

New Plan for integrated rural development Programme

1886. SHRI PRASANNABHAI MEHTA: Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE AND IRRIGATION be pleased to state:

(a) whether an entirely new programme for comprehensive and integrated rural development will be launched by the Government soon;

(b) if so, whether Government feels that the current programme like SFDA, DPAP and Command Area Development have not done enough and hence the need for a fresh approach;

(c) if so, the main features of the new Scheme; and

(d) when the same is likely to be started and the cost of expenditure involved?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND IRRIGATION (SHRI BHANU PRATAP SINGH): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The S. F. D. A. is mainly a beneficiary oriented programme while D. P. A. P. and Command Area Development Programmes mainly follow the 'area' approach. These programmes are restricted to selected areas and beneficiaries and have been quite successful. Under the new programme it is proposed to cover a much larger area in the country. The need for the fresh approach has arisen with a view to achieve the national objective of full employment in rural areas within a certain time frame. Under the new programme the main elements of the area programmes and the beneficiary oriented programme will be brought to bear on each of the areas covered by any one of these programmes depending on the suitability of the programme for the area. Also programming under the new approach will be based on decentralised micro-planning at the block level. It is also proposed to involve voluntary organi-

sations of standing and repute in the formulation and implementation of the Block Plans.

(c) The new Scheme is under formulation.

(d) It will be started from 1978-79. A token budget provision of Rs. 20.00 crores has been made.

12.00 hrs.

RE: MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT DELAY IN INVITING THE LEADER OF THE CONGRESS COALITION TO FORM GOVERNMENT IN MAHARASHTRA

SHRI VAVALAR RAVI (Chirayinkil): Sir, my motion is given on the basis of the latest report received from Maharashtra. 149 Members of the Legislative Assembly have been paraded and present before the Governor. He has not taken any step. The report is that the Governor is himself trying to make Members change their mind instead of working on the constitutional basis to respect the Constitution. The Governor is today trying to become an instrument of a political party at the Centre. This is a complete violation of the Indian Constitution. On that basis I seek your permission to move an adjournment motion:

"That this House be adjourned for the delay in inviting the leader of the majority group of Congress Coalition in Maharashtra to form his government even after the physical appearance of his 149 legislators."

I appeal to the hon'ble Speaker to allow my motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Sathe, you have not given any notice. Mr. Stephen has given.

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola) My submission is that the matter is of such an urgency that an adjournment motion is alright. My friends from Maharashtra and all our Members on this Side feel very much concerned and disturbed particularly when Morarjibhai is the Prime Minister.

[Shri Vasant Sathe]

You will read, Sir, hon'ble Shri Morarjibhai to get an election in Gujarat went to the extent of going on a hunger strike himself, went to the extent of threatening a gherao and satyagrah in this House. (*Interruptions*).

Sir, 150 elected representatives of the Maharashtra Assembly have been paraded. Photographs have been taken. Signatures have been taken. If Governor is not going to allow a people's government to be formed in Maharashtra, it is not within his powers. Under Article 163 he has to have the Council of Ministers. There is no choice for him. Janata Government is trying to bring pressure on the Governor for encouraging horse-trading. There is delay of two days. (*Interruptions*) Morarjibhai, I want to promise from you that the Governor will call Shri Vasantdada Patil.....

(*Interruptions*)**

MR. SPEAKER: Don't record.
(*Interruptions*)**

MR. SPEAKER: You better take your seats. I have called upon the Prime Minister. (*Interruptions*)

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI MORARJI DESAI): May I request my hon. friends not to get excited for nothing? There is no question of the Centre interfering with the discretion of the Governors and if I may make a positive statement, we will not have use of that Governor. If any Governor does not act impartially, independently. There is no question of Central Government influencing any Governor and in this very particular case, on the very first day when the Governor told me about the result, I told him "you decide completely impartially and do what is right. Don't be bothered about anything else." (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Are you satisfied yourself? 150 persons have been paraded. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Why don't you hear him?

