

**RESOLUTION RE SAFEGUARDS AGAINST PARLIAMENTARY DEMOCRACY AND AUTONOMY OF STATES BEING WEAKENED BY THE UNION GOVERNMENT—
contd.**

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, you will have noted. I hope I have not lost my time.

Now, Mr. Vice-Chairman, how does the Governor say such a thing? Which provision in the Constitution authorises the Government to make a statement "The Government in order to be stable must have a substantial majority or a fairly substantial majority?" It is possible for a Government to continue for the entire tenure of five years with a majority of one or two so long as that majority is a majority, and certainly nobody would question it if the policies are also in addition good. Why did Mr. Gopala Reddy go into this kind of political exercise, beyond the scope of his employment and terms of reference, if there are any, to make a suggestion of this kind in regard to U.P.? At the same time, I must say that the Samyuktha Vidhayak Dal had a majority there of 40 or so, and in the present case it is not a question of a substantial majority even. Now, this is the kind of the Governor's report, it is none of the Governor's job to make such remarks. In Kerala, we continued for 27 months in 1957—1959—the Communist Government I have in mind; a Government with a majority of two—and we gave a stable Government and a popular Government which had to be dissolved by a Presidential intervention because there was no other way by which the Government could be get rid of by the Centre. Therefore, he is wrong.

Now, what has he done? Here you see: When the U.P. Assembly was suspended, the Ministry was dissolved, Mr. Charan Singh was the Chief Minister. He could have been asked to continue as a caretaker Government.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh): How long?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He could have been asked. You do not talk about it. He could have been asked to function as a caretaker Government and then the Governor could have given, according to his own logic, instructions or advice for mid-term elections. It is possible to hold mid-term elections with a caretaker Government. In fact, it does happen. General elections take place with the Congress Party in office. Why could this thing not be done in U.P.? Suppose the Governor—I take it for argument's sake—wants more stability that way? No, he did not do so. He suspended the Assembly so that Mr. C. B. Gupta and the Congress could get a chance to win over some people by methods of bribery and corruption and all kinds of wings in order to ask for the revival or the reactivation of the Assembly so that the Congress could be restored. This trickery is well known and that has been done. Therefore I say this. I hope all the parties there in U.P., non-Congress parties, whatever their differences, will not allow the Congress to come back. They should either settle their troubles over the leadership of the Samyukta Vidhayak Dal and get back to reviving the Assembly or they should force the Centre to dissolve the Assembly and go in for mid-term elections. The great people of UP had not rejected and ousted the Congress only to have it brought back in the shameful manner in which Governor Gopala Reddy, on the instruction of the Centre, is trying to do. (*Interruptions*). Therefore, here again violation of Constitutional principles is there.

Take the case of Bihar. There, the Government was formed—how? The Soshit Dal with a membership of 17 or 18 was asked to form the Government on the assurance given by the Congress Party that that party would support the Government. The Congress Party traded in the wings instead of coming to the centre of the stage. And even for installing Mr. B. P. Mandal they had to take to subterfuge or a kind of fake election of a gentleman, Mr. Singh, whom I call a stepney Chief Minister, somehow or other to carry on the ramshackle vehicle of the Soshit Dal alliance so that taking advantage of that

[SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA]

Mr. Mandal could be brought in. Here also there should be an amendment to the Constitution or to other relevant provisions; otherwise, this kind of trickery will go on. The gentleman having been elected to the Lok Sabha did not come there. He remained there for intrigues and for indulging in political corruption and sold himself and sold his conscience to the Congress Party, and the Congress Party went in for him. What I am complaining here is that the Constitution was abused, that the constitutional authority was abused and the Centre did nothing of the kind. Mr. Sudhanshu, the Congress Speaker of the Bihar Assembly, has criticised it. Even Mr. Chavan, who is never tired of doing such things, is hard put to defending what has been done in Bihar. He is shying like a newly-wedded woman. He is shying away from this kind of thing at the very suggestion of something wrong having been done. That is Mr. Chavan. You can understand it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Now finish.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am finishing. You must deduct the other time that is lost. Therefore, I have some suggestions to offer. The States should have larger autonomy. Today we have reached a stage where you cannot think of one party ruling the Centre and the States. In fact we are reaching a stage when the Centre may not be ruled by one party at all. Reactionaries are already talking in terms of having a coalition at the Centre. In fact, Indian monopolists and others have come to the conclusion that they cannot rely on a single party rule in order to maintain their monopoly raj. Therefore, they are thinking in terms of a coalition so that the Congress Party and all the reactionary parties in the Opposition combine in order to produce a coalition Government at the Centre. (Interruption by Shri Sheel Bhadra Yajee). As far as Mr. Sheel Bhadra Yajee is concerned, he is available for any combination.

श्री बिमल कुमार मन्नालालजी
 खोरड़िया (मध्य प्रदेश): शील भद्र नहीं है,
 शील है।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yea, he is not a woman, I agree. Mr. Sheel Bhadra Yajee is available.

श्री शीलभद्र याजी (बिहार): दोनों को
 शर्म आनी चाहिये, जनसंघ को और
 कम्युनिस्टों को भी।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am not going to be provoked by you. As far as you are concerned you will sell to anybody. You will sell to us if we can offer to you a better post.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: Do not talk rubbish.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Good man you are. You have established a record of changing parties. I do not think if anybody else has changed 14 parties.

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: You are wrong. I have never changed parties. I was always in the Congress. Do not talk rubbish.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: My party will not admit you, my esteemed friend.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): You continue.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Because you are an indigestible political element as far as good parties are concerned, no good party will take you. You remain where you are. Therefore, Mr. Vice-Chairman, larger autonomy for the States is needed. Not only in financial matters but also in political matters it is very essential that the Governors' powers and the Centre's power of direction should be drastically modified.

Sir, under our Constitution the Centre has been given a lot of power to interfere in the administration of a State. Now we know the Congress is interfering for partisan end? After the election they have made it abundantly clear that their interference in State affairs is designed to help the Congress Party to restore even decrepit

leadership, like that of Atulya Ghosh, that is their line. They have no respect for the Constitution. Therefore, the relevant provisions to which references were made should be revised, if necessary, by an amendment of the Constitution.

Apart from the fact that more power and larger autonomy should be given to the States, I think that non-Congress Ministers, specially Chief Ministers, whatever their views, should come together and develop public opinion both in their Legislatures and outside in the country so that the Central Government can be forced to part with some of the power, it has concentrated in its hands, politically and economically.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, whereas most resources in the States are only accessible to the Centre for being tapped, it is the State Governments which are called upon to carry out developmental activities, their revenue goes away in that direction. Their power of raising resources on their own is very limited with the result that the State Government have to wait on the threshold of the Finance Minister and at the doorstep of the Finance Minister of the country. Certainly, this is neither in consonance with the federal principle nor does it help the integration of the country or national integration, as you call it.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, similarly the question of Administrative Services will have to be gone into. The I.A.S., the I.P.S. and all other All-India Services, even when their cadres are working in States, they remain in some way under the influence of the Centre and under their discipline. We have seen from our experience of the non-Congress Governments how the Centre tried to utilise their hold over the All-India Services in a manner detrimental to the autonomy of the States and for helping the Congress gains and, now, currently in "operation topple" against the non-Congress Governments in various States. I know from my own experience in West Bengal, Bihar, Uttar Pradesh and other places, that in the case of the All-India Service people who are posted in these States, the Home Ministry has made special arrangements in order to maintain

liaison with those cadres, not for the ordinary common work but for pushing their ends, for carrying on intrigues. I know for a fact that Ministers of West Bengal and Bihar Governments had been spied by their Intelligence. Instruction has gone from the Central Intelligence to carry on espionage and spying activity against Mr. Jyoti Basu, Mr. Ajoy Mookherjee, Mr. Somnath Lahiri, Mr. Biswanath Mukherjee and others. I will tell you my experience of one day when two Ministers came here. I invited them to the Bengali Market, or whatever it is called. They like, what is called Murkan or some such thing wherein you stuff something. I invited Mr. Somnath Lahiri and Mr. Harekrishna Konar. They came with me to the shop, Bang Bhavan. There I found four Intelligence Officers whom I know very well following them and sitting next to us. Mr. Chavan is a shameless creature. He asked his Intelligence officers to follow the Ministers so shamelessly that when they went for having some snacks with me, they were sitting almost next to me. I know them. I identify them. Normally when they see me they offer me Namaste.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Maybe they were there for their protection and security.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes, Sir. I know them. I thought you were nice but you are not so.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA): It is objectionable.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Telephones are tapped. I know instructions were sent, because we have been in the Government. Therefore, we know the art of it. We knew that telephones were being tapped. I could not even talk to the West Bengal Ministers. Telephones were tapped in such a manner by the Central Government here and by other authorities. Therefore, you can see that this whole thing, the Administrative Services, etc. has to be gone into, otherwise this State autonomy becomes meaningless. It becomes meaningless if the Centre maintains this fifth column for spying.

[SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA]

I may inform you, Mr. Vice-Chairman, when we were in Government in Kerala in 1957-59 we caught hold of a letter which the I. G. of that time had written against the Government to some officers in the Centre. The letter in original came into our hands, which Mr. Ajoy Ghosh showed to Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru and Pt. Govind Ballabh Pant. They said they would deal with it. At that time we did not make the issue public. It was in the hand-writing of the officer and the conspiracy between the two, Centre and the State, was divulged. Mr. Govind Ballabh Pant's Home Ministry denied that there was such a letter.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): You should finish.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, therefore, all these things need to be defined. I have given the examples of Bihar, West Bengal and other places. I come to Haryana. Majority was not lost. But the Governor dismissed it. Now you see various standards are being followed according to the convenience of the Congress Party—in some places, dissolution of the Ministry and the Assembly; in another place, dissolution of the Ministry and suspension of the Assembly; in some other place, nothing doing, allow a stepney Chief Minister—in Bihar—to hold the baby till a defector and traitor is made Council Member and given the chance to form the Government. Manipur Assembly was suspended so that the Congress Party could in the meanwhile show a majority, and once the majority went that way, immediately the Assembly was revived, and now a Government is functioning. But the Opposition is demanding mid-term elections. Therefore, I say to-day, Mr. Vice-Chairman, before I sit down. You have to decide whether you are interested in parliamentary democracy or not. You have to decide. We are all for it. (*Interruption by Shri Sheel Bhadra Yajee*) As far as you are concerned, you do not understand anything. You have to decide whether you are in favour of it or against it. If you think that you can condition parliamentary democracy to suit your ends and only to serve your narrow partisan ends,

you shall be ruining yourself. Not only that, you will be ruining parliamentary democracy itself and nothing will be left. The Constitution will become a fiction rather than a political reality of our country. That is quite clear. Therefore, Mr. Vice-Chairman. I think it is necessary that we should discuss the whole matter in the light of the experience of twenty years, especially the experience after the fourth General Election. I, therefore, suggest: let the Prime Minister as leader of the Central Government, rise above partisan considerations and invite an all-party conference, a conference of all the Chief Ministers, where questions of State autonomy and Centre-State relations can be discussed *de novo* in order to suggest such amendments as are necessary to strengthen parliamentary institutions and to reduce, if not eliminate Central interference, and to enlarge the autonomy of the States. Without that, you cannot have parliamentary democracy functioning. That is absolutely clear. You will be having the shadow, but the substance will be hacked away, and ultimately we shall be left with only the shadow of it. We do not want to plod with the shadow while the substance is lost. We want to live with the substance and avoid the shadow of it. Therefore, Mr. Vice-Chairman, in the political life to-day there is need for renewed agitation, renewed movement, in order to reconsider as to in what manner Constitution has got to be amended, what conventions should be well established and laid down, how the Centre-State relations should be shaped, what autonomy the States should enjoy and how much power the Centre should have. We should accept the principle of "minimum power for the Centre, maximum power for the State," whether in economic matters or in political matters or in any other matter. That is how we should arrange the affair. I do not want to say very much. So, I am making this suggestion that these things should be discussed.

As far as we are concerned it is quite clear that parliamentary democracy cannot be trusted in the hands of the Congress Party, more so when it is running a single party Government, this kind of administration,

here. It will never be safe unless the Congress Party is made to sit in the Opposition, unless democratic and left forces occupy the treasury benches and run the Central Government. I know it is long over due. But even so, it is necessary in the interest of defending our democratic movement to see that the Congress is not in a position to defame and degrade our parliamentary institutions, to kill democracy in the manner in which they are killing it, so that at least something is left to build upon and go forth. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Mr. Arjun Arora.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी : चोरड़िया उप-सभापति मझेदय जरा एक व्यवस्था चाहता हूँ। नियम यह है कि जो मोशन मूव करे 30 मिनट उसको मिले और जो दूसरे बोलनेवाले हों उनको 15 मिनट मिले। माननीय भरोशे जी को 30 मिनट आपने इसपर दिये...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Not thirty minutes.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: More than thirty minutes.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चोरड़िया : मैं इसी लिए बीच में नहीं बला। उस रोज जब कस्टिड्यूनन अमेडमेंट बिल चल रहा था तो सारे हाउस ने नियमों की दुहाई देकर हमारे बोलने पर प्रतिबन्ध लगाने की बात कही थी। लेकिन आज नियमों के विपरीत जाकर आप किसी को 30 मिनट बोलने का अवसर दें, यह कैसी व्यवस्था है, इसके बारे में जानकारी चाहता हूँ।

والس چیرمین (شری اکبر علی خان) : مسٹر چورڑیا - آپ کا جو پروپوزیشن ہے وہ بہت واجب ہے لیکن میری گزارش ہے کہ میمبر خود اس کا خیال کریں -

उपसभापति (श्री अकबरअली खाँ): मिस्टर चोरड़िया आपका जो पॉइंट है वह बहुत बाजिव है लेकिन मेरी गुजारिश है कि मेम्बर खुद इसका ख्याल रखें।]

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चोरड़िया : श्रीमन्, मेम्बर खुद ख्याल रखने वाले हैं, फिर भी उस रोज सब लोगों ने मिलकर ऐसी पाबन्दियाँ डाली....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I will make it clear. It was not for your time....

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चोरड़िया : आपने क्लोजर मूव करवाया....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am very sorry, Mr. Chordia did not understand it. He spoke for two hours; he did a good job. But the idea was not to allow him to filibuster it...

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चोरड़िया : I know what you did.

