को क्यों नहीं निगल सकती? तो यह है उनके ऊपर जुल्म की कहानी। जो जुल्म उनके ऊपर होते रहे हैं।

(अवधान)

Sir, this is something very important.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are running against time. Please conclude.

SHRIMATI T. LAKSHMIKANTHAMMA  
Sir, this House has not got a Muslim woman to represent the case of Muslim women.

He is representing the case of so many millions of women. Therefore, please allow him more time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Aga, please be brief.

श्री सयद अहमद आगा: मैं महार की बात करने जा रहा था। आज से सैकड़ों वर्ष पहले या सदियों पहले महार होता था कि दम-बारह रूप औरत को दे दिए और उसमें कहा कि यह तो और तुम जाओ। दम रूप एकड़ाया और नलाक द दिया। यूनिवर्सल डाइवार्स यह होता है। आज दम-बारह रूप के कोई माने नहीं है। इसकी दो मुरते हैं—एक तो उस कदर उन-गडिकेट है कि इसके काई माने नहीं है, एक मुझे मालूम है कि कश्मीर में इसकी एक दूसरा किस्म भी है और शायद हो सकता है पंजाब में भी हां जिस में कि इतना इम्पामिखिल रख दिया जाता था कि वह अदा हो नहीं हो सके। यानी या तो महार इस कदर कम है कि वह बेमानी है और या इतना मुश्किल है कि उसे अदा करना नामुमकिन है। अगर महार, मिगाल के तौर पर, मच्छर की हड्डी एक पाव हो, तो यह महार अदा नहीं हो सकता क्योंकि एक पाव मच्छर की हड्डी तो लार्ड नहीं जा सकती।

इसलिए खाबन्द नलाक के वक्त यह कहेंगे कि तुम पड़ी रहो तुम एक काम कर सकती हो, तुम गुलाम रह सकती हो। तुम मेहनत करो, गुलामी करो और हम दूसरी शादी कर लेंगे। . . . (व्यवधान) इस्लाम में भी जानता हूँ और इस्लाम की स्प्रिट को जानता हूँ। चार शादियों की बात जो कही जा रहे हो वह बख

कही गई? जब अनगिनत शादियों होती थी तब उस पर एक पाबन्दी लगा दी गई कि चार शादी तक तुम कर सकते हो। यह एक हद हो गई जैसे शराब पीने बहुत पीने थे तो शराब के लिए एक हद लगा दी कि चार प्याले तक पी सकते हो। ऐसे ही चार शादी पर हद लगाई गई कि वह भी उस शर्त पर कि तुमको सभी का यकमान बराबर देना होगा लेकिन चकि यकमान एककजन देना पामिखिल नहीं मानिए चार शादी का सवाल नहीं पैदा होता। अगर कोई साहब यह कहने हैं कि उम्माद इसकी इजाजत देना है तो मैं कहता हूँ कि नहीं देता वे विनमूल नहीं देना है। तुम यह एक बहाना करने हो अपनी स्वाहिण तो पूरा करने लिए। और एक और डावरी बसूल रखने लिए तुम एक बहाना बनाने हो। तुम आज एक डावरी लेने हो, कल एक और डावरी देना चाहते हो। यह निजार्त है एकमन्वायेगन है। यह भी यहा होता रहा है कि एक हफने के बाद नलाक दिए जाने रहे है।

मैंने कुछ देर पहले इसी किस्म की बातें एक फोरम में रती थी, वहा लोगो ने वपडे फायन शुरू कर दिए, मेरे खिलाफ लिखना शुरू कर दिया। कुछ आर्टिकल्स मेरे खिलाफ दिन-दूनिश में निकले, मैं उस से मुजबलवाजी हो बह सकता हूँ। वे लोग शायद किनाय को पकू पाए ह, लेकिन किनाय को समझ नहीं सके—वे किनाय-स्वाह हैं, साहिबे किनाय नहीं हैं।

मैं यहा पर काश्मीर की एक लंडकी का जिक्र करना चाहता हूँ—

[श्री सैयद अहमद आगा]

उस का नाम था — सालईश्वरी या सालवेत। उस पर बहुत जुल्म हुआ, उसको जिस कटोरे में खाना दिया जाता था, उस में पत्थर रख कर उस पर चावल के चन्द दाने छिड़क दिए जाते थे, उस की भदर-इन-ला उसपर इतना जुल्म करती थी। लेकिन वह बेचारी उस को बरदाश्त करती थी और पत्थर को भी साफ कर के रखती थी। एक दफा उस की महिलाओं ने कहा कि तुम पत्थर को क्यों साफ करती हो। उस लड़की ने जवाब दिया कि तो वह एक खास चीज है, जो मेरे कटोरे में रखी जाती है, उस के ऊपर चावल के दाने छिड़के जाते हैं, 12 वर्ष से यही खाती आ रही हूँ, इस लिए मुझे उसका साफ रखना जरूरी है। उस का फादर-इन-ला वही पीछे मुन रहा था। उस ने भी उस बात को सुना। जब वह घर में आया तो उस ने देखा कि बाकई उस के कटोरे में पत्थर रखा जाना था। मैं उसको एक कपलेट की शक्ल में आप के मामले रखना चाहता हूँ और खास तौर से उन किताब-खवा लोगों को सुनाना चाहता हूँ ताकि आप की मारफत यह बात उन तक पहुँच जाय। वह कपलेट इस तरह से है —

‘The thoughtless read the holy books  
as parrots in their cage recite  
their reading is like churning water  
fruitless effort, ridiculous conceit’

मैंने “रिडिकुलस कन्सीट” का जिक्र इस लिए किया कि इस के नेहृत उन्होंने मेरे खिलाफ मजामीन-बाजी शुरू कर दी।

मैं यह भी अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि पोलिगैमी ट्यूनीसिया में बन्द कर दी गई है। इस किस्म के रिफार्मज़ तुर्की, ईरान, इराक और सिरिया में भी हो चुके हैं। पाकिस्थान में भी जब यहाँ के लोग वहाँ गए, हमारे ही भाई-बंद थे, उन्होंने भी 1961 में “फैमिली ला आडिन्स” के नेहृत पोलिगैमी पर रोक लगाई, बिना जूडिशियल सैक्शन के खाबिन्द के इस इस्तिथार पर भी पाबन्दी लगाई गई कि वह यूनीलेटरल तलाक दे सके। हमारे यहाँ भी मैं देखता हूँ कि बम्बई और पूना में कुछ थोड़ी बहुत जाग्रति है, लेकिन इस तरफ नहीं है। मैंने वहाँ देखा कि शरीफ तैयब जी और जनाब ए० ए० फैजी साहब इस मामले में बहुत काम कर रहे हैं। उन्होंने कहा है कि यह तरीका इस्लाम के लाफ है। मैं उन मौलवी साहबान को भी यह कहना चाहता हूँ जो यह कहते हैं कि यह उन का पर्सनल-ला है, जब वे इस मामले में इतना शौर मचाने हैं तो मैं उन से पूछता हूँ कि वे “यूजरी” के मुतालिक क्यों नहीं कहते, वह भी तो इस्लाम ने मन्वे किया है, मूमनियत की है, इस के खिलाफ भी तो उन को आवाज उठानी चाहिए। आज स्मग्लिंग क्यों जारी है, इस्लाम इस को इजाजत देता।

ला-आफ-मोजेज में एडल्ट्री की सजा संगसारी (स्टोन-टू-डेथ) रखी गई थी। बाद में हज़रत ईसा के वक्त में हदिसा में इस को बदल दिया गया था।

उस वस्तु एक औरत को सगसारो के  
मौके पर हजरत ईसा के अलफ़ाज  
आप को याद होंगे।

"Sin no more lady, sin no more Where  
are the accusers?"

लेकिन उस के बाद जब इस्लाम आया  
तो इस की सजा "फलोमिंग" रखी  
गई। लेकिन खलीफ़े अब्बल आग  
तो उन्होंने महसूस किया कि इस की  
सजा और ज्यादा सख्त होनी चाहिए,  
इस लिए उन्होंने फिर ला-आफ-मोज़ेज  
को लागू किया। इस लिए मेरा कहना  
है कि इस में तब्दीली लाई जा  
सकती है, मजहब के साथ इस का  
कोई ताल्लुक नहीं है।

मैं यह बात कह कर कंकलूड  
करना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे यहाँ लोअर  
क्लास में वंजेज यकमा होनी चाहिए।  
"महर" की रकम इतनी एडिक्वेट  
होनी चाहिए ताकि अगर कोई अपनी  
औरत को तलाक दे दे और वह  
बेआसरा हो तो वह इस पैसे से कमा  
कर अपना गुज़ारा कर सके, अपने आप  
को पैरो पर खड़ा कर सके।

मैं यहाँ खलील जिब्रान के एक  
कोटेशन के साथ कंकलूड करता हूँ—

"Thus the Christian Bishop and the  
Muslim Imam and the Brahmin priest  
became like sea reptiles who clutch their  
prey with many tentacles and suck their  
blood with numerous mouths".

I cannot do better than conclude with  
this sentence

سُرى سید محمد آغا : سہا سی  
مہودے۔ ڈنٹی سکر صاحب نے  
اس باب کو اور سائٹ کہا اس کو  
میں اور لک کر کے لئے بار برس  
ہوں۔ باب نہ ہے کہ میں عوس  
ہوں اب سول کورس کا۔ اس  
کانگریس کا جس میں نرائم  
مسٹر واسہ اسے کر حلی  
کس پر رہا کو یہاں محورا  
رکنا برا۔ اور نہ میں حد حملے  
اس سے پہلے عرس کر چکا تھا۔

میں اندر حب لسا کے واراد  
کی سائٹ کر ہوں۔ آج شمارے  
سماج میں میں طبعی من ایک  
بھلا طبع ہے جس کو عوام کہے  
ہیں۔ نا رائسٹ کہے جس  
وہ طبع محبت کر لے۔ مردوری  
کرنا ہے کہیں میں کام کرنا ہے۔  
اور ایک طبع وہ ہے جس میں  
معتمد بہت ہے۔ اس میں کسی کا  
فکر نہیں ہے۔ وہ سلف سٹرڈ  
ہیں۔ اور اس کلاس کو سلانگ  
کرنے جس کو ایکسٹنٹر ہیں۔  
یک طبع جو رہا ہے وہ درسانہ  
طبع ہے۔ عیسائی اسی درسانے  
طبع سے لیدرس ابھری ہے۔  
اس درسانے طبع کے لئے میں  
کہہ رہا تھا انکو کسن منسٹر

[سُورِی سَیّد اَحمَد آغا:]

ہے۔ کہ انہوں نے جو اپنے سکولوں کے دروازے لڑکیوں کے لئے کیوں بند کر دیئے ہیں۔ کو ایجوکیشن کے لئے وہ تیار نہیں ہیں۔ یہ ایک بہت بڑا ظلم ان کے ساتھ ہے۔ کیونکہ اگر وہ لڑکی لڑکیوں کو پڑھنے کا موقعہ دینگے تو تمام ظلم کے خلاف واویلہ کریں گیں جو ان پر ہوتا ہے۔ اور عوام کی رعبرے کریں گیں۔ اگر ایک کانویٹ سکول میں با ایک پرائیویٹ سکول میں تواجو لبش ہو سکی ہے تو میری سمجھ میں نہیں آتا کہ ان کو لبوں ہمچیشن ہونا ہے۔ وہ لبوں اس سے لبھرانے ہیں۔ ان سکولوں کے دروازے لڑکیوں کے لئے کون نہیں لہولتے۔ بہ بات میں اس لئے لبہ رہا ہوں کہ اس طبنے کی لڑکیوں پر بے انداز ظلم ہوتے ہیں۔ بہ ہی برے رسومات کی سکار ہیں۔ رسومات کی سکار ہیں۔ لبہیں رسومات بسندی کی سکار ہیں۔ اور انہیں کو بے کار اور بے عمل لبنا جانا ہے۔ اس طبنے میں یہ رسم ہے کہ لڑکی کو جب بیابا جانا ہے تب اس کو کود میں لیکر ڈولی میں رلبا جاتا ہے۔ یعنی وہ بھی انک بنڈل ہے اور اس کو بھی یہی احساس کرایا جانا

