

श्री राजनारायण : क्या कहा ?

श्री सभापति : मैंने यह नहीं कहा ।  
क्या कहा आप देखियेगा ।

श्री राजनारायण : ठीक है । तो मैं बताता हूँ । जो भी आप कहें, टेबल पर नहीं रखेंगे मगर भाषण के साथ कहेंगे ।

श्री शकबर अली खान : नहीं ।

श्री राजनारायण : नहीं क्या है ?  
आप देखेंगे । यू विल सी जस्ट नाऊ ।

#### THE BUDGET—(GENERAL DISCUSSION) (RAJASTHAN), 1967-68

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): Mr. Chairman, I am grateful to you for calling me to speak after such great excitement. Let us travel from the neighbourhood of Raj Bhavan to Rajasthan.

SHRI B. K. P. SINHA (Bihar): From Mr. Rajnarain to Rajasthan.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No. Mr. Rajnarain is my friend. He is my friend always. You are trying to divide us, but it will never happen. I need not agree with him on everything. Now, Mr. Chairman, this should have been discussed today in the newly elected Rajasthan Assembly and it is most unfortunate that this Parliament is called to discuss a subject which is intimately and almost exclusively the subject of a State of the Indian Union, in this case, Rajasthan. Therefore, I protest against the manner in which the Union Government has encroached upon the autonomy and the constitutional rights of the people of Rajasthan and in particular of the State Assembly. As you know, there is the guiding principle that there shall not be any taxation without representation, which was popularised by the freedom fighters and pioneers of democracy in the

United States of America. Here it is not a question of voting any taxes, but Budget matters and financial matters of this kind are to be considered by the representatives of the people of a particular State and sanctioned by them. That power has been taken away, even for a short time, if you like, from the people of Rajasthan and from their elected representatives constituting the State Assembly by this Government for no other reason than that of serving their narrow partisan ends. I charge this Government with political malice, with political vendetta, with political bad faith all along the line, in dealing with the Rajasthan affair. I have been personally associated with the various representations that have been made over this matter to the President of India. It is well known that I am poles apart ideologically and politically from the Swatantra Party or other parties which have formed the coalition or the Samyukta Dal. We have only one member in the Rajasthan Assembly. He does not belong to the Samyukta Dal, but at the same time he has abundantly made it known to the Governor and to the President personally that in the formation of an alternative non-Congress Government, his support and vote should be courted on the side of the Samyukta Dal, so that there is no difficulty whatsoever in an invitation being given to them to form a Government. That has not been done. The Governor has acted in a manner which, to put it mildly, is wholly improper and per haps unconstitutional. The Governor, in his press conference of March 4, said that he did not take into account the votes of the independents. He should have taken into account the votes of independents in counting as to which side has got how much support. Why did he not do so? He should have taken them 'into account as the other State Governments have taken them into account.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

Therefore, again, it was an arrangement to suit the ruling Congress

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] Party, when it discounted the independents in calculating which side or which party or which leader has the majority behind him. Therefore, the whole thing has been done in dramatic manner, with the utterest bad faith, in a scandalous way which is unworthy of a Government which goes by the name of parliamentary government. How was it done? In the elections the Congress Party did not receive fit majority in Rajasthan, as in many other States in the country. It was a magnificent demonstration by the brave people of Rajasthan that they turned down the Congress from office or wanted to turn it down and voted against Congress power. Do I take it from this equally that they were voting for the Rajas or the Maharajas or supporting Ranis and others in their reactionary programme? I do not come to that conclusion. It was a rightful anger, indignation of the masses let down in the course of twenty years of unbroken Congress power which led to the debacle of the Congress in the last general election all over the country. The great Rajasthan people stepped into the scene with majesty and marched forward with the rest of the people in order to bring about nemesis to the Congress Party. Therefore, it is a verdict of democracy as far as the people are concerned. If today certain reactionary parties want to take advantage of this situation, it is our misfortune in the sense that we of the left democratic organisations are weak there and not strong enough so that we can claim the title to leadership of an alternative government or be in a position to form a government. But that is no reason why the Swatantra Party should not be allowed to form a government. The verdict of democracy has to be respected,

whether it suits yoti or not. That is why we of the Communist Party, despite our very serious differences with the Swatantra Party, take the

stand that at least in the formation of the Government, our name should be counted on the anti-Congress or non-Congress side. So, 93 votes in the Assembly were clear. To the Rashtrapati Bhavan 93 MLAs came and presented themselves to the President personally, when they constituted the majority. Mr. Chavan was present and so was I. Mr. Chavan could not challenge these people or the correctness of their representation, but yet we were told that there is doubt about the majority. As far as the Congress Party is concerned, it believes in double standards. It is a wholesaler in double standards. I do not know of any party in the world's parliamentary system which believes in double standards in the manner in which the Congress Party believes in and practises. In Kerala in the mid-term election of 1965 the Marxist Communist Party was returned as the single majority party. It was never invited to form a government by the Governor, even though all the other Opposition parties supported the leader of the Marxist Communist Party and demanded that he be invited to form the government. Why was he not invited? Because at that time it was a question of a non-Congress Government coming into existence. And what happened? They even dissolved the Kerala Assembly in order to satisfy their ego, their hatred, their animus against the Opposition. The result is that the Congress Party has now been reduced to a minority of nine members in the Kerala Assembly. Well, the people have punished them. I have no doubt in my mind that people will punish the calumniators, the traducers of democracy who sit here, whether in Rashtrapati Bhavan or in the Central Secretariat, whether in the South Block or North Block, whenever another chance comes. But a crime has been committed. I think, Madam Deputy Chairman, there should not be any provision in the Constitution empowering the Governor to dissolve in this manner

or suspend in this manner any elected Assembly. The President cannot suspend the Parliament. Why should the Governor be in a position to suspend the Assembly on the orders of some people? That is what I ask. Therefore, I think that the Rajasthan episode has emphasised the need of an amendment of the Constitution so that the Governor does not have any such Power,

Madam, it was open to the Governor to allow the leader of the Samyukta Dal to form a Government and ask him to face the Assembly. The Assembly should have been summoned, but it was not. Why the Assembly was not summoned, I ask. We are told that the Assembly could not meet and before that the proclamation was issued. If that is so, in many parts of the country you would be justified in issuing a proclamation and suspending the Assembly. I am glad that the Congress Members are not saying that the West Bengal Assembly should be suspended for two months or so because there was some breakdown of law and order for a few hours in Calcutta. I am glad they are not saying that. But what a logic. It is very difficult to argue with these Congress people. They are arrogant; they are impervious to commonsense. The power-drunk people have not learnt a lesson even after their debacle in the elections. I even hate to argue anything with them. You can argue with a stone wall and in the end it sees sense but never can you gain anything by arguing with these hapless people who control the Union Government. I know how it has come about. I tell you even at the Secretariat level they were not in agreement. Whereas some Secretaries were opposed to this kind of proclamation, Mr. L. P. Singh, I understand, was in favour of this proclamation. That is how they behave. I say this thing because the bureaucracy runs the country. The more inefficient the Ministers are the

greater the scope for the bureaucracy, because they suffer from an inferiority complex, these Congress leaders, when they stand before an I.C.S. or I.A.S. officer. But see how we behave with those officers in West Bengal and other places. We make them realise that it is their duty to serve the nation and to pursue democratic policies. Government shall be a responsible, popular Government but by no means a bureaucratic Government. That is how we should behave, but here the party Ministers, who by chance and for factional and other reasons have come to occupy the Treasury Benches, go by the advice trotted out to them by the case-hardened bureaucracy. But I will not blame the bureaucracy because they do not contest the elections. I blame Mr. Chavan, I blame the Prime Minister, I blame the whole lot of them who behave in this manner and ride roughshod over the parliamentary institutions. Madam, it is nothing short of conspiracy in Rajasthan. It seems they are interested in allowing a lot of time to Mr. Sukhadia to buy up people, to corrupt people, to indulge in political seduction and kidnapping so that they can claim a majority. I understand that the time is being given to Mr. Sukhadia so that he can come here or go to the Governor to tell him that now he has arranged it and he could be called to form the Government. That is my fear. That is the apprehension of everybody. Therefore, I see that the continuance of this proclamation is in the interest of the Congress Party alone and for no other's interest. We repudiate this kind of thing. I think such people should be impeached. Mr. Sampurnanand should have been asked to resign and should have been asked to go elsewhere. Still he continues there as partyman. Every bit of his being he is a partyman. We know how after Mr. Kamaraj's clarification that the largest single party should be invited to form the Government immediately the Governor chose to dance to the

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] tune of the High Command, and Mr. Sukhadla was invited and even after that he could not form a Government. Such a man should not be allowed to hold parliamentary institutions to ransom in this manner. He should be asked, on the contrary, to be content with the opposition now forming the Government and with facing the opposition on the Treasury Benches and occupying their place in the opposition. That is how they should behave.

Madam, how the State Governments are functioning I will tell you. Some days ago Mr. Annadurai made a serious charge. I may draw your attention to what appeared in the Hindu on the 30th March. Mr. Annadurai made a charge that the Bhaktavatsalam Ministry, the outgoing Congress Ministry which had been defeated in the elections, which was in office for the twilight period, that Bhaktavatsalam Ministry removed certain files of the Home Ministry under the State Government to the Union Home Ministry here. This allegation was made by no other man than the Chief Minister of a State. Please note it. He said files which belonged to the Home Ministry of the Madras Government were being taken away by a Government which had been defeated, which was in office pending the formation of the new Government, to New Delhi to the Union Home Ministry. It was a crime. It was a crime against the Constitution. If you refer to the Seventh Schedule of the Constitution, you will find that Police is a State subject and all the files are the exclusive possession of the State Government. Nobody has a right to take them away, and yet that was being done. It was theft, and theft is no less a theft even if it is committed under the camouflage or cover of the Constitution. After that allegation had been made by Mr. Annadurai, Mr. Bhaktavatsalam, the defeated Congress Chief Minister, the great Congress-leader, in-Tamil-nad, found things going hot, and he has come out with a statement. I invite your attention to his statement.

to what he has said. Mr. Bhaktavatsalam has said: "Files had not been shifted to New Delhi but these files had been destroyed on my order". Well, this is what he says. Here again according to the Times of India of today, Mr. Bhaktavatsalam, former Chief Minister of Madras, had said that he had ordered that files relating to the anti-Hindi agitation in the State need not be kept. Then he gave his precedent. He said that when the British Government handed over power to Congressmen, all papers relating to Congressmen involved in the freedom movement were not made available to the new Government. Thus Mr. Bhaktavatsalam justified the burning of the files. Madam Deputy Chairman, such are the men, these are the constitutional buccaneers sitting in positions of authority.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You should speak on Rajasthan.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: This is what is going on. I am coming to that. This is very relevant. That is what happened to the files. Therefore, I say that they are doing this kind of thing. Madam Deputy Chairman, it is vandalism. I think Mr. Bhaktavatsalam in order to cover up the Centre said that he had burnt the files. Whether the files had been transferred to the Centre or burnt, in one case it is theft; in the other case arson and vandalism. In both cases—such persons are liable to prosecution. I do not know the constitutional details of the law. But can a Chief Minister who had been defeated, before he quits office, order the burning of files? Suppose Mr. Bhaktavatsalam ordered that the Secretariat of Madras shall be burnt, would he be free from prosecution for arson? No. He would have been prosecuted. The Chief Minister was acting beyond his code of employment, outside his capacity and jurisdiction. Therefore his action amounts to participation in the destruction of public property.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please speak about Rajasthan.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I would ask Mr. Annadurai—Madam, please do not interrupt, I am coming to Rajasthan—to consult competent lawyers as to whether Mr. Bhakta-vatsalam, on the basis of the statement which he has made, could not be prosecuted for the destruction of public property. This is a matter to be seriously considered, not like any kind of revenge. But if this happens, what will happen by the time we finish 50 years of parliamentary career—no files will be found here. We will destroy some files, the Congress will destroy others and nothing will have been left if that practice is followed. Well, in British Parliament you cannot think of it. In our country nobody bothers about it, it seems. In England a report of this kind the publication of this report that an outgoing government for party reasons had destroyed files would have created almost a revolution. But here everything is smooth. Well I think the non-Congress Governments, whenever they come to Delhi—their Chief Ministers and others—should make it a point to take up the issue from a constitutional, political and legal angle, and apart from anything else consider the prosecution of those people responsible for the theft and burning of files. Madam, in West Bengal—the same thing is happening; in other places the same thing is happening. I know how they behave. The fifth columnists of the Central Government in the State Governments should be very carefully watched, namely, the administration. I know, when we were in Government in Kerala how the Home Ministry here planted some of their IAS officers, the fifth columnists of the Centre, who used to indulge in secret, clandestine correspondence, one of which came into our hands and we showed it to Mr. Gobind Ballabh Pant and Mr. Jawaharlal Nehru at that time. Now, therefore, who is in authority in Rajasthan? In Rajasthan the Congress is in authority. Governor's rule means nothing. It is a camouflage, it is the same official, the same Congress regime masquerading as the Gover-

nor's rule, which is running the show in Rajasthan. I should like to know—is that how they should take the electoral verdict? Is that how they should behave?

Madam, I am told that the Assembly will be recalled, that the Proclamation will be revoked. When? Here again, they have made it a prestige issue. The thing is, if they revoked it earlier, then it would look as if they are bowing to the people. But this arrogant Congress Government never likes to look as if bowing to the people unless the people kick them out completely. This is one thing.

Secondly, they are waiting for the Parliament session to be over and after the Parliament session is over, they will revoke the proclamation so that we do not get any chance of discussing the manner in which things have been done. Here is an attempt to bypass Parliament. Bypassing Parliament in this manner is again objectionable, if I may put it in that Way.

Therefore, Madam Deputy Chairman, the entire episode of Rajasthan shows that this Government is not in a position to reconcile itself to the verdict of the people. They will say, have we not reconciled ourselves today in West-Bengal, Kerala and other places? Of course, you will. Why won't you reconcile yourself with the verdict in Kerala when you have got nine members, where political seduction is impossible, whereas in Rajasthan or in UP. we see the Congress seducers coming up. What is happening in UP? From the Opposition, from the period of suspension, people had been sought to be bought; having bought them, they could not digest them, a revolt has started within their party. Now, it is shaking, Mr. Chandra Bhanu Gupta is shaking, his shop is about to be closed. This is how it is happening there. Therefore, you see, in Rajasthan, in Pondicherry, in other places, in UP., they are pursuing this kind of line, since the margin is small. You can try, whatever con-

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] stitutional advantages you can get, whatever authority you have got, in order that the Congress Governments can come back to power.

Madam Deputy Chairman, since we are discussing this, I regret that the President did not refuse his assent to the Proclamation. I say this thing. But here I am again on a constitutional point. I know, I will be told that parliamentary democracy means that the President is the constitutional head, and that the President must always assent to whatever is placed before him by the Council of Ministers. Normally, it is a sound proposition. But if a wayward Government violates the Constitution, if a wayward Government commits unconstitutional acts, if a Government in power places the narrow partisan interest above the interests of the nation and above democracy, then it is the duty of the President to invoke his full moral and constitutional authority. I am not saying any other authority, but he should take the moral authority. Cannot the President say, "If you do such a thing, find out another President. I shall not be here. I shall never lend my signature, for example, to the continuance of the emergency, to devaluation or to this kind of act as in Rajasthan?" It is always open to the President to say so. This Congress Party wants, to treat the Presidential office as if it 'is a glittering ostentation meaning nothing to the nation but serving their interests. One day, well, they will come to grief for it. I stand for the superiority of Parliament, I am second to none in upholding it. But I would not like the Presidential office to be made nonsense by the manner in which the Congress Party wants to use it.

Therefore, the time has come, I say, for us to seriously think as to how our President should function. With non-Congress Governments functioning in some States with 60 per cent and more votes going against the party which controls the Centre, the Presi-

dent of India must necessarily re | sent the mood and temper of our people. Electoral verdict is something that should not be disregarded at the Rashtrapati Bhavan. The President's mind should be applied to the Constitution, to the masses, to the constitutional processes as a whole, and if it is so, then it should be seriously thought of. What has been done in Rajasthan or sought to be done in certain other place is patently unconstitutional at least in spirit, if not to letter. It is a fraud on the Constitution. Hence, the President, as the defender of the Constitution, the protector of the Constitution, must come forward with his moral authority, play it in full measure so that he can restrain the hands of a partisan, unconstitutional, ill-advised and malic; Government. That is what should done.

Madam Deputy Chairiman, I said the same thing yesterday, I feel it again today,- and I would like to say it again in this context, that the time has come for us to find out such a President who would be watchful about this action of narrow party considerations, who would have sufficient faith and act from the point of view of democracy . . .

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI K. C. PANT): Madam, on a point of order. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta was so far skirting on the border line. But now he has said specifically that we should think of finding another President. Now I think he has gone beyond the limit . . .

AN HON. MEMBER: Presidential election.

SHRI K. C. PANT: ... by in directly casting a reflection on him.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have not said anything. Whether you find him or not, I am not giving any opinion. I am not at all bringing in any name, as you know. You are canvassing, some of you, for somebody or others. I have no candidate in mind.

SHRI K. C. PANT: The President cannot be discussed here.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Constitutionally, the Proclamation is issued in the name of the President and hence, I would like to suggest a President as would not oblige you the moment . . .

SHRI K. C. PANT: Mr. Gupta will allow me—when he says that the President has obliged us in this case against the spirit of the Constitution, that is an implied criticism of the President. That is not made. He cannot make it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Oh! yes. The trouble with you is this. My young friend Mr. Pant, I have crossed many swords in my time in the House earlier, during the last years of your father, but I hope he will gradually develop the acumen, skill and the parliamentary ability of his father, and if he had been alive today, he would have seen the point that I am making. Unfortunately, he is not there. But he is young, he is to grow old. But the trouble is that one young blood is got mixed up with very bad, old blood. Young blood, if it is to be good, should get a little isolated from the contaminated blood.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta, you are on a very delicate issue. No reflection on the President.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No, no. It is not delicate.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: On the principle laid down in the Constitution you make your speech.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: That article says, that the President should act on the advice of the Council of Ministers. Well, the question is whether it is binding. The convention says that it is binding. But suppose the advice is patently bad. Suppose a mad man is the Prime Minister of the country and he goes and says, I am ordering shooting at sight all over Delhi. Well, is the President to act on his advice? No.