आपने कहा कि क्लेम मसपेंड करो

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: If Mr. Chordia wants to speak for three hours, I will not object. But at that particular time, as you know, with all respect to Mr. Chordia—he is a very clever man, an able man—wanted to filibuster it. We wanted to get it passed that day....

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चोरड़िया : इसीलिये मैं निवेदन करता हूँ कि नियम बरकरार चले.

(Interruptions)

*Hindi transliteration.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, please sit down. *(Interruption.)* No more. Mr. Arjun Arora.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: If the Communist Party and the Jana Sangh stop quarrelling, things in the country will improve, and at least I will have an opportunity to have my say. Thus, when I read the words of this Resolution of Mr. Bhadram...

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: There will not be the right of reply? That is all right. You save that time.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: When I read the words of the Resolution of Mr. Bhadram, I was inclined to support it. But when I heard Mr. Bhadram's speech, I was only half inclined to support it. Now that I have heard the outburst of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, I rise to oppose it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But, Mr. Vice-Chairman the fact that he is a Congress Member determines that he would never support it, because then he will have to leave the Congress.

(Interruption)

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Sir, we have in the past seen and heard of many good causes spoilt by bad advocacy. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is fast becoming a classic example of a bad advocate, and that is why in spite of having a law degree, he could not go a court of law.

3 P.M.

He had to take resort to parliamentary work. Even there his performance is deteriorating every day and his speech today was a perfect example of deterioration. There can be no objection to the proposition that the authority of the Union Government should not be utilised to interfere with the State Governments.

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am interested in not allowing the hon. Member to pass such remarks or criticise me. Let him criticise the Central Government if he has the courage to do so. *Never does he criticise the Congress.*

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Please sit down.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: False pretensions should not be allowed. This gentleman does something outside the House and inside the House they support the Government whenever the Government does anything wrong.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: You will get everything back.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Who are you to give it? Mr. Shukla can give it. Who are you?

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Order, order. Please sit down.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has given a perfect example of his intolerance and he has exposed his faith in democracy. He thinks that it is his right to speak and it is his right to prevent others from saying unpleasant truths.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Talk on the Resolution.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I am coming to the Resolution. But you are nobody to tell me that I should come to the Resolution, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. Sir, if he goes through his speeches carefully, the next morning, he will find that he is a perfect example of irrelevance, because he never speaks to the point.

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Except Kanpur and J. K. groups.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Sir, I know who pays Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta is a paid agent of many people whose names are known to me.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, this Congress leader here calls me a paid agent. Let him name one who pays me. On the other hand, I know to whom he goes and gets this thing or that thing done.

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Please sit down.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, if he can prove that I am a paid agent of somebody, I shall immediately resign. But if I can show that he is being paid by some Kanpur industrialists, will he agree to resign? Let him say. (Interruptions) Sir, on a point of order. He has called me a paid agent. If I also call him a paid agent, will you allow it? I know what he is. Everybody knows it. (Interruptions) A progressive Congressman is letting down the entire Left. He is currying favours. Sir, I can understand Mr. Shukla and others but never can I understand him when he says that. Therefore ask him to withdraw.

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN): Mr. Arora, will you kindly sit down?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta, you are taking money. In fact your entire politics is based on somebody else's money.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, he is indulging in serious propaganda. This gentleman is supposed to be the General Secretary of the ISCUS. I hope it will be noted.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's Communist Party is run on somebody else's money.

(Interruptions)

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam, he has called me a paid agent. He says I am running the Party on others' money. With whose money am I running the Party? On the other hand, shall I tell you something about him?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Do.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Even under your provocation I will not say that.

(Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. Please speak on the Resolution.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Madam, before Mr. Bhupesh Gupta indulged in his outburst, I was saying that a good cause had been spoiled by the bad advocacy of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. But before I come to the point I must reply to the unnecessary tirade of Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. I challenge Mr. Bhupesh Gupta to prove his charges against me to the satisfaction of the Deputy Chairman and I challenge him to stand up and say whether he is prepared to leave the House and the Deputy Chairman in charge of the charges that I have levelled against him. Madam, I am in your hands.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Madam Deputy Chairman, it is not proper for anyone to make charges or counter charges. I would request you to see that this is expunged and these charges should not be there.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Madam, he calls me a paid agent.

(Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I want to appeal to Mr. Arora also that he should speak on the Resolution.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Now, Madam, I once more submit to you that I am prepared that you personally enquire into the charge that Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has levelled against me and I challenge Mr. Bhupesh Gupta to stand up and say the same thing and admit before the House that he is prepared to submit to an enquiry by yourself into the charges that I have levelled against him.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I shall bring witnesses from Kanpur but you have also to prove that I am a paid agent or my Party is run on others' money. We are both prepared to do that. I shall bring Kanpur workers here and I would invite you to Kanpur.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I do not have to go anywhere to prove my charges against Mr. Bhupesh Gupta. I can prove them from the evidence available in Delhi itself.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Do.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now come to the Resolution, Mr. Arora.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Madam, I was saying that nobody would object to the proposition that the authority of the Centre should not be utilised to disturb the State Governments. (*Interruptions*) Mr. Bhupesh Gupta should be thrown out of this House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I shall throw you out of everything.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I shall throw you out of the world.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This gentleman curries favours from the Communist Party. How many times has he approached the Communist Party for favours?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I have never approached the Communist Party for any favours. As a matter of fact I kicked the Communist Party when it adopted its treacherous attitude in 1942. I was a respected Member and a leader of the Communist Party. When Mr. Bhupesh Gupta was unknown, I was a respected leader of the Communist Party but when the Communist Party adopted the treacherous attitude in 1942, I kicked it and Mr. Gupta came in. I have never gone to the Communist Party for any favour whatsoever. It has been the custom for responsible leaders of the Communist Party to come to me for favours irrespective of.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No Communist Party leader has ever met you. If you say that they go to you for favour, it is wrong. I hope they will not

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Responsible leaders of the Communist Party always come to me for favours. Mr. Gupta is an insignificant member of the Communist Party.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Who are the significant members of the Communist Party that come to You?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Mr Gupta is not...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Will you speak on the Resolution?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: When the interruptions are over or they are stopped, then alone I can speak on the Resolution. If Mr. Gupta continues his running commentary, I will continue my sledge hammer...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If you come to the Resolution, there will be no interruptions.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I was saying that there can be no objection to the proposition that the authority of the Cen-

tral Government should not be utilised for interfering with any State Government established by law and which commands a majority in the State Legislature. But I must say what has followed the 1967 elections in many States is not a good example of democracy. Some parties of the Opposition were so exasperated with their repeated defeats and were so frustrated in their lust for power that after the 1967 elections, many incongruous coalitions came into being and it must be said to the credit of the Government of India that it did not interfere even with those incongruous coalitions but incongruous coalitions cannot last for ever. Adversity makes strange bed-fellows. Here the lust for power brought about strange combinations and they were bound to fall. They were bound to quarrel. Take the example of my State of Uttar Pradesh. It was a very incongruous coalition. The coalition was in fact by the Jan Sangh which had 99 Members in a House of 425 Members.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI (Rajasthan): Led by Mr. Charan Singh.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: You do not start the practice of Mr. Gupta. Let me speak.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI: But he fair to us. We are a major party. I only objected to the words that you have used.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Let the advocate of Mr. C. B. Gupta speak.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Let the hiring of Mr. Ajoy Mukerji keep quiet. The major party in the U.P. coalition was the Jan Sangh and in a democracy it is the major party which should lead but in spite of 99 members of the Jan Sangh Party and 14 Members of the Communist Party, unitedly they were not able to form a coalition Government. So they relied upon defectors led by Mr. Charan Singh and offered Mr. Charan Singh, who in the

beginning had a following of only 17 Members, the Chief Ministership on a platter.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI: You asked me not to speak but do not try to be unfair.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: If Mr. Bhandari says that he did not offer Mr. Charan Singh the Chief Ministership....

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI: We did.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: That is what I said that in spite of Jan Sangh having 99 Members.

AN HON. MEMBER: You offered to Mr. Mandal in Bihar...

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I am not defending Mr. Mandal. I do not like him.

श्री ब्रज किशोर प्रसाद सिंह (बिहार) :
 मैं आनरेबल मेम्बर से एक बात पूछना चाहता हूँ, वह उत्तर प्रदेश के हैं, उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार में एक प्रावर्ब चलती है, वह प्रावर्ब आप जानते हैं न, 'नित्यानवे वा फेरा', तो यह नित्यानवे वा फेरा था उनका ।

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: That is how the Opposition Ministry in U.P. came into being. It began with the goodwill of the people and it also began to function with the goodwill of the Centre but within six months the differences came into the open. In October the S.S.P. and the C.P.I. Ministers resigned. There was intrigue, there was horse-trading and the differences were patched up on the surface but the differences continued and the result of that difference was that the administration in U.P. which was never very good, began to sink to lower and lower depths and the citizens of U.P., the eight crores of Indians who live in U.P., began to feel miserable. Though the differences were patched up

[Shri Arjun Arora]

in October, the differences continued. They continued to simmer and again they came to the surface when the C.P.I. and the S.S.P. Ministers again resigned. But in their hatred against the Congress, in their desire to keep the Congress out of office, to keep the largest party in the U.P. Legislature out of office, the C.P.I. and the S.S.P. continued to support the coalition Ministry of Mr. Charan Singh but that was not the end. Mr. Charan Singh felt—and I feel rightly—that the Jan Sangh Ministers, particularly the Jan Sangh Ministers in charge of the Local Self-Government and Co-operation, were misusing their offices to strengthen their party. So Mr. Charan Singh realised it and that was why he reshuffled the portfolios. When Mr. Charan Singh reshuffled the portfolios and took away the two powerful portfolios of Local Self-Government and Co-operation from the Jan Sangh Ministers, these differences became so wide that they could not be patched up. In the meantime there was the S.S.P. which did not want anything to be settled. When Mr. Charan Singh lost the support of the Jan Sangh also, he, like an honourable man, thought it proper to resign. What mistake did the Governor commit in accepting the resignation of Mr. Charan Singh, I fail to understand.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY:
 The mistake was that he did not accept the recommendation for mid-term elections.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: The parties which formed the coalition in U.P., they, for nine days, continued to wrangle, bargain and try to patch up. But they failed to do so. And on the ninth day some of them elected Mr. Ram Chandra Vikal as their leader.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI:
 Who has objected?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: Others objected.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI:
 Who?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: The B.K.D. and the Republican Party.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI:
 In the meeting?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: They objected; I know. I do not know what happened in the meeting; I was not present there but I know that the leaders of the B.K.D. and leaders of the Republican Party and some independents approached the Governor, and they told him that they would not support Mr. Ram Chandra Vikal's leadership. Obviously Mr. Ram Chandra Vikal did not enjoy the support of all the parties of the S.V.D.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI:
 Have they dissociated themselves from the S.V.D.?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: They went to the Governor...

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI:
 Just for information I want to ask. Who has dissociated himself from the S.V.D.?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: They might or might not have; whether they dissociated themselves from the S.V.D. or not is immaterial, but they did not accept Mr. Ram Chandra Vikal as their leader. He was only the leader of the Jan Sangh and a few others, and the Jan Sangh and a few others together were not in a majority in the Assembly. They were not in a position to give U.P. a stable Government.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI:
 What is the sum total now? The Jan Sangh and some others, what is the total now?

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: I am coming.

So the Governor had no option but to come to the conclusion that the S.V.D. had not been able to successfully elect a leader acceptable to all its supporters.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Arjun Arora, your time is over now.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: My time was all taken away by interruptions. Anyway I will not take much time to finish.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. Even so, you began at 2-57. I am allowing fifteen minutes for the interruptions. Even so, your time is over.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: All right Madam; I am concluding. But I have to reply to some queries put by Mr. Bhandari, and I will do it in the lobby.

So the Governor had to come to the conclusion that the S.V.D. was unable to give U.P. a stable Government. Mr. C. B. Gupta, Leader of the Congress Party, also claimed that he could form a Government. But the Governor was so impartial—and I am glad he was so impartial—that he did not take Mr. C. B. Gupta's word as gospel truth.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI: You have no sympathies for your party also.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: And he recommended to the President suspension of the Assembly. Now this suspension may help the S.V.D. to compose its differences. It may enable Mr. Charan Singh to come back. It may enable other parties like B.K.D. and Republican to accept Mr. Ram Chandra Vikal, whatever his abilities as their leader. It may also create conditions in which more and more independents, more and more responsible citizens of U.P. may like to support Mr. C. B. Gupta to give the State a stable Government. So the Governor of U.P. has acted impartially.

There are lots of things to be said about U.P. But I refrain from doing so because my time was taken away by interruptions. I personally feel that, at least in the case of U.P., the Governor has acted most honestly, most impartially, and is entitled to our highest praise.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mulka Govinda Reddy. Do you want to speak? Your name is here.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: Yes, I will speak, Madam, Deputy Chairman. I support this Resolution. The situation that is now obtaining in the country makes us to seriously ponder over the question of relations between the States and the Centre.

In the 1967 General Elections, as we all know, the Congress was defeated in eight or nine States, and in those States non-Congress coalition Governments came into existence. In one State—Rajasthan—even though Congress had lost its majority, because of the manoeuvrings and machinations of the discredited Governor of Rajasthan the Congress Party was able to wean away some members of the opposition and thus get a majority and then form a Ministry. For some time President's rule was imposed in order that the Chief Minister—or the former Chief Minister—of Rajasthan could manage to buy some M.L.As. and get their support to form a Ministry.

And what has happened now in U.P. is more or less the same. When the Chief Minister, when the former Chief Minister, Mr. Charan Singh, advised the Governor that if the S.V.D. could not elect a leader and could not form a Ministry, then, the best course would have been for the Governor to dissolve the Legislature. It is true that the S.V.D. was not in a position to elect a leader acceptable to all its constituent units there. There was something wrong about it, they should not have done it; they should have elected a leader in whom all the constituent units of the S.V.D. had confidence. Still the S.V.D. has the majority, but they were not in a position to elect a leader and form a Ministry. So the best thing for the Governor if he wanted to act impartially and according to the constitutional provisions, would have been that he should have accepted the advice of former Chief Minister, Mr. Charan Singh. It was not only his personal advice; I understand there was a Resolution of the Cabinet to the effect that in case the S.V.D. could not con-

[Shri Mulka Govinda Reddy]

tinue the Ministry or form a Ministry here should be midterm elections in U.P. But here the Governor did not take the advice of the Chief Minister which he was bound to. Here the Chief Minister was not a defeated Chief Minister, as in some other cases, but here was a Chief Minister who had the majority behind him, and he had the authority of the Cabinet.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Reddy, so far as I know the parties were not agreeable to this. Mr. Bhandari can enlighten us. The parties were not agreed to mid-term elections in U.P.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: The point is that the Chief Minister has tendered this advice and it is not an oral advice. In his letter to the Governor he has made this point very clear, and he was the Chief Minister till he resigned, and he had a majority in the Legislature with him. Therefore, it was the bounden duty of the Governor according to the Constitution to accept the advice of the Chief Minister who still had a majority behind him. Instead of doing that he has recommended to the Centre the imposition of President's Rule for some time so that those manoeuvrings and these manipulations can go on in order to bring back the Congress into power in Uttar Pradesh.