ہے کہ تم ایک بنڈل ہو۔ وہ یہی سمجھتی ہے۔ کہ میں بھی ایک بنڈل ہوں اور میرا کام سوائے غلامی کے اور نوئی نہیں ہے۔ یہ ایک ایڈیٹیوٹ ہے۔ قانون کی بات الگ ہے۔ یہ ایک انٹیٹیوٹ بھی ہے۔ ایک زمانہ ایسا لبھا کہ ہمارے ملک میں جس زمانے میں لڑکی کو برقعہ میں رلبھا جانا تھا۔ اب ایسا لبس ہونا چاہئے۔ جب ہم نے آریہ بھٹ فضا میں بیبجا ہے۔ سب اونٹ کی سواری کے زمانے کو لبس لوٹ سکے۔ بہ اس زمانے کی بات ہے جب اونٹ پر سواری کی جانی نہی۔ اب وہ زمانہ بھر لوٹ کر آئے ابسی بات سوچنا غلط ہوکہ مجھے باد آتا ہے آج سے سو برس پہلے کشمیر میں لڑکی بھی اس کا نام سون کیسری تھا۔ سو برس پہلے اس نے یہ خواہش کی تھی کہ وہ، چاند پر جائیکی اس نے بڑی کونشس کی۔ بڑی لگن سے چاند کو پکارتی رہی۔ ماں کہہ کے۔ وہ جانا چاہتی تھی۔ لیکن وہ بیچاری نہیں گئی۔ پر آج وہ زمانہ آگیا ہے۔ جب ہم نے آریہ بھٹ کو سپیس میں بیبج دیا۔ اور ایک وقت آئیگا کہ جب ہم چاند پر بھی جائینگے تو وہ تو

نہیں جا سکی مگر اس کے خواب  
کو ہم پورا کریں گے۔

سوال یہ ہے کہ آج بھی جب  
شادی ہوتی ہے، اس کے ساتھ جوڑا  
وری دی جاتی ہے وہ ایک قبولیت  
کی قیمت ہوتی ہے۔ کہ تم اس کو  
قبول کرو اور اتنی قیمت ہم تم کو  
دیتے ہیں اس کو قبول کرنے  
کے لئے۔ یہ ایک بہت بڑا ظلم

ہے۔ کہ اس لئے یہ ڈاوری دی  
جائے کہ یہ لڑکی قبول ہوئی اور  
وہاں رہے گی۔ اس سے بڑھکر کوئی

اور ظلم نہیں ہو سکتا ہے۔ ایک لڑکی  
کی شادی ہوئی۔ اس میں سوئی دھاگا

نہیں دیا تو کچھ دنوں کے بعد اس  
سے یہ کہا گیا کہ یہ تو سوئی

دھاگہ بھی اپنے ساتھ نہیں لا  
سکی۔ اس کو جو ہیومیلیشن ہوا

صرف اس کارن کہ وہ سوئی دھاگہ  
نہیں لا سکی۔ یہ کتنے بڑے ظلم

کی بات ہے۔ کشمیر کی ایک اور  
لڑکی کا حال سننے سب کے لئے

کھانا پکا مچھلی بنی اس کی ساس  
نے ایک کچی مچھلی کے ٹکڑے

کو اس کی تھالی میں رکھ دیا۔ وہ  
غور سے دیکھنے لگی۔ کہ میں

اس کچی مچھلی کو کیسے  
کھاؤں گی۔ تو اس کی ساس نے

کہا کہ تو اس کو کیسے نہیں نکل  
سکتی۔ میں تو تجھ کو کیسے  
نکل گئی۔ میں تو تجھے  
بنا ڈاوری کے نکل گئی۔  
تو اس کو کیوں نہیں نکل سکتی۔  
تو یہ ہے ان کے اوپر ظلم کی  
کہانی۔ جو ظلم ان کے اوپر ہوتے  
رہے ہیں۔

Sir, this is something very important.

Mr. Chairman: We are running against  
time, please conclude.

Shrimati T. Lakshminikanthamma: Sir, this  
House has not got a Muslim woman to re-  
present the case of muslim women. He is  
representing the case of so many millions  
of women. Therefore, please allow him  
more time.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Aga, please be brief.

شری سید احمد آغا : میں مہر کی  
بات کرنے جا رہا تھا۔ آج سے  
سینکڑوں برس پہلے یا صدیوں  
پہلے مہر ہوتا تھا کہ دس بارہ  
روپے عورت کو دے دئے اور  
اس سے کہا یہ او اور تم جاؤ،  
دس روپے پکڑائے اور طلاق  
دے دیا۔ یونیٹل ڈائیسورس  
یہ ہوتا ہے۔ آج دس بارہ روپے  
کے کوئی معنی نہیں ہیں۔ اس کی  
دو صورتیں ہیں۔ ایک تو اس قدر  
ان ایڈیکویٹ ہے کہ اس کے کوئی

[شری سید احمد آغا:]

معنی نہیں ہیں۔ اور ایک مجھے معلوم ہے کشمیر میں اس کا ایک دوسرا قسم بھی ہے۔ اور شاید ہو سکتا ہے پنجاب میں بھی ہو۔ جس نے کہ انا امبوسیل رکھ دیا جانا تھا۔ کہ وہ ادا ہی نہ ہو سکے یعنی نا تو سہر اس قدر کم ہے کہ وہ بے معنی ہے نا انا مشکل ہے کہ اس کو ادا کرنا نا ممکن ہے۔ سال کے طور پر تو بھی ہے کہ سہر مچھر کی غری کا ایک ماؤ درج ہو تو نہ سہر ادا نہیں ہو سکتا۔ کیونکہ ایک ماؤ مچھر کی غری و لائی نہیں جا سکی اس لئے خاوند طلاؤ کے وقت بہ لہبٹا کہ ہم بڑی رعہ۔ ہم کام کر سکی ہو۔ تم غلام رہ سکی ہو۔ ہم غلامی کرو۔ اور ہم دوسری شادی کرو۔ نینگے۔

اسلام میں بھی جانتا ہوں۔ اور اسلام کی سبب نہ جانتا ہوں۔ چار شادیوں کی بات نہیں جا رہی ہے وہ کب کہی گئی۔ جب ان گنت شادیاں ہوئی ہیں۔ تب اس پر ایک پابندی لادی گئی۔ کہ چار شادی تک نہ کر سکتے ہو۔ یہ ایک حد ہو گئی جسے شراب لوگ بہت پیتے تھے۔ قو شراب کی ایک حد لگا دی کہ پیارے

تک ہی سکتے ہیں۔ اپنے ہی چار شادی کی حد لگائی گئی۔ وہ بھی اس شرط پر کہ سبھی کو یکساں افیکشن دینا ہوگا۔ لیکن چونکہ یکساں افیکشن دینا مسلسل نہیں۔ اس لئے چار شادی کا سوال پیدا نہیں ہوتا۔ اگر کوئی صاحب یہ کہتے ہیں کہ اسلام اس کی اجازت دیتا ہے تو میں کہتا ہوں کہ نہیں دیتا ہے۔ بالکل نہیں دیتا ہے۔ تم یہ ایک بہانہ کر رہے ہو۔ اپنی خواہش کو پورا کرنے کے لئے اور ایک اور داوری وصول کرنے کے لئے ایک بہانہ بنانا چاہتے ہو۔ ہم آج ایک داوری لیں۔ ہو تو کل ایک اور داوری لیں۔ یہ نجارت ہے۔ ایک ایکسپلینس ہے۔ یہ بھی یہاں ہونا رہا ہے۔ کہ ایک ہفتے کے بعد طلاؤ دے دیئے جاتے رہے ہیں۔

میں نے کچھ دیر پہلے اس قسم کی باتیں ایک فورم میں کہی تھیں تو لوگوں نے کبڑے بھارتی شروع کر دیئے ہیں۔ میرے خلاف لکھنا شروع کر دیا۔ کچھ آرٹیکل میرے خلاف دین دنیا میں نکلمے میں اس کو مضمون بنائی ہی کہہ سکتا ہوں۔ وہ لوگ شاید کتاب کو

پڑھہ ہائے میں لیکن کتاب کو  
سمجھ نہیں سکے۔ وہ کتاب  
خواہاں میں۔ صاحب کتاب نہیں  
ہیں۔

میں نہاں پر کشمیر کی ایک  
لڑکی کا ذکر کرنا چاہتا ہوں۔ اس  
کا نام بہا لال اسوری ناٹل رسد  
اس نے بہت ظلم ہوا۔ اس کو جس  
نورے میں لٹانا دیا جانا تھا۔  
اس میں نہر رکھ کر اس پر  
حاول کے حند دے چھڑک  
دینے جانی تھے۔ اس کی مدر۔ اس  
اس نے اس ظلم کرسی بھی  
ایک وہ دجاری اس نے برداشت

کری بھی۔ اور نہر کو بھی  
صاف گھر کے رکھی بھی۔ ایک دفعہ  
اس کی مہینوں کے کہا۔ کہ ہم  
بہر دو دنوں صاف کرسی ہو۔  
اس لڑکی نے جواب دیا کہ وہ  
ایک خاص حشر ہے جو میرے کٹورے  
میں رکھی جاتی ہے اس کے اوپر  
حاول کے دانی چھڑکے جاتے  
ہیں۔ ہاں، اس سے بھی لٹائی  
ارہی ہوں۔ اس لئے مجھے اس کو  
صاف رکھنا ضروری ہے۔ اس کا  
مادر۔ اس نے وہیں بچھے سن رہا تھا۔  
اس نے بھی اس کی بات کو  
سنا۔ جب وہ کھر میں آنا تو اس

نے دیکھا کہ واقعی اس کے  
کٹورے میں نہر رکھا جانا تھا۔  
میں اس کا ایک کمانٹ اب کے  
سامنے رکھنا چاہتا ہوں اور  
خاص طور سے ان کتاب خواہاں  
اوکوں کو سنا چاہتا ہوں۔ تاکہ  
آب کی معرفت نہ بات ان لوگوں  
نک نہج جانے۔ وہ کمانٹ  
۱. طرح سے ہے۔

'The thoughtless read the holy books  
as parrots in their cage recite  
their reading is like churning water  
fruitless efforts, ridiculous conceit'

میں نے ریڈنگس کسٹ کا  
ذکر اس لئے کیا کہ اس کے  
بہت ادبوں نے اسے خلاف  
مضامین ازی شروع کر دی ہے۔

میں نہ بھی عرصہ کرا چاہتا  
ہوں کہ بولگمی۔ ٹیسوسا میں  
مد کر دی گئی ہے۔ اس قسم کے  
رفتور میں برکی۔ اراں اور عراف اور  
سمہرہ میں بھی ہو جاتے ہیں۔  
ہا کسان میں بھی جہاں نہاں کے  
لوٹ ہی گئے ہیں۔ ہمارے بھائی  
مد تھے۔ ادبوں نے بھی ۱۹۶۱  
میں فعلی لا اردنسس کے تحت  
بولیگمی پر روک لگائی۔ سا  
جیونڈنل سکشن کے حاوہ کے اس



اخصار پر بھی باندی لگائی گئی کہ وہ یونیلٹرل طلاق دے سکے۔ ہمارے یہاں بھی مس دیکھا ہوں کہ بعض اور بوندہ مس کچھ نہوڑی مہب جا کر رہی ہے۔ لیکن اس طرف نہیں ہے۔ مس بے وعان دیکھا کہ سرعہ مس حی اور حجاب اے اے میں صاحب اس معاملے میں مہب کاہ کر رہے ہیں۔ انہوں نے کہا ہے کہ طرغہ اسلام کے خلاف ہے۔ مس ان مالوی صاحبان سے کہہ چاہا ہوں کہ وہ حو لہے ہیں۔ یہ ان ۵ ریسٹل لا

ہے۔ جب وہ اس معاملے میں اسل سوری مجھے ہیں تو مس ان سے دیکھا ہوں کہ وہ یورری کے متعلق لدوں نہیں کہتے۔ وہ بھی تو اسلام نے منع کیا ہے۔ ممانت کی ہے۔ اس کے خلاف بھی تو ان کو آوار اٹھای چاہئے۔ آج سمگلنگ کڈوں ہو رہی ہے۔ اسلام اس یورری کی اجازت نہیں دیتا۔

لا آف موزنز مس ایڈلٹری کی سزا سنگساری (سٹون ٹل ڈیٹھ) رکھی گئی تھی۔ بعد میں حضرت عیسا کے وب میں اس کو بدل دیا گیا تھا۔ اس وقت ایک عورت کو سنگساری کے موئے پر حضرت عیسا کے الفاظ آپ کو یاد ہونگے۔

“Sin no more lady, sin no more Where are the accusers”

لیکن اس کے بعد جب اسلام آیا۔ تو اس کی سزا فلاگنگ رکھی گئی۔ لیکن خیفہ اول آئے تو انہوں نے محسوس کیا کہ اس کی سزا اور زیادہ سخت ہونی چاہئے۔ اس نے انہوں نے بھر لا آف موزیز کو لاگو کیا۔ اس لئے سرا کہنا ہے۔ کہ اس میں تبدیلی لائی جا سکتی ہے۔ مذہب کے ساتھ اس کا کوئی تعلق نہیں ہے۔

مس یہ اب کہہ کر کنکلوڈ کرنا چاہا ہوں کہ ہمارے یہاں لوئر کلاس میں ورکز نکساں ہونی چاہیں مہر کی رقم بھی انڈیکوٹ ہونی چاہئے۔ تاکہ اگر کوئی اپنی عورت کو طلاق دے دے تو مہر اسل ہو کہ وہ اس سے سے کما کر اسل گزارا کر سکے۔ اور اپنے آب لو ابے بیروں پر کھڑا کر سکے

مس یہاں خلیل زبران کے ایک کونٹمس کے ساتھ کمنکبود کرنا ہوں۔

“Thus the Christian Bishop and the Muslim Imam and the Brahmin priest became like sea reptiles who clutch their prey with many tentacles and suck their blood with numerous mouths”

I cannot do better than conclude with this sentence.