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: I am very sorry that an excitement is created for nothing. I do not see why they should be excited in this matter. I see it in the papers. I have not had any contact with the Governor. I do not want to have any contact. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA (Delhi Sadar): Sir on a point of order.

SHRI KISHORE LAL (East Delhi): Sir, they do not even allow the Prime Minister to speak. Why do you allow them to speak? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: Sir, please read Article 164 of the Constitution. It says:

"164(I). Other provisions as to Ministers: (1) The Chief Minister shall be appointed by the Governor and the other Ministers shall be appointed by the Governor on the advice of the Chief Minister, and the Ministers shall hold office during the pleasure of the Governor."

अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह गवर्नर का अधिकार है कि वह सेटिस्फाई हो जाय कि कौनसी पार्टी बहुमत में है। अभी तक दोनों पार्टियां क्लेम कर रही हैं, इस लिए जब तक वह दूसरी पार्टी से न पूछ.....

MR. SPEAKER: The point raised is that the Central Government has been trying to interfere with the discretion of the Governor. Otherwise it is completely the discretion of the Governor. The Prime Minister has made a positive statement that they are not interfering.....(*Interruptions*)

SHRI VASANT SATHE: We do not accept that.....(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: The Prime Minister is speaking for the Government.....(*Interruptions*). There is no point of Governor.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA (Thumkañ):
On a point of order.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: The Central Government does not come in. The Prime Minister has categorically stated that he had not talked to the Governor.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: I have not made any allegation against the Prime Minister himself. I have said that from the Central Government some Ministers are influencing. We want a guarantee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Prime Minister speaks on behalf of the Government.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: He is a helpless man. What are you talking.... (Interruptions)**

MR. SPEAKER: Do not record.

I have heard the Prime Minister. I have disallowed the adjournment motion. The adjournment motion is disallowed.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN (Idukki): You have to hear me.

MR. SPEAKER: Under what rule?

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Under rule 60 read with direction 2. Under Direction No. 2 and adjournment motion has got to be taken up after the Question Hour. It is on that basis that the adjournment motion was brought to your notice. I had given notice of an adjournment motion. When the matter comes up you have got three courses open to you: you can reject it; you can allow it. Another course is there. Here it says: provided further that where the Speaker is not in possession of full facts about the matter mentioned, he may before giving or refusing his consent read the notice of the motion and hear from the Minister or the Members concerned a brief statement of facts and then give his decision on the admissibility of the motion. When the matter of adjournment motion was taken up the Prime Minister

being the Minister concerned about it or speaking for the government presumably under this rule stood up and clarified the position of the government. Once that has been done I am entitled to clarify my position in support of the motion.

The Rule says: "and hear from the Minister and or members concerned a brief statement.".....

MR. SPEAKER: which rule?

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Rule 60 second proviso' which says:

"Provided further that where the Speaker is not in possession of full facts about the matter mentioned therein, he may before giving or refusing his consent read the notice of the motion and hear from the Minister and/or members concerned a brief statement on facts...."

Here I would like to submit that there were two adjournment motions. One motion Mr. Vayalar Ravi made his submission. My motion was there and when the matter came up, the Prime Minister stood up and clarified the position of the Government. It is necessary that as a person who gave the notice of adjournment motion I also must be heard in support of my motion. This is under rule. This is in consonance with the natural justice. This has got to be done. The Prime Minister spoke. (Interruptions) I am entitled to say my point of view about it. How do you refuse me the right? Parliament will not be right in refusing me the right. You could have initially said: "Nobody shall say anything about it." You permitted one Member to make his submission: you permitted the Minister and the Minister made his arguments about it. Under what rule, under what right, under what justice, can you refuse me permission to make my submission about the notice I gave you on the adjournment motion? May I submit, Sir? The Prime Minister asked: "Why are you excited?"

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: I want to be heard on this very matter.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, I will hear you.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: This is a matter in which there is considerable concern in different parts of the House.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: Let me first speak on his point of order.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: The Prime Minister made a submission....