In Bihar also, as some hon. Members have already pointed out the Chief Minister was manoeuvring for two days and then he nominated a discredited leader to the Legislative Council and then formed a Ministry headed by the Soshit Dal. Shri Arjun Arora condemned the defectors. I am also one of those who condemn these defectors. In fact it was the Congress Party which disrupted the P.S.P. and other democratic parties and then took these people in without asking them to first resign from the seats to which they had been elected on their party tickets. The Congress thus made these defectors, and then made them adorn the Treasury Benches at the Centre as well as in the

States. It is the Congress Party which should be squarely blamed for encouraging these defectors. It was creditable on the part of Shri Charan Singh, when he got disgusted with the machinations of the Chief Minister of U.P. in those days to have left the party. With him some thirty other Members also left the party. So he had the majority and was elected leader. But what is it that they are doing now in Bengal? There it was the defector and quisling, Dr. P. C. Ghosh who was made Chief Minister without having to go through the process of testing the strength of the Ajoy Mukherjee Government on the floor of the Legislature. The Governor, Mr. Dharma Vira acted in a very high-handed, unconstitutional and illegal manner and that has shaken the foundations of democratic institutions in this country. Again in Punjab a puppet Ministry has been supported by the Congress for the purpose of overthrowing the elected Ministry of Shri Gurnam Singh. In Haryana also the same process was followed by the Congress Party and even though Rao Virendra Singh had the majority in the Legislature in Haryana, the Governor of Haryana decided to dismiss it and to ask the Centre to impose President's Rule there. Wherever the Congress was in a minority and where the non-Congress Governments were functioning the Governors have taken a partisan attitude for overthrowing the non-Congress Governments and helping to restore the Congress to power, even though those Congressmen had been discredited by the electorate in the 1967 general elections. So these Governors have taken double standards. They applied double standards and they have, therefore, forfeited their right to function as impartial Governors under our Constitution. It is, therefore, time the Deputy Chairman, that Parliament reviewed the entire position of the Governors, the functions, and powers of the Governors. In spite of repeated requests, and in spite of repeated reminders and demands that the Governors should be given some sort of Instruments of Instructions so that in a given situation they need not look for guidance from the Central leaders or the Home Minister or the Prime Minister but

could act according to the Constitution and impartially fulfil the obligations under which they will have to function, nothing has been done. Therefore, Madam, Deputy Chairman, it is necessary that we must review the entire relations that now exist between the States and the Centre. It is unfortunate that the Congress has not had the tolerance to tolerate non-Congress Governments coming into being and to work as opposition party in those States. If that is the position and if the Congress wants to rule even in States where they had last the majority and if they want to do it through the Governors or through puppet régimes, then we will lose faith in democratic functioning and in the democratic Constitution that we have given to ourselves. This will undermine our faith in the Constitution itself. Therefore, it is a very serious matter which we should take note of. We do believe in Parliamentary democracy and we should see that the Centre acts with restraint and according to the provisions of the Constitution.

Lastly, Madam Deputy Chairman, I would like to bring to the notice of this House that whenever non-Congress Government were formed the treatment that was meted out to those non-Congress Governments was not fair. When the Ajoy Mukherjee Government wanted more wheat and rice to be supplied to West Bengal the Centre was reluctant to do it. But immediately Dr. P. C. Ghosh was made the Chief Minister more foodgrains were allotted to West Bengal. This is not the way the Central Government should treat the States. After all we have a federal set-up and they should see that all the States, whether there is a Congress Ministry or a non-Congress Ministry there are treated in a fair manner. They should not have political considerations while making allotments of foodgrains or while making financial adjustments or while making grants to the States. Therefore, it is necessary that we have a fresh look at things as they are now prevailing. Though the Constitution is clear with regard to the relations that should exist between the States and the Centre, the Central Government is violating the provisions of the Constitution

and is thus doing a disservice to the cause of democratic institutions. I, therefore, support wholeheartedly the Resolution moved by my hon. friend Shri Bhadram.

श्री हयातुल्ला अन्सारी (उत्तर प्रदेश):

मैंडम डिप्टी चैयरमैन, अब तक जो सारी बहस हुई है वह स्टेटों के बारे में हुई है ? इस समय खास तौर पर उत्तर प्रदेश के बारे में बहस हुई और मुझे अफसोस है कि श्री भूपेश गुप्त जा रहे हैं और मैं उन्हीं को जबाब देने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ। उत्तर प्रदेश में जिस तरह से वहां पर गवर्नमेंट बनी, उसके बारे में मैं कुछ बक ग्राउन्ड बता दू तो अच्छा होगा।

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I am not the mover of the Resolution.

श्री हयातुल्ला अन्सारी : उस में 8 पार्टियां शामिल हुईं। 8 पार्टियों में से मैं दो तीन का तजकिया खासतौर पर करना चाहता हूँ। एक पार्टी जो जनसंघ की है दूसरी कम्युनिस्टों की है और तीसरी स्वतंत्र पार्टी है। इन्क्लूशन के पहले कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के तमाम पेपर यह इलजाम लगाया करते थे कि कांग्रेस जनसंघी हो गई है और वह जनसंघियों से मेल जोल रखना चाहती है और वह ऐसी तरीक़ों कर रही है जिस से जनसंघियों के साथ मेल बढ़े। कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी का यह भी स्वीगन था कि सब में बड़े फासिस्ट पार्टी जो है वह जनसंघ की है। और उसकी मुखालिफ़त करना जरूरी है। कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी जिस तरह से रोज जनसंघियों का मुकाबला करती है उसको हम हाउस में देखा करते हैं। कम्युनिस्टों और जनसंघियों का, दोनों का मुकाबला हाउस के अन्दर और बाहर रोज होता रहता है। जनसंघी भी कम्युनिस्टों को यह समझते हैं कि यह रूस और चीन की पार्टी है और यही खयाल स्वतंत्र पार्टी का भी है। और दोनों ही समझते हैं कि यह पार्टी मुल्क की वफादार नहीं है। यह पार्टी मुल्क को धोका देने के लिए ही बनी हुई है।

(श्री हयातुल्ला अन्सारी)

इतिहास ऐसा हुआ कि उत्तर प्रदेश में कांग्रेस की मेजोरिटी कम बनी और उसमें से बहुत से लोग टूटकर बाहर निकल गये । इस समय में मैं एक और मजे की बात बतलाना चाहता हूँ और वह यह है कि आगे चल कर जो चीफ मिनिस्टर और डिप्टी चीफ मिनिस्टर बने थे, उनका लखनऊ में पहले कुछ झगड़ा हो चुका था । डिप्टी चीफ मिनिस्टर श्री राम प्रकाश एक जमाने में लखनऊ महापालिका के डिप्टी मेयर रह चुके थे । अमीनाबाद में जो वहाँ का सब से बड़ा बाजार है, महापालिका ने वहाँ पर बहुत सी दुकानें बनाईं । जब ये दुकानें बन चुकीं, तो सवाल यह आया कि उनको किस तरह से बांटा जाय । महापालिका में इस बात पर बहस हुई और उसने दुकानों को बांटने के लिए एक सब-कमेटी बना दी । क्योंकि महापालिका समझती थी कि दुकानों का मामला ऐसा है, जिस में लाखों रुपया कमाया जा सकता था यानी दस पन्द्रह लाख कोई चीज नहीं है । 50 लाख रुपया तक कमाया जा सकता था, दुकानों को बांट कर के उस के बाद ऐसा ड्रामा हुआ जो शायद हिन्दोस्तान में बहुत कम हुआ होगा । फिर कमेटी बन गई, कमेटी तैयार थी, मौजूद थी, लेकिन उसी दिन 12 बजे रात को डिप्टी मेयर और एक्जिक्युटिव आफिसर ने मिल के और दुकानें अलॉट कर के किस्सा सब खत्म कर दिया । उन्होंने साइने कर दिया, कमेटी से पूछा ही नहीं । फिर महापालिका की मीटिंग हुई और वहाँ बहुत शोर मच गया . . .

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी : मुझे इस में आपत्ति नहीं कि वे क्या कहना चाहते हैं । यहां पर रामप्रकाश जी नहीं हैं, लेकिन

उन के ऊपर इस सम्बन्ध में कोई चीज कहनी हो तो कहिये ।

श्री हयातुल्ला अन्सारी : जो यहां पर मौजूद नहीं है, उन के बारे में आप अक्सर यहां बातें कर चुके हैं . . .

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी : मेरा यही कहना है कि इस प्रस्ताव के चलते अगर आप किसी को शामिल करना चाहते हैं तो कीजिये ।

श्री हयातुल्ला अन्सारी : यहां मिस्टर गोपाल रेड्डी का नाम लिया गया है, मिस्टर चरण सिंह का नाम लिया गया है, जो यहां मौजूद नहीं हैं । उनका अगर नाम लिया जा सकता है तो कोई बजह नहीं है कि हम बैकग्राउन्ड न बतायें ।

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी : मुझे किसी का नाम लेने पर कोई आपत्ति नहीं है, मैं नाम के लिये नहीं कहता . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN : It is not proper to mention names of those who are not present ; but all the time both sides are indulging in this.

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी : दूसरे यह है कि यह घटना जो वे बता रहे हैं वहाँ पर कारपोरेशन की इसको अगर यहां राज्य सभा में उठाना है और यह इस रेजोल्यूशन में सेंटर स्टेट रिलेशंस में आती है तो वे इसको यहां उठावें ।

श्री हयातुल्ला अन्सारी : गुप्ता जी को बुलाइये वे क्या क्या कह चुके हैं । हुआ यह कि जब रामप्रकाश जी ने यह बहुत बड़ा कारनामा किया चमत्कार दिखाया तो उस जमाने में लोकल सेल्फ गवर्नमेंट का पोर्टफोलियो श्री चरण सिंह के पास था । सारे शहर में शोर हुआ । अखबारों ने क्लियरली कंडेम किया महापालिका के जलसे में कंडेम किया गया । उसके बाद

यह हुआ कि लोकल सेल्फ गवर्नमेन्ट ने इक्वायरी कमेटी बनाई और इक्वायरी कमेटी ने बहुत ही डैमेजिंग रिपोर्ट दी। उस के ऊपर लोकल सेल्फ गवर्नमेन्ट के मिनिस्टर श्री चरण सिंह ने ऐक्शन यह लिया कि महा पालिका को तोड़ दिया। अब यह याद रखिये कि वही श्री राम प्रकाश और वही श्री चरण सिंह मिल के एक मिनिस्ट्री बनाते हैं। पूछा गया कि रिपोर्ट क्या हुई। रिपोर्ट साहब गायब हो गई। वह रिपोर्ट जो महा पालिका के मिसकांडक्ट पर थी वह गायब हो गई। उत्तर प्रदेश की असेम्बली में रोज माँग की जाती थी कि रिपोर्ट लाओ, रिपोर्ट लाओ। लेकिन वह गायब थी आती ही नहीं थी। रामप्रकाश जी की रिपोर्ट गायब हो गई थी। क्वेश्चन किये गये, लेकिन जवाब नहीं दिये गये। वह एग्जिक्युटिव आफिसर जो वहाँ से ट्रांसफर कर दिया गया था उसको श्री चरण सिंह ने ट्रांसफर किया था। उसको फिर वापस बुला लिया गया लखनऊ में कि आ जाओ। रिपोर्ट गायब, सब चीज घुल गई। रोज पुकारा गया लखनऊ के पेर्स में रोज लिखा गया कि कहाँ है वह रिपोर्ट, क्या लिखा था उस में छापो, बाँटो, तक्सीम करो। लेकिन अन्दर से कोल्ड स्टोरेज से वह नहीं निकली। मालूम नहीं उस में है या दोमक उसको चाट गई। बहरहाल वह गायब हो गई।

उसके बाद आप याद रखिये कि क्या होता है। कम्युनिस्ट गले मिलते हैं जनसघ से आओ हाथ मिलाओ, हम और तुम दोनों एक हैं, एक नहीं होंगे तो मिनिस्ट्री, कैसे बनेगी। फिर स्वतंत्र पार्टी मिलती है, कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी मिलती है, जनसघ मिलता है।

श्री बिमलकुमार मन्नालालजी खोरड़िया
 क्या गुप्त जी भी मिल गये।

श्री ह्यातुल्ला अन्सारी लेकिन
 उस के अन्दर एक गडबड हो जाती है।
 वहाँ जो मिनिस्ट्री बनती है, उसकी वही
 हालत होती है जैसी कि एक मसल है।

‘कहाँ की ईंट, कहाँ का रोड़ा

भानमती ने कुनबा जोड़ा।’

आठ घोड़े जोड़े गये गाड़ी में। सच बात यह है कि उन का एक ही रख था। उन के असूल जाने दीजिये, उन के कमिटमेंट्स जाने दीजिये, उनकी थ्युरी जाने दीजिये उन सब चलने वालों का एक ही रख था और वह रख क्या था : मिनिस्ट्री, मिनिस्ट्री मिनिस्ट्री। सब उस पर मिले लेकिन फिर साहब हिस्सा बाँट में लड़ाई होती है और बड़ी सख्त लड़ाई हुई हिस्साबाँट में कि यह पोर्टफोलियो लाओ, वह पोर्टफोलियो लाओ, इस जेब में लाओ, उस जेब में लाओ, इधर लाओ, उधर लाओ, हमारी पार्टी को बढ़ाओ, हमारी पार्टी को बढ़ाओ। बहरहाल ऐक्शन हो गया और उस के बाद उस में बड़े बड़े गडबड हुये और गडबड के बाद जो तमाशा हुआ है, मेरे खयाल में वैसा कहीं नहीं हुआ होगा हिन्दोस्तान में।