SHRIMATI M. GODFREY (NOMINATED-ANGLO-INDIANS): I rise to support the Resolution brought forward by Shri Indrajit Gupta. I suppose, as has been said, being a bachelor he is in a bet or position to bring this Resolution for removing economic and social injustices to women because I suppose he is not tied down to any one woman but he can speak for all women.

Let me begin at the beginning. When a baby is born in a family and it is a girl, the family members are very disappointed because, she will not be of any help to the family when she grows up because in the old society, girls were not permitted to go out and work. So when a girl is born in a family, she should have the same right as a boy to earn and she should get as much place as a boy gets. These old customs die hard. I would really like our society, particularly menfolk to bring it home to women that a girl baby is just as important as a boy.

Seeing a girl, the dowry question crops up in the family. So far as a boy is concerned, the educational qualification that he should have is decided against the dowry that he can get. A boy is educated in our country because he has to secure a good dowry when he gets married, not as a matter of an educated status nor as a matter of pride for the family, but in terms of how much he will get if he is a B.A., how much he will get if he is a B.Sc., how much he will get if he is a Doctor, how much he will get if he is an Engineer. On these standards, the family educates the male members. I think this is a wrong concept which should be wiped out from the minds of people.

Many a girl of a very poor family has no prospect of marriage because the parents cannot afford dowry. This causes a lot of frustration in the minds, particularly of young girls. They feel they could not get husbands. Naturally in frustration many of our girls are seeking other undesirable professions. I would like parents who are really responsible for this to wipe this out from the minds of their girls when they are growing up. Whether they have a dowry or not, if they get a man they should get married. I see many girls who feel they cannot get a good man because

their fathers have no dowry to give. Naturally they try to enter some other profession where they can perhaps earn their living. This is a wrong idea. I would like not only the ladies but particularly our gentlemen-folk to take note of this. I request that in this International Women's Year, one of our programmes of legislations should be that this dowry system should be completely wiped out.

17.00 hrs.

I would request the Minister of Education and Culture to make education for girls compulsory and free even in the higher standards so that our poor girls can get education even without their parents having to spend for them and having to grumble about it.

Regarding the marriage life of the girls, when she is married she takes the husband to be a master and God. In our Indian society, the husband is a God to them. They are not only bound to him by a social bond but are bound to him as if he were God. Whether they are treated as spouses or as a women, they have to be tied down to the men they marry (*Interruptions*). That is the trouble, but the husband does not treat her as a Goddess. This is a very strange position. I would rather like the husband to treat the wife as companion and as equal to him.

Then there is the mother-in-law menace. The mother-in-law feels that she has to put some force on her daughter-in-law. Otherwise, the mother-in-law thinks that she is not a real mother-in-law. I think this concept must also be taken away from the minds of our womenfolk. The mothers-in-law feel that unless they are after these poor girls, they are not doing the work of mother-in-law. So many a girl comes to feel that she has to be a slave in the House and she has got to be dominated by her mother-in-law; whether the mother-in-law is educated or illiterate, she has got to fall at the feet of the mother-in-law every morning, every day; she has to fall at the feet of the husband every day. This kind of customs must be wiped out, particularly in this International Women's Year.

[Shrimati M. Godfrey]

I would not like to advocate the law of divorce, but to free certain women who are bound down to these old customs, because old customs die hard, I would rather like the law of divorce to be brought in this International Women's Year. But make it an enabling law so that those who feel that they would be free by taking divorce may find that it is better that they live a simple life rather than be tyrannised and be living in a 'prison', all their lives in hardship and difficulties.

I would stress one point. Our Prime Minister has very kindly said that during this International Women's Year so many crores of rupees or whatever it is has been sanctioned for seminars and other things. Instead of seminars which go only in the air—making speeches and doing nothing—I would rather like something concrete to be done in every State for the women of our country like homes for working women which are very scarce in our country. When they go from one State to another, they have no place to stay. Then there may be some industrial centres where our drop-out girls, those girls who drop out of high schools, because they are not fit enough for the high school, can take up some sort of work like stitching, shorthand and typewriting and so on. Not that we want them to divorce their husbands, but in case anything should happen to the husband, the girl can find a job for herself.

I make an appeal to men that they should respect women and treat them as their equals. I have read a very distressing news this morning in the papers. What I want to bring to the notice of the House is that women are being mortgaged. This is the heading of a news item 'Harijans mortgage women'. Shall I read it, if you do not mind? It is in *Hindustan Times*. It has happened in Rajasthan. I was really very much perturbed. If you agree, we should have a short discussion on this.

This is from Jaipur:

"Starving Harijans mortgage women — Jaipur, April 24. With the mercury rising sharply, the drought situation is getting worse in the desert areas of Rajasthan. More reports about star-

vation deaths, in addition to those from Doongarpur and Udaipur have come in from Churu and Jhunjhunu districts. Scheduled caste poor women were being mortgaged to contractors of Punjab, Haryana and Delhi, a group of newsmen which recently visited the drought-hit areas of Dataramgarh tehsil of Sikar district was told. The newsmen were informed that several thousand drought-affected Harijans went across the Rajasthan borders last month in search of work. Some contractors in Punjab, Haryana and Delhi exploited their misery so much so that the poor men were compelled to mortgage their young wives, sisters and daughters to them. The Harijans now find it difficult to get back their womenfolk because they can't pay back the debts. The Jhunjhunu zila pramukh Mr. Sheesh Ram Ola has reported a few starvation deaths in his district. According to him the situation is getting out of control."

With this kind of mortgage of young girls and wives and sisters, I think the country should do something. What are we coming to if we are going to mortgage women like this? Mrs. Roza Deshpande said that women were given for the sake of a cow some years ago. Now things are becoming worse and I think we should do something about it.

THE MINISTER OF LABOUR (SHRI RAGHUNATHA REDDY): Reference was made to the provisions of the Constitution. Some of the Members mentioned Fundamental Rights and the Directive Principles of the Constitution. I need not repeat them here again. Reference was also made to the I.L.O convention 100 concerning equal remuneration for women for work of equal value. May I inform the hon. House that this Convention had been ratified by our country sometime back. The Labour Minister's conference had also taken a decision to take such steps as would be necessary to put an end to the disparity that exists between women and men with regard to their work and equal payment for equal work. The Government is seriously considering the introduction of legislation for the purpose of ensuring equal wage for similar job of equal value. I do hope that this

legislation would be introduced as early as possible, perhaps during the current session of Parliament.

With regard to protection from mothers-in-law, I would rather leave this subject to my distinguished friend, the Education Minister who perhaps is better qualified to deal with this matter.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola):** While congratulating Shri Indrajit Gupta for bringing forward this resolution, I want to make only a few points. If we consider why women are in such a disadvantageous position, two major considerations arise. Basically the first is the economic consideration; she is not economically free. All the good sentiments that you express here would really not be able to liberate women from the clutches of tyranny in which she finds herself. The second thing is this. Unless a fundamental change in the approach to relationship between man and women is there, improvement will not come about. It is a very delicate factor. For thousands of years we had learnt to look upon this relationship in a particular way. I recall my visit to the Soviet Union in 1961. In a textile factory I was told that out of 210 women workers—the general manager of the factory was a woman—nearly 160 were unmarried mothers. With all my progressiveness I felt a little shocked and surprised and I asked: what do you mean? She gave me the reason: during the last war nearly two crores of young men were killed and they had to face this problem. The girls who would have got them as husbands could not get them but our society had to grow; what can we do? In Western European countries also they had to face it and the reasons for the growth of the hippy cult lies in that. Nature being what it is, only a woman can become a mother. Women who became mothers out of wedlock were considered illegitimate mothers and their children were also considered illegitimate. The result was that those children were on the streets. They rebelled against society. They were without love, affection and a home. In Russia they said: we do not want our girls to go on the streets. They said: it is your fundamental and natural right to be a mother: the whole society, the whole State will be the father of the children; do not worry; you can

have a child and we will look after them; they are our real future generation and they are going to build the country. This was their approach. When society grew and the balance was restored in the male-female ratio, they are getting married. Home is a necessity, they said. Let us not think that in the context of equality there is any attempt to destroy the home. At the same time a sense of equality in the matter of sex and motherhood will have to be taken into consideration. When you say that among the tribals there is greater freedom or equality, it is basically because of this concept of sex. When you consider the question of equality, our whole approach has to change. We were just now talking of dowry. If you want to make any change in matters relating to dowry, divorce, etc. I do not think we should bring amendments. In my humble opinion the amendment by Shrimati Savitri Shyam should not be brought. Let us not unnecessarily touch the sentiments of certain sections relating to personal law. This is the only reason on which this thing is being put forward. Shri Aga had spoken just now; Mrs. Godfrey also had spoken; she is not here just now. What is the personal law of Christians relating to family planning? Can a Christian woman, a poor woman afford to have ten children? She cannot maintain even two. Are we going to compel her and say: no, you are a Catholic; you must have ten children. It is all non-sense. But we do not want to hurt their sentiments. The same is the case with Muslim women. I know so many countries where Islam is being practised including Turkey under Kamal Ata Tark, which have brought about reforms in the personal laws of women. But in this country we fight shy of even touching it, saying it is Muslim personal law.

An amendment has been given for inserting the words "as far as possible" after the words "measures aimed at removing". Nobody says you are going to remove them immediately. You want to dilute it further by saying "measures aimed at removing as far as possible"! Has it got any meaning? I really do not know who advised this amendment. I am sure the Leader of the House has not advised it.

**SHRI JANESHWAR MISRA:** She has done it.

**SHRI VASANT SATHE:** I request the Education Minister and Shrimati Savitri Shyam to reconsider this amendment. If at all anybody is so sensitive, you can remove the words "particularly in the field of marriage and divorce laws". But what about dowry customs? Is it a personal law? Don't you want the words "maternity or child welfare"? Then it says "unequal pay for equal work", "educational and employment opportunities", and "vocational training and facilities for working mothers". Don't you want these things? All these are enshrined in the directive principles of our Constitution. Don't you want in the International Women's Year at least to adopt a resolution for once again dedicating ourselves to this cause? Why do we make light of this? If you have any reservation, you can delete "particularly in the field of marriage and divorce laws", but otherwise, this resolution is perfectly all right and this House should unanimously adopt it.

**THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (DR. SAROJINI MAHISHI):** Sir, I am extremely happy that the whole House has become aware of the legal, social, economic and other disabilities of women in our country. The UN Resolution also says that this is the International Women's Year and efforts should be made to bring about radical changes for the uplift of women. It is mainly with a view to creating better facilities and raising the status of women in all fields that this thing has been brought at the UN level. In our country, conditions do differ. Hon. members have spoken about the past glory, present difficulties and what the future should be for women. We always had the greatest reverence and regard for women in our country:

यत्र नारयस्तु पूज्यन्ते रम्यते तत्र  
देवताः

"Wherever women are worshipped, Gods rejoice"! They may continue to be worshipped, but the question is, are they treated as human beings? They must have been treated as goddesses. But goddesses do not demand anything, whereas human beings demand certain things. They have certain needs and aspirations.