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: Let me say something about it.

MR. SPEAKER: I will hear you, Mr Prime Minister.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: But he cannot go into the merits of the case.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: The Prime Minister asked: "Why are you getting excited?" Why should I not feel excited because this is an extraordinary situation....

MR. SPEAKER: No. No. You are going into the merits of the case. I am hearing your point of orders. If I allow....

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Are you going to refuse me permission?

MR. SPEAKER: I will consider that.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: There were about it. The other notice—you heard about it. The other notice—you will not hear about it? You have heard the Minister about it. You must hear me also.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: Mr Prime Minister.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: No, I am hearing the Prime Minister.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: When my hon. friend wants that he has a right to speak, because I had explained what was the matter, Rule 60, which he has quoted, says:

"The Speaker if he gives consent under rule 56 and holds that the mat-

ter proposed to be discussed is in order, shall call the member concerned who shall rise in his place and ask for leave to move the adjournment of the House.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: I am not saying under that.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: That is a different matter altogether. The Speaker has not allowed it.

AN HON. MEMBER: *Ab initio* he has no right to raise it.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: Therefore that does not arise. Even then, let me say this: Why all this excitement? I was explaining, but I was not allowed to complete my explanation. What can I do? I am not helpless in Government, but I am helpless against shouting in this House. I cannot do anything. I have got to bear with it. I cannot do it in return. I cannot do that because that will aggravate it. Therefore I cannot do it. I was not heard when I was saying that for the Government to issue any direction to the Governor in this matter would be very wrong and unconstitutional. It was stated that the Prime Minister is helpless, the other Ministers do it. No other Ministers can try to do it. I am not helpless with my Ministers. I am helpless with my hon. friends. I am not at all helpless there.

SHRI VASANT SATHÉ: What is the use? You are. With one particular Minister, you are completely helpless.
(Interruptions)

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: Why do you want to add to his shouting? Let him about. If there is one Member shouting we can cope with it. But if all of them shout together how can we cope with it?

Therefore, it is not right when I said that we do not want to interfere in matters like this, there is no question of Government interfering. Then, about this question of delay, I read about it in papers. I have not enquired because that also can be taken as interference.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: How did you interfere in Karnataka? Please tell us.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: That I will reply not now. I will do it when I reply to the debate on the President's Address. Why don't you have patience?

SHRI VASANT SATHE: On 3rd January the Assembly was to meet. But on 31st you dissolved it. How did you do that?

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: Will you have some patience? You don't seem to have any patience.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: These are doubts in our minds.

MR. SPEAKER: You are on a different point altogether now.

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: That will be covered when I give my reply on the President's Address. I am going to explain and tell you all about it, but just now I am not going to be drawn into it because that would not be right. I have been reading for the last two days that they have given a list of 149 Members and have also produced them before the Governor. The other side has given a list of 145 Members.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: How can that be? We have given 150. How can they give a list of 145?

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: I do not want to go into the details of it, and I read also that the Governor is taking time to see who is right. I believe the matter may have been decided now, by 12 O'clock. That is what I was told by others from Bombay, not by the Government that it will be decided today. I don't know all this excitement. I do not think there is any cause for grievance. Unnecessarily they are excited over this. I do not know why there is this excitement.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: It is a question ultimately of democracy. People have their rights. You should have a democratic rule.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I am deciding the point of order first.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: The point of order is not important. This is more important—the substance.