एक वाक्या मैं और बयान कर देता हूँ। मालूम हुआ कि मिनिस्ट्री टूट रही है। हमारे डिप्टी चीफ मिनिस्टर स्टेटमेंट देने बैठते हैं प्रैस के सामने। उन से पूछा गया कि तुम्हारी पार्टी किधर जायेगी और उस में नाम आता है चरण सिंह जी का। उस पर डिप्टी चीफ मिनिस्टर साहब कहते हैं कि वे भाग कर कहाँ जायेंगे वे अपना सब घर जला चुके हैं। उस के बाद यहाँ आये हैं। पब्लिकली जलील करना अपने चीफ मिनिस्टर को, यह सिर्फ उत्तर प्रदेश में हुआ और कहीं नहीं हुआ।

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी : यह किस
 प्रखबार में छपा ।

श्री हयातुल्ला अन्सारी : हमारे
 प्रखबार में छपा है "कौमी आवाज" में छपा
 है । मैं उसके लिये फुल्ली रिस्पॉसिबिल
 हूँ ।

(Interruptions)

उसके बाद अभी तमाशा खत्म नहीं
 हुआ । कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी ने इस इस तरीके
 से जलील किया है चरण सिंह जी को
 कि दुनिया में कोई कर नहीं सकता ।
 स्वतन्त्र पार्टी ने भी खूब खबर ली, खूब
 स्टेटमेंट हंते थे और प्रेस को बड़ा अच्छा
 मौका मिल गया, कभी इनसे खबर ले
 रहे हैं, अभी उनसे खबर ले रहे हैं, कभी
 इनसे पूछ रहे हैं, कभी उनसे पूछ रहे
 हैं । आठ महीने यह काम रहा । हम यह
 मानते हैं कि हमारे यहां जनता भोली
 है पढ़े लिखे लोग ज्यादा नहीं हैं, लेकिन
 जिन्होंने आजादी की लड़ाई में बेइन्तहा
 हिस्सा लिया है, वे इतने नादान भी नहीं
 हैं, वे इतने भोले नहीं हैं, वे इतने मूर्ख
 नहीं हैं कि वे इस लड़ाई के कारोबार को
 न समझ सकें कि यह लड़ाई क्यों हो रही
 है, ये एक दूसरे की ले पुलिंग क्यों कर
 रहे हैं । यह लड़ाई पोर्टफोलियो की थी
 कि यह पोर्टफोलियो इधर होना चाहिये,
 यह पोर्टफोलियो उधर होना चाहिये ।
 न जाने कितने पोर्टफोलियो डिप्टी चीफ
 मिनिस्टर के पास थे और चीफ मिनिस्टर
 वहां घिरे हुये थे, कब्जे में थे ...

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी : चरण सिंह
 जी को ले रहे हैं कांग्रेस में ।

श्री हयातुल्ला अन्सारी : हा तो आपको
 लेने वाले हैं ।

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी : ख्वाब
 देखियेगा इसका ।

श्री हयातुल्ला अन्सारी : अब जरा एक
 तमाशा और देखिये । चरण सिंह जी जब
 कांग्रेस में थे, तो इस बात के लिये मशहूर
 थे कि वे बहुत ही मजबूत इरादे के हैं ।
 यह रहा है उनका कैरेक्टर कि वे बहुत
 मजबूत इरादे के थे । फिर भी उत्तर प्रदेश
 तो बहुत भूखा था, खाने को बहुत कम
 पैदा हुआ था । इसलिये प्रोक्योरमेंट के
 लिये उन्होंने कुछ लाज बनाये और कहा
 कि यह फायनल है । उसके बाद उसमें एक
 तबदीली की गई और उन्होंने कहा कि
 यह फायनल है । उसके बाद साहब, फिर
 एक तबदीली की गई और उन्होंने
 कहा कि यह फायनल है । फिर और
 तबदीलियां की गई और गिनती में 22 चेन्जेज
 हुये प्रोक्योरमेंट के लाज में । हर मिनिस्टर
 कहता था कि हमें अपनी कांस्टिटेसी
 को देखना है, हमें अपनी कांस्टिटेसी को
 देखना है । इस तरह 22 तबदीलियां
 की गईं । यह है कैरेक्टर कि हर तबदीली
 के बाद यह कहा गया कि यह फायनल
 है और फिर भी वह चीज चलती रही ।
 हमारी हिम्मत नहीं है कि एक ही बात को
 हम 22 दफा दोहराएं । लेकिन वह 22
 दफा चेन्जेज हुये हैं । ऐसी गवर्नमेंट कब
 तक चल सकती थी ।

इसके बाद मैं एक मामला उर्दू
 का उठाऊंगा । जनसंघ तो उर्दू का पक्का
 मुखालिफ है । यहां सब उर्दू बोलते हैं,
 लेकिन उर्दू के मुखालिफ हैं । वहां सात
 पार्टियां जा हैं, उनमें से एक को छोड़ कर
 जो कि कांग्रेस की थी, बाकी छह पार्टियों
 ने अपने एलेक्शन मैनीफेस्टो में डिक्लेयर

किया था कि अगर हम पावर में आ गये तो उर्दू को हम सैंकेंड आफिशियल लैंग्वेज बनायेंगे । हमारे यहां दस्तूर 345 जो है, उसमें सैंकेंड आफिशियल लैंग्वेज का मतलब सिर्फ इतना है कि यू० पी० गवर्नमेंट किसी परपज के लिये सरकारी तौर पर मानले कि उर्दू सैंकेंड लैंग्वेज कहलायेगी, तो उसको यह दर्जा मिल जायेगा । अगर असेम्बली में यह पास कर दिया जाय कि तीन चार साइनबोर्ड उर्दू में रहेंगे, तो वह सैंकेंड आफिशियल लैंग्वेज कहलायेगी । तो उर्दू वालों ने कहा कि उर्दू को सैंकेंड आफिशियल लैंग्वेज बनाओ । जिन पार्टियों ने एनैक्शन में वसमें खाई थी पब्लिक में, जलसे में, तकरीरों में, प्रैस कांफ्रेंसों में कि हम उर्दू को सैंकेंड आफिशियल लैंग्वेज बनायेंगे और जब उनकी गवर्नमेंट आ गई, तो उनसे कहा गया कि अब बनाओ उर्दू को सैंकेंड आफिशियल लैंग्वेज । अब आप देखिये कि क्या क्या पुतड़ेबाजियां की गई उससे निकलने के लिये । जनसंघ वालों ने कहा कि उर्दू के लोग चाहते हैं कि उर्दू की वही पोजीशन हो जा हिन्दी की है । मुझ से एक बड़े लीडर ने यह कहा तो मैंने उनसे कहा कि हम ख्वाब में भी ऐसा नहीं चाहते हैं । हम कतई ऐसा नहीं चाहते हैं । हमने, दरअसल इन्कार किया और हर आदमी से इन्कार किया, लेकिन हमने यह कहा कि अगर जनसंघ ने ऐसा न कहा तो उस बेचारे के पास कहने के लिये क्या रहेगा । कुछ रहेगा नहीं कहने को, इसलिए यही कहा जाय कि उर्दू वाले यह चाहते हैं, यह इल्जाम लगाया गया । इसके पीछे एम० एस० पी० वाले, प्रजा सोशलिस्ट वाले, रिपब्लिकन स्वतन्त्र पार्टी भी आ गई, वे सब पार्टियां जिन्होंने कहा था कि उर्दू को सैंकेंड लैंग्वेज बनाएंगे । यह तो वादों की हकीकत है । उसके बाद एम० एस० पी० कह रही है कि अपने वादे पूरे करो । एम० एस० पी० यह कह कर हट रही है कि अपने वादे पूरे करो । दयानतदारी

के बारे में किस्सा बता चुका हूं मेयर का । एक और वाक्या बताऊं । हमारे मिनिस्टर मुजफ्फर साहब पर इल्जाम लगाया गया कि उन्होंने एक ट्रक का परमिट गलत ले लिया, यह कहा गया कि उन पर इन्क्वायरी बिठाएंगे । उन्होंने कहा, पब्लिक स्टेटमेंट किया कि इन्क्वायरी बिठाओ । फिर यह हुआ कि एक नया कोर्ट बनेगा और जो इल्जाम लगाए जाने वाला भी सौ रुपए दे उसकी कोर्ट इन्क्वायरी करेगा । उन्होंने कहा कि सौ रुपए ले लो, इन्क्वायरी कर ली, यह रोज रोज का चिल्लाना तो बन्द हो, लेकिन किस्सा चलता रहा ।

उर्दू का मामला खत्म हो गया । सारी यू० पी० में रायट्स हुए । मैं शुक्रिया अदा करता हूं कम्यूनिस्ट पार्टी का, जिसने कहा कि ये जनसंघ ने कराए हैं, पब्लिक ने भी कहा । रायट्स भी हुए, उर्दू भी खत्म की गई, कोई अच्छा काम नहीं हुआ, प्रोक्योरमेंट भी ठीक नहीं हुआ, गल्ला नहीं मिला, बीज नहीं मिले, कोई काम नहीं हुआ 8-10 महीनों में । लेकिन इलेक्शन होगा तो बोट कैसे लेंगे । इस लिए करते कुछ थे और बाहर निकल कर दूसरी बात करते थे । यह गाड़ी कितने दिन तक चल सकती थी । मैंने सुना नहीं है हिस्टरी में किन्हीं भी खाने वालों में, पंसा इकट्ठे करने वालों में फूट न हुई हो । इस तरह गाड़ी चल नहीं सकती थी । यह मैं मानता हूं कि इसमें कोई उसूल नहीं था, कोई सिद्धांत नहीं था, सिर्फ ऊपर ऊपर के कपड़े थे । हिस्सा बांट करने के लिए कोई रास्ता ठीक नहीं था, इस लिए पार्टी टूटी ।

एक मामला और हो गया । इस हद को पहुंचे कि फाइनल डिपार्टमेंट ने कह दिया कि एक स्टेप आगे बढ़ें तो तीन महीने के बाद

[श्री हयातुल्ला अन्सारी]

पहली तारीख को हम तनख्वाह नहीं बाट सकेंगे। गवर्नमेन्ट यहाँ से टूटी। एस० एस० पी० ने बहाना ले लिया कि वादे पूरे करो। एक वादे के कल का खून उनकी जेब पर था, उर्दू वाले वादे का, लेकिन वे चेहरे बदल सकते हैं, पब्लिक में जा सकते हैं। इस बारे में यह गवर्नमेन्ट बहुत अच्छी है। खुद ही गलतियाँ करेंगे, लेकिन कोई शर्म नहीं आएगी। खून चेहरे पर मल लेते हैं, लेकिन सुर्खी नहीं आती। सब लाल नज़र आ रहे हैं, मगर समझ रहे हैं कि हम गोरे हैं। इस तरह कहीं गाड़ी चल सकती थी? एस० वी० डी० की गवर्नमेन्ट टूटी है, इसलिए कि हर पार्टी दो किस्तियों पर सवार थी, एक इधर जा रही है, एक उधर जा रही है, समझती थी कि हम चमत्कार दिखायेंगे। तमाशा यह हुआ कि सुबह यह तय किया कि चरण सिंह हमारे लीडर हैं और पर्चा भेज दिया गवर्नर के पास, शाम को तय किया विकल लीडर होंगे, उनका पर्चा भेज दिया। दो-चार पार्टियों ने कहा हम इनके साथ नहीं हैं। यह कैफियत है, बताइए किसे मानें। इतनी बड़ी मेजारिटी किसी पार्टी की नहीं थी कि किसी पार्टी के इधर या उधर होने पर उसकी मेजारिटी मानी जाती। एक के लिए कह दिया कि ये चीफ मिनिस्टर होंगे, उसके पास सौ भी आदमी नहीं हैं, लेकिन जब चीफ मिनिस्टर कह दिया, पार्टी लीडर मजूर किया गया तो बारगेन करने की पावर मिल जायगी, दो मिनिस्ट्रियाँ तुम्हें देंगे, दो मिनिस्ट्रियाँ तुम्हें देंगे यह कह कर वह खरीद सकता है।

श्री बिमलकुमार मन्नालाल जी औरड़िया:
जैसा राजस्थान में हुआ।

श्री हयातुल्ला अन्सारी : एस० वी० डी० पार्टी नहीं है, 8 पार्टियों से बनी है 8 पार्टियों का अलग-अलग प्रोग्राम है, अलग नाम है, अलग करेक्टर है, हर एक पार्टी कहती है कि हमारी राय यह है, हमारी राय यह नहीं है। आज ही मैं पढ़ रहा था कि मेरठ के अन्दर कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी ने और एस० एस० पी० दोनों ने कहा है कि हम एस० वी० डी० की जोड़न नहीं करेंगे।

यू० पी० का किस्सा तो मैं बयान कर चुका हूँ। मुझे हर स्टेट का बयान करना था लेकिन अब नहीं कर सकूँगा, क्योंकि वक्त नहीं है। इस रिजोल्यूशन में जो कहा गया है कि कास्टीट्यूशन के मुताबिक नहीं हुआ, गड़बड़ पाई गई है, वैसे कोई बात नहीं है। यह हो सकता है कि थोड़ी सी मेजारिटी वाली सबसे बड़ी पार्टी कांग्रेस को मौका नहीं दिया बारगेन करने का, इनमें से किसी को दे दिया कि तुम बारगेन कर लो। गवर्नर बहुत अच्छा है, उसने कोई गड़बड़ नहीं की, गवर्नर का राइट था, गवर्नर की ड्यूटी थी जो उसने किया। इस लिए मैं समझता हूँ कि कोई गड़बड़ नहीं हुई है और इसलिए मैं इस रिजोल्यूशन की मुखातिफ करता हूँ।

श्री निरंजन वर्मा (मध्य प्रदेश) :
आदरणीया उपसभापति जी, वास्तव में सदन के सामने बड़ा गम्भीर प्रश्न है, जिसमें व्यक्तियों की या दलों की राय पर नहीं चलना चाहिये और न ही इस प्रश्न को इस प्रकार लाया जाना चाहिए। यह बहुत ही नाजुक प्रश्न है। अभी दो-तीन भाइयों ने बहुत हल्के दिल से विचार करने का यत्न किया।

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA) in the Chair.]