There have been many great women in this country who were writers in Rig Veda, but at the same time, there were people who said, women do not have the authority of reading vedas! In the name of protecting society and having a patriarchal system, the law-makers were unkind to women. The birth of a son was rejoiced while the birth of a girl was considered to be a liability to the family. The veda says:

पुत्रेण दुहिता समा

"Daughter should be considered on par with a son" There have been great women like Gargi, Maitreyi and Sulabha who could participate in discussions on Upanishads and philosophic matters. But in the later period, the law-makers became unkind to women. They said, woman does not even deserve a share in her father's property. She could have a little amount of *stridhan*, which was described by Yajnavalkya as "the present given by mother, brother or father at the time of the marriage, with the bride and bridegroom sitting before nuptial fire":

भ्रातृमातृपितुर्दत्तं अद्यग्निं उपाहृतम् ।  
अधिवेदनिकायं व स्त्रीधनं परि-  
कीर्तितम् ॥

Later on this *stridhan* was to be used by the husband when there was an emergency in the family. It was left to the discretion of the husband to say whether there was an emergency or not. Poets have described woman as incarnation of beauty, her gait as the gait of a swan, her eyes as the eyes of a deer and so on. Some economists put them together and said, the whole value of the deer, swan, lotus etc. put together would not exceed a small amount! The poets described her as the embodiment of beauty. The Hindi poet said:

अबला जीवन, हाथ तेरी यही कहानी,  
आंचल में है दूध और आंखों में पानी ।

Some people quote Tulsidas out of context. He said:

ढोल गंवार शूद्र पशु नारी,  
ये सब ताड़न के अधिकारी ।

Quoting it out of context, some people say that women also should be given physical punishment. There were days when physical punishment was given. She was thrown into the background economically, socially and legally. I ask; can the position of a woman be substituted by any commodity? The great Sanskrit poet of the 7th century, Bhavabhuti describes the conversation between the silvan deity and the ladies. The silvan deity asks:

किमरंभः स राजा संप्रति ?

“What has the king started now?”

तेन राजा कतृख्वमेधः संप्राप्तः

“That king has started a horse sacrifice.”

किं परिणीतमपि ?

“Has he married again? He has banished Sita”.

शान्तं पापं, शान्तं पापम्

“God forbid”.

का तस्य सहधर्मचारिणी यजे ?

“Who is his *Sahadharmacharini*?”

हिरण्यमयी सीता प्रतिकृतिः

“A golden image of Sita”.

Rama is described as a very great and magnanimous soul, harder than *vajra* but softer than flower petals. Who indeed can understand the mind of the great people?

वज्रादपि कठोराणि मृदूनि कुसुमादपि  
लोकोत्तराणां चेतासि को हि विज्ञातु-  
मर्हति ॥

Sita's place is being substituted by a golden image and the sacrifice is being carried on. Later on, we find the wife's position is being substituted by other commodities also. It was not necessary that she should participate in the sacrifice. She is thrown into the background as she is incapable of participation in religious rites because she has no education and she could not exercise her rights properly. Even though it is said by the Vedas मातृदेवो भव “Mother is

considered as God”, that right to be God was no longer there because she could not attend to the spiritual side. Looking only to the physical aspect could not solve the problem. She could not attend to the spiritual side because she has no education and no right to participate in these things. Let us forget the history of those bygone days. Even when Sita was performing the Sandhya Vandana Hanuman was saying:

संध्याकाल मनाः श्यामा ध्रुवमेप्यति  
जानकी

नदी येमां शुभजलां संध्यार्थे वरवर्णिनी।

Women used to enjoy rights along with men but, in course of time, those rights were taken away.

When the joint family was there, there was a system called *Niyoga* under which when the husband died, the widow could raise an issue for the family with the help of the brother of the deceased husband. But when the family broke up all these customs and usages were thrown in the background.

Later on, in order to strengthen the patriarchal system of family, there used to be sons of different types—son born to oneself (*Auras*), adoption (*dattaka*), artificial (*krithrima*), born in a concealed way (*gudha*) and purchased (*kreettha*). All these sons were recognised, but daughters were not recognised.

In the International Women's Year we cannot remove all these things which have come by ages. But I do say that positive measures should be taken in the present circumstances to ameliorate the condition of women, to improve their status and also to give them better opportunities to lead the life of a good human being, not only in this country but throughout the world.

As late as 1937 we find a piece of legislation brought for women. The Hindu Women's Right to Property Act was brought in the year 1937 when the British Government was there. But, at that time, a widow in the family could enjoy only limited estate in the property, and not absolute right in the property. After taking into consideration the pitiable position in

[Dr. Sarojini Mahishi]

which the widow was placed, this piece of legislation was brought in force in India. Till then for a century women did not enjoy equal rights, they had legal disabilities. Therefore, how can you expect them to have development of the personality?

During the time of the rulers we find that art was being patronised, so also music and dance in the court. But there was no attempt at that time to give education to women. An agitation had to be made for the education of women. Even then there was hardly any response. It used to be believed that if a woman in a family learnt to read and write, some evil would befall that family. Today we have travelled a long distance from that. Now we think that if a woman does not know how to read and write, evil would befall that family. That is the long distance that we have covered.

Today the education of women is on the increase. It is encouraging that it is getting a good response. What is that good response. I leave it to the hon. Members to decide. Literacy among women has today reached the percentage of 14. Earlier it was 7; then it rose to 10, 12 and now it is 14; not more than that. While the general literacy programme has gone up to 40 per cent, we see that among women it is hardly 14 per cent. Therefore, I would say that in spite of all the legislation, all the economic measures, all the educational activities that are being carried on, the response from the women is not very encouraging. Why that is so, I would like to deal with shortly.

Whenever I have travelled throughout the length and breadth of the country, especially in the rural areas, I have noticed that women do not come to the forefront for attending the meetings. They stand behind the trees, behind the walls or in their houses. When I ask them to come and sit before, they would sit in front of me. But they would say:

जब तक आप यहां है, तब तक  
हमारे मर्द चुप बैठे रहते हैं।  
लेकिन जब आप चली जाती है,  
तो कहते है कि आगे क्यों बैठे

हो। इसलिए पहले आप उन से  
कहिए, और तब हम से कहिए।

Therefore, I do not know whether the men in our country have got to be educated to have their outlook changed, or the women have to be educated.

Women have got to be educated. The Directive Principles of State Policy, the provisions of the Constitution relating to the equal protection of the law and equality before the law are there. The question is how to translate them into action. The Child Marriage Restraint Act is there, the Caste Disabilities Prevention Act is there, the Bigamy Prevention Act is there, the Dowry Prohibition Act is there. Yet, hon. Members know that these social legislations have not been so effective? Why have they not been effective?

SHRIMATI T. LAKSHMIKANTHAM-  
MA: The hon. Labour Minister assured the members that he would be bringing a legislation soon. In the same way, will the Law Minister assure the House that she will also bring some legislation instead of only making a general speech?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The reason was perhaps that the hon. Labour Minister was a man!

SHRIMATI T. LAKSHMIKANTHAM-  
MA: Do you mean to say that men are more liberal than women?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not know.

SHRIMATI T. LAKSHMIKANTHAM-  
MA: We will not be satisfied by a mere speech. Let her assure us of what the Government are going to do to remove discrimination.

DR. SAROJINI MAHISHI: So many social legislations have been brought forward in this very House. Efforts are being made in the direction of making them very effective. But, in spite of all these things, sometimes we find that the position could not be improved. If we make some of these things cognisable, there would be more of harassment. So, the change has to be brought about in a gradual way.

The Committee on the Status of Women has recommended that in the case of dowry both the person who offers and the receiver should be brought within the ambit of the Act and it should be made a cognisable offence. As it is, it is a non-cognisable offence. But there are difficulties in the way. As the hon. lady Member has said, there should be specific effort in this direction. I am one with the sentiments and feelings expressed in this House.

The hon. Member made a reference to the piece of legislation that is going to be introduced by the Labour Ministry. I may inform the hon. Member that it was approved by the Law Ministry. In addition to that, other efforts are also being made in that direction, continuous efforts. But the House should also be aware of the fact that social legislation can be effectively implemented only with an enlightened society, and so efforts for that enlightenment of the society have also got to be made.

**SHRIMATI T. LAKSHMIKANTHAM-MA:** What about the discrimination in regard to property rights?

**DR. SARAJINI MAHISHI:** There are a number of factors involved in this. The State Governments are there to implement many of the legislations. Continuous efforts are being made in that direction, as the Prime Minister assured the House. Hon. Members have expressed their keen desire to see all positive steps are being taken in that direction. The Law Ministry is not away from all these things. We will make positive efforts in this direction and give the fullest co-operation and coordination to all the Ministries which are bringing all these things. We will be eagerly co-operating in all the activities which the Education Minister or the Labour Minister will be undertaking.

**SHRI B. V. NAIK (Kanara):** We have moved some amendments. Are you permitting us to participate in the debate? Is it not the practice that those who have given notice are given an opportunity?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** The normal practice in this House has been that merely by giving a notice of amendment you are not asked to speak, unless you express your desire to speak.

**SHRI B. V. NAIK (Kanara):** Invariably such members are given an opportunity.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Let us not enter into a debate. The Minister was to have spoken at 5.15. Now it is already 5.35 p.m. I have with me a list of four or five speakers. I am completely at the disposal of the House. I think I should now call the hon. Minister.

Already the Deputy-Speaker has said that there has been some irregularity. Therefore, this debate should be concluded today at any cost. I have before me the names of Shri P. G. Mavalankar, Shri Y. S. Mahajan, Shri Mohapatra. The half an hour discussion is not to be taken up. So, I will give five minutes each to these three Members and Shri B. V. Naik. The discussion will be over by 6.30.

180

**SHRI Y. S. MAHAJAN (Buldana):** I am glad that this resolution urging the nation to improve the status of women has been brought forward by a male member of the House. I congratulate Mr. Indrajit Gupta on this resolution.

The United Nations, by declaring 1975 as the International Women's Year, has focussed attention on the vital problems which centre round women all the world over. In our country there has no doubt been considerable improvement in the status of women since the attainment of independence. We find that in the last century and a half, all the great social reformers fought for the emancipation of women, for removing their disabilities and freeing them from harmful social customs. Still, unfortunately it is true to say that in spite of the Constitutional provisions and other legal enactments passed by Parliament and the State Legislatures to protect the rights of women, improvements in their educational and cultural standards, the majority of women in the country still suffer from oppressive social customs, the absence of a uniform civil law and a feudal outlook on the part of men.

As a result of educational advance in our country, women have come to occupy responsible positions in all walks of life, in all professions and the administrative services. They have made a significant contribution, particularly in the educational



[Shri Y. S. Mahajan]

field and I find that there are 24,000 women teachers in our colleges and universities. The number of graduate women teachers in schools is about 94,000. We have over 20,000 women doctors with graduate or post-graduate degrees.

Though there are some of the high-lights of the economic and social progress made by women, we cannot but deplore the fact that only 18.7 per cent Indian women are literate though the percentage of literacy among men is not higher than 39.4. In my view, educational progress alone can ensure the all round progress of women, remove their difficulties in all walks of life, secure for them equality with men in economic and social life and particularly as regards marriage and divorce.

During this year the Government should make arrangements for making primary education compulsory all over the country and also secondary education for girls. It should also provide facilities for vocational and technical education in all the districts of the country.

This is a subject which has been discussed for years but during the last 25 years the Government has not been able to make primary and secondary education free and compulsory for girls in this country.

As regards inheritance of property, the Hindu Succession Act of 1956 confers upon a woman the right to inherit the property of her husband equally with a son, daughter and mother in case of intestacy. An unmarried woman, a widow or a divorced wife can now adopt a child. There are laws which provide also for equal pay for equal work with men. Women have also been heirs under Muslim laws for a limited amount of property. But the right of inheritance given to a daughter under the Hindu Succession Act is defeasible because a person by making a will can dispose of his property among his sons and leave nothing to his daughters.

There are a number of laws passed in this country, but most of them have not been properly implemented. If the Government had been determined to implement the laws

passed so far, we would have made great progress in improving the status of women in this country.