Suppose a *banchcha* comes to cap-

ture the power in Delhi through elections somehow or the other and he advises the President on these lines. Can he say, "I will do that"? He will not. It is a very important principle. You are quite right, Madam Deputy Chairman. Recall the history of the Weimar Republic. After the World War it was one of the finest Constitutions ever written by a bourgeois jurist and a Constitutional lawyer for Parliament. The Weimar Constitution was not discarded by law or amended. It was subverted from within. The President, under the Weimar Constitution!, permitted the Prime Minister, or the Chancellor, as they called it, to violate it step by step. And when Hitler came he demanded complete violation in a particular manner which is open to doubt. He said he would go on violating it. The Weimar Constitution remained. The President remained and Fascism came; War came. Now, therefore, it is a matter of study for all Constitutional lawyers and political students and students of political science as to how the great Constitution with all its limitations was flouted and raped in the name of the Constitution and how the President was helpless and allowed the Fascist to take charge of the nation who committed the crimes humanity has never known. I am not saying that it is going to happen. But this is a very relevant point. Therefore, I say the President should not have issued this Proclamation, all the more so after we had presented 93 members of the Rajasthan Assembly at Rashtrapati Bhawan. Never such a thing has happened.

It was beyond all doubt that the Congress did not have the majority. After the presentation of 93 people at the Rashtrapati Bhawan, why did the President not ask Mr. Chavan to revoke the Proclamation? Why did he not advise the Government to revoke the Proclamation? In fact, why did the Government not revoke it? I will attribute it to; (i) partisan interest of the Congress Party, and (ii) taking the President for granted. I can give so many Presidential stories.

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] I have been here for 15 years. I have known Presidents also. But I would not give it. As you yourself said, it is a delicate subject as to how kitchen Cabinets are run.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Come to the issue, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I know you will also be shocked because I want this Congress to get out lock, stock and barrel. That is what is my mission in life. That is what I am here for. Therefore, I am not interested in their scandals and quarrels, in their fight for spoils of office, as you know.

Madam, Deputy Chairman, how could we have faith in this Government? Now this Government is bringing in Supreme Court retired Judges to executive posts. What will happen to this country? Why are they bringing Supreme Court Judges here for executive posts, Vice-Chairmanship, or Vice-Presidentship? Find other people, educationists and so on, independent people. But this is how they function. Even when we defeat a Minister, the ex-Finance Minister, Mr. Sachin Chaudhuri, immediately an appointment has to be found for him in England as the High Commissioner for India. Are we living in a Moghul Raj that all the women in the court, whom the Badshah loves must be admitted to the harem, must be a part of the harem? Are we living in a situation when all those who have been Ministers can never be commoners, that they must always be High Commissioners or Ambassadors or Governors or Up-Rashtrapati or some such thing? If nothing else, he must be the Chairman of the Reforms Committee. Have you reached the stage when you cannot think of anything except this, that you must always be in high positions? Is the talent of the country so wanting that you cannot find talent except from the circles of defeated Congress candidates or politicians or superannuated politicians of the ruling party? There is no decency left.

Therefore, Madam Deputy Chairman, I say and I say with regret that the President of India has been ill-advised by the Government. That is what I say. Therefore, the President, whoever he may be, should know how to stand up to the illegal, unconstitutional, partisan methods of this party that controls the Central Government or, for that matter, the Union Council of Ministers.

Finally, before I sit down, I would even now at this late hour request you to cancel the Proclamation, the only honourable thing to do. Immediately cancel the Proclamation. President Radhakrishnan should advise that if they cannot show probity, they should at least show common decency. Let this Government show common decency by revoking the Proclamation, by inviting the Leader of the Sam-yukta Dal to form the Government, by summoning at once the Rajasthan Assembly and allowing the Congress Party there to sit in the Opposition, and if they have got the support, topple the Government and get back to the Treasury Benches. I know the Treasury Benches is their first love. They love the Treasury Benches more than they love their wives and children, I can well understand their feelings for the Treasury Benches. They stick to them like the leeches. But let them for a while sit in the Rajasthan Opposition and see how we feel. After all, I am sitting here for the last 15 years feeling the agony and the suffering. Then if you have a majority, you can get back to the Treasury Benches. Therefore, Rajasthan is the acide test. Do not bring in another political issue. The issue is Constitutional. Which political parties are there, is not the matter. At the moment the matter is whether the Opposition, that commands the majority, is going to have its right, as given by the Constitution, to form an alternative non-Congress Government. Well, that is the only issue.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now you should wind up.



SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Whether the Rajasthan Assembly should be called immediately is the question. What right have they got to suspend the Assembly? The Assembly is supreme and sovereign in its right, and you are invoking your Central authority to suspend a State Assembly, and yet you are talking eloquent, waxing eloquent about Centre-State relationship. It is sheer nonsense. The Rajasthan example shows that the Congress does not sincerely mean good Centre-State relationship. If they had meant it, they would have followed the logic of it. What they say they do not do.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Therefore, we say that this should be done, done at once. Madam Deputy Chairman, I demand before this Parliament the Rajasthan Assembly should be recalled; it should be summoned because we want to make it known to the people that it is Parliament which is supreme, that if during the Parliament Session the Assembly can be adjourned, if it had been suspended for the time being, then it is during the Session of Parliament, again, that it is brought to life and placed in its rightful position. This is my final demand. But I know the young Minister will not be in a position to answer this. I should like this question to be answered by the Prime Minister or the Home Minister himself. Because he is very young I do not like to use any harsh words against him. But I should like to use some harsh words against the Prime Minister— although she is not older than I, and certainly against the Home Minister who is slightly older than I am. Therefore, Madam Deputy Chairman, the Home Minister should come and give an answer to what we have said and face certain questions that we may still have to ask. The Home Minister should not run away after having committed the rape of the Constitution in Rajasthan.

DR. (MRS.) MANGLA DEVI TALWAR (Rajasthan): Madam Deputy Chairman, much has been said already. When I was listening to Mr. Bhupesh Gupta's speech I thought I was sitting in a political meeting and Mr. Bhupesh Gupta was speaking there on behalf of his party. He has talked about everything that he could think of excepting on one subject and that was about the subject of Rajasthan. Mr. Gupta said that the President's Rule was unconstitutional. I would remind him of one thing. I would read before you and this august House a cutting from "The Patriot" which has Mr. Gupta's leanings. It is to-day's paper with the heading 'Crisis deepens in Rajasthan— Cracks in Dal reported'. It is 'From our correspondent'. It is not a Congress Member who has written it, it is from the paper's own correspondent and it says:

"March 30, Jaipur: The move to give a formal shape to the Sam-yukta Dal of the various Opposition parties and independent legislators in the suspended Rajasthan Assembly collapsed to-day when a meeting of the Opposition legislators this morning abandoned the idea of formulating a constitution for the Dal".

Next it says:

"The draft of the Constitution was circulated yesterday and the meeting was convened this morning at the Janata Party office to approve it."

What happened?—

"Most of the speakers at the meeting opposed the move and suggested that various parties should function separately in the legislature."

Later it goes on to say:

"Even the suggestion made by Maharawal Laxman Singh of Dungarpur to elect Raja Man Singh of Bharatpur as acting

[Dr. (Mrs.) Mangladevi Talwar.] secretary of the Dal or the purpose of convening meeting's was not accepted by the legislators.

Today's development according to political observers, marked the beginning of the end of the efforts to instal a non-Congress Government in Rajasthan.

The Swatantra-Jana Sangh circles were to-day taken to task at the meeting by CPI member Rama-nanda Aggarwal for 'misrepresenting' the position of his party in regard to the proposed Samyukta Dal."

Mr. Aggarwal is the President of the Rajasthan Jan Sangh.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI (Rajasthan): He is not mentioned here. He is the other Ramanand Aggarwal.

DR. (MRS.) MANGLADEVI TALWAR: I am reading, I am not speaking on my own.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI: Do not confuse with the two Aggarwals.

DR. (MRS.) MANGLADEVI TALWAR:

"Mr. Aggarwal told the meeting of the Opposition legislators that his party would maintain its separate and distinct identity in the Assembly."

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI: Perhaps you follow.

DR. (MRS.) MANGLADEVI TALWAR:

"He had only offered to extend his support to the Samyukta Dal on the basis of the 17 point programme. He however made it clear that his party would support the Samyukta Dal in the formation of the Government. Mr. Aggarwal objected . . ."

So they are not agreed even now. The Samyukta Dal was not formed before the elections were held. It is only alterwaids that efforts have been made and there are great differences of opinion.

I would now refer to another point, he said that the Opposition parties have formed, their Dal which can form an alternative Government in Rajasthan. That is not quite correct. Mr. Gupta suggested the taking away of the powers of the President and the Governor regarding the legislations in the States.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI: He h-vs not involved th\* President. Only Governor he said.

DR. (MRS.) MANGLADEVI TALWAR: Later on he mentioned that the President should have acted independently of the advice of his Council of Ministers. One thing I would suggest 10 this august House, through you, that our democracy is based on parliamentary Government and parliamentary form of Government is in existence in England only and we have taken many things from that country. There should be a convention in this House—I can speak only for this House—that the President should not be discussed in this House because the President is the Head of the State and he is supposed to be. and he is, above parties, all political parties.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA) in the Chair]

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया  
(मध्य प्रदेश) : मैं एक निवेदन करना  
चाहता हूँ श्रीमन् . . .

DR. (MRS.) MANGLADEVI TALWAR: Let me speak. I do not disturb anyone of your party. Let me have my say for a few minute\*

**श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया:** मैं केवल एक निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ श्रीमन् कि यह वित्त मंत्रालय से संबंधित बिल है गृह मंत्रालय मंत्री को क्यों कष्ट दिया जा रहा है। वित्त मंत्री को क्यों कष्ट करने नहीं दिया जा रहा है ?

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) :** वित्त मंत्री अभी तक बैठे हुए थे।

**श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया :** उनके किसी दुसरे भाई को मिजवा देते यहां। गृह मंत्रालय के मंत्री को कष्ट दिया जाय यह तो आप ठीक समझ सकते हैं। जवाब तो वित्त मंत्रालय के मंत्री को देना है न कि गृह मंत्री को।

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) :** वित्त मंत्रालय के लोग बैठे हैं नोट्स लिये जा रहे हैं दे दिये जायेंगे।

**श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया :** हमको तो चाहिये कि यहां वित्त मंत्रालय के मंत्री आकर बैठें।

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) :** मैं यह नहीं मान सकता।

**गृह-कार्य मंत्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री विद्या चरण शुक्ल) :** कलेक्टिव्ह रिस्पान्सिबिलिटी है मिनिस्टर्स की आप समझते नहीं हैं कोई बात तो क्यों बोलते हैं ?

**DR. (MRS.) MANGLADEVI TALWAR:** I was speaking . . .

**श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया :** मैं जानना चाहूंगा स्पष्ट रुलिंग आप दें कि जब यह राजस्थान का बजट वित्त मंत्रालय से संबंधित है ठीक है कलेक्टिव्ह रिस्पान्सिबिलिटी है तो क्या यह सदन का अपमान नहीं है कि वित्त मंत्रालय के दो दो तीन तीन मंत्री होते हुए भी उनमें से एक भी नहीं

बैठा हुआ है। हम कह सकते हैं लंच आवर है चले गये हैं मगर कहा जा सकता है कि अमुक अमुक मंत्री बैठे, अंदर बैठे। इसका मतलब यह नहीं है कि जिस मंत्रालय का दिल हो उस मंत्रालय का मंत्री यहां न बैठे। उसको यहां आकर बैठना चाहिये। इस बात में जो भी मतलब हो आप देखने का कष्ट करें।

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA):** I will only refer Mr. Chordia to the definition of the Finance Minister. "Finance Minister includes any Minister in the Ministry".

**SHRI V. M. CHORDIA:** What is the rule?

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA):** You look up the Rules. You continue your speech, Mrs. Talwar.

**DR. (MRS.) MANGLADEVI TALWAR:** I was referring to the convention that we should develop in this august House that we should not discuss the Head of the State as it is the convention in England. There is a constitutional monarchy in England.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA):** Just a minute. Item 2—definition of the Finance Minister says 'Finance Minister includes any Minister'.

**SHRI V. M. CHORDIA:** Thank you.

**DR. (MRS.) MANGLADEVI TALWAR:** There the constitutional monarch or the Sovereign is not discussed and on the same lines we should act.

**SHRI R. S. KHANDEKAR (Madhya Pradesh):** Even though the rule says that, but you can ask anyone of them to come.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA):** That is a different matter.

SHRI R. S. KHANDEKAR: There are series of Ministers in the Finance Ministry and they can be asked to be present.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: You continue. Mrs. Talwar.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE (West Bengal): Are you guiding the House, Mr. Shukla? Who are you there to ask the lady to proceed or not? You should know your position and limits.

DR. (MRS.) MANGLADEVI TALWAR: I was referring that it would be a healthy convention to be developed in this House.

Now x refer to a few points about the Rajasthan Budget which I have stood to speak on. There is an allotment of Rs. 12 crores for drought relief and for the scarcity areas. This is not enough. I think there should be more. There has been the failure of rains in 1963, then in 1965 and again in 1966. So like Bihar the entire expenditure on famine relief should be borne by the Centre. In the present case the Centre has not borne the full amount.

Power scarcity in Rajasthan is a chronic disease with the result that no big industry can be established in the State. So alternative sources should be found for electrification of the State. Experts from the Irrigation Research Institute at Poona should be invited to assist the State experts about the Gandhisagar dam where water is very scarce. What remission in land revenue is being given to the peasants in the drought-affected areas? Just as it has been done in Punjab? I think it is desirable and it is necessary to give them relief.

Sir, I am grateful to the Finance Minister to sanction a special loan to clear the State's overdraft drawn on the Reserve Bank.

Then, in the Fourth Plan the Centre should allocate some big industries to

Rajasthan in order to remove the regional disparity in the matter of industrialisation.

I am glad that the Government has appointed a man of the stature of Sardar Hukum Singh as Governor of the State. He is an independent person having no party affiliations. I hope that would please the hon. Members on the opposition side.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHAN-DARI: Is he not a Congressman?

DR. (MRS.) MANGLADEVI TALWAR: Well, he has been an independent, and even now he will be so.

There is one more point that I would like to make. Now Mr. Bhu-pesh Gupta has referred to Bengal and other States having non-Congress Governments. I do not want to do that but I would like to say this that violence has been encouraged by some of the political parties. It is a two-sided sword; like a boomerang it will go back to anyone who preaches it. and the Calcutta episode is an example of it, and whichever Government comes to power will have to face the violence indulged in by people of different times, because the people were influenced or incited by some of the political parties before the Elections to take to violence. There fore. I think it is in the interests of the people of India, and also of the political parties to only resort to constitutional and peaceful means even if they want to oppose any other party or any other Government of the day.

With these words, Sir, I support the people of India, and also of the

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, राजस्थान के बजट पर ग्राम चुन व के बा राजस्थान की विधान सभा के बजट संसद् में विचार हो इस से बढ़ कर प्रजातंत्र के लिये और बड़ा कलंक नहीं हो सकता । पिछले दिनों में राजस्थान में जो घटनाएं

हुई मैं उनको दोहराना नहीं चाहूंगा राष्ट्र-पति के अभिभाषण पर विचार के समय मैं ने विश्वास से वे सारी परिस्थितियां यहां रखने की कोशिश की थी। किन्तु बार-बार सरकार की तरफ से एक ही जवाब आया कि राजस्थान में परिस्थितियों को सामान्य होने दिया जाय और सब सत्ता के प्रतिनिधियों ने इस बात को दोहराने की कोशिश की है कि वे आवश्यकता से अधिक राजस्थान में राष्ट्रपति के शासन को नहीं चाहते। मैं आज निर्विवाद रूप से एक बात कह सकता हूं कि अब राजस्थान में एक ही असामान्य बात बची है और वह है वहां के वर्तमान गवर्नर। इन गवर्नर महोदय के अतिरिक्त राजस्थान में एक भी असामान्य बात नहीं है, राजस्थान की परिस्थिति में कुछ भी असामान्यता नहीं है। शुरू से गवर्नर महोदय ने जिस तरीके से राजस्थान की परिस्थितियों को हैंडल किया है . . .

**SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA:** According to the rules, Sir, I think that a Governor and his conduct as Governor cannot be discussed in the House.

**SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI:** I think it applies only to the President.

**THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA):** Earlier also his name has been mentioned. So there is no bar.

**श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी :** उस समय भी यह नके ऊपर आरोप लगाया गया था कि उन्हें राष्ट्रपति महोदय का प्रतिनिधि होने का दावा करना चाहिये लेकिन उन्होंने उनके बजाय वहां की राजनीतिक गुत्थियों में फंस कर राजनीतिक दबावों के आधार पर निर्णय लेने की कोशिशें कीं।

पिछले दिनों में लोक सभा में भी केन्द्रीय सरकार के गृह-मंत्री के सामने मेरे दल के

नेता श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी जी ने एक बात कही थी कि गवर्नर का शासन लागू होने के बाद भी उस समय के मुख्य मंत्री, श्री सुखाडिया जी के पास सरकार की फाइलें जा रही हैं और उसको रोकवाने की कोशिश की जाय, फाइलों में दखल दिया जा रहा है उसको रोकने की कोशिश की जाय। आज तक उसके बारे में जवाब नहीं मिला है। यहां से जो दो सलाहकार भेजे गये हैं राजस्थान के लिये और इन दो सलाहकारों में राजस्थान के विभागों का वितरण किया गया है। शायद सारे देश को यह बात जान कर आश्चर्य हुआ होगा कि विभागों का वितरण करते समय राजस्थान के गवर्नर महोदय ने जनरल ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन, होम और अप्वाइन्टमेंट्स का इन्तजाम खुद अपने हाथ में रखा है और ऐडवाइजर्स की मार्फत वे चलना नहीं चाहते। मैं समझता हूं कि इससे यह चार्ज साबित होता है कि स्वयं होम का पोर्टफोलियो और जनरल ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन की जिम्मेदारी अपने हाथ में रख कर वे राजस्थान की फाइलों में गड़बड़ करवाना चाहते हैं और अपनी निगरानी में राजस्थान के उस समय के मंत्रियों के हाथों में आज भी वे राजस्थान की फाइलों को बिगड़वाने की गुंजाइश देना चाहते हैं। दुनिया में कहीं यह उदाहरण नहीं मिलेगा जहां राज्य का गवर्नर प्रशासन की कुछ जिम्मेदारियों को सीधे अपने हाथ में रख कर, अपने ऐडवाइजर्स को भी बाईपास कर के, प्रशासन को चलाने की कोशिश करे। आज इस मौके पर मैं सीधा चार्ज लगाना चाहता हूं कि राजस्थान के गवर्नर महोदय आज राष्ट्रपति के नुमाइन्दे न रह कर राजस्थान सरकार के होम सेक्रेट्री के पद तक अपने को गिरा देने के लिये तैयार हैं। आज आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि राजस्थान के लोगों के अन्दर विश्वास को बिटाये रखने के लिये, बिना एक दिन की देरी किये गवर्नर महोदय को वहां से बुला लिया जाय। नये गवर्नर की नियुक्ति की घोषणा हो गई है और कोई कारण नहीं कि

[श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी]

संपूर्णानन्द जी को, उनका टर्म समाप्त होने तक जो वे वहां चन्द दिनों के मेहमान रह गये हैं, उसमें राजस्थान के सारे प्रशासन को बिगाड़ने का और झकझोर डालने का मौका दिया जाय ।

उन्हें एपाइन्टमेंट का महकमा भी अपने पास रखने की जरूरत महसूस हुई । क्यों ? क्या वह अपने अधिकार में कुछ और लोगों को नौकरियां दिलवाने में दिलचस्पी रखते हैं । उनके घर के कई रिश्तेदार पहले ही राजस्थान स्थान की सरकार में नौकरियां पा रहे हैं । उनके सुपुत्र वहां की साहित्य-अकादमी के अध्यक्ष हैं, उनकी पुत्र-वधु आकाशवाणी के अन्दर नौकरी कर रही है ।

DR. (MRS.) MANGLADEVI TALWAR: It is an all-India service.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANTDARI: We are discussing the Rajasthan Budget, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): You are going too far off the ground.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI: Then, Sir, I will come back.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया : एपाइन्टमेंट्स की चर्चा की है । एपाइन्टमेंट्स की चर्चा करते हुए उन्होंने कहा कि इस विभाग को उन्होंने अपने पास रखा है ।

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी : मैंने कहा था कि राजस्थान में पहले से लोग लगे हुए हैं और क्या वे और लोगों के लिये गुंजाइश लेना चाहते हैं ।

DR. (MRS.) MANGLADEVI TALWAR: Mr. Bhandari has mentioned that the Governor's son is the

President of some cultural or? tion. But it is a voluntary organisation and has nothing whatever to do with the Government. He also said that the Governor's daughter-in-law is employed in the All India Radio, but this is an all-India Service. She may be posted to-day in Rajasthan. Tomorrow she might be posted somewhere else.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA): Let us not go into individual cases.