भाई हयातुल्ला जी ने लखनऊ की कहा-निया सुनाई, आज लखनऊ और बनारस की कहानियों की आवश्यकता नहीं है।

श्रीमन्, पहले मैं विरोधी दल का नेता था एक रियासत में। उस समय से मेरी धारणा यह बन गई है कि मुसलमान भाइयों में से 95 प्रतिशत भाइयों में शायद ही कोई ऐसा होगा, जो उर्दू के बारे में और मुसलमानों पर जुल्मों की कोई चर्चा न करे। हम हयातुल्ला भाई से यह निवेदन करना चाहते हैं कि उर्दू भाषा उनकी नहीं है हमारी भी भाषा है और उसे हम अपनी भाषा समझते हैं फर्क थोड़ा सा है और वह इतना है...

श्री हयातुल्ला अन्तारी : मैंने जिन्दगी में कभी नहीं कहा कि उर्दू मुसलमानों की भाषा है।

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : आपकी इस कृपा के लिए धन्यवाद। आपने कहा कि उर्दू भाषा के बारे में जनसंघ ने यह किया, वह किया। मैं निवेदन करता हूँ कि जनसंघ का दृष्टिकोण सुन लीजिए। भाषा हमारी है, शत-प्रतिशत हमारी है। आप अरबी लिपि को हटा दो, चाहे तामिल की लिपि रख दो, बस उर्दू हमारी भाषा है, कोई अन्तर नहीं है।

इसी प्रकार और दूसरे मित्रों ने जो बातें कहीं हम उनसे यह निवेदन करना चाहते हैं कि यह प्रश्न बड़ी नाजुक स्थिति में जा रहा है कि केन्द्र और राज्यों के

आपस में संबंध कैसे रहे। जो आदरणीय मित्र यहाँ विद्यमान हैं, उनके सामने हम कुछ पहले की घटनाएँ रखेंगे। आधे सप्ताह में रोम का साम्राज्य था। रोम का साम्राज्य इसलिए मिटा कि वहाँ पर आपस में लड़ाई हुई और वहाँ के प्रांतों के लिए अधिक अधिकार मागे गए। ठीक उसी प्रकार से...

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : वर्मा जी, साम्राज्य की बात नहीं है, यहाँ पर डेमोक्रेसी है, न सम्राट है, न साम्राज्य है।

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : मित्र याजी, उस समय रोमन साम्राज्य था, था गणतन्त्र के पहले और उसके बाद, इसलिए मैं निवेदन कर रहा हूँ। उसके पश्चात्.....

एक माननीय सदस्य : राजा थे।

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : राजाओं की बात नहीं है। प्रजातन्त्र की सुन लीजिए, अमरीका में गृह युद्ध हुआ। वह इसी प्रश्न पर हुआ और थोड़ा बहुत गृह युद्ध नहीं हुआ, लगभग 20 वर्ष तक चलता रहा। इंग्लैंड में जहाँ अच्छी डेमोक्रेसी है, वहाँ भी स्काटलैंड और वेल्स के लिये किस प्रकार के अधिकार दिए जाय, इसके बारे में झगड़ा हुआ और रूस के कम्युनिस्ट देश में वहाँ का सुल्तान इत्येब नाम का जो अच्छा ऊँचे दर्जे का कजेन 4 P.M. का रहने वाला था, उसने पेन-टर्किश आटो-नौमी के लिये यत्न किया। और उसके दाहिने हाथ स्टालिन ने उसको गिरफ्तार करवाया था। तो यह प्रश्न कोई साधारण स्थिति का नहीं है। हम चाहते हैं कि और जनसंघ की विचारधारा वाले जितने हैं, कहते हैं कि केन्द्र को पूरी सत्ता रखनी चाहिये, जब केन्द्र के हाथ में से अगर सत्ता थोड़ी बहुत

[श्री निरंजन वर्मा]

जायगी तो सारे प्रान्त अलग अलग अपना राग अलपेगे और अपना अपना करिश्मा दिखायेंगे लेकिन श्रीमान् इस के बाद भी कि केन्द्र के पास बहुत अधिक सत्ता रहे, तब भी केन्द्र की संचात्मक शासन में कुटुम्ब में पिता का कर्तव्य वहन करना चाहिये, जैसे एक पिता है वह पूरी गृहस्थी चलाता है, किसी के प्रति अन्याय नहीं करता, उस तरह अगर यह उत्तरदायित्व केन्द्र चलाता रहे और अपने हाथ में सत्ता रखता रहे तो किसी प्रकार की लड़ाई झगड़ा हो नहीं सकता, लेकिन हमें दुख है कि केन्द्र ने अपने उस व्यवहार को कुछ नीचे कर दिया। उदाहरण के लिये आज की नहीं आज से पांच सात वर्ष पहले की बात मैं करता हूँ हमारे याजी भाई, जो बड़े पुराने राजनीतिज्ञ हैं वह अपने व्याख्यान में, यदि उनका कभी समय आया तो उत्तर दें कि केरल में जब वहाँ पर कम्युनिस्टों का बहुमत था तो वर्तमान की प्रधान मंत्राणी महोदया ने वहाँ जाकर के बहुमत को बदलने का यत्न किया और उसके बाद राष्ट्रपति के शासन को लगाने के लिये पूरी कोशिश की। यह एक हस्तक्षेप हुआ।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : कांग्रेस के वक्त भी राष्ट्रपति शासन वहाँ हुआ।

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : उसके पश्चात् राजस्थान का उदाहरण है। राजस्थान में इससे ज्यादा और क्या हो सकता है कि राजस्थान की असेम्बली से सारे माननीय सदस्यों को यहां लाकर जैसे कि प्राथमिक शाला के बच्चों को गिनती पढ़ाई जाती है उसी तरह से 1, 2, 3, कर कर के उनको 93 गिना दिया गया, जब वे राष्ट्रपति को मिलने के लिये गये तो 93 आदमियों ने

हस्ताक्षर कर दिया और अटल जी के यहां पर जब एक ग्रुप फोटो हुआ तो वहां भी पूरे 93 आदमी थे, किन्तु इसके पश्चात् भी केन्द्र ने अपनी सत्ता का दुरुपयोग करके वहां पर असेम्बली को तो समाप्त नहीं किया लेकिन वहां पर पूरा का पूरा तंत्र अपने हाथ में लेने का यत्न किया। ये दो घटनाये हुईं और तीसरी घटना बंगाल की है, चौथी बिहार की और पाचवीं घटना उत्तर प्रदेश की है। और उसके बाद भी केन्द्र किस प्रकार के हस्तक्षेप करता है यह मैं निवेदन करूँ। यहां पर हमारे प्रदेश के एक हमारे मित्र मंत्री हैं, मैं उनकी बड़ी इज्जत करता हूँ, आयु में मुझसे छोटे हैं और विद्वान हैं लेकिन क्या यह उचित है कि केन्द्र का कोई मंत्री प्रान्तों में, राज्यों में जाय और वहां पर कहीं कहीं डाकुओं के बारे में कहीं पुलिस सुपरिन्टेण्डेंट के बारे में और कहीं पर किसी हरिजन या आदि-वासी को भड़काने का कोई काम करे.....

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरङ्गिया : पुरानी आदत नहीं गई।

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : यह सम्भव नहीं होना चाहिये। इतना संतोष रखना चाहिए कि अगर 20 वर्ष तक आपका राज रहा तो छः महीने के लिये या एक साल के लिये दूसरा भी राज कर ले, अगर कोई करने लगे तो आपको नाराज नहीं होना चाहिये। यह प्रजातंत्र है।

श्री विद्या चरण शक्ल : सब बोलना भी बन्द है।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : जो बुरा है उसको कहेंगे।

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : ... ऐसा नहीं कि प्रजातंत्र में किसी की सत्ता हमेशा के लिये ही रहेगी।

श्री शील भद्र याजी : वहाँ जाकर वहाँ की बात कहेंगे ही ।

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : याजी जी को उत्तर देने में हम सक्षम नहीं हैं, उनको तो बहुत अच्छा उत्तर एक विरोधी सदस्य श्री भूपेश गुप्ता दिया करते हैं, हम उनको उत्तर देने में सक्षम नहीं हैं । श्रीमान्, यह प्रजातंत्र है, जिस प्रकार कि बगीचे में भिन्न भिन्न प्रकार के फूल और भिन्न भिन्न प्रकार के पेड़ रहते हैं और बगीचे की शोभा इसी में है तो प्रजातंत्र में सब प्रकार के राजनीतिक-तंत्र फलते फूलते रहें, लेकिन यह यत्न करना कि अधिक से अधिक हमारी पार्टी का ही शासन रहे, हम समझते हैं कि यह प्रजातंत्र के विकास के लिये सबसे खतरनाक तरीका है और उसे सहन नहीं किया जाना चाहिये । यहां हमारे काँग्रेसी मित्र हैं, हम भी मानते हैं कि बहुत से काँग्रेसी मित्र विद्वान हैं, बहुत से ऐसे मित्र हैं जिनका 25 वर्ष से अधिक का राजनीतिक जीवन है और हम यह भी समझते हैं कि ऐसा भी नहीं है कि वे सब बातें जानते न हो वे सब जानते हैं, लेकिन व जरा हृदय पर हाथ रख कर विचार करे कि देश में अकाँग्रेसी प्रजातंत्र के जो राज हैं उन को मिटाने के लिये उन्होंने कितना कितना किया है । अगर ये सारी की सारी बातें बतानी हों तो श्री हयातुल्ला अंसारी साहब ने तो शाहनामा पढ़ कर सुना दिया था और मुझे तुलसीकृत रामायण ही सुनानी पड़ जायगी जिसकी कोई आवश्यकता नहीं है । पिछले दिनों यहाँ पर इस प्रकार के बहुत से कार्य हुए और अगर उन कार्यों का जिक्र किया जाये तो कोई भी निष्पक्ष आदमी और कोई भी राजनीतिज्ञ इसी परिणाम पर पहुँचेगा कि केन्द्र और प्रान्तों दोनों के सम्बन्ध कटुता के होते चले जा रहे हैं और उसी का यह परिणाम है श्रीमान्, प्रान्तों में स्वायत्तता अधिक दे दी गई और केन्द्र से वह नहीं संभाला गया तो जब एक प्रान्त में संविधान

जलता है तिरंगा झंडा जलता है तब दूसरे प्रान्त भी हाथ से निकल जायेंगे यह बात सही है लेकिन इस के बाद भी अगर केन्द्र हस्तक्षेप करता चला गया और छोटी छोटी बातों पर वहाँ के मंत्रीमंडलों को बर्खास्त करने के लिये तैयार हो गया और यही ध्यान रखा कि इनका ही, काँग्रेस का ही मंत्रिमंडल बन जाय अगर केन्द्र की यह मनोकामना रही तो देश में यह प्रजातंत्र का सफल प्रयोग नहीं है यहाँ पर निश्चित रूप से प्रजातंत्र मिट जायगा । इन 9-10 महीनों से जब से कि भारत वर्ष में दूसरे प्रकार की काँग्रेस की विरोधी विचार धारा वालों के राज आये तो काँग्रेसी यह सहन नहीं कर सके । हम तो काँग्रेस के मित्रों से कहते हैं, पूछते हैं और याजी जी से खास तौर पर पूछते हैं वह बतावें कि 1937 के इलेक्शन के बाद जब काँग्रेस ने पाँच प्रान्तों में मत्ता खो दी वह हार गये और कहीं पर कृषक मजदूर पार्टी, कहीं पर जमींदारों की पार्टी नेतृत्व में आई उस वक्त श्रीमान कहां चले गये थे ? उनको आप नहीं मिटा पाये । बंगाल का हाल आपको मालूम है पंजाब का हाल आपको मालूम है और दूसरे स्थानों का हाल मालूम है लेकिन उस समय आपकी ताकत नहीं थी, शक्ति नहीं थी, इसलिये अपने सिर पर हाथ रखकर, उन को सिर पर बैठा कर के 1947 में हिन्दुस्तान और पाकिस्तान का बंटवारा कर दिया । अगर यह बात उस जमाने में आपके सहन करने की, धैर्य करने की हुई तो फिर हम आपसे निवेदन करते हैं कि अब घबड़ाने की आवश्यकता नहीं, धैर्य धारण कीजिये और जो यह कहते हैं कि आठ आठ या दस दस पार्टियों को मिला कर के यह भानुमती का कुनवा है उनको यह नहीं भूलना चाहिये कि काँग्रेस का राज जीवन पर्यन्त तक कभी रह नहीं सकता, कभी भी ससार में एक ही मत्ता का राज नहीं हुआ और हम तो कहते हैं कि 1947 में

[श्री निरंजन वर्मा]

कांग्रेस सत्ता में रही उस से कुछ लाभ हुआ और वह लाभ यह हुआ कि अगर एक ही सत्ता का राज भारतवर्ष में नहीं होता तो पूरे देश में, भारतवर्ष में, अनेक प्रान्तों में अनेक स्थानों में जो एक ही तरह की स्थिरता थी, एकता थी वह नहीं रह पाती निश्चित रूप से कांग्रेस को उसका श्रेय है लेकिन उसके साथ साथ अब कांग्रेस बिखरने वाली भी है और जो लोग कल तक यह कहते थे कि कांग्रेस मिलाजुला मंत्रिमंडल नहीं बनायेगी उनको भी अब से बड़ी पार्टी इमर्ज होने के बाद भी मंत्रिमंडल अकेले न बना कर इस पार्टी या उस पार्टी के मिले जुले मंत्रिमंडल का साथ देना पड़ा ।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : 1937 में भी क्या आसाम में कोनीशन गवर्नमेंट कांग्रेस ने नहीं बनाई थी ?