In the field of marriage and divorce, women suffer most from discriminatory practices, oppressive social customs, religious fanaticism and lack of legal protection. I will not again mention the legal provisions made so far, but there is one very great evil in this country, namely polygamy, and this is tolerated because a particular section of our community does not see the desirability of ending it. I think this is due to a wrong interpretation of the scriptures. I hope that this system will be terminated as soon as possible.

In the Report on the Status of Women made by the Committee, they say that most of the Muslim women who were asked to give evidence have said that they are against polygamy. Therefore, public opinion is against it, and it should be respected by the Government.

As regards dowry, much has been said about it. I am not going to wax eloquent on the evils of dowry, but, I believe, this system will continue till our society becomes enlightened. There is only one remedy for it, namely adult and love marriages. Dowry exists because the marriages of daughters and sons are arranged by their parents. When they arrange those marriages, they make arrangements for dowry also. If the arranged marriages or child marriages are stopped, and marriages take place on the basis of affection or love between intending partners, then only, I think, will the dowry system come to an end.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR (Ahmedabad) : I join wholeheartedly all those who have preceded me in congratulating my esteemed friend, Shri Indrajit Gupta, who has moved the resolution and who, while doing so a fortnight ago, made such a brilliant speech on his resolution.

A place of honour for Indian women in ancient India was no doubt very much assured and the Minister of State in the Ministry of Company Affairs and Law in her learned speech a little while ago also told us how Indian women in the past,

especially in ancient India, were respected and even worshipped and were treated on a par with men, how they were considered an integral part in all religious Pujas and other ceremonies. But, as custom became more and more strong, then unfortunately *roodhi* gave women lesser and lesser status and men became too powerful. The *Shastra* says one thing, and *roodhi* says another. *Roodhi* unfortunately began to prevail and it was the men who decided it in the rural and urban parts of India. Under the law the men decided that women should not have certain rights and privileges, certain places of honour. Therefore, I feel that we in this country are particularly fortunately placed in reviving the earlier liberal attitude towards women.

As the Prime Minister rightly pointed out one should not look at the problem from the angle of a man or a woman, but from the angle of a human being. If you look at it from the angle of a human being, then women must be respected and treated with courtesy, consideration, fairness and equality.

I do not think it is right to say that women should be considered first as something less than men, something less than equal and then start going on giving consideration or showing mercy to them. Even they themselves will take offence if such an attitude is to be shown to them. Therefore if you look at the problem, the problem is basically the problem of creating a certain climate of awareness. Are men really aware of the kind of problem that exists? Are women also equally aware of the kind of problems that exist? I say this because I do not know how many men, particularly in modern India, have really considered that the woman has not only an equal place but the woman has a personality and a dignity of her own which from the point of view of human personality, human development, is something valuable which they must cherish, protect and enhance. Therefore, fundamentally, it is a question of one's human attitude.

My next point is, if you combine both awareness and attitude, then, I feel that this is really a matter not so much of

legislation although legislation can play a significant part but it is more a matter of liberal education, not only in formal institutions but also in the families. It must start at home. How many of us, for example, as husbands, respect our wives? If we do not respect our wives, how many of our children will then respect woman as the mother? After all, it is a question of an almost invisible education that goes on in the family, that goes on in the schools and colleges and, in general, in every walk of life. Therefore, this attitude has to be changed. It can be changed. I do not say that it cannot be changed by a social legislation. But a social legislation must precede education and it must be liberal education, humanised education. Only that will really make the situation vastly different.

Then, I want to suggest, although it is a question of awareness and attitude, at root, the whole problem is largely though not fully and, certainly, not exclusively, the problem of economic opportunities, of economic situations. I come from Gujarat and it is one of our shames that our women-folk I suppose, that is not only true of Gujarat but I can speak with greater information about my own State of Gujarat—that women in Gujarat are suffering from all kinds of social, economic, educational backwardness. For instance, the literacy percentage of women in Gujarat, in rural areas, is hardly 3 to 4 whereas, in the same State of Gujarat in urban areas, for women, it is as high as 20 to 25 per cent. Therefore, within the same State, between urban and rural areas, there is a vast difference.

Then, the number of suicides that are committed by women in Gujarat is something which makes me very much ashamed. Everyday, there are cases of a number of women committing suicide. Now whatever is reported in the press is less than what actually happens. These women feel suffocated, suppressed, downcast and down-hearted. They must be freed from all this. Therefore, if you want to get rid of this state of affairs, the women's independence must be achieved through certain economic rights and freedoms which must be made available to them. Unless women have a certain assurance of economic rights and

[Shri P. G. Mavalankar]

employment opportunities, not on an *ad hoc* basis but on a regular basis. I am afraid, women may not be able to have independence with a sense of exhilaration, with a sense of liberalisation of their personality or development, along with men-folk.

I also feel that about their education, we must do something very quickly—I hope, the Education Minister will reply to this aspect of the matter—with regard to the problem of women's education. I refer to my own State of Gujarat. We were among the first to make girls' education free right upto the S.S.C. I am glad to say that. I would like this process to be extended further. Gandhiji used to say, if you educate one girl, it is almost educating 10 boys, because a good educated girl in the family will make all the difference and the family will have a different attitude to the whole problem. The Kasturba Gandhi National Memorial Trust of which Mahatma Gandhi was the Chairman—his wife, Kasturba died in 1944—has been concentrating on this very question of women's education, particularly in rural areas. Its whole object is to go and work in villages, in rural areas, with less than 5000 population and concentrate particularly on women's education, on women of all ages.

Therefore, I feel that education is the true salvation ultimately. I would end by saying that 1975, the International Women's Year, should only mean a symbolic and significant beginning in the right direction. We should not stop on 31st December saying that now the Year has ended and all is over. What we should say is that this International Women's Year has given us a chance to make a significant beginning. And let us hope that in the years and decades to come, we shall make rapid strides in the desired direction. From that angle, I end, as I started, by saying that I warmly support and commend Shri Indrajit Gupta's Resolution. I hope the Government of India and the voluntary agencies and men and women, together, will look at the problems from a human angle—the problem of liberal education, the problem of awareness and attitude to be developed in the society at large.

SHRI SHYAM SUNDER MOHAPATRA

(Balsore): Mr. Chairman, Sir, in this International Women's Year it is befitting that we discuss such a great problem as emancipation of women. I have a feeling, and I am convinced, that unless women occupy major assignments in our country, including a majority of the seats in Parliament and Assemblies, no such Resolution is going to give them better status in society. When socialism was ushered in in Soviet Russia after the Bolshevik Revolution, Lenin saw to it that women had their places in every section of social life. He used to tell the secretaries of the party units that women who work shoulder to shoulder in the revolution should have their due places in the society. Krupps Kaya used to say that women should have their place in the party hierarchy as also in the Government. In India the fate of women is worse than anything. I must, in fact, say, that the fate of women in the whole world is also worse than anything. This is what the report of I.L.O. says:

"The working women today may earn only half as much as a man in the same job."

I have seen myself in the tribal areas the tribal women working more than the men, but they are hardly paid half the wage a man gets.

What is the fate of Harijan women today in Rajasthan? I have tabled a call-attention notice on this. Women have been mortgaged. Harijan women have been mortgaged because the Harijan families wanted food. What a shame that this should happen in 1975, in the International Women's Year!

Now I come to polygamy. Are we to discuss polygamy even in this year—a man having three or four wives and being permitted by law to do so? Let him belong to any community, Hindu or Muslim or Parsi or Sikh. If you want to have socialism, it presupposes that everybody is equal. No man, whatever may be his position, Minister or Governor or Chief Minister or IAS officer or IPS officer, should have more than one wife. I feel that we cannot have a right to have more than one wife.

Dowry should be made a cognizable offence. The shape of dowry has changed now. If you want an IAS bridegroom or IFS bridegroom, the dowry to be given is Rs. 1 lakh—all sorts of electrical equipment, refrigerator, air-conditioner, Ambassador car which now costs Rs. 34,000. And everything taken together will be more than a lakh of rupees. Any handsome class I officer may demand nothing less than a lakh of rupees. So, Sir, taking on demanding dowry should be made a cognizable offence.

I want to say only one thing and then conclude. Can we not give dignity to our womenfolk? When I see journals, largely circulated weeklies depicting nude pictures or half nude pictures, journals calling themselves as progressive journals and editors proclaiming their leadership of the progressive world but publishing on the back page, or the inside page nude pictures, can not our women revolt against this?

Can we not urge on our Information and Broadcasting Minister or our esteemed Prime Minister that such journals should be banned? Are these journals fit for our sisters and children? Then I see in some journals women giving the confessions of their lives, how easy their private life was, exclusive stories. Are we to see that our sisters should read them? If you want a Kolynos toothpaste, there is a Kolynos smile by a beautiful woman. If you want a hair oil you see the picture of a beautiful girl with her tresses spread up to her hips. Can we not stop this belittling the dignity of our womenfolk? . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: You want only the women to rise in revolt against it?

SHRI SHYAM SUNDER MOHAPATRA: No. Men also should join. The whole country should revolt. Unless the woman who is rightly called the center of the family is given a say in making our society a progressive one, and also in seeing that in every walk of life men and women enjoy equal rights, unless at every level right from the Prime Ministership of the country down to the lowest position in society the woman has her say, I do not think the women are going to have a better treatment in this society.

SHRI B. V. NAIK (Kanara): There is already a male resistance coming from Mr. Jagannatha Rao. I must confess with all regrets at my command that somehow the entire discussion has become extremely narrow.

First and foremost is the specific point of repetition about the bachelorhood of Mr. Indrajit Gupta . . .

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: Is it a point at all?

SHRI B. V. NAIK: Whether there is any relevance about it or not but there is a sort of a drawing room conversation going on as to who should marry and when, an absolutely personal issue forgetting the larger issue which touches upon 30 crores of people. Whether Mr. Gupta marries to-day or tomorrow or does not marry at all—does it make any difference for him?

I want to challenge certain attitudes—even yours, Mr. Madhu Limaye, if I can. The issue is: do we know more about women to discuss the whole issue than a bachelor? Therefore, it is no question of any drawing room conversation or a social discussion. But I thought that some fundamental points were involved in it. The lady members here vied with one another to help the cause of women in the country. Now, I will have to give a compliment to our Speaker when he said that the Members who are here do not represent any sex and that we do not have a sex. Therefore, because this is a subject pertaining to women, do I abdicate my responsibility for representing in a very limited sense at least 50% of the women voters who come from my constituency? Is it an exclusive business of Shrimati Parvati Krishnan and other lady members to speak about it?

18.00 HRS.

Sir, the only handicap which I confess is that we do not know, the male Members do not know how to be a female and vice-versa. On similar counts, if we shut out our women Members saying that it does not pertain to you, and therefore, this will be meaningless, we will be going down a blind alley. Sir, I thought I had to put in a lot of work. I discussed it, as far

[Shri B. V. Naik]

as possible, with a wide spectrum of opinion. But, I think, Mr. Indrajit Gupta, does not think very much about my own amendment nor does the hon. Minister. As far as I could make out, there were three points of view that were presented. One was presented by Mr. Indrajit Gupta, Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan and Mrs. Roza Deshpande. The other one was presented by Mr. Jagannatharao Joshi, in a very learned speech.

**SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN:**  
He is a bachelor.

**SHRI B. V. NAIK:** Makes no difference. Bachelors may be knowing more about women than the so-called married men. No offence meant to Mr. Indrajit Gupta. The other one was presented by Mr. Jagannatharao Joshi and Dr. Sarojini Mahishi. The two view points, Sir, were very crystal clear. One said that the path of amelioration and liberation of women, on the basis of what has been observed in the developed parts of the world, is the socialist path.

