**श्री शिव चन्द्र झा** (बिहार) : सब विषयों पर चर्चा होने की बात की गई है, लेकिन प्लैनिग जिसके मुताबिक सारे देश की अर्थ-व्यवस्था नियमित हो रही है क्या इस पर चर्चा नहीं होनी चाहिये । इतना अहम विषय है लेकिन मैं देख रहा हूं कि प्लेनिग पर चर्चा होने की बात नहीं हो रही है । मैने हाफ-एन-आवर डिसकशन पर नोटिस दिया था । अब बड़ी चर्चा नहीं कर पाते तो भी प्लेनिग पर जो इम्पार्टन्ट विषय है, सारी अर्थ-व्यवस्था प्लेन कर रहे हैं, सारा हिसाब बना रहे है, इस पर भी चर्चा होनी चाहिये ।

लेकिन मैं देख रहा हूं कि कोई आवाज़ इसके लिये नहीं उठती है । इसलिये मेरा निवेदन है कि इस सत्र में प्लेनिग पर चर्चा हो ।

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Karnataka): Let us take up the Bill.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): To all our suggestions, we are not finding any response. The hon. Minister will kindly listen. Sir, many motions you have admitted, but they are all, almost all, ignored. No time is found for most of them or all of them. Here, two things I would like to say. The Shah Commission Interim Reports should be discussed. The other House has done it—they will continue—and there is no reason why we should not do it. It is absurd that everything is being said and done about the Shah Commission but we are not going to discuss it. Even action is taken on the basis of the reports of the Shah Commission, but we do not discuss it. Sir, I insist that the two Interim Reports of the Shah Commission should be discussed. Time must be found, if necessary, by sitting on a Saturday or on any other day.

Secondly, the language issue should be discussed a little. The other House has done it, but I do not know why we should not do it. As you know very well we raised it at the meeting of the Prime Minister with Opposition leaders on the 8th of this month—only three days ago. Sir, we pointed out some of the things which call for a discussion. What the Prime Minister said I am not going to say here, but only one point I should like to mention here. We pointed out there that in one legislature at least—it has got two Houses; U.P. Assembly and Council—newly elected members are not allowed to take the Oath in Urdu. We strongly objected to it. And the Government itself was surprised. The Prime Minister was surprised; others were surprised.

Dr. Ahmad, who was a Member of this House and who has now been elected to the U.P. Legislative Council, wanted to take oath in Urdu. He was not allowed. He was told he should take oath either in English or in Hindi. Hindi, I can understand but Urdu should also be allowed. Instead, he is asked to take oath in English. Sir, English gets preference over Urdu in the matter of taking oath. Urdu is a national language. Fancy, of all States, in U.P. Urdu is not being allowed to be used for taking oath. Sir, I must say that the Prime Minister said that he would immediately enquire about it. And they have also made some enquiries from me—the officials and so on—and I am sure some steps are being taken. But the matter is too serious. The three-language formula should be implemented. Sir, what is important is transition from English to the regional languages. Nothing is being done properly. I think the matter should be discussed.

---

**Personal Explanation by Shri Bhupesh Gupta regarding allegations against Shri Biju Patnaik**

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, I took permission from the Chair for a personal explanation to set the record straight following yesterday's proceedings. The Chairman, in your presence, said that I could raise it after the Calling Attention motion. If I don't do it today, it will be bad because it is already in the papers. As you know, Mr. Biju

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta]

yesterday's proceedings. The Chairman, in your presence, said that I could raise it after the Calling Attention motion. If I don't do it today, it will be bad because it is already in the papers. As you know, Mr. Biju Patnaik yesterday said something in his reply. When I referred to Mr. Biju Patnaik in connection with commissions of inquiry and said that he has survived so many commissions, Mr. Biju Patnaik said in the proceedings of yesterday:

> "Sir, the Chief Justice of the Madras High Court was appointed to enquire and he found that all the allegations of men like him"—meaning me—"and Surendra Dwivedi were false." "Therefore, Mr. Surendra Dwivedi lost his case with the people."

This is what he said then. I did not intervene because I did not want to disturb the debate. Now it is in the proceedings. The whole statement is false. The Chief Justice of Madras High Court, Mr. Justice Khanna, was appointed on the commission in 1967 by a notification of October 26, 1967. He found him guilty of five allegations and improprieties out of the six allegations made. This will be found on page 791 of the report of the Khanna Commission which was submitted on January 15, 1969. On the basis of the charges made against Shri Patnaik a Cabinet Sub-Committee was appointed earlier in 1964-1965 and based on this report Mr. M. C. Chagla—he was not Justice at that time—said in the Lok Sabha on March 15, 1965:

> "I say with all the strength I possess that we have no doubt that the Chief Minister of Orissa, Shri Patnaik, had behaved in a manner unworthy of a Chief Minister."

He also said,

> "We did not give a clear bill to Shri Patnaik and Shri Mitra. We said they were guilty of impropriety."

This happened in 1965. I am putting the record straight. This will be found in the Lok Sabha debate on column 4319 dated March 15, 1965. Then, Shri Patnaik said that he won the election and everybody else lost. This is again false. In 1967 Mr. Patnaik contested an election to a parliamentary constituency against Mr. Dwivedi and lost it with a margin of 17,000 votes or so and Mr. Dwivedi won the Lok Sabha seat with a margin of 11,000 votes. Again elections were held in 1971 after the Khanna Commission report. Mr. Patnaik contested three Assembly seat and one Lok Sabha seat, and he lost the Lok Sabha seat to the CPI candidate, Mr. Panda. Therefore, it is a false statement that has been made in this House. The only thing I would like to request the Ministers, Mr. Patnaik in particular, is this. These are all from the proceedings of the Lok Sabha, the Khanna Commission report and the Cabinet sub-Committee findings. Mr. Patnaik is in the habit of getting up now and then and making entirely false statements. I am not asking for a privileges Committee...

SHRI ANANT PRASAD SHARMA (Bihar): Why are you not asking for it?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, I am not because—what is the use of asking for a Privileges Committee?—nothing can correct Mr. Patnaik. Therefore, I tell the honourable Members, new members, to note here you have a Minister who makes such false statements, entirely false statements on the question of allegations as I have shown now, again a false statement on the question of election. And then he says that I was making a false statement. Is it fair? This should be condemned and criticised. This is the most deplorable conduct, the most reprehensible conduct, on the part of a member of the Cabinet. The Minister for Parliamentary Affairs is here. Will you kindly ask him to go and read the Khanna Commission re-