श्री विमल कुमार मन्नालाल जी चौरड़िया : यह तो पुरानी आदत है लेकिन फिर भी कहते हैं कि भानुमती का कनुवा, जोड़ा ऐसा किया वैसा किया ।

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : ... मनुष्य की सब से बड़ी कमजोरी क्या है ? यूनान के दार्शनिक ने मनुष्य की सब से बड़ी कमजोरी को बताया है, उन दार्शनिकों ने कहा है कि मनुष्य की सब से बड़ी कमजोरी यह है कि वह नहीं समझ पाता कि उसका सब से ऊंचा शीर्ष समय कौन सा है कौन सा सब से ऊंचाई का काल है वह हमेशा समझता है कि जिस स्थान पर है उससे और आगे बढ़ेंगे लेकिन होता यह है कि सब से ऊंचा जो स्थान है उस तक पहुंच कर वह अगले साल, अगली बार, एक दम से नीचे गिरने लगता है । तो मैं यह अपने मित्रों से कहना चाहता हूं । यह बात तो

निश्चित है । जो बुद्धिमान हैं उनको इशारा काफी है, वह लड़ते झगड़ते नहीं क्यों तर्क करते हैं, अपना भविष्य आप देखें ।

अगर आप चाहते हैं कि कांग्रेस केन्द्र में जिस प्रकार पहले भी, सारे प्रान्तों में जिस प्रकार पहले थी उसी प्रकार अब रहने वाली है तो ऐसा नहीं होगा । अब तो आपके हाथ से सत्ता निकलती जा रही है और अगर इस सत्ता को आप रो रोकर दूसरों को कष्ट देकर, गालियां देकर दोगे तो आपकी इसमें उच्चता नहीं है । हमारे प्रान्त में हमारे मुख्य मंत्री जी श्री द्वारिका प्रसाद मिश्र जी के हाथ से सत्ता निकलने लगी तो उन्होंने ऊपर से नीचे तक एक एक इंच, जल जल कर, मर मर कर, सत्ता को जाने दिया । इस से उनकी शोभा नहीं हुई । इससे तो चरण सिंह जो हजार गुना अच्छे आदमी हैं जिन्होंने सत्ता को ठुकराया दिया और उन्होंने यहां तक कहा कि मैं आप के द्वारा मुख्य मंत्री चुनने के बाद भी मुख्य मंत्री बनना स्वीकार नहीं करता ।

(Interruptions)

श्री विमल कुमार मन्नालाल जी चौरड़िया : मीठा मीठा गप कड़वा कड़वा थू । हम अच्छा बोलेंगे तो पुराने कांग्रेसी हो, बुरा बोलेंगे तो जनसंघी हो ।

श्री निरंजन वर्मा : मैं श्रीमान, इसी बात की आलोचना कर रहा था कि आदमी को यह व्यर्थ का मोह छोड़ देना चाहिये । यह गद्दी का मोह जब तक रहेगा तब तक भारतवर्ष का शासन अच्छा नहीं चल सकता और जब यह शासन का मोह छोड़ दोगे तो परमात्मा की कृपा से आप में बुद्धि की कमी नहीं है और अगर वह त्याग आ जाय, तो इस देश का बहुत भला हो सकता है ।

शब्दों के साथ जो यह प्रस्ताव है उसको उस संशोधन के साथ में जो हमारी पार्टी की तरफ से दिया गया है, मैं अपना समर्थन देता हूँ ।

DR. (MRS.) MANGLADEVI TALWAR (Rajasthan): Sir, a very long debate has taken place on the present Resolution. Therefore, I move....

Shri G. MURAHARI (Uttar Pradesh): We have given certain names.

DR. (MRS.) MANGLADEVI TALWAR: that the question may now be put.

(Interruptions)

SHRI V. M. CHORDIA: She can move, we can oppose and you can support us.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): I think we have had a long discussion on this. Each party has taken part in this.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया:

यह इतने महत्व का प्रश्न है । प्रजातन्त्र के मूलभूत सिद्धांत इस में निहित है और ऐसी स्थिति में सब का विचार जानना अत्यावश्यक है ।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : हम भी इस पर बोलने वाले थे लेकिन हम त्याग करते हैं । क्लोजर होना चाहिये ।

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया: आप के पास कुछ बोलने के लिये नहीं है ।

SHRI P. C. MITRA (Bihar): Under the rule, if a closure is moved, the Chair has to take the opinion of the House.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया: मैं तो पहले इस बात को चाहूंगा कि चेयरमैन साहब इस को इस वक्त हाउस की ओपीनियन जानने के लिये को नहीं रखें । सदस्य महोदया ने अपना प्रस्ताव इस लिये रखा

है कि वे समझती हैं कि इस पर काफी चर्चा हो गई । मैं समझता हूँ कि वे अपने प्रस्ताव को वापस लें (Interruption) आप बीच में बोलते क्यों हैं, समझ में नहीं आता है । आखिर हम को भी अधिकार है कुछ बोलें, नहीं तो बैठ जायें । तो मेरा यह निवेदन है कि इस से अधिक महत्व का प्रश्न यह है कि इस में अपने सदन से भिन्न-भिन्न सदस्यों का विचार जानने का अवसर मिलना चाहिए । दूसरी बात यह है कि साधारणतः जब कोई शासकीय प्रस्ताव होता है तो उस में व्हिपिंग वगैरह चल सकती है । इस में तो कोई व्हिप का सवाल नहीं है। कई माननीय सदस्य शाहे-नामा पढ़ सकते हैं, कई तुलसीकृत रामायण का उदाहरण देते हैं । मगर इसके साथ-साथ जो मौलिक बातें हैं उनका वर्णन आता है । इसलिये मैं माननीय सदस्यों महोदया से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि वह अपना प्रस्ताव वापस ले लें । अगर वह वापस न लें तो मैं सदन के सदस्यों से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि उन के प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार नहीं करें । इस पर जो अच्छा विषय है वह हमारे प्रजातन्त्र के सिद्धांतों पर प्रकाश डालने वाला है, हमारी भावनाओं को मजबूत करने वाला है । दूसरा प्रस्ताव सम्भवतः माननीय सदस्या महोदया का है इस लिये बे चाहती हैं कि उन का प्रस्ताव आए लेकिन यह प्रस्ताव उन के प्रस्ताव से कम इम्पोर्टेंट नहीं है, और कम से कम इस प्रस्ताव के बारे में जो मोस्ट इम्पोर्टेंट हैं, मूवर महोदय, वह अभी गैर हाजिर हैं.....

श्री ब्रज किशोर प्रसाद सिंह : माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, आपने अपील की जो प्रथा चलाई है मैं उस प्रथा का अनुकरण करना चाहता हूँ । आप जानते हैं हमारे देश में स्त्रियों को कितने ऊंचे आसन में बिठाया गया है

[श्री ब्रज किशोर प्रसाद सिंह]

और हमारे ये मित्र भारतीय संस्कृति के बड़े भारी पृष्ठपोषक हैं। हमारे यहाँ कहा गया है :

“यत्र नारास्तु पूज्यन्ते रमन्ते तत्र देवता”
 आज जितना दृष्टिकोण है, जो भी कुछ बात कही जा सकती है, वह इस बात पर कही गई—जैसे कोई बोहा है :

“तत्त्व तत्त्व सुरा कही,
 तुलसी कही झूठी ;
 बची खुची सो कबिरा कही,
 और कही सो झूठी ।”

अब जो कुछ कहना था वह कहा गया उसके बाद जो कहेगा वह झूठा होगा।

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया :
 यानी हमारे मंत्री जी जो कहेंगे वह झूठा कहेगे।

श्री यिद्याचरण शुक्ल : हम बोल चुके हैं उसके ऊपर पहले ही।

श्री ब्रज किशोर प्रसाद सिंह : इस लिये मैं कहूँगा कि वास्तविकता का ख्याल रखते हुए और भारतीय संस्कृति, जिस का नारा वे सदा बुलन्द करते हैं उसका ख्याल करते हुए, माननीया सदस्या के प्रस्ताव से महमत होंगे और उनका प्रस्ताव लैप्स नहीं हो, इस में उनकी मदद करेंगे।

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया :
 इस बहस को 5 मिनट कम 5 बजे तक चलने दिया जाय।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): We have been discussing the Resolution for the second day and Members from all parties and of all shades of opinion have already spoken.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (West Bengal): I have not yet spoken. Mr. Chandrasekharan has not spoken yet.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया :
 प्रमुख पार्टियाँ तो अभी बोलने से रह गई हैं।

श्री शीलभद्र याजी : भेजने श्रद्धा० के० पी० सिन्हा ने जो अपील की उस पर ध्यान नहीं देते हैं तो इस मामले पर मीटिंग हो जानी चाहिये।

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, different points of view have been sufficiently placed. Now, we from the Opposition have to speak. Just now, we observe that the different parties have placed their points of view.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: No.

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA: As far as the Congress is concerned, the Right Communist Party is concerned and the Jan Sangh is concerned, it is all right. Now, nobody from these parties should speak. We, who have not yet expressed ourselves, should be allowed to speak. That we have said. That is the point that you should know how the different persons and parties feel about this Resolution.

SHRI KOTA PUNNAIAH (Andhra Pradesh): It is very difficult for all Members to express their opinions on all these matters. We have had enough discussion on this Resolution. It would be proper and better that Mrs. Mangladevi Talwar's Resolution should come up.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Either we go by agreement or we continue this. She may move the Resolution. After ten

minutes, I can say that enough discussion has taken place. It is a matter of opinion. Therefore, let this go on for a while—we are also interested in that—till 4.45. We are all sympathetic. Here there will not be any reply. Therefore, that time can be utilised for moving that Resolution. We are quite prepared.

(Interruptions.)

SHRI CHITTA BASU : There is an amendment in my name and so far I have not been given the chance of explaining my point of view with regard to this Resolution and my amendment. How can you pass over me?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA) : I think Shri Chitta Basu has given notice of an amendment. So, I think at least he can speak, if the House agrees.

SHRI CHITTA BASU : It is not a question of agreeing or not. I have got the right to explain my amendment.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : Unless by a Resolution the House changes the business, the House will tolerate. Let Mr. Chitta Basu speak. We shall make it possible for the hon. lady Member to move her Resolution .. (Interruptions.) You will move it.

SHRI G. H. VALIMOHMED MOMIN : The motion is to be put before the House.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA : May I suggest a compromise that the Resolution may be taken up latest by 4.45? Let us have this compromise.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : You want to put it to vote? Somehow or other it gets talked out. Sir, my position is quite clear. We need not quarrel in this matter. I would like the other Resolution of the hon'ble lady Member to come because on that Resolution she may have her point of view and we have our point of view.

SHRI G. H. VALIMOHMED MOMIN : There are speakers on this side also. Let there be no discrimination.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA) : I think we can go on with this Resolution till 4-45 after which we will take up the other Resolution.

SHRI G. H. VALIMOHMED MOMIN : What about her motion, Sir?

SHRI CHITTA BASU : The motion was not allowed.

DR. (MRS.) MANGLADEVI TALWAR : Sir, since I will be allowed to move my motion today at 4-45 P.M. I agree with the arrangement.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA) : Mr. Chitta Basu.

SHRI CHITTA BASU : Mr. Vice-Chairman, I rise to support the Resolution standing in the name of my hon. friend, Mr. Bhadram. While supporting this Resolution I have also moved an amendment in order to give it a much more concrete shape so that the Government may act upon the Resolution, if passed. I do not read out the amendment as such.

Sir, you know that after the last general election there has been a phenomenal change in the intra-spectrum of Indian politics in many States. Non-Congress Governments have been brought into being while at the Centre the Congress has been in power. Apart from any other factor today, this very single factor necessitates the reappraisal of Centre-State relationship and the re-assessment of the relationship between the States and the Centre on the basis of the new condition that has been brought about. Sir, in this respect two vital aspects of the Centre-State relations are to be dwelt upon. The first is the office of the Governor, its role, its function, its power, its loyalty and the Constitutional obligations that the Governors of the States are to dis-

[SHRI CHITTA BASU]

charge. And another point is the financial relation between the States and the Centre.

Sir, as far as I am concerned, I do not dwell upon the particular aspect of the Centre-State relation which is connected, more or less, with the office of the Governor because this great House has had an opportunity of discussing the matter in this perspective. Something has happened throughout the country, particularly in West Bengal, Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Haryana etc. That being so, the Centre-State relations have been adequately discussed in this House and I do not like to discuss this aspect of the problem here in this House today. I will more or less limit myself to that particular aspect which relates to the financial relation, between the Centre and the States, and in arriving at any definite conclusion in this matter I would like the House to bear in mind the particular characteristics, the particular peculiarities of the Constitution of our country that we have today. I think it will be noted by all that our Constitution, which is a written one, has got elaborate provisions about many problems of the country, and what I feel is that in the Constitution there are unitary trends largely pronounced and also the federal spirit embedded in it. It is a debatable point whether there should be the unitary system or a federal system. Without entering into that debate, I am to say that the present Constitution as it is today has unitary trends and also certain federal spirit embedded. Let there be a harmonious blending between this unitary trend and also the federal concept. But to my horror and dismay that federal spirit of our Constitution is being thrown away; the Constitution is being robbed of that spirit, and the power that be at the Centre is taking certain steps which instead of retaining the federal character of the Constitution is becoming more and more unitary in its functioning. That being the case, naturally the Centre-State relations are gradually becoming strained which will ultimately bring the ruination of the parliamentary institution that we have got in our country today.

Sir, I feel that in our Constitution there are certain provisions which particularly

discuss the financial relations of the Centre and the States. They are given in articles 268, 270, 272, 269, 275 and 282 of the Constitution. And in this matter I can show you with enough figures at my disposal that many States now say that their State economy cannot be run in a proper way unless the Central Government comes out with much more financial aid, and in the whole matter, I am constrained to say, the financial assistance of the Centre has all along been just adjusting the budgetary need of the States or helping in certain ways to finance the developmental plans of the States. In that respect some discretionary grants and loans are given. I am constrained to give you certain figures which will show the large amounts of money which are involved in the matter of transfer of Central resources to the States. I quote from the Memorandum on the Central Budget of the current year. In this it will be found that Union taxes and duties come to Rs. 370 crores, 23 per cent. of the total earnings. Statutory grants come to Rs. 149 crores, that is, 9 per cent. Other grants are 18 per cent. and loans etc. are 50 per cent. That being the case, it will be quite evident that for the States' finances a large amount comes from the Central Government either by way of loans or by assistance. But these loans and assistance are simply on the basis of discretion, and this discretion is exercised sometimes on political consideration.

If you permit me to say something, to quote certain opinions given by certain State Governments, I will quote the opinion given by the Governor of the Madras State.