The other one is by Mr. Joshi interspersed with a few quotations from Sanskrit language and an abundance of Sanskrit quotations by Dr. Mahishi, learned hon. Minister of State of Law, surfeit with quotations from history, mythology, pre-history and Sanskrit. Sir, does clarity of thought simply develop because it is quoted in a sort of a language like Sanskrit or for that reason our Minister may like to quote from Urdu or for that matter in Persian? Some may quote from Greek and Latin. I am quite sure that to the large masses of this country, these quotations will remain absolutely irrelevant. We do not know about the pre-historian mythology and history. Under the circumstances, I think, one of the banes of the Hindu society, in this country, has been the Sanskritisation of our society, has been the Brahmanisation of our society and when we think about the improvement of conditions in society, about improvement of India, when we speak about the representative Indian women, we speak about the class, the elite, the chosen few, which is absolutely irrelevant to the large masses in this country who remain outside the selected ken of people, who are standing on the very top of the pyramid of Indian society. Their

laws, their morals, their morse, their chores and their conduct are absolutely irrelevant for the 90% of the population. Therefore, if you want to make any law, whether for the masses of Muslims or for the masses of Christians or for the masses of Hindus or for the untouchables or for the Sudras or for the varied other classes who have not been born twice—we do not know how they are born twice: we have all been born once—for those people, if you want to make any law, kindly, Mr. hon. Minister, go to the root of the problem. They do not have their uppish attitude. They do not have their social morse and morals. Therefore, to make it relevant, I would like to take along with the undisputed practical results that have been quoted not only by our friend, Mr. Sathe, in regard to USSR but, in regard to other countries as well. What about Scandinavia, what about most of the socialist countries?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Naik, you are no doubt making some points. But, we have to confine ourselves to the time schedule. Please conclude within a few minutes.

**SHRI B. V. NAIK:** I would like an admixture of this equality between men and women with an approach of humanism keeping the woman as the centre of all our development. In that case, I think the future would have to take into consideration the already existing cultural patterns in regard to our tribal culture, a sort of genuine native culture. I would not go into the details like a sociologist or anthropologist. But what I was trying to suggest is that until and unless we are able to build up framework in which women will be in a position to exercise as well as assert their rights, we will not be in a position to move forward.

Therefore, making a concrete suggestion, why not at least at the gram panchayat level keep a majority for the women members? They have not to go to a large number of other places. A lady MP may have to go upto Delhi, but in the villages at least you can reserve 50 or 51 per cent of the seats to women. In the town panchayats, in respect of other urban municipal organisations, these levers of power, these strategic positions, if they are afforded

to them, will help them to come up. I think the only way out is to create a sort of watchdog committee, a sort of committee which would take care of the interests of women not only in the International Women's Year but in the course of the decade.

I would not have been completing without reference to a very brilliant book which I read in parts. I do not know the validity of the thesis that has been presented there, but I have been struck with certain original thinking by what women's liberation leader, Miss Keith Millet in her *Sexual Politics*. She has tried to give an interpretation of the development of society . . . This is no laughing matter; this is not pornography. She has tried to give a sociological explanation for the male dominance in society over the centuries.

DR. RANEN SEN (Barasat): You can give a few quotations from the book if you have it with you.

SHRI B. V. NAIK: If even at your age, you are so much anxious about this . . .

DR. RANEN SEN (Barasat): This is the age.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Who told you there is restriction of age?

SHRI B. V. NAIK: This is a serious matter. What I am trying to tell you is that the society cannot let women remain static. If we want to take some positive steps, the old attitudes and values will have to yield place to new ones.

In deference to the extreme earnestness with which the Mover of the Resolution has moved his Resolution, I withdraw my amendment, but at the same time kindly remove those words 'as far as possible'. If the whole of it cannot be accepted, particularly for the sake of other considerations, remove that 'as far as possible'; cut the Resolution into half, but for heaven's sake, kindly accept the Resolution in the name of women, in the name of our mothers and sisters and the millions that are in our country.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Limaye wanted to speak. Shri Goswami who preceded me in the Chair made the statement that so

many speakers would be allowed. He named four with five minutes to each. We have to close the debate at 6.30.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai): Shri Limaye was not present at that time. Now he is here.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE rose—

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not know. The debate has to be closed after a given time.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF PERSONNEL AND ADMINISTRATIVE REFORMS AND DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI OM MEHTA): We will adjourn at 6-30 p.m.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He may speak.

श्री मधु लिमये: सभापति महोदय, श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्त के द्वारा जो संकल्प रखा गया है, मैं उसका तहेदिल से समर्थन करता हूँ। जब प्रधानमंत्री जी बोल रही थीं, उस समय मैं सदन में मौजूद था, और बड़ी उत्सुकता के साथ मैं उनका भाषण सुन रहा था। मुझे आशा थी कि हम लोग अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय महिला वर्ष मना रहे हैं, इसको मद्देनजर रखते हुए वह आज कोई न कोई घोषणा करेंगी। लेकिन अफसोस की बात है कि उन्होंने बहुत ही साधारण बातें कहीं और इस साल के लिये कोई ठोस कार्यक्रम नहीं बताया।

मैं सभी पहलुओं पर नहीं बोलना चाहता हूँ। मैं केवल शिक्षा की चर्चा करना चाहता हूँ क्योंकि शिक्षा मंत्री जवाब देने वाले हैं। महिलाओं के स्टेटस के सम्बन्ध में जो कमेटी सरकार ने बनाई थी, उसकी रिपोर्ट आपके सामने आई है और उसमें कई सुझाव दिये गये हैं। उन सुझावों में शिक्षा के बारे में जो बातें कही गई हैं, उसकी ओर मैं मंत्री महोदय का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ।

## [श्री मधु लिमये]

"In spite of the expansion of the formal system of education now covers only ten per cent of the total female population, less than 7 per cent of the 15-25 age group, less than 2 per cent of the 25 and above age group have received any formal education. The number of illiterate women has increased from 61 million in 1950-51 to 215 million in 1970-71."

कुल मिलाकर औरतो में निरक्षरों की संख्या बढ़ती चली जा रही है। ऐसी हालत में मैं चाहता हूँ कि आज मंत्री महोदय केवल यही घोषणा करें कि हर गांव में लड़कियों के लिये स्कूल खोला जायेगा और उनके लिये सैकेण्डरी एजुकेशन मुफ्त बना दी जायेगी। अगर मंत्री महोदय इतना भी कह देते हैं तो मैं समझूंगा—और सभी महिलाएँ भी यही समझेंगी—कि उन्होंने इस साल बहुत बड़ा काम किया है।

अभी मेरे मित्र अनेक-पत्नी प्रणाली की चर्चा कर रहे थे। मैंने पिछले वृक्षवार को बताया था कि हालांकि हिन्दू मैरिज एक्ट के तहत इस पर पाबन्दी है, इस कमेटी ने कहा है कि हिन्दुओं में अनेक-पत्नी की प्रणाली मुसलमानों से भी ज्यादा है। मुसलमानों में ये कानूनी चीज है, जब कि हिन्दुओं में यह गैर-कानूनी है। कमेटी का कहना है कि हिन्दुओं में 5 प्रतिशत से अधिक अनेक-पत्नी वाले विवाह हो रहे हैं और मुसलमानों में इसके लिये छूट होते हुए भी 4 प्रतिशत के आसपास। इसलिये मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस पहलू को भी सरकार अपने सामने रखे।

अन्त में मैं मंत्री महोदय से फिर प्रार्थना करना चाहता हूँ कि शिक्षा के बारे में आज वह जरूर घोषणा करें और कम-से-कम सैकेण्डरी एजुकेशन को मुफ्त बना दें, वरना अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय महिला वर्ष का सरकार जो नाटक कर रही है,

उसका कोई नितीजा विकसने वाला नहीं है।

SHRIMATI SHEILA KAUL (Lucknow): Sir, it amazes me that it has taken the present civilisation so long to realise the suffering of a human being. When I say a human being, I mean a woman because woman is as much a part of human beings as man. Only now one thinks that woman matters. We have talked of women's emancipation and passed laws for women. Since 1954 we have passed 10 or 12 Acts for women's amelioration, but what has actually happened? These Acts are not being implemented. We want them to be implemented. For instance, the Sharda Act is there, but in villages and even in cities, girls at the age of 12 or 13 are married and nobody takes any notice. When I say that women are suffering, I am talking not only of Indian women but women the world over. They have suffered a lot at the hands of men. I am sorry to say this, but this is very clear to all of us. Man has to be educated so that he may change his attitude towards woman. She is not to be treated as a door mat or a chattel or a bit of holdall which you can carry and throw away whenever you like. Man must change this attitude of "land lordism" towards woman. We have suffered for long and we do not want to suffer any more. I do feel that it is very important that the attitude of man towards woman has to be changed and the Acts passed should be implemented in letter and spirit.

शिक्षा और समाज कल्याण मंत्रालय तथा संस्कृति विभाग में उप-मंत्री (श्री अरविन्द नेताम) सभापति महोदय, माननीय सदस्य, श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्त, ने यह सकल्प ला कर इस सदन को महिलाओं से सम्बन्धित बहुत सी बातों पर चर्चा करने का अवसर दिया है, जिस के लिए मैं भी उन का आभारी हूँ।

मैंने श्री गुप्त के वाक्य को बहुत गौर से सुना है। उन्होंने बहुत से मुद्दे उठाये हैं और बहुत से प्रश्न किये हैं, और साथ साथ उन के जवाब

भी उन्होंने दिये ह। कुछ प्रश्नों के सम्बन्ध में मैं थोड़ा बहुत कहना चाहूंगा।

अनेक माननीय सदस्यों ने इस संकल्प में रुचि ली है और महिलाओं के बारे में बहुत सी बातें कही हैं। सभी इस बात से सहमत हैं कि वर्तमान समय में देश में महिलाओं की स्थिति सतोषप्रद नहीं है। किन्तु, जैसा कि कई माननीय सदस्यों ने कहा है, प्राचीन समय में जो स्थिति थी, उस में काफी परिवर्तन हुआ है। इस के कारण बहुत से हो सकते हैं। जो ऐतिहासिक उतार-चढ़ाव हुए हैं, उन का असर भी हमारे समाज पर पड़ा है। श्री साठे ने कहा है कि महिलाओं के पिछड़ेपन के आर्थिक कारण भी हैं। इस सम्बन्ध में भी प्राचीन काल की तुलना में परिवर्तन हुआ है।

पुरुषों और महिलाओं के बीच बहुत सी असमानताएँ हैं और हम सब इस असमानता को दूर करने के बारे में कहते हैं और उस के लिए प्रयास करने सभी सदस्यों ने यह जोर दिया कि यह दूर होनी चाहिए। यह बात सही है। हम अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय महिला वर्ष मना रहे हैं और इस वर्ष में हम सब का प्रयास होना चाहिए। परन्तु अगर देखें तो यह जो आज महिलाओं की स्थिति है समाज में वह कोई चन्द्र वर्षों की बात नहीं है। यह कई हजार सालों से, सैकड़ों सालों से चलती चली आ रही है। तो एक दम परिवर्तन हो जाय यह तो बड़ा मुश्किल है। एक बात और भी कह देना चाहूंगा कि केवल मात्र लेजिस्लेशन से या कानून बनाने से हम समझते हैं कि यह बीज दूर हो जायेगी तो यह तो बहुत मुश्किल है। यह तो समाज का जो एटीट्यूड है, व्यवहार है, किस ढंग से वह इसकी अवल में लाते हैं इस पर

अधिक निर्भर करता है। महिला समाज जो आज काफी पिछड़ा हुआ है उसका जो मुख्य कारण है वह तो मैं समझता हूँ कि उसका शिक्षित नहीं होना है। इस संबंध में यह बात सही है कि शिक्षा किसी भी समाज में समानता जन्मे के लिए बहुत जरूरी है। बिना शिक्षा के कोई भी वर्ग चाहे पुरुष हो या महिला हो अपने अधिकार या कर्तव्य को समझने में असमर्थ रहता है। बहुत से सदस्यों ने शिक्षा के बहुत से आंकड़े दिये हैं। मैं विस्तार में उनमें जाना नहीं चाहता हूँ। परन्तु जो साक्षरता की बात है, निम्नये जी ने भी इसके बारे में कहा है, यह बात सही है कि जिस रफ्तार में जनसंख्या बढ़ रही है उस रफ्तार से हम साक्षरता नहीं बढ़ा पाये हैं। परन्तु पिछले दस सालों में साक्षरता की प्रतिशत को यदि हम देखें तो इससे पता चलेगा कि 1961 में 15.34 प्रतिशत साक्षरता थी जब कि 1971 में वह 21.48 प्रतिशत है। यह 14 तक की एंज ग्रुप के बच्चों के आंकड़े हैं। इस ढंग ने 61 और 71 के बीच में साक्षरता की रफ्तार बढ़ी है परन्तु उस रफ्तार में नहीं बढ़ी है जिस रफ्तार से जनसंख्या बढ़ी है। शिक्षा के बारे में निम्नये जी ने भी कहा स्कूल शिक्षा में वृद्धि होनी चाहिए। इस संबंध में मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि शिक्षा की स्थिति भी यदि हम 46-47 की देखें और अब की देखें तो चाहे प्राइमरी हो, सेकेंडरी हो या कानेज और यूनीवर्सिटी लेवल की शिक्षा हो सभी में काफी मात्रा में वृद्धि हुई है और इसके अलावा भी जो साइंस ग्रेजुएट है, आर्ट्स ग्रेजुएट है, डॉक्टर, माइस्टिस्ट, इंजीनियर, इनमें भी काफी वृद्धि हुई है। अगर आप पिछले दस या बीस साल के आंकड़ों को देखें। इसलिए ऐसी बात नहीं है कि शिक्षा की परसेंटेज