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी : आज राजस्थान का यह सारा मजला वर्तमान गवर्नर महोदय के कारण ही उलझा हुआ है । यह सारा जो कंडकट पिछले दिनों में हुआ उस कंडकट ने उनके इस बड़े पद को काफी हद तक गिरा दिया है । अब जब नये गवर्नर महोदय की नियुक्ति हो गई है तो केवल वर्तमान गवर्नर के वर्तमान कार्य काल के पूरे होने तक राजस्थान के लोगों को उनके जनतंत्रीय अधिकारों के प्रयोग से रोका जाय—इस एक जिद को पकड़ कर केन्द्रीय सरकार को नहीं बैठना चाहिये और अगर एक व्यक्ति के कारण दो करोड़ सवा दो करोड़ लोगों के अधिकारों को रोका जा रहा है तो केन्द्रीय सरकार को इस विषय में जल्दी से जल्दी कदम उठा कर रास्ता निकालना चाहिये और राजस्थान के लोगों को उनके जो स्वाभाविक अधिकार हैं उनको दिलाने में एक दिशा देनी चाहिये ।

मैं यह अश्वसन चाहता हूँ कि नये गवर्नर महोदय जब राजस्थान जायें तो उनके जाने से पहले से कम से कम ठीक ढंग से डमोक्रेटिक फंक्शनिंग वहां प्रारम्भ कर दी जाय इस परिस्थिति को पैदा करके उनको जल्दी से जल्दी राजस्थान में भेजने की कौशिल्य करें ।

मुझे एक बात के लिये वधाई देनी है सरकार को, देर-आयत दुरुस्त आयत 7 मार्च को गोलीकांड हुआ था । तीन दिन पहले एक जज की नियुक्ति जरूर

वहाँ हो गई। मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि केन्द्रीय सरकार इस बात पर भी ध्यान दे कि जो अफसरान उस दिन के गोलीकांड के लिये जिम्मेदार थे उन्हें वह हटाये ताकि यह सारी जांच ठीक प्रकार से हो सके। यहाँ पिछले लगभग तीन हफ्तों से उन्हीं अधिकारियों ने लोगों को डरानेकी और गवाहों को रोकने की कौशिशें की हैं। अनेको लोग उस गोलीकांड और उसके पहले से लापता थे। जब उनके नाम डूँड कर उनके बारे में जानकारी प्रकाशित की गई तब उनके बारे में स्पष्टीकरण करने की कौशिशें की गई। मैं उन लोगों से मिला, मैंने पूछा कहां थे। उन्होंने कहा कि हमें कहने के लिये भजबूर न करिये, हमें रवाया गया है, हम कहीं भी थे, अब लौट आये हैं, इससे ज्यादा आपको हम इस समय कुछ नहीं बता सकते। मेरा निवेदन है इस आधार पर कि सरकार द्वारा अधिकारियों को वहाँ से हटा दिया जाय ताकि न्यायिक जांच के कार्य में कोई बाधा उत्पन्न न हो।

यह बजट जो यहाँ पेश हुआ, यह बजट राजस्थान की आर्थिक स्थिति की बुरी से बुरी अवस्था का परिचायक है। राजस्थान के विकास के कार्यों की दृष्टि से राजस्थान की साधन संपन्नता इस बजट के साथ समाप्त हो चुकी है। राजस्थान कुछ कंट्रीब्यूट करने की स्थिति में नहीं रह पाया। पिछले वर्षों से चली आई सरकार के कारनामों से और केवल केन्द्रीय सरकार ही जो कुछ थोड़ा रहुत दे पायेगी राजस्थान के सारे विकास का नक्शा उसी पर निर्भर करता हुआ दिखाई देता है। यह सारी की सारी फाइनेंसियल बैकरोप्सी की हालत क्यों पैदा हुई। पिछले दस वर्षों से लगातार राजस्थान के जितने बजट पेश हुए घाटे के बजट रहे। वहाँ पर कोई कैपिटल फारमेशन नहीं हो सका और आज यह हालत है कि

राजस्थान के विकास का सारा मामला ठप्प हो कर पड़ा है। यह जो साल खत्म हो रहा है यह 16 करोड़ रुपये के घाटे में खत होगा। जो अगले साल का बजट पेश किया गया है वह भी घाटे का बजट है। राजस्थान में रिजर्व बैंक का 16 करोड़ रुपये का ओवर ड्राफ्ट है। यहाँ पर हमारा पब्लिक डेट बढ़ा है और इतना बढ़ा है कि उसके ब्याज ब्याज का हमें 20 करोड़ 9 लाख रुपया इस वर्ष देना पड़ा है। आज इस हालत में राजस्थान की आर्थिक विशेषताओं या आर्थिक संपन्नताओं की हम चर्चा करें तो यह बड़ी अजीब सी बात है, विशेषकर ऐसी परिस्थिति में जब कि राजस्थान पिछले 4 वर्षों से लगातार अकालग्रस्त रहा है। इस बार भी जो रबी की फसल अभी खड़ी थी पिछले दस दिनों में जो भीषण वर्षा हुई है, ओला वृष्टि हुई है उसने इस सारी रबी की फसल पर जो आशाएं बंधी थीं वे भी सारी की सारी समाप्त कर दी।

**श्री नेकीराम (हरियाना) :** उसकी जिम्मेदारी भी कांग्रेस की है ?

**श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी :** मैंने जिम्मेदारी नहीं डाली। अगर आप लेना चाहे तो मैं मशकूर हूँगा। अकाल सहायता के काम पिछले दिनों में चले हैं। राजस्थान में अकाल सहायता के नाम पर . . .

**श्री नेकी राम :** अच्छा होगा आप खुल कर कहें कि कांग्रेस ने सारी फसलें खत्म कर दी।

**श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी :** वह आपको शोभा देगा। जाते-जाते आप यह काम करते जाइये।

**श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया :** कुछ बँल जरूर चर गये हैं।

**श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी :** पिछले दिनों में बहुत बड़ी रकम करीब 770 लाख रुपये अकाल सहायता के नाम पर राजस्थान में खर्च हुई है। राजस्थान के मंत्रिमंडल में . . .

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भार्गव) :** भंडारी जी आपके 15 मिनट पूरे हो रहे हैं, अब आप खत्म करिये।

**श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी :** बस अभी। अकाल के बारे में यह नियम है कि सारे सरकारी अधिकारी एक निश्चित समय नवम्बर के महीने तक अपनी रिपोर्ट दे देते हैं फसल के हालात को देख कर और सरकार की तरफ से दी जाने वाली सारी मदद उसके आधार पर दी जाती है।

स्वयं कांग्रेस के मंत्रिमंडल में इस अकाल सहायता के मामले को ले कर बहुत बड़ा तूफान उठा, मंत्रिमंडल उस समय टूटा इसी बात को ले कर कि जिन इलाकों में अकाल की रिपोर्ट्स मिली थीं उनमें सहायता नहीं दी गई और दुसरे इलाकों में अकाल की सहायता का पैसा खर्चा हुआ। आज इन चुनावों के बाद यह स्पष्ट रूप से देखा जा सकता है—यहां पर मैं सदस्य महोदय को याद दिला देना चाहता हूं कि राजस्थान के जिन निर्वाचन क्षेत्रों से कांग्रेस जीत कर आई है, मैं चाहूंगा कि वह मेरी आवाज में आवाज मिलायें—कि इस बार राजस्थान में चुनाव के मौके पर किन किन जगहों पर, किन किन तहसीलों में अकाल का काम चल रहा था, किन किन इलाकों में मजदूर काम कर रहे थे और नि किन इलाकों से कांग्रेस जीत कर आई है। इसकी एक जांच होनी चाहिये तो अपने आप पता लग जायगा कि अकाल राहत के काम का, अकाल के काम में लगे हुए मजदूरों का लाभ उठा कर कांग्रेस ने अपने चुनावों के अन्दर कौन से करियमें पैदा करने की कोशिश की। आज यह जरूरी

है, इन सब बातों में हमें जाना चाहिये। पिछले दिनों में सारे देश में जिस तरह अनाज का संकट चला उसी तरह राजस्थान में भी रहा है। लेकिन राजस्थान में निकासी के प्रश्न को लेकर अनेकों बार पाबन्दी लगी। अनेकों बार पाबन्दी हटी। राजस्थान में कोर्स ग्रेन में चना ज्यादा होता है तो चने की निकासी कभी खुलती है कभी बन्द होती है। पिछले दिनों यह तय किया गया कि राजस्थान से चना बाहर निकाला जाय और एक फार्मूला तय हुआ कि जो भी राजस्थान के चना बेचने वाले हैं उनको सारे गोदाम के आधार पर तीन हिस्से करने चाहिये, एक हिस्सा राज्य को दें एक हिस्सा बहार भेजें और एक हिस्सा पब्लिक को बेचें और इस शर्त पर लोगों को क्लियरेंस सर्टीफिकेट दे दिया गया चने की निकासी करने का, परन्तु अचानक वह निकासी करने की आज्ञायें रद्द कर दी गई, जो चना बाहर भेजने के लिये लदा था उसे रोक दिया गया और जो चना सरकारी गोदामों पर तोलने के लिये पहुंचा था उसको तौला नहीं गया। आपको आश्चर्य होगा कि यह डेढ़ साल पहल की बात है लेकिन पिछले नवम्बर, दिस बर के महीने में उन सारे व्यापारियों को जिनको चने के बारे में एन० सी० अोज दे दिये गये थे और निकासी करने के लिये इजाजत दे दी गई थी उनको डैमेज के क्लेमस के रूप में इसके कम्पेनसेशन के नाम पर एक बहुत बड़ी रकम राजस्थान के खजाने से दी गई। मैं समझता हूं कि सरकारी नीति की असफलता के कारण पैदा हुई हानि का खमियाजा इन लोगों को डैमेज के रूप में पब्लिक फंड से सरकारी खजाने पर बोझ डाल कर दिया है इस स्कैंडल की ठीक तरह से जांच होनी चाहिये।

इसी तरह से राजस्थान में वन सम्पदा भी बहुत है परन्तु शायद आपको यह जान कर आश्चर्य होगा कि राजस्थान में वनों से जितनी आमदनी होती है वह लगभग सारी की सारी वनों के एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन पर खर्च हो जाती



है, 115 लाख रुपया अगर आमदनी है तो 114 लाख रुपया का खर्चा है यानी सारे फॉरैस्ट के महकमे में एक लाख रुपये की बचत है एक साल में। यह क्यों हो रहा है, किस तरीके से वह सारा किया जा रहा है। राजस्थान में जब 1954 में जागीर रिजम्पशन हुआ था तो वह प्रो आफ आल इनकम्बर्सेज हुआ था, कोई जिम्मेदारी सरकार पर नहीं थी। लेकिन उस समय जागीरदारों से रिजम्पशन के कानून से बचने के लिये अपने जंगलों के ठेके दिये।

**उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री महावीर प्रसाद भांबा) :** आपको समाप्त करना पड़ेगा 20 मिनट हो गये।

**श्री नेकी राम :** यह अच्छा होगा, श्रीमान्, आप तो पिछली बेंच वाले इसका जवाब दें।

**श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी :** कोई चिन्ता नहीं। सरकार के ऊपर कोई जिम्मेदारी नहीं थी। यह सरकार का काम है, एक बार सरकार के जिम्मे वह जागीरें सुपुर्द कर दी गईं, तो यह जागीरदारों का प्रश्न नहीं है बल्कि उन ठेकेदारों के क्लेम्स को 13 साल के बाद ले कर राजस्थान की सरकार ने उन जंगलों को उन्हीं कंडीशंस पर उन्हीं ठेकेदारों को फिर से दिया है और राजस्थान के लोगों को कम से कम दो करोड़ रुपये की जंगल की आमदनी से वंचित किया है। ये तरीके राजस्थान की आमदनी के रास्ते में बाधक बनें और फिर हम चाहें कि राजस्थान में रिसोर्सेज इकट्ठे हों, राजस्थान की भलाई के लिये वहां साधन हों, नहीं तो कोई कारण नहीं कि 3 करोड़ रुपये के घाटे का बजट हो। अभी तक यहां पर टैक्सेज की बात नहीं की गई है परन्तु यह साफ दिखता है कि 3 करोड़ के घाटे के बजट को तीन महीने के बाद नये टैक्स लगा कर पूरा किया जायगा और लोगों के ऊपर बजन डालने की कोशिश की जायगी। लोग पूछ सकते हैं कि जिस तरीके से हम सरकारी साधनों का दुरुपयोग करते हैं, कुछ इंटरस्टेड पार्टीज का लाभ पहुंचाने की कोशिश करते

हैं, इन नीतियों में अगर बदल कर दिया जाय तो कोई कारण नहीं कि लोगों को अपनी आवश्यकताओं की पूर्ति करने के लिये साधन उपलब्ध न हों।

मैं केवल एक बात आपसे निवेदन कर अपना भाषण समाप्त करूंगा। पिछले दिनों में ये सारे खर्चे करने के बाद भी राजस्थान में जो एकानामी की जा सकती थी वह राजस्थान की सरकार ने नहीं की। हम और आप जानते हैं कि पिछले दिनों में मंत्री मंडल की बढ़ोतरी के कारण करीब 330 लाख रुपये का नया बजन लोगों के ऊपर डाला गया है, 330 लाख रुपये का। नई कारें खरीदी गईं मंत्रियों के सरकारी कामों के लिये। आज जब यहां हम चाहते हैं कि राजस्थान के बजट को मंजूरी दें, ऐसा किसी भी कारण से हो किन्तु केन्द्रीय वित्त मंत्री को राजस्थान के बजट को बदलने और रखने का मौका मिला है तो एक सिलवर लाईनिंग इन दि क्लाउड अभी हो सकती है कि वह इस मौके पर राजस्थान के अन्दर सांबंजनिक धन और सांबंजनिक सम्पत्ति का दुरुपयोग हुआ है पिछले 10, 12 वर्षों में लगातार उसको स्टीमलाइन कर के जो कुछ भी गड़बड़ियां हुई हैं उनकी ठीक प्रकार से जांच करवा कर इन सारी चीजों को ठीक करें ताकि लोगों को वहां राहत मिलने का एक रास्ता दिखाई दे सके।

**SHRI R. S. KHANDEKAR:** Mr. Vice-Chairman, we are discussing the Rajasthan Budget here and so I will confine my remarks to only Rajasthan and its economy. I believe we will get an opportunity of discussing the revocation of the President's Proclamation very soon in this House and therefore, I will not speak at length on that subject. But even then I will be failing in my duty if I do not lodge my strongest protest against the way in which the Rajasthan affair has been handled by the Central Government.

(Shri R. S. Khandekar.) Sir, you are aware that after the last general elections the political map of India has vastly changed. In almost half the number of States non-Congress Governments have been installed and even at the Centre there is a very thin majority of the ruling party, that is to say, the Congress Party. In these circumstances it was quite necessary for the Congress to have taken a realistic view of the situation and changed its policy. But I am sorry to find that the ruling party has still its old complacency or they are still in their own manoeuvres for seeking office. After the general elections, Sir, you are aware that in Rajasthan the Congress failed to get a majority. It is true that no other party could get more seats than the Congress Party. Even then when the Opposition was united and they claimed that they could form the Government it was naturally the duty of the Governor to invite the leader of the United Opposition and to give him a chance to form a government. This has been done in other States also. No party except the Congress was the largest party in other States also, but the Congress members there were either more realistic or the Governors were cleverer or more realistic and they invited the leaders of the Opposition and asked them to form governments. And now we see that they are working fairly well in those States. The same thing could have been done in Rajasthan. But for reasons not known to us but known to the Governor perhaps or to the Central Government, this was not done. Time was taken and the Chief Minister or the proposed Chief Minister, Shri Mohanlal Sukhadia, was allowed some time to manoeuvre to buy or to make all sorts of attempts to win over certain independents. They could not be won over. And then all these incidents happened and of that you are aware. I need not repeat all that here. Apart from the constitutionality of it under which the Governor was bound to invite the leader of the largest

group, for the sake of democracy for which the Congress Party always shouts from the house tops, it would have been fair on the part of the Governor to have invited the leader of the United Opposition. But that he did not do. I do not know personally whether there were any motives behind it or whether he wanted to shield the proposed Chief Minister, Shri Sukhadia. Why this has not been done I do not know, but it just strikes my mind that before the elections as you will also remember, a memorandum was presented to the President against the misdeeds, a memorandum containing charges of corruption and nepotism against the then Chief Minister of Rajasthan, Shri Mohanlal Sukhadia. It may be that if a non-Congress was installed there that memorandum and the charges mentioned therein might have been investigated and therefore Mr. Sukhadia or the Governor or the Central leadership did not want to go into that question and they did not want to get those things exposed—it may be so—and therefore exposed it may be so and herefore attempts were made to see that somehow Shri Sukhadia was made the Chief Minister of Rajasthan. I say this because this has happened in Orissa. You are aware that in Orissa a non-Congress Government is installed and they have resolved that all cases of ministerial corruption before taking over the power there, should be investigated. Even the Congress Party there has joined in this demand and in this resolution. They have said not only for the period from 1956 or 1962—I don't remember what it is—ever since the attainment of independence, whoever the Ministers were, whatever charges were levelled against them, all those charges should be investigated and I presume that the Government there has agreed to that proposition also. Precisely this enquiry into the charges or the alleged charges against Mr. Sukhadia might have prevented him from informing the Governor that he could not form a ministry and somehow he has tried and

managed to himself come back to power and avoid this issue. Therefore the whole manner in which the Rajasthan affair is handled smacks of a very striking atmosphere, of a stinking smell. There is something fishy about it all and the Central Government also cannot escape responsibility in this matter. However, as I said, enough can be said about it and more opportunities will be provided when we discuss the revocation of the Presidential Order. So I will not dwell on this point any more now. But it is really very strange that in this way the Government should have handled the situation and the Central Government also should be a party to this.