In Madras State, in the last Budget Session, the Governor said. "It is the firm view of my Government"—that is Madras Government—"that in the light of the experience in the last 15 years a high level review of the provisions of the Constitution dealing with the delimitation of the resources and powers as between the Centre and the State is essential." And if I am allowed to quote the opinion of the West Bengal Government, it will be astonishing to see what grievances the West Bengal Government has got against the Centre with regard to financial assistance. I will not read

out the whole portion I will only quote a certain portion where it has been said "It will appear that West Bengal has got only Rs 35 crores for her special needs over and above what is admissible to her on population basis, whereas Andhra Pradesh has got Rs 77 crores, Gujarat Rs. 47 crores, Madhya Pradesh Rs 102 crores, Madras Rs 60 crores, Mysore Rs 87 crores, Punjab Rs. 68 crores, Rajasthan Rs 105 crores and U. P Rs 86 crores, over and above what is admissible to these States on population basis" Sir herein lies the case. Rightly or wrongly certain States feel that in the matter of financial assistance, justice has not been done to those particular States. I am in possession of the opinions of various State Governments, but my approach is not a parochial approach, it is not a regional approach. I want simply to highlight the problem and say that there are certain States which will be perfectly competent to raise this question. And this question has not been raised only by the State Governments alone. This opinion was expressed even by the Finance Commission itself. If I am allowed to quote from one of the reports of the Finance Commission, you will find that they are also in favour of having some re-assessment and re-appraisal of the allocation of Central assistance. Dr. P. V. Rajamannar says in his report of the Fourth Finance Commission "After fifteen years of working of the provisions of the Constitution during which period four Finance Commissions have been appointed, I think the time is ripe to have a review of the Union State financial relationship, particularly in view of the setting up of a Planning Commission"

Sir without indulging in any further quotations, what I want to bring home here is this, that the situation is such not only on the question of political issues, but also on the question of financial allocation that there should be a re appraisal and re assessment in these relations between the Centre and the State. And that can only be done if the Government is pleased to think that there should be a complete re-assessment, a complete reconsideration, of the relevant provisions of the Constitution dealing with the

Centre-State relationship, and for that purpose, under article 263 of the Constitution, there is a provision that the President may appoint such an inter-State Council in order to discuss and recommend a method by which the Centre State relationship can be improved. On that line, I move this amendment and I think the House will do well if it considers it and accepts it.

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I will first read out the Resolution for the purpose of developing my argument in support of it. "This House is of opinion that the Union Government should ensure by statutory provisions that its authority and power are not liable to be used for weakening and undermining in any manner the well established ways of Parliamentary democracy or the autonomy of States" Mr. Vice Chairman; Sir, there are two parts in this Resolution. The first part is that there should be statutory provisions. To that one may say "There should be no statutory provisions, we should go on merrily as we are doing now." I can understand that opposition. But I believe that there is none in this House who can refuse to agree to the second part of this Resolution. The second part of the Resolution is that the "Central Government's authority and power are not liable to be used for weakening and undermining in any manner the well established ways of Parliamentary democracy or the autonomy of States." Is there anybody even on the Congress side who can get up and say "Yes, the Central Government is here to weaken Parliamentary democracy or the autonomy of the States?" I believe that so far as this part is concerned, they would also support the Resolution. If they say that they are opposed to it, then they have got to say "We support dictatorship." Unless there is anybody here to support dictatorship and oppose democracy everybody has to agree to the second part of the Resolution. Unfortunately the real meaning of this Resolution has not been properly understood, considered or highlighted. So I appeal to the Members of the House that if we believe in democracy, we should support this part of the Resolution and also the other part, namely, that there

[SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA]

should be statutory provisions to ensure what we all believe the Central Government should not do. If we do not have statutory provisions, where does it lead us? Mr Vice-Chairman, Sir, on the 14th of November, 1967, before the West Bengal Government headed by Ajoy Mukherjee was dismissed, I issued a statement which was circulated by P.T.I. and published in all the regional papers at least. I warned the Governor against dismissing the Ministry on the basis of an advice given by the Law Ministry of the Government of India. I said in advance, seven-days before he dismissed the Ministry, that he would be responsible for a Constitutional crisis. Mr. Vice-Chairman, we had a Constitutional crisis and to-day we are having President's rule in the State of West Bengal. What for? Because the Governor did not heed my warning, because the Centre advised him to dismiss the Ajoy Mukherjee Ministry. Heavens would not have fallen if the Governor had waited till the 18th of December. Mr. Ajoy Mukherjee said that because of procurement, they could not call the session earlier and that they should wait till the 18th of December. If the Governor had waited, then there would not have been a ruling of this nature by the Speaker, defection by Sankardas Banerjee and Ashutosh Ghosh and ultimately the collapse of the Government elected by the people. Mr Vice Chairman this is not the only instance. The Rajasthan instance is there. It was just the reverse there. Here the Governor felt satisfied subjectively, without waiting for the mandate of the House and dismissed the Government. In Rajasthan every man was shown to the President but the Governor was not satisfied. See the difference. In one State, there was Congress Government. In the other, it was a non-Congress Government. If this thing persists, in this way, the States will not have any respect for the Central Government which is necessary. It is imperative to keep India together, to maintain the unity of the country. Otherwise, you will be responsible for the destruction of the unity of India and raising fissiparous tendencies in the different States, leading them to claim more and

more power for the States and sometimes leading them to say "We should be separated from the Centre," and encouraging separatist tendencies. So I am giving a warning to the Congress Members that unless this Resolution is passed, unless things are done according to the spirit of this Resolution, it will be a danger of which we should take full note in advance.

SHRI P. C. MITRA. Mr. Vice-Chairman, the Resolution has been drafted in such a way that nobody can apparently object to some portion of it. As for instance "its authority and power are not liable, to be used for weakening and undermining in any manner the well established ways of Parliamentary Democracy or autonomy of States." None of us would like to weaken Parliamentary democracy or autonomy of States. But what is the underlying object of bringing forward this Resolution? This indicates that probably the Union Government is interfering in the well established ways of parliamentary democracy or the autonomy of the States. Under the Constitution there is a statutory provision about the Centre-State relations. So we cannot support this Resolution as it has been drafted. I think no valid argument has been put forward by any Member to show that the Union Government took any step to weaken and undermine the well-established ways of parliamentary democracy or the autonomy of the States as envisaged in the Constitution. Rather I must submit that the Centre was a silent onlooker of complete erosion of law and order and the provisions of the Constitution in some of the non-Congress States during the last ten months. I can give many instances. When the Naxalbari happenings took place, the Centre did not interfere. The then Chief Minister of West Bengal came here and took certain powers from the Home Ministry so that he could seize the weapons from some of the persons who were violating the law.

Besides that, who started these defections? (*Interruptions*). After the general elections they tried to lure certain Congress Members who could never aspire to be Ministers and Chief Ministers and

they knew that if they remained in the Congress they would never become Chief Ministers. So they lured them. Now with what cheek they say that the Congress has started the defections? In four States they made Congress defectors as Chief Ministers. Incidentally I may state that it has been observed that often parents ignore or tolerate mischiefs or unjust demands of a naughty child. Such children always think as of right they must get bigger and more bigger sweets and when those sweets are denied or taken away from them legitimately, they start crying and howling like anything. The same attitude is shown by these people when defectors, started from their ranks, then began howling as if the Constitution has been eroded. In the case of West Bengal I would just like to quote what Shri Ajoy Mukherjee had said on October 2. (Interruption) He made draft of a letter which has to be sent to the Governor. That letter is dated October 2, 1967. (Interruptions)

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA. Sir, Shri Ajoy Mukherji is not a Member of the House. He cannot read it.

SHRI P. C. MITRA. It is not an unauthorised pamphlet which I am reading. It has got publicity in 'Current'. (Interruptions) You must have the patience to listen. You want only bouquets, you must also be ready to get some brickbats. (Interruptions) It has been clearly stated here as follows:

"But after the election, the verdict of the people was clearly in favour of the formation of a United Front Government to serve the people. In accordance with this verdict, these 14 parties formed the United Front. Some of these parties have more or less the same ideologies and objectives, while others have different objectives."

(Interruptions)

Shri Ajoy Mukherjee, continuing, writes

"But still they formed the United Front Government in the hope of working together in the service of the State on the basis of an 18-Point Programme. However, after working together for the last six or seven months, it is becoming clear that they cannot work together, chiefly because of the Left Communist Party and its allies. From their professions and their action, it is obvious that they have no faith in Parliamentary democracy and they are exploiting their position in the Ministry and in the Legislature only to further the interests of their own parties. For this they do not hesitate to commit assaults on the workers of other parties, coercion and even arson."

Is it not a fact that the PSP and the SSP had raised a hue and cry about the assaults made and murders committed of their partymen? Then it says,

"A basic principle of parliamentary democracy is joint responsibility of the Cabinet, in other words a Ministry has to take full responsibility for Cabinet decisions. But it has been noted that the Left Communist Party does not hesitate to disown responsibility even for decisions unanimously reached with full support of their own Ministries."

Further it says, if they get power,

"Thousands and thousands of houses, schools, temples, mosques and churches will be burnt to ashes and lakhs of people will be killed; many will lose their parents, their children, their husbands and wives."

Within the CPM (Communist Party, Marxist), again an Ultra-Left group has emerged, which is openly supporting China, shouting slogans like 'Mao Tse-tung Zindabad', 'Mao Tse-tung Lal Salaam'."

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): Please resume your seat, Mr. Mitra.

SHRI P. C. MITRA: Sir, they said many things about Bihar. It is unfortunate that Mr. Kaul referred to it as impropriety of the Governor in nominating Mr. B. P. Mandal in the Council . . .

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): Please resume your seat, Mr. Mitra.

SHRI P. C. MITRA: Now Mr. B. P. Mandal was in the United Front Ministry for about six months as an S.S.P. member though he was an M.P. Nobody raised any question about that.

(Interruption)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): We have decided to go on with this only till 4.45 P.M. and we have already exceeded by a few minutes.

SHRI G. MURAHARI : Our Party has not spoken on this. I would request you to call Mr. Chandrasekharan and he will finish before five.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): Mr. Mitra can speak for two more minutes and after that Mr. Chandrasekharan will speak.

SHRI P. C. MITRA: What happened in Bihar? They only castigated four Governors but did not castigate Mr. Ananthasayanam Ayyangar who was a former Governor of Bihar and who knew that the Mahamaya Ministry in Bihar had no majority in the Assembly for months but he did not even advise the then Chief Minister to call the Assembly to test his strength. So they did not say a single word about him because that served their purpose but they objected to Mr. Kanungo's action. Mr. Kanungo acted very constitutionally and nobody can take any

exception to it. So long as there is a constitutional provision that the leader of a party or parties who commands a majority in the Assembly is to be called to form Ministry, how could he refuse to ask Shri Satish Prasad Singh to form his Ministry? How could he refuse to accept the advice of the then Chief Minister not only the Chief Minister but the then Cabinet headed by Mr. Singh, to nominate Mr. Mandal as a member of the council? How could he refuse to call Mr. Mandal to form a Ministry, on the resignation of Mr. Singh when Congress Dal alliance had elected him as their leader as, under the Constitution, the leader of the majority party should be called? So he had to call Mr. Mandal to form a perfectly constitutional Ministry. So long as this Constitution is there, you cannot say that he acted in any way unconstitutionally.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA) : Anybody wanting to speak?

SHRI K. CHANDRASEKHARAN (Kerala): No. Sir, I will forego. . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA)) : We have now some amendments before us.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : No voting. It should be held over and let the other thing come because first of all we would like to say that one group has not been represented, the S.S.P. which is an important group and they are entitled to have fifteen minutes.

SHRI K. CHANDRASEKHARAN : It is not a question of my not wanting to speak but I do not want to speak for five minutes only.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Hon. Members opposite felt that we should accommodate Dr. Talwar and although we disagree with her Resolution, out of courtesy we said we would accommodate.

Let this Resolution be held over and let her move her Resolution. Later we will revert to this. You can do that. You had the discretionary power. We are not insisting on the vote. That is the best way. Alternately he should be allowed to speak for fifteen minutes. He can speak for seven minutes now and later he can have another eight minutes, whichever way you like.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): Fifteen minute's time is the maximum time for which an hon. Member can speak and normally, if it is the maximum limit, one can speak in 5 or 10 minutes. We can even sit five minutes longer.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : We do not sit longer.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): If you do not want to accommodate your colleague....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: There is no rule that the vote must be taken. We held over and after Dr. Talwar has her full say on her Resolution, if we have time, on the next non-official day we shall revert to this otherwise this will lapse. We are ready for it. The accommodation should be mutual.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): We will vote on the amendment before we take up the next Resolution. We want to dispose of this Resolution now and then take up the next Resolution.

SHRI G. MURAHARI: Then we will speak on the amendment.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA) : The House decided that we would have discussion only up to 4.45. There was a closure motion before the House . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No closure motion.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): There was a motion before the House.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: There is none. If anybody moves it, let it be debated.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): I think the understanding was this.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA : Mr. Vice-Chairman, you took the sense of the House and the general agreement among the Members was that the debate on the present Resolution will conclude at 4.45 and after that the other Member, Dr. Talwar will be allowed to move her Resolution and even Mr. Gupta signified his consent to that. As far as this particular Resolution is concerned, it should be treated as talked out. There is no need for taking a vote on it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We agree.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: But if the rules provide—as far as I am concerned, I do not object to its being talked out—that a vote has to be taken, the you or I cannot help it. If the House wants it to be talked out and if the rules do not prohibit that, I have no objection but if the rules provide that a vote has to be taken, then you or I cannot help. We have to go according to the rules.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: My friend is very accommodative and I appreciate it Mr. Shukla has shown a great gesture. He nods approvingly and I also nod approvingly but the difficulty is this. The first difficulty is....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA) : We have had plenty of discussion on this. If you want to sit beyond five O' clock....

HON. MEMBERS: No.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We shall
see.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): There is nothing to see. If the House wants to sit after five, then this can go on.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You can always, with the consent of the House, extend the House till twelve in the night. There is no contention about it. There is no question....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): It is questioned because the time is drawing nearer.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Mr. Shukla has raised a very interesting point. He says that he is agreeable to treat it as a Resolution that is talked out. I fully sympathise with him and I agree with him because otherwise we would like to accommodate Dr. Talwar's Resolution despite the fact that we have got very great disagreement over it. Now what are you going to do? You see the consequence. Where is the rule? Will you read it?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): Under which rule?