[श्री अरविन्द नेताम]

में वृद्धि नहीं हुई है। वृद्धि हुई है परन्तु उस मात्रा में नहीं हुई है जिस मात्रा में होनी चाहिए या जिस मात्रा में जनमंख्या में वृद्धि हुई है।

बहुत से सदस्यो ने कहा कि बहुत सारे स्कूलों में खास करके भारत सरकार द्वारा संचालित स्कूलों में को-एजुकेशन नहीं है। मैं बताना चाहूंगा कि सेटल स्कूल जो गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया के हैं उनमें को-एजुकेशन है। इसके अलावा भी और बहुत सी स्कीम हैं अपने मंत्रालय की ओर से या दूसरे भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों की ओर से जो शिक्षा को बढ़ाने में मदद कर रहे हैं उसमें को नान फार्मल एजुकेशन एजुकेशन मिनिसट्री के द्वारा चलाया जाता है या फकटल लिट्रेसी प्रोग्राम फार एडल्ट वूमन समाज कल्याण विभाग द्वारा चलाया जा रहा है। इसके अलावा कृषि मंत्रालय द्वारा दूसरे मंत्रालयों के जरिये कार्यक्रम चलाये जा रहे हैं इन सब कार्यक्रमों में हमें बहुत कुछ लिट्रेसी के पर्सेंटज को बढ़ाने में मदद मिलेगी। नान-फार्मल एजुकेशन फिफ्थ प्लान में 15 से 20 साल की एज की महिलाओं के लिए स्टेट गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से और कुछ वालंटरी ऑर्गेनाइजेशन की तरफ से करने जा रहे हैं और उम्मीद है इस फिफ्थ प्लान में 200 तोकल सेटर्स खुल जायेंगे जिनमें 6000 महिलाये इस पाचवी योजना में कवर की जायेंगी। इसके साथ ही जो नेहरू युवक केन्द्र के यूथ कोऑर्डिनेटर हैं इनका भी सहयोग इसमें ले रहे हैं ताकि जो नान-फार्मल एजुकेशन है उसके जरिये लिट्रेसी में वृद्धि कर सकें। इसके अलावा जो फार्मल लिट्रेसी प्रोग्राम है 15 से 45 साल तक की महिलाओं के लिए उसमें 60 लाख रुपये रखे गये हैं। इसमें होम केयर, चाइल्ड केयर आदि के संबंध

में हम महिलाओं को प्रशिक्षित करेंगे।

इस ढंग से और भी जो कार्यक्रम हैं एग्रिकल्चर मिनिसट्री के और हेल्थ मिनिसट्री के भी जो कार्यक्रम हैं खास कर लिट्रेसी के क्षेत्र में महिलाओं को आगे बढ़ाने में उनसे मदद मिलेगी। इसके अलावा कुछ वोकेशनल ट्रेनिंग या वोकेशनल स्कूलों के बारे में भी चर्चा की गई है। श्रीमती रोजा देशपाण्डे ने महाराष्ट्र के वोकेशनल इंस्टीट्यूट के बारे में कहा है। इस संबंध में मैं जरूर ध्यान दूंगा। श्रीमती रोजा देशपाण्डे ने कहा यह सब पेपर पर है, यह बात गलत है। खास कर गवर्नमेंट के जो पालिटेक्निक हैं उसमें 25 महिलाओं के लिए है मारे स्टेट सेक्टर में। इसके अलावा बहुत से जो पालिटेक्निक हैं उनमें बहुत से ऐसे क्लेब्स हैं जिनमें हम उनको प्रशिक्षित करने हैं। लेबर मिनिसट्री के द्वारा डायरेक्टर जनरल आफ एम्प्लायमेंट एण्ड ट्रेनिंग के जरिये से बहुत सी महिलाओं को ट्राफिकलमैन की ट्रेनिंग दे रहे हैं। 45 इजोनियरिंग एण्ड नान-इजोनियरिंग ट्रेड्स हैं इनमें इनको ट्रेनिंग देने का प्रोग्राम है। इन्स्टीट्यूट ट्रेनिंग इंस्टीट्यूट्स में जो डायरेक्टर जनरल आफ एम्प्लायमेंट एण्ड ट्रेनिंग के माध्यम से होता है और इसमें हररोड 7 सेंट्रल ट्रेनिंग इंस्टीट्यूट्स हैं जिनमें इन्स्ट्रक्टर हैं और उनमें बहुत से इन्स्ट्रक्टर हैं केवल महिलाओं के लिए हैं। इस तरह हम बहुत सी स्कीमों में महिलाओं को वोके- गनल ट्रेनिंग के लिए चला रहे हैं। डायरेक्टर जनरल आफ एम्प्लायमेंट एण्ड ट्रेनिंग अपने एम्प्लायमेंट एक्स्पेंजेज में महिलाओं के लिए विशेष रूप से अलग सेक्- गन खोला है ताकि महिलाओं की समस्याओं पर अवलोकन से ध्यान दिया जा सके।

बहुत से सदस्यो ने चर्चा बीमनस होस्टल के बारे में भी जिक्र किया है

खास कर के मिसेज गोडफ्रे ने। इस संबंध में मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि पिछले साल यानी फोर्थ प्लान के अन्त में हमने करीब 52 लाख रुपया 45 वर्किंग वीमैन्स होस्टल के लिए दिया है और करीब 60 लाख रुपया इस साल के लिए हमने रखा है। मोबाइल फ्रिज के लिए भी हमने 5 लाख रुपया रखा है। फेमिली और चाइल्ड कैल्फेयर के लिए भी 28 लाख रुपये हमने रखे हैं। इनके माध्यम से हम बहुत सी महिलाओं के जो कार्यक्रम हैं उनको मजबूत कर सकते हैं और उसमें थोड़ी बहुत सुविधा हम प्रदान कर सकते हैं।

बहुत से माननीय सदस्यों ने सामाजिक कानूनों के बारे में अपने अपने विचार व्यक्त किये हैं। बहुत से जो सामाजिक कानून सरकार की ओर से बनाये गये हैं चाहे वह स्पेशल मैनेज ऐक्ट हो, मैरेज ऐक्ट हो, डावरी के बारे में हो या और भी जो बहुत से कानून हैं, यह बात सही है कि उनमें कुछ खामियां हो सकती हैं परन्तु यह कहना कि ये बिल्कुल बेकार हैं यह तो सही नहीं है। सवाल यह है कि आज तक उनका इम्प्ली-मेंटेशन ठीक ढंग से नहीं हो पाया है यह बात सही है। बहुत से सदस्यों ने कहा कि जो भी कानून बनाये गये हैं उनमें परिवर्तन और सुधार होना चाहिए परन्तु मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि जो कुछ भी कानून आज है उन पर हम कहां तक अमल करने में सफल रहे हैं यह बहुत सोचने की बात है।... (व्यवधान) बहुत से सदस्यों ने जो कहा कि सशोधन होना चाहिए उसके संबंध में मैं कह रहा हूं यह तभीसार्थक हो सकता है जब कि जो कानून गवर्नमेंट के हैं अभी भी उनको लागू करने में या उनको अमल में लाने में हम सफल हों। समाज अभी तक

उसके बारे में कांशस नहीं है। सवाल यह है कि जब तक किसी भी कानून के बारे में समाज जागृत या कांशस नहीं होगा तब तक उस कानून से कोई लाभ नहीं हो सकता। .... (व्यवधान) यह इसलिए मैं कह रहा हूं कि समाज की ओर से कानून के बारे में जब तक मांग न हो और समाज उसके बारे में जागृत न हो कि उसको बदला जाय तब तक उससे कोई फायदा नहीं होगा। आज जितने भी ऐक्ट हैं, डावरी ऐक्ट है या विवाह कानून है इनके लिए तो समाज को चाहिए.....

**श्री रामावतार शास्त्री (पटना) :** जो कानून बनाने वाले डावरी लेते हैं उनका क्या होगा ?

**श्री अरविन्द नेताम :** वही तो मैं कह रहा हूं। उसमें हम और आप सब शामिल हैं।

श्रीमती रोजा देशपाण्डे जी ने कहा कि आदिवासियों से बहुत सी अच्छी बातें हैं, खास कर विवाह, डावरी और तलाक के बारे में। सभापति महोदय, सौभाग्य से मैं भी देश के एक बहुत बड़े आदिवासी समाज से आता हूँ....

**श्रीमती रोजा देशपाण्डे :** मैंने कहा है कि वहां औरतों को इक्वल स्टेटस मिलता है।

**श्री अरविन्द नेताम :** यह बात सही है कि विवाह, डावरी और तलाक के बारे में आदिवासी समाज में दूसरे समाजों के मुकाबले बहुत अच्छी प्रथाएँ हैं। मैं तो यह चाहता हूँ कि कम से कम हमारा शिक्षित समाज आदिवासी समाज के जो कस्टम्स हैं, प्रथाएँ हैं, उन से कुछ सीखे। केवल यह कह देना कि कानून बनाया जाय, कानून में परिवर्तन करना उतना सहायक नहीं होगा जितना हम सब को

[श्री अरविन्द नेताम]

मिलकर, चाहे बालट्री ऑर्गेनिजेशन के माध्यम से या दूसरी संस्थाओं के माध्यम से, समाज में जाग्रति पैदा करने से हो सकता है। फिर भी जहां तक कानून की बात है, बहुत सी बातें इस समय मानव मंत्रालय के विचाराधीन हैं।

श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्ता ने कुछ बातें नेशनल कमेटी के सम्बन्ध में कही हैं—डाबरी के बारे में, लीगल एड के बारे में, जिन पर इस सदन में पहले भी कई बार चर्चा हो चुकी है। क्रेचेंड के सम्बन्ध से भी पहले कह चुका हूँ।

श्री राजावतार शास्त्री कोई नई बात नहीं बोल रहे हैं। कुछ नई बात कहिये।

श्री अरविन्द नेताम नई बात तो आप लोगो ने भी नहीं की है।

जहां तक अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय महिला वर्ष का सम्बन्ध है—बहुत से माननीय सदस्यों ने कहा कि कुछ ठोस कार्यक्रम होना चाहिये। इस अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय महिला वर्ष के सम्बन्ध में मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि किसी ठोस कार्यक्रम के बजाय अगर हम यह सोचें कि इस वर्ष में हम देश और समाज को जाग्रत करेंगे—तो यह एक बहुत बड़ी बात होगी, ठोस कार्यक्रम के अलावा हम को इस तरफ़ विशेष काम करना चाहिये।

MR CHAIRMAN The main question posed by the hon. Members who have spoken is: What are we going to do to create an awakening so that more effective implementation of the law can be made?

श्री अरविन्द नेताम इस सम्बन्ध में एक राष्ट्रीय कमेटी बनाई गई है, प्रधान मंत्री जी उस की संसदीय हैं। ब्लाक लेवल से लेकर नीचे के लेवल तक

के लिये कुछ कार्यक्रम निर्धारित किये गये हैं। हमारे मंत्रालय की ओर से अन्तर्मंत्रालय, इन्टर डिपार्टमेंटल कोऑर्डिनेशन कमेटी बनाई गई है। महिला वर्ष के अन्तर्गत जो कार्यक्रम होंगे, समय समय पर उन की प्रगति को देखेंगे।

श्रीमती टी. सखीकान्तम्मा: सभा-

पति महोदय, जो हमारे हक हैं, वे हम को दीजिये। इस में जाग्रति का क्या सवाल है। तलपु में एक कहावत है—

A man will not get married unless his madness is cured. His madness will not be cured unless he is married.

जब स्टेटस नहीं देते तो और क्या दे रहे हैं। जाग्रति कैसे आयेगी?