Having said this much, I would now come to certain specific problems of Rajasthan. As we are discussing the Budget of Rajasthan it is my duty to refer to certain important problems of Rajasthan although I do not belong to Rajasthan, because the problems of Rajasthan are not dissimilar to the problems of the State I am coming from, namely, Madhya Pradesh. The problem of dacoits in Rajasthan is as serious there as in the State of Madhya Pradesh.

I do not know what steps have been taken by the Rajasthan Government or whoever the Government may be because I do not see that this will be a permanent arrangement. I am quite sure and I am hopeful that Prteoidenitla Tule will soon be over and the real elected representatives of Rajasthan will be able to deliberate these points, to pass their Budget and take over the administration in that State. But for the time being whoever the Government may be, they should pay serious attention to this problem. I will not go into the details of every problem but only just mention them so as to focus the attention of the Government of the day.

The problem of food is acute in the whole country and so it is in Rajasthan too. Many steps have been taken [

to increase the production of food-grains but in spite of the drought or in spite of the failure of the Congress Government in the last 20 years no special efforts were made to increase foodgrain production. Like Madhya Pradesh in Rajasthan also there are many rivers which have long ravines. They are there on account of nature; like Chambal for instance. Chambal flows in Rajasthan also and there are other tributaries also that flow there. There are miles and miles of these ravines and there are about 3 lakh acres of land which can be reclaimed. These ravines can be reclaimed and an agricultural programme on a planned and scientific basis can be taken up there.

Similarly Rajasthan is backward in industries and railways. Of course railways is the responsibility of the Centre and now the Centre is framing this Budget and the Centre is responsible for the Budget and the Centre should see that a good network of railways is laid there. They should also ensure that the mineral wealth of Rajasthan is exploited for the development of Rajasthan.

There is one more thing. As a member of a Study Team of the Administrative Reforms Commission I had occasion to tour some parts of Rajasthan and I was very much surprised or rather grieved to learn that in Rajasthan all sections reported that there was high-handedness, there was great interference by the Executive in all spheres of administration including the judicial administration of course at a lower level.

It was most surprising. When I compared the administration of Rajasthan with the other adjoining States I found that Rajasthan was better administered, but with regard to ministerial interference or executive interference it was appalling and I think no State could beat Rajasthan. I do not know what the condition is now, but I do not think it will be changed overnight. Even with regard to small appointments or appoint-<

[Shri R. S. Khandekar.] merits to higher posts, nothing could be done there unless the Minister concerned is consulted or the Minister concerned directs it. Even if rules and regulations are there, they are not followed. If at all, they are followed with impunity. They are followed more in their breach.

[THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

I was told that this was not the case only with a particular Service. This was so with the entire provincial Services, excepting the IAS. Now, in respect of small appointments, even appointments of peons, there was direct ministerial interference. Now, the Government has come into the hands of the Centre, they should take special care to avoid this. This is a slur on the Rajasthan administration. I am not divulging the secrets of the Committee, but this was a fact that was reported to me by almost every section whom I met there. This was most surprising. Similarly, there the Government servants had grievances about their service conditions, etc. I was told that there were staff councils, but I do not think the staff councils are any good to the Government servants. The Rajasthan Government had appointed Mr. Mathur, who was a Member of the other House and who is a member of the Administrative Reforms Commission, to look into it and he has produced a very beautiful report on the Rajasthan Administrative Service. I do not know how much of it is being followed in that State or how many recommendations the Government have accepted and how many recommendations they have not accepted. So I would urge upon the Central Government for the time being or the people's Government which will be there after some time, to look into the special problems of the Government servants and of the entire administrative structure in Rajasthan.

Then one thing I found in the Budget is the mention of privy purses.

You are aware that the ex-Ruler is and the small and big Jagirdars played great havoc, if I may say so, in the last elections not only in Rajasthan, but also in other States. There was a demand that the concentration of money in the hands of a few privileged Rulers should be curtailed. If this is allowed to grow, then hardly there would be any fine and fair elections. If you look into the election results of certain States you will find that the hold of old Rajas and Maharajas still prevails. For some time they were either lying low or they were with the ruling party. But when their deal could not be settled with the ruling party they opted out and they tried their power in this election. They have tested it. They have become confident that with their money, with their influence, with their traditions, with all the (g)Ulamoui; these Rulers have even now, they can win over large sections of the people and get themselves elected to Parliament or to Legislatures and capture power. I think this is a very dangerous thing for democracy, because it is not going to be free and fair election. It means that money will play its part and, therefore, the time has come to consider whether these privy purses should be given to these Princes. Soon after the elections there was a demand that the privy purses of the ex-Rulers should be discontinued and there was an argument that it could not be done because of the covenant. To state that this is covenant or an agreement is not enough. We have seen that even the British people had so many covenants with the Raja- and Maharajas. If they could be changed, why not these covenants which the Central Government entered into, at the time of integration or reorganisation of States? They should be changed now, if they are being misused in this way. Therefore, I demand that these privy purses should be either stopped or curtailed and some change in the electoral law should be made whereby a person having a certain amount of money should not contest elections and

should not use his undue influence to win over the votes of the poor people.

Now, lastly, I urge that this is not a very happy position in Rajasthan today. President's Rule is not liked by anybody. Even some sections of the ruling party are opposed to this method of handling the situation. Now, it was said that as soon as normalcy returned, the Assembly would be summoned, I do not think there was any incident after that episode some days ago, probably a month ago. There is peace in Rajasthan. It is high time that the Assembly was convened and the popularly elected democratic government installed in Rajasthan.

**श्री राजनारायण (उत्तर प्रदेश) :**  
माननीया, राजस्थान के बारे में जो खर्चा मांगा जा रहा है, उसके देने में हमको बहुत ही आपत्ति है; क्योंकि राजस्थान में यदि देखा जाय तो इस समय जनतंत्र मर चुका है।

यह सही है कि विपक्ष में तर्क यह दिया जायगा कि संविधान में राष्ट्रपति शासन लागू करने की जो व्यवस्था है, उसका अनुसरण किया गया है। मगर यदि सही तरीके से और साधु बुद्धि से संविधान की व्याख्या हो, तो मैं कहूंगा कि अनुसरण नहीं किया गया है।

राजस्थान में चुनाव हुआ या सारे देश में चुनाव हुआ और राजस्थान में चुनाव के पूर्व कांग्रेस सरकार थी। हमारे सदन के सम्मानित सदस्य इस बात को अब जरूर महसूस करने लगे होंगे कि सरकार में रहने वालों को और विरोधी दल वालों को चुनाव के मैदान में साधनों की कितनी असमानता है। जो सरकार में रहकर अपनी पार्टी का चुनाव अभियान चलाता है, उसके लिये बहुत सी सहूलियतें होती हैं। अभी कल ही इसी सदन में माननीया, आपने सुना और

देखा कि प्रधान मंत्री, श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी एयर फोर्स के हवाई जहाज से बराबर भ्रमण करती रहीं और उसमें हुआ खर्च 28 हजार रुपया, 22 हजार मील का सफ़र। तो यह सहूलियत जिस सत्ताधारी दल को प्राप्त हो और वह भी कानून और जनतंत्र माना जाय, तो मैं चाहूंगा कि लोग अब कम से कम इतना तो कहने लगे कि यह जनतंत्र का मखौल है, यह जनतंत्र नहीं है। जनतंत्र की व्याख्या होनी चाहिए, समाजवाद की व्याख्या होनी चाहिए। सदन में समय कम रहता है, इन सत्तों और तथ्यों का निरूपण करने का मौका कम मिलता है, मगर मैं पुनः कहना चाहता हूँ कि सोशलिज्म क्या है, जनतंत्र क्या है? मेरे नज़दीक समाजवाद और जनतंत्र पर्यायवाची हैं, एक दूसरे का अर्थ एक दूसरा है, बिना जनतंत्र के समाजवाद नहीं, बिना समाजवाद के जनतंत्र नहीं। हमारे यहां संविधान में लिखा हुआ है कि कानून की बराबरी रहेगी, राजनीति की बराबरी रहेगी, मगर क्या कानून और राजनीति की बराबरी रहने मात्र से अर्थ की बराबरी हो जायगी या समाज में बराबरी हो जायगी? जब तक आर्थिक समानता न हो, राजनीतिक समानता होने मात्र से जनतंत्र नहीं होगा। इस सदन के सम्मानित सदस्य जानते हैं कि प्रधान मंत्री के चुनाव तक में, मंत्रि-परिषद में कौन लिए जाएं, कौन न लिए जाएं—इन सब में आज देश के बड़े-बड़े पूंजीपतियों का दखल है और उनकी तरफ से आज इशारे बाजियां होती हैं कि फलां रखा जाय, फलां न रखा जाय। अब यह सत्य छिपाया नहीं जा सकता है। राजस्थान में जब कांग्रेस की सरकार थी, कांग्रेसी टुकूमत के पास सभी साधनों और हर प्रकार की सुविधा के रहते हुए भी वहां की जनता ने साहस और हिम्मत दिखाई और कांग्रेस को बहुमत में हराया, कांग्रेस की उतनी शक्ति नहीं आई कि वह अपने बूते पर सरकार बना पाती। कांग्रेस बहुमत में नहीं आई, सीधे-सीधे जनतंत्र ने कांग्रेस की सरकार में अविश्वास

[श्री राजनारायण ]

प्रकट किया। अगर कोई जनतंत्र का विद्यार्थी हो या अध्यापक हो, तो मैं विनम्रता के साथ निवेदन करूंगा कि मण्डिष्क का अपव्यय न करें, बुद्धि का अपहरण न करें। आप संतुलन रख कर खोजेंगे, तो यही आयेगा कि सरकार में जनता ने अविश्वास प्रकट कर दिया। उसी सरकार को पुनः येन-केन-प्रकारेण लाने के लिए राष्ट्रपति का शासन लागू किया जाना संविधान के साथ अत्याचार है, संविधान के साथ बलात्कार है। मैं अफसोस के साथ कहना चाहूंगा कि वर्तमान केन्द्रीय सरकार ने, जो श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी के नेतृत्व में चल रही है, पहला जो जवम्भ अनराध किया है, वह यही किया है कि राष्ट्रपति को यह सुझाव दिया है कि राजस्थान में प्रेसीडेंट रूल कायम किया जाय।

माननीया, मेरे बहुत से मित्र सदन के बाहर मिलते रहते हैं। वे जरा इस सत्य को समझें कि आज जिनके पास अतुल सम्पत्ति है, जिनके पास अतुल साधन हैं और दूसरा जो उसके विपक्ष में है गरीब है, साधन-विहीन है, उसके लिए कांग्रेस पार्टी के खिलाफ चुनाव लड़ना कितना मुश्किल था। इसकी अनुभूति करें और इस मुश्किल के साथ भी अगर विपक्ष ने कांग्रेस को इस स्थिति में ला कर रख दिया है कि तुम्हारी अब सरकार बनाने की हैसियत नहीं रह गई है, तो यह एक मामूली चीज नहीं हुई है, यह एक बड़ी चीज हुई है और इस चीज को देख कर आज सत्ताधारी दल घबड़ा गया है।

हमारे बहुत से अच्छे मित्र जिनको मैं निजी मित्र कह सकता हूँ, राजनीतिक मित्र नहीं हैं, इस समय कांग्रेस पार्टी में हैं और इस सदन में भी विद्यमान हैं। अक्सर हमको कहा करते हैं अरे भाई, तुम कभी कभी व्यक्तिगत मामलों में फंस जाया करते हो और मैं उनसे कहता हूँ कि मैं व्यक्ति-

गत मामलों में फंसता ही नहीं। कान्क्रीट और एक्स्ट्रेक्ट आज इन दोनों का फर्क कांग्रेस सत्ताधारी दल में नहीं रह गया है। कांग्रेस सत्ताधारी दल समझता है कि एक्स्ट्रेक्ट बोलते चले जाओ, चाहे कान्क्रीट उसके विलकुल उल्टा हो। आज कांग्रेस में कौन ऐसा है, जो हमसे अच्छी हिन्दी न बोल सकता हो, कौन ऐसा है जो बढ़िया से बढ़िया शब्दों का इस्तेमाल न कर सकता हो। समाजवाद का नाम वे भी लेंगे, जनतंत्र का नाम वे भी लेंगे। जनतांत्रिक वृक्ष की शीतल छाया में जनता आनन्दविभोर हो रही है—कांग्रेस के लोग यह अक्सर कहा करते हैं। मैं भी उनसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इसके माने क्या हैं? फ्रीडम किसको कहते हैं, स्वतंत्रता के माने क्या हैं, आजादी के माने क्या हैं, कभी गम्भीरता से बैठकर सोचा गया है—

Freedom is the recognition of necessities; from the realm of necessities to the realm of freedom.

स्वतंत्रता तब होगी, जब मनुष्य अपनी विवशता के क्षेत्र से निकल कर स्वच्छन्द वातावरण में विचरण करेगा। जब हमारी मजबूरियाँ, हमारी विवशताएँ, हमारी आवश्यकताएँ, हमें दबाती चली जाती हों और हमसे कहा जाय कि हम आजाद हैं, जनतंत्र प्रणाली फल-फूल रही है, तो मैं कहूंगा कि बुद्धि के साथ धोखा मत दो, बुद्धि के साथ धोखा किया जा रहा है। इसलिए— Socialism is the total sum of human knowledge.

समाजवाद को देखा जाय, तो यह एक विकास की व्यवस्था है, स्टेटिक नहीं है, जड़ नहीं है। इसमें कान्शस फोर्स, सचेत शक्तियाँ हैं, बलाईन्ड फोर्स, अन्धी शक्तियाँ नहीं हैं। आज कांग्रेस को मैं देखता हूँ वह अन्धी शक्ति है, वह सचेत शक्ति नहीं रह गई है। क्या कारण है? वह कौनसी सरकार होगी, जो राष्ट्रपति महोदय को यह निकृष्ट सलाह देगी कि हारी हुई कांग्रेस को सत्ता में लाने के लिए गवर्नर का राज, राष्ट्रपति का राज कायम कर दिया जाय?

उस सरकार की प्रिरेक्विजिट क्या होगी, पहले की शर्तें क्या होंगी ? वही सरकार जिसके दिमाग को नरक-कुंड के गन्धे कीड़े ने चाट कर जर्जरित कर दिया हो, वही राष्ट्रपति को ऐसा सुझाव दे सकती है कि राजस्थान में प्रेसिडेंट का रूल कायम किया जाये । कोई बढ़िया सरकार कोई जनतंत्री सरकार, कोई समाजवादी सरकार ऐसी सलाह नहीं दे सकती । तो श्रीमती इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी के नेतृत्व में जो नई सरकार बनी उसने पहला यह कुकर्म किया कि जनतंत्र की पीठ में भयंकर छुरा मारा, संविधान की हत्या की, मगर यह एकाएक तो हो नहीं जायगा । मैं किसी पर भी कोई व्यक्तिगत आक्षेप हरगिज नहीं करता; हमारी आदत नहीं है, मगर मैं करूँ क्या ? अगर हमारे सदन के सम्मानित सदस्य सार्वजनिक ढंग की जो बातें हैं, उनको भी व्यक्तिगत मानने लगे, तो हमारी बड़ी मुसीबत हो जायगी । तो मैं उनसे कहना चाहूँगा कि समाज और व्यक्ति में क्या फर्क है ? क्या समाज को व्यक्तिगत मानें ? अगर दर्शन में चला जाय, तो मैं आपके जरिए कहना चाहूँगा कि यह हमारी त्वचा है, इस त्वचा के बाहर जो कुछ भी है वह पब्लिक है, सार्वजनिक है, इस त्वचा के अन्दर जो है, वह अपना है, पर्सनल है, इसके बाहर सब समाज है । हम सरकार के मंत्री के बारे में कुछ कहें, तो वे कहते हैं कि यह व्यक्तिगत है, व्यक्तिगत है । 'व्यक्तिगत' शब्द के नारे के आगे जो आज केन्द्रीय सरकार में भ्रष्टाचार का कीचड़ जमा हुआ है, उस भ्रष्टाचार के कीचड़ पर राख डालने की कोशिश न करें । अगर भ्रष्टाचार के कीचड़ पर राख डालने की कोशिश होगी, तो भयंकर विस्फोट होगा, जिसे कोई नहीं रोक सकता । कौन कहता है कि सशस्त्र क्रान्ति बहुत अच्छी चीज है । समाजवाद का विचार्यी होने के नाते मैं भी कहता हूँ कि सशस्त्र क्रान्ति कोई अच्छी चीज नहीं है । समाजवाद तो मानवता का पुजारी है । मार्क्स ने भी कभी नहीं कहा,