SHRI A. M. TARIQ (Jammu and Kashmir): He is just marking time.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): There is no question of marking time. I would request the Member to say what his submission is and under what rule he is doing it?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Under what rule you are asking for it? Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is in your discretion. You 5 P.M. have the right to change, you have the right to make us sit longer of course. You are right; I agree. Now the Government, now the Treasury Benches are agreeable as you have seen, and Mr. Shukla for once has been accommodating my friend

अभी विमल कुमार मन्नालाल जै रडिया जब यह तय हो गया था कि 4 बज कर 45 मिनट पर यह "टाक आउट" हो जाय तो हमको यह मान कर चलना चाहिये।

(Interruptions.)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I own no responsibility for its not coming. It is now 5 O'clock and the House cannot sit.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): I have already said that if the House desires we will have to sit longer. Is the House prepared to sit longer?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): Is it the wish of the House that we should sit longer? Is it the wish of the House that today the sitting be extended by fifteen Minutes?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, according to my watch it is already past 5 O'clock. It will be irregular to sit any longer, and even if we sit, first will come the amendments to this. The first amendment will be put a division taken. Then the second amendment will be put and a division taken. Then the third amendment will be put and a division taken, and so on. Leaving aside all that, it is already two minutes past five of the clock and we cannot sit any longer today. Therefore you adjourn the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): The House has a right to sit longer.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, not on a non-official day unless . . .

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY: After 5 O'clock the Chair has no authority; it should have been done before 5 O'clock.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): Is it the sense of the House that we extend the sitting by fifteen minutes?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, no, we cannot sit.

SHRI MULKA GOVINDA REDDY :
After 5 O'clock it is not proper to put it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We should adjourn now; the Resolution will be continued on the next day. Now we do not want to sit. My submission is simply this. On a non-official day non-official business, under the rules and by convention, starts at 12 O'clock and ends at 5 O'clock; no more.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: We may benefit by the experience of Mr. Kaul.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: After that, as you know, at 5 O'clock Government sometimes take up official business. Therefore, after 5 O'clock only official business you can take up, no non-official, private Member's Resolution. Now, if the Government has any official business, we are ready for it. Since they have none today you cannot prolong the House any more. If you do, you will be acting against all rules. The House should be adjourned now and things carried over to the next non-official day meant? For the business, and we assure Shrimati Mangladevi Talwar that next time we shall go out of the way to accommodate her. What can we do? They did not accept our proposal. Even Mr. Shukla's suggestion was not accepted. Are we to blame. We cannot sit any more Mr. Vice-Chairman, I formally submit; is there any Government business before the House? If there is no Government business, why are you not adjourning the House? Is it because it is a Congress Member's Resolution? Why are you not adjourning the House? The non-official business day today is already over.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): Have you finished with your submissions? Please resume your seat. Well, the position before the House is this that a Closure Motion was moved....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, no Closure Motion; who moved it?

SHRI G. MURAHARI: Where is the Motion? Nobody moved it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): Let me finish. Please listen. The hon. Member, Mr. Bhupeah Gupta, was not here when this happened.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, Mr. Vice-Chairman; no Closure Motion. Where is the Closure Motion? Who moved it?

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): Will you please listen? Please listen. Shrimati Mangladevi Talwar moved a motion for closure of the debate at about 4 O'Clock after which there was some discussion from both sides of the House, and it was suggested that she should be allowed to introduce her Resolution, and as a consensus it was agreed that this should be allowed to be done but that the debate on this Resolution should proceed till a certain hour, and it was on that understanding that we proceeded on with the debate on this Resolution. And now the assurance that the House has given by agreeing to Shrimati Mangladevi Talwar introducing her Resolution stands.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, you cannot do it that way. Now Mr. Vice-Chairman, I invite your attention to the rules. Kindly see rule on 'Closure', rule 244. This is 244.(1):

"At any time after a motion has been made, any member may move, "That the question be now put . . ."

Well, we never heard anybody say "That the question be now put". It proceeds further to say:

"...and unless it appears to the Chairman that the motion is an abuse of these rules or an infringement of the right of reasonable debate, the Chairman shall then put the motion "That the question be now put".

[SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA]

Please look up the proceedings. You never put that motion "That the question be now put". How do you say then that it is a motion for closure? You never said it, "That the question be now put". Then, putting it to the House you take the verdict of the House on it. You have to take opinion of the House by saying "Those who are in favour say 'aye'; those who are against say 'no' and then, if the voice is predominantly in favour, you say, "The ayes have it; the ayes have it." You will have to say all this. Did you do all that? No, nothing of the kind; nothing of the kind you did. The same rule further says in the proviso:

"Provided that the Chairman may allow any member any right of reply which he may have under these rules."

Therefore, in a Closure Motion there is the right of reply. And the right of reply arises only when there is a debate. You did not allow even a chance for a debate on the Closure Motion. Therefore, none of the requirements in rule 244 had been met. Now you are right when you say that you went by consensus. But that is no Closure Motion. Therefore Mr. Vice-Chairman, I beg of you, please do not take cover under rule 244. If you say that there was a consensus we say we agree there was consensus. But if that consensus has not materialised despite my efforts and the efforts of my esteemed friend, Mr. Shukla, it is somebody else to blame. Neither Mr. Shukla is to blame for it, nor we are to blame for it. With all that, Sir, now we are hungry and tired. The day is over. Please adjourn the House and let us all go. Otherwise, everything you now do will go on record in the proceedings. People will see what you have done after 5 O'clock, will see that you had conducted private member's business. Therefore, I appeal to you to adjourn the House. It is already time and adjournment of the House for the day is the only thing left.

श्री महावीर दास (बिहार) : एक मिनट
 मैं भी दो मिस्टर भूपेश गुप्त जितने ग्राम-
 सेन्ट कर रहे थे सब सुन रहा था। सब से

पहली बात यह है कि उन्होंने 'जन्टिलमेन्स एग्जिमेट' में बाधा डाली। दूसरी बात यह है कि श्री भूपेश गुप्त हाऊस न चले इस के लिये रूल के रूल आपके सामने पेश कर रहे हैं। उनका महत्व तो खत्म हो गया लेकिन मेरी बात का महत्व खत्म नहीं हुआ, और इस लिये नहीं हुआ कि Before 5 O'clock, I moved the resolution for extension of time and so I have full right to ask what happened to it. Did it go unheard?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): I had taken....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA : I do not quarrel with them; they are unnecessarily angry with me.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA : The Chair should be allowed to speak. When you are on your legs Sir, other Members should not intervene. You should be allowed to speak. You should be allowed to speak when you are on your legs.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): Well, I think we should proceed on with the voting on this. The House has already agreed to proceed with this and then..... (Interruptions).

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, no, Mr. Vice-Chairman; we cannot accept that position. Despite all our sympathies for Shrimati Mangladevi Talwar's Resolution we cannot accept the stand you are taking. We will not allow this position. How can we? Do you expect us to violate the rules?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): We are not violating any rules.

SHRI G. MURAHARI: It is now after 5 o'clock and we must adjourn.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You know, the other day Mr. Akbar Ali Khan adjourned the House. So now adjourn the House.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): Well, I shall now put amendment No. 1 to vote.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, no, it would be illegal; it is illegal; it is illegal; it is illegal, and if you do, the House will have no confidence in the Vice-Chairman because of his violation of the rules, and I will have to move that the House has no confidence in this Vice-Chairman. You cannot have it that way. You cannot have it against the rules. We have been arguing against such a procedure. You have to show a precedent for it. If you can show one instance from these proceedings of fifteen years I shall submit to you, I shall apologise to you. If that is not so and still you adopt this line, we will move a motion here that we have no confidence in you.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: Mr. Vice-Chairman, the House is master of its own procedure. The House can decide to sit even beyond 5 O'clock if it is the pleasure of the House....

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: ...and if you decide, you should give a clear ruling. My submission is that you should give a clear ruling and then take the House on according to your ruling, and not mind the interruptions by other Members.

SHRI A. M. TARIQ: Here is Mr. Kaul who can enlighten us.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You cannot tell me under which rule you proceed on. Please understand the position, Sir..

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS (Orissa) : Sir, May I ..

SHRI A. M. TARIQ: Let us hear Mr. Kaul.

SHRI BANKA BEHARY DAS: Yes, but after I have made my submission. I will not take long. Last year it so happened that I had a motion to be moved and at 5 o'clock the Minister was replying and though other Members were agreeable to sit beyond five and discuss

my motion the Treasury Bench objected to it and said that on a non-official day the convention was that beyond five they would not take up a non-official business. Therefore, my motion did not come up. That being the case such a convention had been established last year and my humble request is that that convention should not be broken now because of some people's convenience or inconvenience.

SHRI YASHODHA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Shri Bhupesh Gupta is right. Unless a formal motion is put before the House, the House cannot take up a closure motion. But a gentleman's agreement was there and that agreement has been broken. Anyway, if the House is willing to allow her to move her motion she can do so. Otherwise it cannot be done. Neither a formal motion was moved nor a formal motion seconded.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA :
No seconding is necessary.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The House can adopt a motion waiving that rule and then will agree to do it.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: There was no formal closure motion. But then we did have a gentleman's agreement and everybody said that they would sit and at 4.45 they would allow her to move her motion. And then others were allowed to speak. That is what happened. Now, in all fairness let us not be technical. If the House agrees let it allow her to move her motion. Otherwise if we are to go only by the rules we cannot do it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Only the rules will obtain now. Suppose this Resolution comes up fifteen days later the heavens are not going to fall. Blame us, if you like but ..

(Interruptions)

श्री हयंतुल्ला अंसारी : श्री भूपेश गुप्त दो घंटे से बोल रहे हैं।

AN HON. MEMBER: A Congress Member was speaking.

श्री हयातुल्ला अन्सारी : मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हाऊस पांच बजे के बाद भी चल रहा है तो इसका मतलब यह हुआ कि हाऊस कांटिन्यु कर रहा है। . . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI G. MURAHARI: Actually Mr. Ansari was wasting the time.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We sincerely meant it and that is why we all remained here. Unfortunately things took a different turn. Blame us if you like. Criticise us, but you cannot now take up any other business except by a resolution of the House waiving the rule. In that case that motion or resolution seeking to waive the rule will be the subject-matter of discussion. Of course, do it and we are prepared to sit up to 12 mid-night even. But that also should have been done before five o'clock. I am surprised we are still continuing here. Many times we have not been able to move resolutions the same day. What is the harm if we do not move that resolution today?

(Interruptions)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): Order, order. Dr. Mangladevi Talwar wants to say something.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We want to hear Mr. Kaul.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): Yes, Mrs. Talwar.

DR. (MRS.) MANGLADEVI TALWAR: It was, I think, unanimously decided upon or agreed—it was a gentleman's agreement—that hon. Members would sit and I would be allowed to move my Resolution at 4.45 P.M. or at 4.50 P.M., it did not matter whether 4.45 or 4.50 Mr. Vice-Chairman,

that was decided and hon. Members on both sides of the House had agreed. But then they were speaking for the last half-an-hour and over and if they had not spoken so much, Mr. Vice-Chairman, I would have been given five minutes for moving my Resolution. I may now be allowed to . . .

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Then in future also we will do it. Why do you want to take that responsibility?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): Let her finish.

DR. (MRS.) MANGLADEVI TALWAR: Now the House has been sitting for the last so many minutes, for about fifteen minutes or so beyond five. So I request you, Sir, to kindly, permit me to move my Resolution. It will not take more than a few minutes.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: But the House has no business before it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): Hon. Members themselves had agreed.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Many agreements take place which do not materialise. You can discuss it and apportion blame. You may blame us.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): Mr. Gupta and others said that the procedure followed in this House is that a Resolution might not be voted upon and Mrs. Talwar may be allowed to move her Resolution. That was the position and you agreed to it I ask . . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI G. MURAHARI: Mr. Chandrasekharan should be allowed to speak. You are going back on promise.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): No, I called Mr. Chandrasekharan.

SHRI G. MURAHARI: Yes, but only when there were 5 minutes left.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): You should accommodate her for a few minutes. What do you say, Mrs. Talwar? Why don't you speak?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, no. Today we cannot have it. We are prepared to have it today provided on every Friday the same thing is allowed and we are allowed to move our Resolutions. If your office agrees, let it be done. Any way, an exception is being made now.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): No exception is being made.

(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, you are confused. We never said that this motion should not be voted on.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): I think you are going back on the assurance.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: The assurance was not on voting. The assurance was that she would be accommodated and we do stand by that assurance. Let us have it on the next non-official day. That is what we say. She will be accommodated.

SHRI M. N. KAUL: Sir, as I understand the position—I was not here at that time—there was a unanimous decision or a consensus in the House that the Resolution which was under discussion should be disposed of at 4.45 and after that the hon. Member should be allowed to move her Resolution. That was the agreement. Actually what happened was—I was not here at that time—at 4.45 this agreement was not enforced. Nothing happened at 4.45. So factually the result is that at 4.45 what should have happened according to that agreement, did not happen. And then according to . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: A Congress Member was speaking.

SHRI M. N. KAUL: The third factor is that the House was scheduled to sit up to five o'clock. But as a matter of fact we have gone on discussing beyond five. These are the facts which you have to consider and say whether in these circumstances that agreement can be enforced without the House being further consulted.

AN HON. MEMBER: No more necessity for consultation.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That was up to 5 o'clock. Nothing more now.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): Please sit down.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You can waive the rule by a Resolution.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM NIWAS MIRDHA): Please sit down. Could I have my say? As I just now stated, the position was that at 4.00 or thereabouts one hon. Member, Mrs. Talwar, moved for closure. That closure motion was not taken up. Instead, there were some Members who participated in the discussion giving their opinions. It turned out that there was a consensus in the House to debate this motion till 4.45 and after that Mrs. Talwar would be allowed to move her motion. But as it turned out, that consensus did not work out. Because even if the Members gave their consent at that time they are not going to stick to it at a later stage. Whatever the reasons the consensus as it is has failed and we revert to the position as to whether Shrimati Talwar should be allowed to move her Resolution or not. It is no use going on debating like this. We proceeded on the basis of a consensus and if the consensus is sought to be—I would not say torpedoed—denied or if the consent of the various parties were to be taken back from what was a consensus at that time I do not think there is any use in proceeding with this.

discussion. All procedures, whether by way of consensus or whether they are proceedings, can go on only if all the parties in the House co-operate. I do not think we can decide this matter by merely debating one way or another. Consensus is a matter of spirit; it is a matter of compromise and if one steps out of it and says that we do not agree and brings up the rules it means we revert to the position as it obtains under the Rules of Procedure. I do not think

there is any idea in proceeding with this discussion, I wish we had proceeded according to consensus. Unfortunately I have no choice but to adjourn the House to meet on Monday at 11.00 A.M.

The House then adjourned at twenty one minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Monday, the 4th March, 1968.