MR. SPEAKER: When it is raised, it is important. When the matter is raised I have to decide. Two hon. Members have given notice of adjournment motion on identical matters. One was Mr. Vayalar Ravi and the other was Mr. Stephen. Mr. Vayalar Ravi's motion had come earlier. I have not given consent to either of them under Rule 60. I have not given consent at all and in fact, when Mr. Stephen met me in my chamber, I said I would consider it afterwards. That is what I told them and that is what my former order is. Without my consent, Mr. Vayalar Ravi raised the question. When Mr. Vayalar Ravi raised a certain point, he said that the Central Government was interfering with the discretion of the Governor. That is why I asked the Prime Minister whether it was a fact. The Prime Minister has denied it and he has denied it on behalf of the Government. I have to accept that. Now there is no question of any Member being entitled to say because the second proviso to Rule 60 says:

“Provided further that where the Speaker is not in possession of full facts about the matter mentioned therein,”—the question is whether the Central Government is interfering or not “he may, before giving or refusing his consent, read the notice of the motion and hear from the Minister/or Members concerned.

It is entirely left to the Speaker to find out the facts. It is not a question of anybody having any right. The allegation is that the Central Government is interfering. Therefore, I have allowed the Prime Minister to clarify that point and so there is no question arising at all. I have not given consent under Rule 60 and I do not propose to give any. This is not a matter....

SHRI VASANT SATHE: What is the issue now? (*Interruptions*) The Prime Minister was good enough to explain. Where is the question of your consent? It has become redundant. You have become redundant now. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: We don't want to participate in the deliberations. I want to make a statement about that. Why is it happening? (*Interruptions*). I am not going to yield. If you are not going to allow me, it would be a most unprecedented procedure. I rise as the leader of the party. (*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER: Under what rule does it come? I will allow it if there is any rule.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Will you allow me only if there is a rule? You will not allow me if I am.... (*Interruptions*) Under what rule do I walk out? Before walking out, would you not allow me to make a statement? (*Interruptions*) What is the sort of thing that is going on? One side you have heard. The other side you are not prepared to hear.

MR. SPEAKER: I have not heard anything.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Before anybody was called, you could have said 'No discussion under rule 60'. You permitted a discussion for a full half-an-hour. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I am not permitting.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: The matter involved is very very important. It is a matter on which all of us are agitated.

MR. SPEAKER: I am not in agreement. I don't allow this any more. Don't record.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I do not allow anything.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Show me the precedent. I will allow it.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: There are any number of precedents. (*Interruptions*)**

MR. SPEAKER: No. Not allowed. I would not Don't record. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Until I say, don't record. (*Interruption****)

MR. SPEAKER: Don't record until I ask you. (*Interruption****)

MR. SPEAKER: Nothing is going on record. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I have already taken the decision, you are not obeying it... I called upon the Prime Minister to reply.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: I want to explain my stand.

MR. SPEAKER: If you are giving your reason for walking out, then I will get it recorded.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Take it that way.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA: Under what rule, you are allowing him?

MR. SPEAKER: The reasons for walking out have been allowed. From the precedent I have found that earlier also when the people walked out, they had made a statement.

(*Interruptions***)

I have made the decision. I am allowing the reasons. Any leader who is walking out, can make a statement why he is walking out. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Either allow us to walk out by making a statement or allow us to sit here and not listen to the Prime Minister. Choose between the two.

MR. SPEAKER: Now, you record. There is a precedent:

"On 10-3-73, after the Minister of Home Affairs replied to the debate on the resolution regarding the President's Proclamation under article 356 in relation to Tamil Nadu, Shri Era Sezhiyan, the leader of the DMK group, made a statement that the action taken by the Central Government was unconstitutional and that they were not satisfied with the reply given by the Minister. Thereafter, the members walked out."

So, I am permitting him to make a statement giving reasons for walking out.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Mr Speaker, Sir.....

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai): On a point of order, Sir. I have nothing to say if you permit any hon. Member or the leader of any party or group to make a statement. There is nothing wrong in that. But if the intention is expressed before that he is making a statement giving reasons as a prelude to walk-out, it is creating a dangerous precedent. You can allow him to make a statement but not a statement just for giving reasons for walkout. If it will be a dangerous precedent. What will be a dangerous precedent. What time a group leader will say, "I want to walk out and, therefore, you allow me to make a statement." It will be creating a mess of the whole business of the House. Therefore, I would make a submission to you, please don't mention that you are allowing him to give reasons for walking out. You are entitled to allow any member to make any statement. But please don't mention that it is because they are walking out. It is their choice if they want to walk out.