लेनिन ने भी कभी नहीं कहा कि सशस्त्र क्रान्ति लाजिमी है, मगर यह कहा कि जब आवश्यकता पड़े, तो होगी । गांधी जी ने भी यहां तक कहा कायरता के विरुद्ध— गांधी जी ने उदाहरण दिया कि एक महिला है, कोई उसके साथ जबरदस्ती कर रहा है, अन्याय कर रहा है, क्या करोगे, भागोगे ? क्या इस डर से भागोगे कि तुम उसको बचाने गए तो तुम्हारी जान चली जायगी तो यह कायरता होगी; कायरता से हिंसा को मैं पसन्द करता हूँ—यह महात्मा गांधी ने कहा है । इसलिये हिंसा और अहिंसा की बात में जायेंगे तो बहुत सी चीजें आयेंगी । यहां तक कि 1942 ई० में जब कि हम लोग रेल की पटरियां उखाड़ रहे थे, खम्बे गिरा रहे थे, अंग्रेजी साम्राज्यवाद की चारों चूलों को ढीला कर रहे थे, उस समय भी आज सरकारी पक्ष में जो बहुत से लोग बैठे हैं हमसे विवाद करते थे कि यह क्या कर रहे हो । कितने राज्यपाल बने हैं, जो कहते हैं कि राजनारायण मुल्क सौ साल पीछे चला गया । सौ साल पीछे चला गया यह आज जाना है । राजपाल बने हैं । खुदा की कुदरत है जो नाचीज को चीज बना दे, जो बेशऊर थे वह बातमीज बन बैठे । इसलिये मैं कहूँगा कि अगर हमको जनतांत्रिक तरीका नहीं अपनाने देना चाहते और अपनी संख्या के बल पर हमें संसदीय प्रणाली का अनुगमन नहीं करने दिया जायगा, तो होगा क्या । बड़ी चिन्ता का विषय है । मैं देख रहा हूँ कि हमें दबाया जा रहा है । मैं कहना चाहता हूँ, अदब के साथ कहना चाहता हूँ, इज्जत और आदर रखते हुये कहना चाहता हूँ कि क्या यह किसी सरकार के लिये शोभा की बात है कि सरकार के प्रमुख मंत्रियों पर, प्रधान मंत्री पर, भयंकर भयंकर आरोप लगे हों और प्रधान मंत्री बार बार कहें कि नहीं आ सकती वह सदन में आ कर जवाब न दे पायें । हमने ऐसा कहीं जनतंत्र में देखा नहीं, हमने कहीं जनतंत्र में ऐसा सुना नहीं । सदन के बाहर जिन लोगों से

[श्री राजनारायण]

हमारी बातचीत होती है, सब यही कहते हैं कि कारण क्या है। मैं नाम नहीं लूंगा। बड़े से बड़े आदमी कहते हैं कि जब हमारा शार्ट नोटिस क्वेश्चन था तो क्या बात है। हमने तो यही पूछा था कि क्या रूस की सरकार न सेबिल कोट दिया था, प्रधान मंत्री को आकर बता देना चाहिये था कि दिया या नहीं दिया, मामला साफ हो जाता। हमने तो यही पूछा था।

**उपसभापति :** अब यह तो राजस्थान बजट है।

**श्री राजनारायण :** इसलिये कह रहा हूँ कि ऐसे नेतृत्व पर जो सरकार चल रही है, उस सरकार के रहते-रहते राजस्थान में एक पैसा खर्च करने की इजाजत नहीं दी जा सकती। माननीया, इसीलिये मैं इसको अर्ज कर रहा हूँ; क्योंकि आखिर इसी सरकार ने तो सलाह दी, आज जो सरकार है उसी सरकार ने तो राष्ट्रपति को यह सलाह दी कि राजस्थान में राष्ट्रपति का शासन लागू कराया जाय। तो क्यों दें? कारण क्या है? उस कारण को मैं बता रहा हूँ। माननीया आज कहीं केन्द्र में कांग्रेस का बहुमत खत्म हो जाय, 20-25 का मामला है, वह दिन दूर नहीं कि यह हो, हो कर रहेगा यह मैं आज भविष्यवाणी किये देता हूँ, 20-25 उधर से उधर चले आये, तो फिर मामला साफ है; इसलिये तोपो, तोपो, तोपो, भ्रष्टाचार को छिपाओ, छिपाओ, छिपाओ, जितना छिपाओ उतना ही भ्रष्टाचार उभर रहा है, जितना छिपाओ उतना ही उभर रहा है। इसलिये मैं कहता हूँ कि इस सदन में जो संयम है, जो मर्यादा है, उस मर्यादा को तोड़ने की नापाक कोशिश नहीं होनी चाहिये, चाहे कोई बड़ा से बड़ा पुरुष हो। हम सदन की मर्यादा की सुरक्षा में आये हैं, इसलिये हम अपने ऊपर जोखिम लेने को तैयार हैं। यह क्या कोई अच्छी बात है कि किसी प्रधान मंत्री के ऊपर यह चार्ज लगा हो कि 25 हजार रुपये की इन्होंने अपने नाम जमीन खरीदी,

17 हजार रुपये की स्टेशन वॉगन ले ली, इन्होंने जो अपना रिटर्न जमा किया है, उसमें दो बड़े बड़े हीरे जवाहरात को छिपा रखा है। सड़कों पर जब यह चर्चा हो, फिर उस प्रधान मंत्री को सबसे पहले यह काम करना चाहिये कि आ कर अपने ऊपर लगाये हुये कीचड़ को, गन्दगी को, दूर करे, किन्तु बिना उसे दूर किये हुये वह सरकार का नेतृत्व करती हैं, तो उस सरकार से कभी भी कोई साफ काम हो ही नहीं सकता, वह असम्भव है, नामुमकिन है। हमारे मित्र तो बहुत कुछ जानते होंगे। कार्ल मार्क्स जब ब्रिटिश म्यूजियम लाइब्रेरी में पढ़ने बैठता था, तो पढ़ते पढ़ते सन सेट हो जाता था, वह सो जाता था, उसको जगाया जाता था और कहा जाता था कि चलिये। कोट का बटन गिरवी रख रख कर उसने पढ़ा। माननीया, आप जानती हैं, बहुत सारी बातों को जानती होंगी। इसी सदन में कहा कि हमारा आदर्श तो महात्मा गांधी है। आज राष्ट्रपिता बापू के नाम पर लोग कमाई कर रहे हैं, चाहे वह हम हों, चाहे सरकारी पक्ष के, कांग्रेसी सरकार के पक्ष के लोग हों, क्या राष्ट्रपिता के आदर्श का हमने याद रखा है? एक दफा कस्तूरबा ने एक लाख रुपये की हार को देने से इंकार किया, तो गांधी ने, बापू ने कहा कि वोट ले लो, उनके परिवार में वोटिंग हुई सारे लड़कों ने गांधी जी के पक्ष में वोट दिया, कस्तूरबा अलग रह गई। गांधी जी ने कहा, बा, समझ लो यह तुमको हमारी बदीलत मिला है, इसलिये तुम इसको ट्रस्ट में दे दो, जिससे कि विद्यार्थियों की पढ़ाई हो। यहाँ बड़े-बड़े उपहार मिल रहे हैं। श्री एम० ओ० मथाई के लेटर में सारा जिक्र है, वर्णन है, लेकिन उस पर कोई सफाई यहाँ पर नहीं की जा रही है। मुझको एक टंकनेकैलिटी की आइ में . . .

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA (Uttar Pradesh): On a point of order. This matter has already been ruled out by the Chair and I see no reason why this should be brought in at every stage. You should not allow it and



all such portions should be scored out from the records.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:  
Continue.

श्री राजनारायण : आप ठीक समझ गईं कि किस धातु के आदमी हैं ।

पंडित श्यामसुन्दर नारायण तन्खा :  
आप भी समझते हैं, हम भी समझते हैं ।

उपसभापति : आपके पांच मिनट हैं ।

श्री राजनारायण : आपने तो हमें आधा घंटा कहा था, हमको याद है कि आधा घंटा कहा है, हमारी घड़ी में 21 मिनट बीते हैं ।

उपसभापति : अच्छा, 7 मिनट और ।

श्री राजनारायण : 9 मिनट हैं । हम हर तरह से चौकस रहते हैं, घड़ी देखते रहते हैं, क्योंकि चारों तरफ से हमें सराउंड किये रहते हैं, हमारे ऊपर हमला बहुत है, बाण बहुत चलते हैं और हम बाणों को मोड़ने के लिये तैयार रहते हैं ।

तो हमारा कहना यह है कि आखिर हम कर क्या रहे हैं । हम अपने को साधु कहते हैं, हम अपने को संयमी कहते हैं । मैं आपकी जानकारी के लिये फिर पढ़ना चाहता हूँ, यह हमारा कहना नहीं है ।

उपसभापति : आप क्या पढ़ते हो ?

श्री राजनारायण : यह राष्ट्रपति का रेडियो ब्राडकास्ट है, डा० राधाकृष्णन् का, राष्ट्रपति का रेडियो ब्राडकास्ट है । यह हमको मिला है, यह हमने वहां से मंगवाया है । इसके तीसरे पेज पर यह है :

"Charges of corruption are frequently made against people at all levels of Government, Central and State. Immediate disposal of these charges is essential. If the charges are false, their falsehood should be exposed."

मैं भी यही चाहता हूँ । अगर हमारे चार्जज गलत हैं, तो प्राइम मिनिस्टर आ कर यहाँ सफाई कर दें कि हमारे ऊपर लगाये गये चार्जज गलत हैं । आगे राष्ट्रपति डा० राधाकृष्णन् कहते हैं, अपने रेडियो ब्राडकास्ट में :

"If there is any basis for them, this should be admitted and rectified. Such admission will enhance the prestige of the Government."

अगर चार्जज सही हैं तो . . .

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): On the advice of the Government. गवर्नमेंट का जो ड्राफ्ट होता है, वही राष्ट्रपति अपने ब्राडकास्ट में कहते हैं ।

श्री राजनारायण : बिल्कुल गलत । बैठिये । मैं समझता हूँ कि उनसे मैं ज्यादा जानता हूँ राष्ट्रपति को बजाय उनके जो श्रीमान् यहाँ शेरवानी पाजामा में बोल रहे हैं । मैं यह कह रहा हूँ कि यह ब्राडकास्ट 26 जनवरी को हुआ ।

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN:  
Madam, I am saying about the general procedure, about parliamentary procedure, and constitutionally, the President is to go according to their advice.

श्री राजनारायण : माननीया, यह हमारे समय में नहीं लिया जायगा । अगर सदस्य जानना चाहें, तो मैं आपको बता दूँ कि रेडियो ब्राडकास्ट राष्ट्रपति ने प्राइम मिनिस्टर को दिखाया तक नहीं था । यह सदन जान ले । राष्ट्रपति ने 26 जनवरी को जो रेडियो ब्राडकास्ट किया था, उसकी स्थिति सरी थी ।

पंडित श्यामसुन्दर नारायण तन्खा :  
यह आपका कहना है ।

श्री राजनारायण : ऐसा नहीं है तो बेरिफाई कर लें । आप मत करें, जो जानते

**[श्री राजनारायण]**

हों वह कीन करें जो अज्ञानी हों वह न करें। केवल एक बात राष्ट्रपति ने उसे कही थी कि आखिर में हमने धन्यवाद दिया है, जो प्रधान मंत्री ने किया है, उसके बारे में ऐसा लिखा है, लेकिन 26 जनवरी के ब्राडकास्ट को प्रेसिडेंट ने दिखाया नहीं था; क्योंकि प्रेसिडेंट निश्चित रूप से समझ गये थे कि हमको नहीं रहना है, इसलिये उन्होंने उसमें चार्ज भी गम्भीर लगाये थे। ये प्रेसिडेंट के चार्ज हैं। उसको भी कड़ा चाहता हूँ। जरा इसको देखा जाय।

**श्री अकबर अली खान :** कैसे कहते हैं कि प्रेसिडेंट नहीं रहना चाहते, प्रेसिडेंट तो हम उन्हें रखेंगे।

**श्री राजनारायण :** रबिये। तो ठीक है, हमारे तो गुरु ही हैं, हमारा तो सारा सम्मान, आदर उनके लिये है, मगर ऐसा नहीं है कि अभी उनके लिये है, तो डा० ज.किर हुसैन के लिये नहीं है, दोनों के लिये है। हम सेकुलर हैं।

**पंडित श्यामसुन्दर नारायण तन्ना :** हमको भी उतना ही है। आप अकेले नहीं है।

**श्री राजनारायण :** देखिये माननीया, इतना समय हमारे में मत रखिये।

"The last year has been the worst since independence, full of natural calamities and human failures. In spite of our increased agricultural output and industrial production, we are unable to meet the requirements of a growing population. The drought conditions are worse than ever before in this country. Yet, even after making allowance for all the difficulties of the situation, we cannot forgive widespread incompetence and the gross mismanagement of our resources."

यह प्रेसिडेंट का हुना है, यह हमारा कहना नहीं है।

"We cannot overlook the fact that, in a country of chronic food shortage, a third of the annual produce is destroyed by pests and waste."

तो यह हमारे प्रेसिडेंट का कहना है। वही कांग्रेस सरकार रह गई प्रधान मंत्री इन्दिरा नेहरू गांधी की सरकार और इसी कांग्रेस सरकार में जनतंत्र की हत्या हो रही है और फिर हमारे मित्र पंत जी कहते हैं, उसके लिये वोट ग्रान अकाउन्ट कर दो। मेरे लिये यह असम्भव है, उनके लिए स्नेह का भाव रखते हुए भी हमारी मुसीबत है।

आगे माननीया हमें प्रधान मंत्री का एक महान नवीकरण एक पुस्तिका मिली है। इस ओर भी ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ। ग्राम चुनाव ने यह सबक दिया है कि "देश काम, प्रगति और परिवर्तन चाहता है।" यह प्रधान मंत्री ने लिखा है देश के लिये। उनको यह समझ में आया है ग्राम चुनाव के बाद। ग्राम चुनाव ने यह सबक दिया है गोया कि यह सबक पहले उनके पास नहीं था। ग्राम चुनाव ने क्या सबक दिया है कि देश काम चाहता है, प्रगति चाहता है और परिवर्तन चाहता है। यह सबक हमेशा से है। कोई भी देश ऐसा नहीं है, जो काम न चाहता रहा हो या प्रगति न चाहता रहा हो, प्रगतिशील होना न चाहता रहा हो। प्रगतिशीलता दुनिया का नियम है। गांधी जी ने कहा, दुनिया के दो ही सिद्धान्त हैं : एक विकास एक मृत्यु। मार्क्स ने रिवोल्यूशन इवोल्यूशन कहा। मार्क्स ने कहा मात्रा भेद होते होते गठभेद हो जाता है। हम कहते हैं, एक अनन्त है, एक प्रवाह है। प्रधान मंत्री ने क्या परिवर्तन किया? यही परिवर्तन किया कि जनता का राज्य होना चाहिये था, वहाँ प्रेस का रुल जारी कर दिया। आज मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि राजस्थान में

जिस ढंग से बंगलिंग हुई है, जिस ढंग से संविधान के साथ धोखा किया गया है, जनता की इच्छा के साथ गद्दारी की गई है, वहां की जन भावना की अभिव्यक्ति पर पर्दा डाला गया है। केवल एक नुस्ते नजरिये से मैं आज साफ एलान कर देना चाहता हूँ कि यह बीच का प्रयोग केवल इसलिए दिया गया कि कांग्रेस का बहुमत हो जाय और प्रेसिडेंट का रुल तब तक वहां कायम रहेगा जब तक कांग्रेस का बहुमत नहीं होगा। (*Time bell rings*) कांग्रेस का बहुमत जिस घड़ी हो जायेगा, तिकड़मबाजी, अनियमितता और बर्झमानी के भागों को अख्तियार करके, उसी दिन वह प्रेसिडेंट का रुल खत्म हो जायेगा। कांग्रेस का बहुमत तो है लेकिन उस बहुमत में भी कांग्रेस अपनी गवर्नमेंट नहीं बना सकी।

तो मैं पुनः आपके जरिये इस सदन से अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि सदन के सम्मानित सदस्य जरा सरकार को चेतावनी दें। अगर सरकार आज इस मामले को ठीक नहीं करना चाहती है तो माननीया आप देख रही हैं, उत्तर प्रदेश में क्या होने जा रहा है? हो सकता है, शाम को ही हमारी बुल बंद आ जाय और हम चले जायें। उत्तर प्रदेश में भी गड़बड़ हो रही है, उत्तर प्रदेश में भी कांग्रेस सरकार का तख्ता पलटेगा, आज पलटे, कल पलटे या दस पन्द्रह दिनों बाद पलटे। आज जिस स्टेट में आपने तिकड़म की है प्रेसिडेंट रुल कायम करके, जन भावना को दबाने के लिये उस अब जनता चलाने नहीं देगी चाहे इसके लिए जो भी मुसीबत उठानी पड़े। हम उस मुसीबत को उठाने के लिये तैयार हैं।

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: Madam Deputy Chairman, no sadder commentary upon the way in which the Congress Party has been dealing with democracy can be provided than this Proclamation under article 356 of the Constitution in relation to Rajasthan.

I have heard in the course of the Budget Debate interpellations and interjections from the Benches on the other side to the effect that, well, the Congress is still the majority party in most of the States though in some of the States the Congress has not been able to form the Ministry. But than the question is not really that, and I think the Members of the ruling Party should now begin to appreciate and realise that actually the disintegration has started. The saddest part of it is this that though the disintegration of the Congress as the ruling party has started in the country, the Congress Members refuse to read the writing on the wall and go on committing a grave affront, a great outrage on democracy just after the election in Rajasthan. Well, it is correctly said that those whom the gods want to destroy first make them mad, and I am quite sure that the Congress what it has done immediately after the election, in spite of the fact that they lost so much of prestige throughout India, that itself shows that they are persisting in careering through the mad path which they have chalked out for the last 20 years for their complete destruction.

Madam Deputy Chairman, we are now discussing a Budget and I do not know by what right or by what authority except the right of authority of authoritarianism we are discussing a Budget for a State which had its election and by virtue of that election the elected representatives of that State ought to have discussed their own Budget, their State Budget, a Budget which could have brought welfare to the State. It was for them to discuss their Budget. But as interlopers, so to say, we are discussing the Budget for Rajasthan. We are discussing the Budget for Rajasthan by virtue of an aberration of the Constitutional democracy which has been presented to us in the form of a Proclamation under article 356 of the Constitution. No greater abuse of the rights of the Constitution has ever been seen than this distorted application, this unwarranted, un-

[Shri A. P. Chatterjee.]

democratic application of the principles of the Constitution.

Madam Deputy Chairman, I do not know under what authority actually the provisions of article 3J6 have been invoked in over-ruling the popular will in Rajasthan and in upsetting the Assembly there and setting up the President's Rule. I know the answer will be this, that we have done it in accordance with the letter of the Constitution. But is it all? Is it really the last word on democracy? I should say that the spirit of the Constitution has also to be complied with; the spirit of the Constitution has also to be obeyed. If the spirit is not respected, you cannot justify your action by pointing to this fact that the letter of the Constitution has been obeyed by you, because it is not a question of arguing a case or pleading your own brief in a court of law. It is actually a case of pleading your case before the political forum of the people of India. And I am quite sure, Madam Deputy Chairman, in that pleading before the forum of people of India Government have lost their case, the Congress Party has lost their case. The Congress Party has nothing to show to the people that what they have done is in consonance with the canons of democracy. It is a sad thing that we here in this House are now discussing the Budget for Rajasthan instead of the elected representatives of the people of Rajasthan. I know these words are bandied about outside and inside the House that, "Well, the representatives were the Rajahs and Maharajahs belonging to the Swatantra Party who may not have much to say on behalf of democracy", this, that and the other.