When the power is there, everybody respects and obeys and all that.

श्री अरविन्द नेताम अन्त में, मैं माननीय सदस्य से, जिन्होंने इस मकल्प को पेश किया है, अनुरोध करता हूँ कि उन के मकल्प की जो मशा है, सरकार उस से पूरी तरह से सहमत है, लेकिन जो सशोधन श्रीमती सावित्री दयाम जी ने पेश किया है, उस सशोधन के साथ सरकार इस को स्वीकार करता है।

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA I know there is a lot of agitation going on in the official benches because some party meeting or something like that is to take place in the adjacent hall. However much I may have consideration for their anxiety to get away from here, I am afraid I must excuse my right even if I do not take up too much time.

The point is that my purpose in moving this motion was a limited one, and that was to initiate a discussion for the first time on this issue particularly since this happens to be the International Women's Year. To that extent, my purpose has been more than served. The record shows that about 22 hon. Members have participated in the debate and I am extremely grateful.

to them; I am particularly grateful because I find that, since we are normally accustomed to debate political issues and party issues here, we do not generally get an opportunity to speak and debate on issues of this type which cut across party lines. I am grateful to many members of the ruling Party who spoke here and who have shown that they are extremely serious, they are motivated by a sense of urgency on this issue of women's rights and they are not at all satisfied with the performance of their own government. That has been made clear by a number of speeches here. Particularly I would like to congratulate my friend, Mr. Aga, who made a very courageous speech on a delicate subject of this type.

I only want to say this that I am extremely disappointed over the response of the Government because this motion of mine was not brought just at any time, in a vacuum. It has been brought in the specific context of a Resolution adopted by the United Nations of which our country happens to be a member. And now I find that the amendment which has been proposed and which is being sponsored or supported by the Government is even less specific and more vague than the Resolution adopted by an international body like the United Nations. When an international body passes a Resolution, we expect that to be in more general terms or more vague terms, if you like to call it that way. But when member, countries are called upon to translate that into action, then their Resolutions or motions are supposed to be more specific and more concrete. On that aspect, I must say, I am most disappointed. I have put a few concrete things into the body of my Resolution and those are the things which the official amendment wants to delete.

Secondly, they want to inject this phrase 'as far as possible'. I do not think it is necessary because everybody knows that it is understood. By passing a Resolution here, all these things are not going to be accomplished in one year. Everybody knows that. This is a fight going on for centuries and may take a good many decades more. It is not going to be fought within the confines of this Chamber; it is an integral

part of the struggle for democracy and socialism—the struggle for women's rights. But I wanted a Resolution to be passed here which would at least give some encouragement, some hope, some sustenance, to those progressive forces who are fighting outside on this issue.

But, Sir, the use of this phrase 'as far as possible', which I had occasion to point out in my earlier speech, was a favourite phrase employed by the Indian delegates in the past at meetings of the United Nations' Sub Committees who went on moving amendments in the name of India saying in every proposal, "Put in the term 'as far as possible', 'as far as possible' ". But they could not get it passed in the United Nations; they had to withdraw those amendments ultimately. And here again that phrase is being put in. Mind you, I have chosen my words very carefully; I did not say in my Resolution, specific legislative and administrative measures for removing the economic and social injustices; I have only said 'aimed at removing'—whose outlook, whose perspective, is to move towards removing. But even there they say, "No; you must put in the phrase 'as far as possible' ". If you want to limit and qualify every thing in this way, it does not give us much confidence that the Government is serious about the matter.

The only thing that is specific and that has emerged in the debate is the assurance—I take it as an assurance—given by the hon. Minister for Labour that a Bill for giving legislative sanction to the principle of equal pay for equal work is going to be introduced, possibly, in this very session itself. Very good. That is a good thing, long over-due. But there are many other matters on which I had expected some specific assurance. That did not come. I was expecting Dr. Sarojini Mahishi to say that at least the recommendations made in the 59th Report of the Law Commission of India, where they themselves have recommended certain amendments to the Hindu Marriages Act and the Special Marriages Act, are under active consideration or will be given legislative shape or scope sometime or the other. Not a word was said about it. I do not know what the difficulty is. What is the difficulty? Why cruelty, for example, or separation should not be made an independent ground for divorce instead

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

of being only a ground for legal separation? Why a husband and wife who by mutual consent want to have a divorce are compelled under the law to wait at least for one year before their petition is even heard? Why? What for? These things cannot be changed? They cannot be amended? What is the difficulty?

In a way I am disappointed at the total outlook of the Government. The Prime Minister came here. I am thankful to her. By intervening in the debate at least it will get some more publicity and some more people in the country will at least have some idea that the subject was debated in the House. She did not say anything specifically. She uttered some very good and noble sentiments. That is true. But we wanted some assurance from the Government. That has not been forthcoming at all.

I do not want to raise all these issues again—the question of employment opportunities for women, educational opportunities, vocational training, etc. My friend, Shri Arvind Netam, has tried his best. I know he is working within the constraints of certain financial allocations which the Prime Minister was good enough to point out and remind us that the axe will fall first and foremost on these things, on the allotment for these very social reform measures. So, we cannot expect much. There is no use talking about the Fifth Plan because the Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission has said that it is as good as dead. He made a statement only day before yesterday. We do not have much to look forward.

I am the last man to think that this struggle for the rights of women is to base itself primarily or to base its hopes and aspirations primarily on what the Government is going to do. I fully agree with Mr. Arvind Netam. It is not by looking just at the Government that we are going to solve this problem. It is a question of much wider awakening of the conscience and a much bigger sustained movement which has to be carried on and primarily this has to be carried on, if this is going to be the Government's attitude, by several other organizations outside, by mass organizations, by women's organizations, by social organizations and by political parties. Since we are at the moment engaged in a dia-

logue about electoral reforms which has been started the other day and which is continuing, I will remind the House again that my Party is going to insist on this provision that at least 15% of seats in the Parliament, in the Lok Sabha, must be reserved for women. Why not? I do not understand it. If out of 525 members, we cannot have even 70 or 75 women members what is the use of talking about this? . . .

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION, SOCIAL WELFARE AND CULTURE (PROF. S. NURUL HASAN): May I just give a suggestion for the consideration of my hon. friend?

In Rajya Sabha, if all political parties decide that if there is any shortfall when we elect women members, my Party has tried to make up the quota. I think the other parties also will bear this in mind.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Very well, very well. We will discuss the case about Rajya Sabha which, in any case, we want to abolish. That is a different matter. Our proposal is that it should be abolished.

I am faced with a choice. If I insist on my resolution as it is, then the Government, because the members are sitting in the hall waiting for a party meeting and you have to only press the bell and the majority will be summoned and my resolution will be defeated. I do not think it will be a good thing also for the world to know that by a majority vote the Indian Parliament defeated a resolution like mine.

I also do not want that in the International Women's Year people should know in other countries and the United Nations should know, that the sovereign Parliament of India dispersed after talking out this subject and failed to adopt any resolution at all. That also will not be a very good thing. Therefore, after much deliberation, Sir, I have come to the conclusion that although it is a very unpleasant thing for me, I am willing to accept this amendment at least as a preliminary commitment which is being forced on the Government by means of a unanimous resolution of this House. In that case, it will read as follows. If Mrs. Savitri Shyam's amendment is accepted by the entire House, it will read as follows:

"On the occasion of the declaration by the United Nations of 1975, as 'International Women's Year, this House urges upon the Prime Minister to initiate a comprehensive programme of specific legislative and administrative measures aimed at removing, as far as possible, the economic and social injustices, disabilities and discriminations to which Indian women continue to be subjected."

All the detailing out of it, according to this amendment should be deleted. Alright. But, at least this Resolution, if amended, will still bind the Government down to a programme.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: Why not request the Government to withdraw their own amendment?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: I have been trying. Mr. Mavalankar, for the last two hours.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: What is the point of their accepting the spirit but not accepting the Resolution itself.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Then, the only other alternative for me is to withdraw my Resolution and we all go home without anything, which I don't wish to do. It will get us bad odour, I can tell you, in the international community. It will be a confession of complete impotence of this Parliament, where the spirit in which so many Members have spoken is certainly in favour of my Resolution. Member after Member even of the Congress Party has said that there is nothing wrong with the Resolution and that it should be supported. What am I to do? (*Interruptions*). The only alternative is that we tell the world that we were incapable of passing any Resolution. Soon, 1975 will be over and we can all comfortably forget about International Women's Year and relapse back into our old centuries slumber. I want something to be done here which will go in the record that at least Government was committed to a programme of specific legislative measures and administrative measures. What are those specific measures, Government will have to tell us from time to time and we can catch them from time to time.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: You want them to commit to some pious wishes. They don't.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Better than not committing them to anything. At least, I believe that the movement outside is not going to go to sleep. People are not in the same condition as they were years ago. People are awake. They are awakening. They are going to fight. I know many members this side are equally as dissatisfied as I am. I have appealed to the Minister. I have appealed to the friends opposite. But, they say that there are difficulties; if the phrase 'as far as possible' is not included here, then, they do not know to what extent they will become committed. I do not understand this argument anyway. As for the rest, about marriage and divorce and all that, I understand, there may be some difficulties just now, because it may be mis-interpreted by some communities. We have to take society as it is and not as we would like to be.

SHRIMATI T. LAKSHMIKANTHAM: Moreover, there will be a misunderstanding in the country that we have reservations as far as the rights of women are concerned, if this amendment is accepted. I would request Government once again to consider it.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: I do not think any reaction or response is going to come now. What is this Mr. Raghu Ramaiah? Your wife is a leader of women movement. If I go and tell her that you sat here, doing like this, you will get into trouble at home, I can tell you.

Without taking up further time, I accept the amendment which has been moved by Shrimati Savitri Shyam as the lesser evil, which I have to accept.

SHRI OM MEHTA: The amendment has come from a lady.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: We know. I commend this Resolution, as amended, for the unanimous acceptance of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before I put the Resolution to vote, the amendments moved by Shri Naik and Shrimati Savitri Shyam have to be disposed of

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: Where is the Mover?

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN: The Mover might have been convinced by Shri Gupta's speech and might like to withdraw the amendment.

SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH: No, no.

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN: The Mover is not here. She might have been convinced by Shri Gupta's speech.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Once it is moved, it is the property of the House.

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN: Still we would like to know whether the Mover would withdraw it.

SHRI B. V. NAIK: I am not pressing my amendment. I seek the leave of the House to withdraw my amendment.

*Amendment No. 2 was, by leave, withdrawn.*

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That in the Resolution,—

- (i) after "at removing" insert "as far as possible"
- (ii) omit "particularly in the field of marriage and divorce laws, dowry customs, maternity and child welfare in the rural areas, unequal pay for equal work, educational and employment opportunities, vocational training and facilities for working mothers". (4)

*The motion was adopted.*

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will put the main Resolution as amended to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"On the occasion of the declaration by the United Nations of 1975, as 'International Women's Year', this House urges upon the Prime Minister to initiate a comprehensive programme of specific legislative and administrative measures aimed at removing, as far as possible, the economic and social in-

justices, disabilities and discriminations to which Indian women continue to be subjected".

*The motion was adopted.*

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Resolution, as amended, is adopted unanimously.

18.55 Hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: REPORT OF COMMISSION OF INQUIRY INTO DISAPPEARANCE OF NETHAJI SUBHAS CHANDRA BOSE—Contd.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Further discussion on the following Resolution moved by Shri Samar Guha on the 11th April 1975:

"This House strongly deprecates all the slanderous remarks made against Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose in the Report of the 'One-man Commission of Inquiry into disappearance of Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose', particularly on pages 7, 16, 30, 31, 37, 124 and 125, by Justice G. D. Khosla, as its Chairman, and urges upon the Government to expunge these disparaging, distorted, factually incorrect and unwarranted observations, before the Report is made available for public circulation as they militate the patriotic sentiment of our countrymen and further, in resonance of our national feeling in this regard, this highest forum of the Will of the Indian people once again affirms nation's solemn homage to the greatest revolutionary pilgrim of our motherland, who played the historic role, like an epic hero, in the war of liberation of United India".

Shri Samar Guha may continue his speech.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contd.): I have already moved the Resolution. I will resume my speech on the next occasion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned to meet at 11 A. M. on Monday, 28th April, 1975.

18.55 Hrs.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, April 28, 1975/Vaisakha 8, 1897 (Saka).*