I am not going into that question whether the Rajas and Maharajas are democrats. We are not the persons to see that and that is not the point for discussion here. The point for discussion is that if the people of the State chooses the Rajas and Maha-

rajas as their representatives, who are you, busy bodies here in this Ministry, to point out to them that they should not have the rule of the Rajas and Maharajas which they have chosen for themselves and not the rule of the President which you choose to impose upon them? Is that the principle of democracy which you want to impose? Is that the principle of democracy which you want to implement? The principle of democracy is that the rule must be of the representatives of the people. You cannot dictate to the people which representatives they will choose and whom they will elect. If you begin to give instructions to the people, if you begin to say to the people that their choice is wrong, along that channel comes Fascism. Along that channel comes dictatorship because immediately you think that you are wiser than the people, immediately you want to impose your own personal rule upon the people. That way really dictatorship is brought about. That way really Hitlerism flourishes. It is not the business of the Ministry to say which representatives will rule a particular State and which representatives will not rule. Therefore it was a travesty of democracy to have issued this Proclamation. Look at the circumstances in which this Proclamation was issued. The circumstances are tell-tale circumstances. The circumstances are such as to point out unmistakably that the Congress party was not willing to have a non-Congress Ministry in Rajasthan. I do not know really if the stake was only Rajasthan. Perhaps the stake was the Congress rule in the other States also, perhaps in the State of U.P. also. They wanted to browbeat the people, they wanted to browbeat the representatives of the people and by issuing the Proclamation in Rajasthan they wanted to rule the other parts of India also. The stake was much higher for the Congress than actually it was sought to be represented to the people. Really they wanted to have clamped upon the entire country their own rule even though the people

dismissed their rule through the ballot boxes.

You know the circumstances in which the President's Rule was promulgated in Rajasthan. On 27th February Maharawal Laxman Singh was there. He may be a Maharaja. I am a Communist and not an apologist for the Maharajas. If I was given my way, then I would be the first person to take away the Privy Purse from them but these Congress people are giving them the Privy Purse. The Congress Ministry is nursing the Rajas and Maharajas, the hoodlums and blackmarketeers as well as the monopolists. They are nursing them. I am not an apologist for the Maharajas and Maharanis but what I say is that you cannot really dictate to the people what kind of Government they will have. The people of Rajasthan elected the Maharajas, maybe Maharajas and Maharanis and on 27th February 1967 Maharawal Laxman Singh, the Leader of the non-Congress Opposition Party went to the Government and said: 'We have the majority and you must call -us to form a Ministry'. You know this Governor, who poses to be a great philosopher, whose philosophy only consists in how to throttle the democracy—actually it appears that "whatever be his democracy, whatever be his philosophy, that is not a democratic philosophy—invited on 4th March 1967 Mr. Sukhadia, the Chief Minister, who was carrying on the Caretaker Government, according to him, in the State of Rajasthan and asked him to form the Government. There were disturbances and on 12th March Mr. Sukhadia definitely and categorically says that he is not in a position to form a Government. Yet the Governor does not call the Opposition to form a Ministry, Yet the Governor does not call the Leader of the non-Congress Opposition to form a Ministry and to have a democratic Government in Rajasthan. It was his obligation to do so. I know the letter of the Constitution is now being so much talked about here but according to article 164 was

168 RS^7.

it not obligatory upon the Governor of Rajasthan to have a Ministry which would advise him and if it was obligatory!—because article 164 says that there shall be a Council of Ministers to advise the Governor, and there is no way out of it that the Governor must have a Council of Ministers to advise him, if the article says this—was it not his obligation to see that a Council of Ministers is drawn from a party which will have a majority in the Legislature in Rajasthan? It was quite clear at that moment—on 12th March—when Mr. Sukhadia said to the Governor: 'I am not prepared, I am not in a position to form a Ministry—and when article 164 laid the obligation on the Governor to have a Council of Ministers—I use the word 'obligation\* because it was obligatory on the Governor to form a Council of Ministers—I use the word 'obligation' without a Council of Ministers to advise him—if that was his obligation, if Mr. Sukhadia declined to form a Ministry, was it not his duty to call the Leader of the non-Congress group to form the Government, who had definitely 92 Members behind him and one Communist Member is saying that he will support a non-Congress Ministry but not a Congress Ministry'. So he had 93 Members on his side, giving the non-Congress Opposition a clear majority. That was his obligation but that was not to be. This Governor, who dabbles in philosophy, who dabbles in politics, goes beyond his depths and issues a statement. Look at the statement which he has given. I have rarely found this line of reasoning from a constitutional Governor, a Governor who ought to be a Constitutional Governor, according to the Constitution. He says this: "I feel that I cannot conscientiously call upon the other group." Is it left to his conscience to call one group or the other? Is it left to his discretion to call one group or the other? You know that article 164 does not give, in the formation of a Ministry, any discretion to the Governor. The discretion of the Governor is really

[Shri A. P. Chatterjee.] confined, according to the Constitution, to certain specified matters and those are specified in the Sixth Schedule, they are mentioned in paragraphs 18 and 19 of the Sixth Schedule. Really in those matters the Governor can exercise his discretion. He cannot exercise his discretion in any other matter. There is no discretion at all involved in having a Ministry formed to carry on a democratic Government in Rajasthan and yet the Governor says 'I cannot conscientiously call upon the other group.'. What conscience is there in the Governor not to have called the non-Congress' Opposition to form a Ministry? I would say that he betrayed his conscience, he butchered his conscience by not calling the non-Congress Opposition to form a Ministry. It does not rest here. I would say that Dr. Sampurnanand, in issuing the statement, acted like a modern Don Quixote who wanted to tilt at the wind mill of democracy. I know he is now having to retire or go out. That is the lot or that is the fate of all Don Quixotes who want to tilt at the windmills. He was tilting at the windmill here. He has said: "These people have - deliberately broken the law themselves." How did they break the law? Look at the gem of a statement which the Governor has made.

Madam, I have taken only fifteen minutes. You will please allow me five or seven minutes more.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Five more.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: Seven minutes.

Now, Madam Deputy Chairman, what he says in the letter? He says this: They refused to leave the jail saying that they would not go unless everyone arrested in connection with the agitation was released simultaneously. And now, Madam, this is the example of the lawlessness of the persons who were already put inside

the jail by the Sukhadia Government. Madam, I am just placing this before you and before this House that if certain persons who are in Jail, if they say that they cannot really bring to bear their influence upon the people unless all the people arrested in connection with the agitation are released, is it breaking the law? Is it saying something defiance of the law? I think that it is the pre-condition for normalisation of conditions in a particular area when the leaders say, 'You release all and then we shall take charge of the normalisation of the conditions in the State.' And because they said this, therefore this Governor comes forward and says that they said this; therefore they are persons wedded to law and therefore I did not invite them. Madam, it would be a bad day for democracy in India when the Governor should be given the discretion to find out whether particular representatives elected by the people are or are not wedded to law and democracy, and say, according to his own subjective opinion, as to who is the person wedded to law and who is the person wedded not to law and then to call persons to form the Ministry. It would be a bad day for democracy if such a thing comes about. But then we have to say this with regret that this has come about, and this Governor has now come forward with a statement which is not worth the ink even with which it is written. It is a statement which does not bear moment's scrutiny. And then what else has been done? According to article 356 the President has to act on the advice of the Governor or he has to act on his own motion. It is admitted that he has acted on the advice of the Governor, and as I told you, Madam, the whole thing was done on the 14th of March, 1967. Now on the 14th of March the caretaker Ministry of Mr. Sukhadia was on the saddle. It is quite imaginable, therefore, that the Governor who, according to article 163 of the Constitution cannot act on his own motion but must act on the advice of the Minister-

try, acted on the advice of this caretaker Ministry of Mr. Sukhadia, a Ministry which had lost its majority in the Legislature, which could not claim the majority in the Legislature and who definitely said on the 12th of March that he could not form the Ministry. Yet, on the advice of Mr. Sukhadia and his group, Dr. Sampurnanand acts, and on the basis of the report of Dr. Sampurnanand the President issues the Proclamation. Madam Deputy Chairman, this, in my submission, is a great affront to democracy. Yet, we of this House are asked to discuss a Budget which the elected representatives of the people ought to have discussed.

One word more, Madam, I will say, and it is this.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, continue.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: One word more. I asked for more but you gave me only five minutes more. It is not even that. Even the five minutes are not yet over, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have only one word more to say, and I think one minute should suffice.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: I have not a Gargantuan mouth and I cannot express everything in one minute. It is all right; only two minutes.

Now, Madam, it has been said in the course of the debate in this House that the President should or should not have acted in a particular manner. Of course I have got my reservations on this point. I will never agree with these observations made as to when the President should or should not act up to the advice of a Minister or the advice of the Home Minister or the Prime Minister. If the President acts on his own initiative and does not act on the advice of the Ministry, well, then again a kind of dictatorship will come, which certainly I cannot approve of, and which I certainly do not support. But that is not the ques-

tion; it is not a question of really criticising the Proclamation of the President; the Proclamation has "Been made by the President no doubt on the report of the Governor. But again, according to the provisions of the Constitution the President also acts on the advice of the Ministry. Really therefore the Congress Ministry in the Centre had advised the President to issue the Proclamation under article 356. Therefore the whole thing . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now I think you must wind up, because there are two more speakers.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: I am winding up within a minute.

Therefore it is not a question of really a Proclamation issued by the President in his own individual judgment; it is a question of the issue of the Proclamation by the President on the advice of the Congress Ministry there and the Congress Ministry at the Centre advised the President to issue the Proclamation under article 356 of the Constitution, and this advice has been given by the Congress Ministry in violation of all principles of democracy, in violation of the expressed wishes of the people of Rajasthan who wanted to have their own representatives to rule them, and not the President to rule them through the same Governor who put them inside the jail and killed seven persons by firing and who again suggested the winding up of the Assembly.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: The last sentence I will say. It is now high time and proper—of course two Congress Ministers have said "It is high time that they should not mark time, and we expect them, and the people of India expect them—well, if they do not want to dig their own graves further—to revoke this Proclamation without any further delay, if they have got any little sympathy or

any little consideration for the principles of democracy.

This is all, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Devi Singh, Please be brief.

SHRI DEVI SINGH (Rajasthan): I will try. माननीया उपसभापति महोदया आज यह दुर्भाग्य का विषय है कि राजस्थान के बजट पर राजस्थान की जनता के द्वारा चुने हुए नुमाइन्दों के होते हुए इस हाउस के अन्दर विचार करना पड़ रहा है। यह प्रश्न क्यों आया ? हमारे राजस्थान के राज्यपाल ने यह सिफारिश की थी कि राजस्थान में व्यवस्था बिगड़ी हुई है, शान्ति नहीं है। इसलिए वहां राष्ट्रपति शासन की घोषणा की जाय और उसके ऊपर राष्ट्रपति शासन की घोषणा 13 तारीख को हुई। अब प्रश्न यह आता है कि हमारे सामने कि राज्यपाल ने जो राष्ट्रपति को लिखा वास्तव में उसमें कितनी सचाई थी। वास्तव में क्या राजस्थान के अन्दर स्थिति बिगड़ी हुई थी, क्या वहां शान्ति नहीं थी ? मैं आपके सामने इस चीज के सम्बन्ध में कुछ तथ्य रखना चाहता हूँ।

जब 2 मार्च को राज्यपाल के द्वारा इस निर्णय को घोषणा होने को थी कि वे किसको सरकार बनाने के लिए आमंत्रित करते हैं उस रोज उन्होंने कुछ विचारधारा अपना बनाई और उस विचारधारा के अनुसार उन्होंने कागज साइक्लोस्टाइल करके प्रैस की मीटिंग के पहले सब तैयारी कर रखी थी। 11 बजे का उन्होंने समय दिया था। 10 बजे विरोधी दल के नेता उनसे मिलते हैं और एक कम्युनिस्ट सदस्य जिनके लिए उनकी धारणा थी कि वे तटस्थ रहेंगे वे भी उनके साथ जाते हैं। अब उनके जाने से राज्यपाल महोदय का जो निर्णय था

वह सारा गड़बड़ हो गया। राज्यपाल महोदय जो सबसे बैठे थे उसके बजाय कम्युनिस्ट सदस्य ने लिखित रूप में दे दिया और जबानी कह दिया कि मेरा मत विरोधी दल की सरकार के साथ माना जाय। उस समय आते वक्त एक निर्दलीय सदस्य यह कहते हैं कि— I hope your decision will be impartial. इसके ऊपर राज्यपाल के मस्तिष्क का संतुलन बिगड़ जाता है। वे कहते हैं कि ऐसी चीजें सुनने का मैं आदी नहीं हूँ और इसलिए 24 घंटे तक उनको अपना निश्चय पोस्टपोन करना पड़ता है। अब आप सोचिए कि सम्पूर्णानन्द जैसे राजनीतिज्ञ जो यू० पी० जैसे प्रान्त के मुख्य मंत्री रहे इतने वर्षों से जो राजनीति में रहे एक निर्दलीय सदस्य के इस सेन्टेंस कहने पर कि— I hope you will be impartial. उनके मस्तिष्क का संतुलन नहीं रह सका। तो इसका तात्पर्य क्या हुआ। इसका तात्पर्य यह हुआ कि वह जो निर्णय लेने वाले थे उन का सारा निर्णय गड़बड़ हो गया था इसलिए वह 24 घंटे में दुबारा दूसरा तरीका निकालना चाहते थे। उसके बाद मैं आपसे निवेदन करूँ कि उसी रोज 2 तारीख को सायंकाल जयपुर में एक बहुत बड़ी आम सभा हुई कई लाख की भीड़ थी और वह उस मीटिंग में बिल्कुल शान्त रही। उसके बाद 3 तारीख को उनका निर्णय आना था और उस रोज सुबह 5 बजे से धारा 144 लागू कर दी जाती है। आप ख्याल फर्माइये कि धारा 144 लागू कर राज्यपाल अपना निर्णय सुनावें इसका तात्पर्य क्या हुआ। इसका तात्पर्य बिल्कुल स्पष्ट था कि राज्यपाल को खुद यह महसूस हो रहा था कि वह एक गलत कदम उठाने जा रहे हैं और उनका गलत कदम ऐसा है कि उनको धारा 144 पहले से लगा देना जरूरी है और उन्होंने धारा 144 सुबह पांच बजे से लगाई जब कि 11 बजे निर्णय देना था। क्या हमारे देश के इतिहास में बताया जा सकता है कि किसी प्रान्त में बहुमत से जीती हुई सरकार



के लिये निर्णय देने के पहले धारा 144 लगाने की कभी जरूरत पड़ी है। अगर नहीं पड़ी तो राजस्थान में राज्यपाल को धारा 144 पहले से लागाने की आवश्यकता क्यों पड़ी? क्योंकि वह खुद यह मान रहे थे कि वह जो निर्णय देने जा रहे हैं वह गलत है, निष्पक्ष नहीं है और इसलिये उन्होंने धारा 144 लागू करवाई।

इसके बाद आप देखिये की 5 तारीख को धारा 144 के विरुद्ध तमाम संयुक्त पार्टियों की तरफ से जलूस निकाला गया और उसमें तमाम पार्टियों के नेता अरेस्ट हुए। अरेस्ट के बाद पुलिस के द्वारा लाठी चार्ज हुआ, टीयरगैस छोड़ी गई परन्तु जनता बिल्कुल शान्त रही। जनता की तरफ से बिल्कुल कोई गड़बड़ी नहीं हुई। आप देखिये कि 5 तारीख के बाद 7 तारीख को जैसा कि कहा जाता है कि जनता ने हमला किया इस लिये फायरिंग की नौबत आ गई। प्रश्न यह है कि धारा 144 को 7 तारीख को उठा लिया जाता है, यहां से गृह मंत्री ने कहा कि तमाम जो अरेस्टेड नेता हैं वे सब रिहा कर दिए जायेंगे और धारा 144 वहां से हटा दी जायगी। डेढ़ बजे रेडियो के द्वारा यह अनाउंस होता है कि धारा 144 हटा ली गई किन्तु नेताओं को छोड़ा नहीं गया, पुलिस को शहर से हटाया नहीं गया। इसका तात्पर्य था कि वहां उा वक्त जो केयर-टेकर गवर्नमेंट श्री मुखड़िया जी की थी वह चाहती थी कि गड़बड़ हो। आप देखिये कि जनता ने जब अपने नेताओं के छोड़े जाने की खबर सुनी तो वह जेल जाने के लिये इकट्ठा हुई और खाना हुई; पुलिस शहर में मौजूद थी और उसके सामने आते ही पुलिस ने फायरिंग प्रोपन की। कहा यह जाता है कि पुलिस ने सेल्फ डिफेंस में फायरिंग की। साढ़े तीन बजे वह फायरिंग चली और पांच बजे तक चलती रही। अब आप सोचें कि सेल्फ डिफेंस में साढ़े तीन बजे से पांच बजे तक कहीं फायरिंग चल सकती है।

किसी मजिस्ट्रेट का आर्डर नहीं था फायरिंग के लिये और जो फायरिंग जयपुर में हुई वह शहर में कई स्थानों पर हुई।

**SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA:** It is the subject matter of a judicial enquiry by a High Court judge.

**श्री देवी सिंह :** मैं तो वही कह रहा हूँ जो कि तथ्य है। दीजिए आर फेक्ट्स। मैं और कुछ नहीं कह रहा हूँ।

**THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** He says it is the subject matter of a judicial enquiry and so it is sub judice.

**SHRI DEVI SINGH:** These are facts.

**SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA:** A High Court judge is looking into this.

**श्री देवी सिंह :** मेरा निवेदन जो था वह यह था कि सेल्फ डिफेंस के अन्दर फायरिंग हुई 7 तारीख को और 7 तारीख के बाद से लेकर 13 तारीख तक जयपुर में कोई घटना नहीं हुई। आपका जो सरकारी रेडियो है वह बोलता रहा है, उन्होंने कहा कि जयपुर में कोई भी अप्रिय घटना नहीं घटी, अखबारों में यह बराबर आता रहा कि शांति है। मतलब यह कि 7 तारीख से 13 तारीख के बीच कोई घटना ऐसी नहीं हुई जिससे आप कह सकते हैं कि शांति भंग हुई या शांति भंग होने का अन्देश हुआ। कर्फ्यू जो लगा हुआ था उसमें सुबह तीन घंटे और सायंकाल तीन घंटे का रिलैक्सेशन दिया जाता था और उसके बीच में कोई घटना नहीं हुई। तो फिर हमारी सरकार ने कैसे मान लिया कि राजस्थान में शांति व्यवस्था नहीं रही थी और इसलिये वहां के जो चुने हुए नुमाइन्दे थे उनको न शपथ दिलाकर राष्ट्रपति शासन करने की आवश्यकता पड़ी। मान लीजिये कि ऐसा कोई कारण होता भी तो 7 तारीख के बाद 8 को, 9 को, 10 को, किसी भी तारीख को यह घोषणा

[ श्री देवी ]

हो सकती थी, परन्तु जब 12 तारीख को श्री सुब्बाड़िया ने यह कहा कि मैं सरकार नहीं बना सकता हूँ तब 13 तारीख को यह घोषणा की गई कि राष्ट्रपति का शासन किया जाता है क्यों कि वहाँ शांति नहीं है। मैं पूछता हूँ कि क्या 7 तारीख से 13 तारीख के बीच में वहाँ शांति नहीं थी और अगर नहीं मानते तो उसकी पहले घोषणा क्यों नहीं हुई। यह स्पष्ट निश्चय कर रहा है कि चूंकि श्री सुब्बाड़िया सरकार बनाने में असमर्थ रहे इसलिये विरोधी दलों की सरकार को मौका नहीं देना चाहते थे और राज्यपाल ने यह एक तरीका निकाला, या यह कहिये कि उन्होंने राष्ट्रपति शासन लागू करने के लिये शांति भंग होने का एक तरीका बताया।

अब मैं यही निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि 7 तारीख से ले कर आज के दिन तक जयपुर के अन्दर कोई घटना नहीं हुई है अगर हुई है तो मंत्री महोदय फर्मायें। अब 7 तारीख से ले कर आज तक वहाँ कोई ऐसी घटना नहीं घटी है तो फिर आप कैसे कह सकते हैं कि जयपुर और राजस्थान में शान्ति नहीं है इसलिये हमें राष्ट्रपति शासन लागू करना पड़ा। इसका मतलब बिल्कुल स्पष्ट है कि जनता के द्वारा चुने हुये नुमाइंदों की सरकार नहीं बनाया चाहते हैं, वहाँ डेमोक्रेसी को नहीं चलने देना चाहते हैं, आप सिर्फ यह चाहते हैं कि कांग्रेस की सरकार हो तो चले बना विरोधी दल की सरकार नहीं चले।

यह आप देख लें कि इसी चीज को ले कर चलें कि एक दिन फायरिंग हुई इसलिये वहाँ व्यवस्था नहीं है तो आपसे मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि इसके पहले सुब्बाड़िया जी के शासन में उदयपुर में गोली चली है तो तब क्यों नहीं आपने सुब्बाड़िया

जी की सरकार को बर्खास्त किया था या यह नहीं कहा कि वहाँ फायरिंग हुई है, व्यवस्था नहीं है, इसलिये राजस्थान में यह सरकार नहीं रखते। इसके अलावा और भी अनेक प्रान्तों में समय समय पर ऐसी घटनाएँ हुई, उन घटनाओं को ले कर गोलियाँ चलाई गईं, आदमी मारे गये, व्यवस्थाएँ बिगड़ीं, परन्तु सरकार ने कहीं यह कदम नहीं उठाया। तो यह सीतेला व्यवहार राजस्थान के साथ क्यों किया जा रहा है। क्या मैं यह पूछ सकता हूँ कि देश की आजादी के बाद यहाँ दिल्ली में कितनी दफा गोलियाँ चलीं। जहाँ तक मेरी जानकारी है यहाँ सब से पहले 1954 ई० में और फिर 1956 में गोली चली और फिर 1966 को 7 नवम्बर को पार्लियामेंट हाउस के सामने चली। तब क्यों नहीं कहा कि इसलिये यहाँ की कांग्रेस सरकार को हटा कर राष्ट्रपति का शासन हो। इतनी अव्यवस्था हो गई थी, यहाँ राजधानी में पार्लियामेंट हाउस के सामने गोली चल रही थी, लोग मर रहे थे और आप चुपचाप बैठ थे, आपने नन्दा जी को एक शिकार बना कर भिनिस्ट्री से निकाल दिया और आपकी गवर्नमेंट बनो रही, यहाँ भी राष्ट्रपति शासन किया जाना चाहिये था। अगर राजस्थान में एक दिन गोली चलने से इतना नुकान हो गया कि राजस्थान में शान्ति नहीं है इसलिये हमको वहाँ चुने हुये नुमाइंदों को जो सरकार हो उसको हटा देना चाहिये।

मैं आप लोगों के सामने और हाउस के सामने आज यह रखना चाहता हूँ कि वास्तव में राजस्थान के साथ जो बर्ताव हुआ है यह एक बहुत ही अनुचित बर्ताव हुआ है जिसको हम डेमोक्रेसी की हत्या कह सकते हैं। राजस्थान में जनता के साथ एक मखौल हो रहा है और पार्लियामेंट को और आपको आज यह

सोचना चाहिये कि वास्तव में जो है वह चीज नहीं चल सकती है, जनता इस तरह से नहीं दबाई जा सकती है। आज जो सही नुमाइंदा हैं उनके हाथ में शासन आना चाहिये आपके राष्ट्रपति के शासन को शीघ्रातिशीघ्र हटाना चाहिये।

**श्री जगत नारायण (पंजाब) :** मैडम डिपुटी चैयरमैन, मैं आपकी बसाकत से वजीर साहब की खिदमत में यह अर्ज करना चाहता हूँ कि वे ठंडे दिल से मेरे दो मुझावों पर गौर करने की कोशिश करें। मेरा पहला सुझाव यह है कि राजस्थान में कांग्रेस बहुमत में नहीं आ सकी इसलिये वहाँ पर कांग्रेस को अपोजिशन में बैठना चाहिये। मैडम आपको याद होगा एक साल पहले जब कि केरल में राष्ट्रपति राज के मुताल्लिक वहाँ पर बहस हुई थी तो उस वक्त मैंने यह कहा था कि कांग्रेस को अपोजिशन में बैठना भी सीखना चाहिये। मगर उस वक्त तो मेरी बात को स्वीकार नहीं किया गया। अब की बैलट ने कांग्रेस की यह स्वीकार कराया है कई जगह पर कि वह अपोजिशन में बैठे। तो मैं बड़े अदब से वजीर साहब की खिदमत में अर्ज करूँगा कि आज उन्होंने जो बजट पेश किया है उस बजट को तो आज पास हो ही जाना है मगर आज ही वे अपनी तकरीर में वह ऐलान करें कि वह राष्ट्रपति राज को खत्म कराते हैं और इसके साथ ही वह यह कहें कि कांग्रेस वहाँ अकलियत में है और अपोजिशन में बैठेगी। अगर आज यह वातावरण हमारी केन्द्रीय सरकार पैदा करने की कोशिश करेगी तो मैं समझता हूँ कि यकीनन उनके हक में एक आवाज उठेगी। मगर मुझे शक है इस बात का कि वह मेरे इस सुझाव पर गौर करने की कोशिश करेंगे। मैं क्यों कहता हूँ कि उनको गौर करना चाहिये क्योंकि

वज्जारत बनाने के लिये एक ही यार्डिस्टिक होनी चाहिये। पंजाब में भी कांग्रेस अकलियत में थी तो वहाँ पर जो आज गौर कांग्रेसी वज्जारत बनी है वह सात अपोजिशन के इन्डिपेन्डेंट मेम्बरान की वजह से बनी है और यहाँ पर राजस्थान में जो गौर-कांग्रेसी वज्जारत गवर्नर ने नहीं बनाने दी और उन्होंने जो एक दलाल अपनी दी कि जो इन्डिपेन्डेंट हैं उन पर कोई ऐगवार नहीं किया जा सकता है, उनकी कोई पार्टी नहीं है मगर आज जो देश की अदब है उसके मुताबिक आज आप देख लें कि पंजाब में भी कांग्रेसियों ने फ्लोर क्रास किया है और वे अपोजिशन में आकर शामिल हुए हैं आज हरियाणा में जो पहले आपकी कांग्रेस की वज्जारत बनी थी वहाँ पर भी कांग्रेस ने फ्लोर क्रास किया है और वहाँ गौर-कांग्रेसी वज्जारत बनी है और न मालूम कल यू० पी० में क्या हो जाय वहाँ भी शायद कांग्रेस फ्लोर क्रास कर जाय और इस तरह वहाँ भी एक गौर-कांग्रेसी वज्जारत बन जाय। तो सिर्फ यह यार्डिस्टिक रखना कि जो इन्डिपेन्डेंट हैं उनकी कोई पार्टी नहीं है उनको काउन्ट नहीं करना है गौर कांग्रेस वज्जारत बनाने के लिये, तो यह गलत यार्डिस्टिक थी जो गवर्नर ने राजस्थान में अख्तियार की। मगर पंजाब में वह गलती नहीं की गई वहाँ इन्डिपेन्डेंट को साथ मिला कर गौर कांग्रेस मंत्रिमंडल बनाने की इजाजत दी गई।

**श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी :** राजस्थान के आंदोलन से सवक ले लिया।

**श्री जगत नारायण :** यह मैं समझता हूँ सवक ले लिया। मगर वहाँ आपने देखा कि महाराजा पटियाला जिनके मुकाबले में कांग्रेस ने अपना आदमी खड़ा किया था, उनका खयाल था कि वह कांग्रेस में शामिल हो जायेंगे, वे इन्डिपेन्डेंट कामयाब होंगे लेकिन अमा तक वे

[ श्री जगत नारायण ]

इन्डिपेन्डेंट है, कांग्रेस में शामिल नहीं हुए। इसलिये मैं बड़े भ्रदब से आपकी वसाकत से प्रधान मंत्री की खिदमत में भी अर्ज करूंगा कि वे इस बात को अब भी सोचें सुखाडिया साहब और एक या दो या चार आदमियों को अपने साथ मिलाने की अब भी सोच रहे हैं। उनको यह कोशिश खत्म कर देनी चाहिये क्योंकि वह मेरे खयाल में कामयाब नहीं होगी। अब वहां कांग्रेस का अपोजिशन में बैठना चाहिये और अपोजिशन में बैठ कर गैर कांग्रेसी वजारत को वहां बनने का मौका देना चाहिये।

**सरदार रघुवीर सिंह पंजहजारी** (पंजाब) : अगर आप कांग्रेस मिनिसट्री को तोड़ना चाहते हैं तो क्या कांग्रेस को हक नहीं कि वह गैर कांग्रेस मिनिसट्री को तोड़े।

**श्री जगत नारायण** : नहीं मैं, बनने के बाद की बात कह रहा हूं। आपकी हिम्मत है तो तोड़िये। इस वक्त, मैं समझता हूं, पब्लिक की वडिवट का अहतराम होना चाहिये कि आपको अकसरियत में क्यों नहीं रखा गया। यह मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूं।

तीसरी बात, मंडम मैं आपकी वकासत से, क्योंकि आपको भी कांग्रेस से बहुत भारी प्रेम है, आप देशभक्त हैं, कहना चाहता हूं कि आज कांग्रेस को देखना चाहिये कि आज सारे देश में लोग क्या कहा करते हैं। आप किसी मजलिस में चले जायं, शादी में चले जायं, किसी भी जगह बैठें। लोग एक ही सवाल यह पूछते हैं कि मुल्क का क्या बनेगा, इस देश का क्या बनेगा, यह देश जा रहा है। मैं हैरान हूं कि हमारे कांग्रेस के बड़े बने नेता इस वक्त को समझने की कोशिश

नहीं कर रहे हैं। मैं चाहता हूं कि वे समझने की कोशिश करें। आज कांग्रेस के हाथों से आधा मुल्क निकल गया है। उनको यह सोचने की कोशिश करनी चाहिये कि इस देश को हम इकट्ठा कैसे कर सकते हैं नहीं तो दस साल के बाद क्या नवशा होगा। बेरल एक अलाहिदा मुल्क बन जायेगा, मद्रास एक अलाहिदा मुल्क बन जायेगा, बंगाल एक अलाहिदा मुल्क बन जायेगा। जित तरह की हालत आज देश में चल रही है इतको कांग्रेस को पढ़ना, सोचना और समझना चाहिये।

तो फिर सवाल उठता है कांग्रेस को क्या करना चाहिये। मेरी नाचीज राय में कांग्रेस को सेन्टर में अकसरियत में होते हुए भी नेलनल गवर्नमेंट बँडानी चाहिये। अगर वह खुद मिसाल पेश करे तो यकीनन आज जहां जहां गैर कांग्रेसी वजारतें हैं और दूसरे सूवाजाद में कांग्रेस वजारतें भी हैं, तो वहां भी अपोजिशन वजारत बनाएं और यहां नेशनल गवर्नमेंट बनाएं। तो यकीनन यह जो तीन चार समस्याएं देश के सामने हैं वे उनको हल करने की कोशिश करेंगे। सबसे भारी समस्या इस वक्त फूड की समस्या है। हमें यह सोचना चाहिये कि आज केरल के मुख्य मंत्री कहते हैं अगर आपने हमें राइस नहीं दिया तो हम जितना एक्सचेंज कमाते हैं वह हमें दीजिए हम दूसरे देशों से वह हासिल करेंगे, मद्रास वाले कहते हैं हम बर्मा से हासिल करेंगे। तो आज जो हर सूबा है वह आज सेन्टर के हाथों से निकलने की कोशिश कर रहा है। जहां जहां गैर कांग्रेसी वजारतें बनी हैं—मैं पढ़ना नहीं चाहता आपने सिर्फ दस मिनट का समय दिया है—आप धबड़ते हैं। मैं बता सकता हूं कि क्या क्या एलानात गैर कांग्रेसी सरकारों की वजारतें कर रही हैं। हमारा सेन्टर वह मदद न दे तो फिर हमारे लिये कोई

रास्ता नहीं रहेगा कि हम सेन्टर से बग़ावत करें। तो इस चीज़ को पढ़ने की कोशिश करें, जो कि एन दीवार पर लिखा जा रहा है। हमारे कांग्रेस के नेताओं को समझने की कोशिश करनी चाहिये और यह तभी हो सकता है अगर सेन्टर में एक नेशनल गवर्नमेंट बनाएँ और सूबाजाद में वह कोएलिशन सरकारें बनाएँ। मैं समझता हूँ, ऐसा करने से यकीनन वह देश की बिदमत भी कर सकेंगे और जो देश की मुश्किलत है, जैसे कि फूड की मुश्किलत है, जैसे सूबाजाद अपनी अपनी आँखें दिखा रहे हैं, वहाँ पर भी और दूसरी जगह वे भी अपने हाथ में रख सकेंगे और देश को आगे ले जाने की कोशिश करेंगे। नहीं तो, अगर यह नहीं किया गया, तो मैं बड़े अदब से कहना चाहता हूँ कि दस साल के बाद हिन्दुस्तान का एक नक्शा होगा, हिन्दुस्तान जिसको सरदार पटेल ने अपने तदावीर से एक करने की कोशिश की थी, आदर्श देश बनाने की कोशिश की, वह देश टुकड़े टुकड़े हो जायेगा और टुकड़े टुकड़े हो जाने के बाद न मालूम इन देश का क्या बनेगा। यकीनन वे यह बात जानते होंगे कि हमारे जो आज खेबैया हैं, नेता हैं, क्या उनकी इस इलेक्शन से समझ आयी है या इलेक्शन के भतायज से उन्होंने कोई सबक हासिल करने की कोशिश की है या नहीं। उनको चाहिये कि वे अपने हुकूमत की बाग-डोर खुद न लें, सबको साथ लें, और साथ लेकर इस देश को चलाने की कोशिश करें। जैसा कि हमारे सबसे बड़े पुराने स्टैट्समैन श्री राजगोपालाचारी ने कहा है कि सेन्टर में आपको नेशनल गवर्नमेंट बनानी चाहिये और सूबाजाद में अपोजिशन गवर्नमेंट बनानाकर इस देश को उन्नति के मार्ग में ले जाने की कोशिश की जानी चाहिये। अगर आपने ऐसा किया जैसा कि राजस्थान में किया है— मैं उस बहस में पड़ना नहीं चाहता, काफी कुछ

कहा गया है कि कैसे राष्ट्रपति राज लागू हुआ—और मैं समझता हूँ कि सपुर्णानन्द जैसे लायक आदमी से गलती हो गई है और गलती होने के बाद उन्होंने उसे अपने प्रेस्टीज का बचे-बचन बना दिया और केन्द्रीय सरकार ने भी उसको प्रेस्टीज का बचेबचन बना दिया कि जब तक गवर्नर रहेंगे तब तक राष्ट्रपति राज को कायम करना है, उससे यह हालत पैदा हुई कि जब से गोली चली राजस्थान में उसके तीन दिन बाद जिस वक़्त मुखाडिया साहब ने कहा मैं वज़ारत नहीं बना सकता तो गवर्नर को चाहिये था कि अपोजिशन पार्टी को कहते कि आप वज़ारत बनाईये, हम आपको मौका देते हैं। मगर ऐसा नहीं किया गया। सिर्फ़ इसलिये कि गवर्नर ने अपना प्रेस्टीज बनाने का कोशिश की और केन्द्रीय सरकार ने भी गवर्नर का प्रेस्टीज बनाने की कोशिश की और इस तरह से वह गलती हुई और उस गलती का खमियाजा सारे भारतवर्ष में बदनामी तौर पर इस राजस्थान के मामले को लेकर हो रहा है।

तो मैडम, मैंने आपकी वसकित से एक सच्चे भारतीय के नाते दो सुझाव रखे हैं। एक सच्चे देशभक्त के नाते रखे हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि आज जो स्थिति है सारे भारत-वर्ष में उसको समझने की कोशिश करनी चाहिये और उसको ठीक करने की कोशिश करनी चाहिये ताकि यह देश उन्नति कर सके और इस देश के टुकड़े न हों, जिस तरह सरदार पटेल ने इस देश को मजबूत बनाया था, इकट्ठा किया था उसी तरह यह इकट्ठा रहे, कहीं टुकड़ों में न बंट जाय या किसी और बुरी हालत में न हो जाय इसको कांग्रेस को सोचने और समझने की कोशिश करनी चाहिये और इसको सुधारने की कोशिश करनी चाहिये।

बहुत बहुत आपका धन्यवाद।

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA:  
Madam Deputy Chairman, since there

[Shri Vidya Charan Shukla.] is not much time I shall limit my intervention only to a few broad points which have been raised and which concern my Ministry. Madam, the Governor's action has actually formed the basis of most of the criticism that hon. Members from the Opposition have levelled. The initial judgment of the Governor regarding the strength of the respective parties, may have been right or may have been wrong but there was no justification for taking this matter on to the streets to challenge the judgment of the Governor. The Opposition members, who were talking of democracy here should have realised that the best course for the Opposition members in Rajasthan Assembly was to wait for a few days, three to four days, when the Assembly was going to be convened and in that Assembly session they could have proved that the judgment of the Governor was wrong and Mr. Sukhadia did not command the majority in the House. That would have been a constitutional action and nobody could have had any objection to that course of action being followed but it was most unfortunate that the Opposition leaders in Rajasthan decided to take this matter on to the streets, organised demonstrations, formed a Sangharsh Samiti, issued all kinds of provocative statements made all kinds of provocative speeches and brought about such threat to law and order under which no democratic Government could function in Rajasthan. I do not want to dwell upon the details of this matter because it has been argued very well and threadbare in public in newspapers but this fact stands out completely that unfortunately the Opposition members in Rajasthan did not live up to their professed love of democracy while tackling this matter. I wish they had.

The other thing that has been said here is that there was no real threat to peace in Rajasthan when the Central Government decided to promulgate President's rule in Rajasthan. It can be proved with reference to documents; it can also be proved with

reference to newspapers, with reference to the statements issued by various leaders of the Opposition statements issued by the Convener of the Sangharsha Samiti, that there was a real threat, a very big threat to peace in Rajasthan in case the democratic process was allowed to continue

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI: On what date was it issued? That we must note.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: I am not yielding because I have no time.

When the Governor called upon Mr. Sukhadia to form the Government then the M. L. As. sitting in Opposition decided that they will organise a protest day. They sent telegrams all over to organise a protest day and they also decided that they will not allow the swearing in ceremony to go on. This was the threat posed by the Opposition and because of this the only course that was left open to the Governor was to advise the President to take over.

श्री विमलकुमार मन्नालालजी चौरड़िया :  
आप जनतंत्र की हत्या कर दीजिये और हम  
चुप बैठे रहें यह नहीं हो सकता ।

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We have a discussion on this on Monday and then you can raise your points.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: It is a patent fact that the independents in Rajasthan could not be entirely depended upon for their loyalty to this group or that. It was clear from the way they kept on writing notes to this party or that party, giving their allegiance to this party on one day and to another party on another day, and it would have been very undesirable for anybody to depend on these independents. So the only course left open to the Governor was to call upon the largest single party in the legislature to try and form the Government. And if as

our friends in the Opposition say the Congress did not have the majority they were not required to wait for more than three or four days to test whether the Governor's judgment was right or their judgment was right and I wish they had adopted the democratic process to decide this matter.

It was also questioned, Madam, why the Governor called upon the Congress Party in Rajasthan legislature to form the Government and the instance of Kerala was quoted when the Communist Party which was the largest single party in Kerala was not called upon to form the Government in Kerala. But my friend who raised this matter forgot that earlier in Madras there was a precedent. In 1952 Mr. T. Prakasam who was the largest single party was called upon to form the Government although he did not enjoy a clear majority in the legislature and there was no objection raised then. So this matter is always left to the discretion and judgment of the Governor concerned. Taking all the factors into consideration he can decide which leader to invite and which to invite for forming the Government. I would say that here the judgment of the Governor was quite sound in asking the leader the largest single party in the legislature to come forward and try to form the Government.

Then, Sir, hon. Members raised a point about the delay in the judicial enquiry being instituted to enquire into the unfortunate firing that took place in Rajasthan. As we have already explained, immediately the Government took a decision to order a judicial enquiry into the firing the Government requested the Chief Justice of Rajasthan High Court to name a Judge and as soon as the name of the Judge who agreed to enquire into this matter was given to us, immediately the announcement regarding the Commission was made. There was no delay as far as we are concerned.

The Governor has also been criticised for keeping with him Home, Ap-

pointments and other Departments and giving some other Departments to the Advisers. I would like to say, Members that it is not always obligatory for the Governor to have Advisers, and I would invite your attention to the case of Punjab. When the Governor's rule was imposed in Punjab just before partition the Governor did not appoint any Advisers. He performed all the functions until the State was divided and democratic Governments were installed in them. So it is very unfortunate that hon. Members have chosen to attribute motives to the Governor for keeping Home and other Departments with him while having some Advisers to look after other things.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI: This is a good pick and choose; there is no doubt.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: If he had appointed no Advisers then he would have been dealing with all the subjects. So I do not think hon. Members can say that that would have been better than this.

It is rather unfortunate that personal attacks have been made on a respectable person, a person who is respected in the country as a very learned man, a man who is famous for his intelligence, his erudition and his philosophical attitude towards life.

SHRI V. M. CHORDTA: His services to the Congress also.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: I would only say that that kind of personal attacks lead us nowhere.

Then there were few points which were made by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta about Ministers being misled by bureaucrats and all these things. I do not think we can take such charges seriously because we hear them day in and day out. They have been repudiated. Probably Mr. Bhupesh Gupta has some experience of Kerala and perhaps he has heard something about West Bengal. As far as we are

[Shri Vidya Charan Shukta.] concerned we go by our own judgment and we are not misled by anybody. I think, Madam, I have taken the time that was given to me and I would say that the House should pass the Budget of Rajasthan. They should not have any doubt about the bona fides of either the Governor or of the Central Government in connection with the President's Rule.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I raised another point. Will the files of the Rajasthan Government remain safe, because the Congress people before they went out of office had destroyed some of the files? Have you taken care to see that files of the Rajasthan Government remain where they are?

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: Well, I presume that such care is being taken.

SHRI K. C. PANT: Madam, I am grateful to the hon. Members who have participated in this debate for their comments and suggestions and I hope that the Rajasthan Government and the Rajasthan Legislature, when it comes into being, will take their comments into account. I can assure hon. Members that the Government here is as anxious as they are that a popular Government should be resorted to in Rajasthan.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: And very soon.

SHRI K. C. PANT: It is not without a trace of regret that this state of bringing forward this Budget has been accepted by us. We hope that the situation there will normalise very soon.

Now, much of the debate that has taken place today could well have taken place on Monday and it would have given me the opportunity of hearing more on the budgetary and financial aspects of the Rajasthan situation. For instance, from Mr. Bhupe- h Gupta, I would have had the benefit of his knowledge and experi-

ence on the financial matters of Rajasthan, but he devoted his attention more to the political aspects and deprived me of that benefit. Whatever there is to be said on the political aspects has been covered by my colleague who just spoke and, therefore, Madam, I shall confine myself to budgetary and financial aspects and to a few general remarks of a political nature perhaps somewhere in the course of my speech. Now, so far as the budgetary position of Rajasthan goes, the position briefly is this and I will not go into details. There is a revenue deficit of Rs. 19 crores in the Revised estimates for 1966-67 as against a budgeted revenue surplus of Rs. 0.89 crores. There is an overall deficit of Rs. 16 crores as against a nominal budgeted surplus for 1966-67, and in 1967-68, the overall deficit is estimated at Rs. 3 crores. That is the overall position. So far as the Plans go, in 1966-67 the total Plan outlay was Rs. 48 crores. The Central assistance was Rs. 38.6 crores. In 1967-68 the State Government has unfortunately been unable to find any resources to contribute to the Plan. The Plan provision is now of the order of Rs. 33 crores, which entirely consists of Central assistance.

Then, there is one other matter which I think I should mention of a budgetary nature, i.e., in relation to overdraft. At the beginning of the year, the overdraft of the Rajasthan Government stood at Rs. 22 crores with the Reserve Bank. This was cleared at the end of June, 1966. Now, the estimate of overdraft at the end of the current year is Rs. 16 crores. The House knows that there is an obligation on the part of the State\* to clear their overdrafts before the end of the current month. It is proposed to sanction a special loan to the State Government to clear this overdraft, subject to recovery in the next two years. Both the loan and the partial recovery for this year are reflected in the budgeted figures. This matter was raised yesterday also. We are discussing with various State



Governments the best ways and means to avoid unauthorised overdrafts in future. Now, Madam, I shall not take the<sup>1</sup> time of the House with more details concerning the Budget.

Now, I shall try to deal with some of the points that have been raised in the course of the debate. Referring to my hon. friend, Shri Bhupesh Gupta, I should first thank him for his very graceful references to me, very warm and kind references, which I heartily reciprocate. I take this opportunity also of reciprocating the very kind sentiments expressed yesterday by Shri Rajnarain. I have the greatest affection for both of them and it is incidental that we are on either side of the House. I hope that it will not interfere with the warmth of their feeling, towards me. Coming to the debate, I could feel the torment of soul through which Mr. Bhupesh Gupta and Mr. Chatterjee should have passed while suggesting that the Congress Government should not remain in Rajasthan, because they were well aware of the alternative and I dare say that if they are honest with us, they like the alternative even less than the Congress Government. They can d<sup>env</sup> it, but the alternative in Rajasthan to the Congress Government is something that cannot gladden their hearts, I am quite sure of that, nor that of Mr. Rajnarain perhaps. That poses, to my mind, one of the basic difficulties of the present political situation in India. It is all very well to work unitedly to displace the Congress, but what is much more relevant is who replaces the Congress. And if the Congress is replaced by forces which are not to the liking of certain political parties, is it not honest on their part to realise this and to at least say in passing that for all its faults the Congress was perhaps a shade better than what is going to replace it? This is all what I want to say on this particular subject.

Then. Mr. Bhupesh Gupta referred to the fact that double standards were applied in the case of Kerala and Rajasthan. The most outstanding fact

of the case in Rajasthan as wen as the case in Kerala was that the Governor's advice wa<sub>s</sub> accepted. That is the central fact in both the situations and I (Tare say that if the Governor's advice had not been accepted, then the Congress Government here at the Centre would have been charged with murdering the Constitution with much more validity than it is today. It acted strictly in accordance with the constitutional provisions. Whether the Governor exercised hi<sub>s</sub> judgment rightly or wrongly, is another matter. I personally think, knowing him as I do, he is a very fair man and that to the best of his conscience he must have exercised his judgment fairly. I think Mr. Rajnarain will bear me out. He may have made a mistake, but not consciously or wilfully. I have too much respect for him a<sub>s</sub> a person to think that he went out of his way to do something which he thought was wrong. But that is beside the point. The central point is he gave certain advice and it was obligatory on the part of the Central Government under the Constitution to accept that advice. If it had not been accepted, the Central Government would be open to the charge of acting contrary to the Constitution. So, the central point in both these States is the same and no double standards have been followed.

SHRI A. P. CHATTERJEE: Is it obligatory on the part of the Central Government to accept it? They should have<sup>1</sup> refused it. Is it not in the Constitution that the president should satisfy himself?

SHRI K. C. PANT: My friend would perhaps like to refer to the relevant clauses, and he would realise that in this matter the Governor's advice is the advice that ig accepted by the Centre, and not to accept it is not open to the Central Government.

Coming to the other point which Mr. Bhupesh Gupta made, which he has often made and which the other opposition parties have made, his point is that Congressmen like to stick to

[Shri K. C. Pant] office like leeches. That is the colloquial phrase which he used. Perhaps there is a certain human frailty among Congressmen and they like to stay in Power. Perhaps some of our friends opposite are not completely free from this virus, and now we find that in many of the States all kinds of combinations are taking place just to come into power. I can understand that the Congress which has gone to the people with a certain programme with a certain policy, with a certain manifesto, when it is returned in a majority, is impertinent enough to form Governments. But I cannot understand how parties with diametrically opposite programmes, diametrically opposite policies, who have gone to the people with their respective policies, can be disloyal to the people and form Governments with their opposites. I cannot understand this. Madam, because, it is betraying the confidence of the people. They have been elected by the people because they have gone to the people with a certain programme, with a certain image. How can the Communist Party which has gone to the people with a certain image combine with the Jansanyh, with the Swatantra Party or with the D. M. K.? But they got together to form Governments. So, I do not want to rub it in as it is such an obvious point. But I think those who live in glass houses should not throw stones at others.

Then, Madam, there were some points made by Mrs. Talwar. She raised the question of drought relief. I certainly can throw a lot of light on that. I have papers here, but I do not want to take the time of the House unnecessarily with details. The main point is that ever since 1965 Rajasthan has been suffering from a series of droughts, except in the year 1964. In 1963, 1965 and 1966 there were repeated failures of rain, and this has necessitated relief measures having to be taken all along from 1963-64. This year it was particularly bad with the result that while Rs. 1.31

crores was spent in 1965-66, in 1968-67 the expenditure rose to Rs. 12 crores. In the course of last year Rs. 12 crores was spent on drought and famine relief measures in the State of Rajasthan, and the bulk this, if I may say so, was met by assistance from the Centre. This has affected the State's finances, the overall budgetary position to the extent of Rs. 11 crores. Among the relief measures that were taken were:

- Suspension of land revenue.
- Offering of persons who could work employment in relief works in scarcity areas.
- Adequate arrangements to ensure drinking water.
- Fodder at cheap rates for cattle.
- All those persons who were not fit to work on relief works were allowed gratuitous relief.
- Proper arrangements for the supply of foodgrains to the affected population—foodgrains were supplied through price shops.

In the next financial year, that 1967-68 a provision of Rs. 7.75 crores has been made for providing relief to the affected people. As a long-term measure there is the Rajasthan Canal and the State Government has also prepared another outline of a scheme for permanent improvement of drought affected areas. This scheme is at present under the consideration of the Ministry of Agriculture and the Planning Commission.

I think that this should prove satisfactory, and although I have some more details to give, I do not think it will be necessary to go into them at this stage.

Mrs. Talwar raised the question of chronic power scarcity in Rajasthan. Madam, the fact of the matter is that power scarcity has hit Rajas-

than in the last couple of years, particularly in the last year, because of the shortage of rainfall and the fact that Gandhisagar Dam where this water was collected and from which electricity was generated could not therefore generate the power that was expected to be generated by it, and this has hit industries also in Rajasthan. The generation in Gandhisagar is reduced to 24 MW, Rajasthan's share of that being 12 MW, from August to March, and only 5 to 6 MW from April to July as against the generating capacity of 90 MW. One can see what a serious shortage it is. Rajasthan's State Electricity Board took a number of emergency steps to cope with the situation. It constructed 132 KV Ratangarh-Jaipur line in a record period of three months. It commissioned all the available units including the uneconomical and old sets. It procured and installed additional diesel generating sets. It purchased a gas turbine at a cost of Rs. 70 lakhs and installed it at Kota. There was a question the other day as to why the gas turbine was not commissioned. It was not commissioned because its generating cost was very high as compared to the selling price of power in Rajasthan. Now negotiations are going on between the consumers and the Electricity Board to work out a price acceptable to both after which I hope it will be commissioned. It is anticipated that the power position will considerably improve during the next few years and the firm generating capacity will increase from 95 MW at the end of the Third Plan to 501 MW at the end of the Fourth Plan period. The major projects which are likely to be completed are:

- (1) Satpura project from which Rajasthan will get 125 MW;
- (2) Rana Pratapsagar from which it will get 40 MW;
- (3) Rajasthan Atomic Power project from which it will get

200 MW, the entire quantity generated.

I would only add a word about the rural electrification scheme. I will not say that the progress has been entirely satisfactory but there has been progress. The number of localities electrified has increased from 1200 at the end of the Third Plan to 1700 at the end of the first year of the Fourth Plan. Wells have been energised from 6800 to 10,900.

There were a couple of other questions. There was some question about industrialisation. Industries are coming up, and while I do not want to go into details, I would only like to assure her that the draft outline of the Fourth Plan envisages an investment of Rs. 107 crores on the following undertakings:

1. Khetri Copper Smelter.
2. Zinc Smelter at Udaipur.
3. Precision Instruments Factory at Kota.
4. Hindustan Machine Tools Factory at Ajmer.
5. Sodium Sulphate Plant and Salt Washery at Sambhar.

These are all Central public sector projects. Apart from these there are some private sector projects as well as some State projects.

Mr. Bhandari referred to the fact that the Congress had given relief measures in certain districts and had taken advantage of this in getting returned. Again it is a very difficult argument to meet. Would he have preferred that no relief measure\* should have been given so that the Congress would not have been returned? I do not think he possibly could have meant that. Now, here is the position. He referred to two districts, he referred to Dungarpore and Banswara.

SHRI SUNDAR SINGH BHANDARI: I have not referred to anything.

SHRI K. C. PANT: But I can give you the position in these two districts, if you are interested. In any case, in these two districts, about Rs 2J crores were spent as against Rs. 11.7 crores of total expenditure.

Now, I think I have almost done with most of the points that have been raised.

Shri Khandekar raised a point about the necessity to grow more food and tackle this problem of ravines. Well, both the Forest Department and the Agricultural Department are carrying out work in the ravine areas to arrest further deterioration of soil and to have reclamation and afforestation of the ravine areas. In the Third Plan, 1,460 acres were treated by the Forest Department.

I do realise that perhaps some of the points raised by hon. Members have not been covered in my reply. The main reason for that is that I just do not have the time. I have been told that we have got to cover the various other items still—the Appropriation Bills and something else—on the agenda. So, I would not like to take up more time of the House. The only point is this. I do not know whether it is the wish of the House to have another debate on the Appropriation Bills. But if the House does not wish to have another debate on the Appropriation Bills, I could easily waive my introductory speeches to the Appropriation Bills and thereby save some more time. I leave it entirely to the House.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now you can move the next two Bills, Mr. Pant.

**THE RAJASTHAN APPROPRIATION  
(VOTE ON ACCOUNT) BILL, 1967**

**THE RAJASTHAN APPROPRIATION  
BILL, 1967**

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE  
MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI K. C.  
PANT): Madam, I move;

"That the Bill to provide for the  
withdrawal of certain sums from

and out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Rajasthan for the services of a part of the financial year 1967-68, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration." Madam, I also move:

"That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Rajasthan for the services of the financial year 1966-67, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The questions were proposed.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We have taken very much time on General

श्री सुन्दर सिंह भंडारी (राजस्थान) :  
उपसभापति महोदया, अभी राजस्थान के बजट पर विवाद का उत्तर देते समय राजस्थान नहर का उल्लेख किया गया था। राजस्थान नहर के नाम पर बहुत साल तक राजस्थान के लोगों को विशेष बंधवाया गया है, परन्तु हमेशा वही बात चलती रही और यह आशाएं दवाई गई थी कि इसे केन्द्र के अधीन ले लिया जायेगा। अभी तक 45 करोड़ रु० के लगभग इस पर खर्च हो चुका है और अब एक दम से फैसला हुआ है कि इसे केन्द्र के अधीन नहीं लिया जायेगा। पिछले साल जब यहां चर्चा हुई, तो इसके फेड प्रोग्राम की बात कही गई थी। आज राजस्थान के बजट में जो इसके लिये खर्चा होगा, उसको देख कर आश्चर्य यह होगा कि जहां इसके सारे इस्टेब्लिशमेंट और काम पर 3 करोड़ रुपये वर्ष भर में खर्च होंगे, वहां 2 करोड़ 50 लाख रु० केवल इस पर लगी हुई पूंजी के व्याज के लिये हमें देना पड़ेगा। राजस्थान नहर पर 5 करोड़ 59 लाख रु० होते हुए उसमें काम जितना होगा यह स्वयं में स्पष्ट है, सेल्फ एक्सप्लेनेटरी और राजस्थान के ऊपर वह एक जवर्दती का कितना बड़ा बोझा लादा गया है इस बात को हम अनुभव कर सकते हैं। यह राजस्थान