MR. SPEAKER: I am allowing him to make a statement

SHRI MOHD. SHAFI QURESHI (Aanatnag): Mr. Krishnappa from our party also wants to speak.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: A situation has arisen to which my party spokesmen have taken objection. Our party has taken objection to certain things that are happening in the country....

SHRI AMRIT NAHATA (Pali): Mr. Speaker, Sir. supposing I want to stage a walk out, will you allow me to make a statement?

MR. SPEAKER: I will consider when you think of it.

SHRI AMRIT NAHATA: Will you allow everybody? (Interruptions) Everybody will make a statement then.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: We are not able to cooperate with you for three reasons. One is that it is elementary in parliamentary practice that when an issue is before the House, when one aspect of the issue has been permitted to be placed before the House, the other interested party must be permitted to have its say also. This fundamental rule, according to me, was violated. The issue before the House, was, whether you will allow or give permission for an adjournment motion for which I had given notice. On that matter, when the discussion took place, with your permission or without your permission, the Prime Minister put forth a point of view of the Government.

This is an elementary parliamentary courtesy that the interest of party on the other side must also be heard before the Chair finally gives his ruling.

(Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER: No. (Interruptions):

MR. SPEAKER: Why don't you have patience?

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: Although I sought your permission to place my point of view before you, I was not given permission. Against that, I have got the greatest objection. Sir, I record my objection to that, (2) on the

[Shri C. M. Stephen]
question about the Government's action with respect to the Maharashtra issue. (Interruptions)

SHRI VASANT SATHE: What you are asking about West Bengal. (Interruptions). Your behaviour in Maharashtra is undemocratic, high-handed and arbitrary. This is why we are walking out. (Interruptions).

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: The Prime Minister made a statement that he has nothing to do with. . . . (Interruptions). These are the very fundamentals of the way the polity has got to function. (Interruptions). It is submitted that the Governor. (Interruptions). It is for the Prime Minister to say, to give up his basic responsibility in a federal polity against that attitude. (Interruptions).

SHRI VASANT SATHE: We will also disturb you. (Interruptions).

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: It is for the Prime Minister to say. . . . (Interruptions). Government will have nothing to do with it. (Interruptions). To give up his basic responsibility in a federal polity against that attitude (Interruptions). (3) A people selection took place. Members who have returned. It is fundamental that a Ministry must be formed and any constitutional lawyer says. (Interruptions). Either the major party can be called or the party which commands a majority can be called. Here two parties emerged. One is the Janata Party. The other two Congress which happen to be in the parliamentary parties the major parties, they should have been. (Interruptions).

AN. HON. MEMBER: Only in Maharashtra. . . . (Interruptions).

SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR (Pondicherry): 150 Members. (Interruptions). What happens is this. In Maharashtra, elections took place on the plea that it was necessary.

SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR: I want to know, Sir. . . . (Interruptions).

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: (Interruptions). To continue in this House. (Interruptions).

SHRI M. V. KRISHNAPPA (Chickballapur): For the same reason, we also show our protest and walk out. (Interruptions).

At this stage, some hon. Members left the House.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: Mr. Speaker, we protest. . . . The Governor, who is acting in utter disregard of the Constitution, should be recalled immediately. We make a protest and walk out.

MR. SPEAKER: Prime Minister.

12.55 hrs.

MOTION OF THANKS ON THE
PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS—Contd.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRI MORARJI DESAI): May I say, Sir, that it is very unfortunate that all this time should have been taken for doing what they have done now. I do not think it helps any cause. Yet, I cannot quarrel with their liberty to do even wrong things which they want to do. Why have I to say anything? But I do say that, when they think about what has happened, they will realise that they have said all this for nothing; for nothing they spent their energy, and the time of the House. I do not know how much money has been wasted. But all these things are inescapable in Parliamentary life and, therefore, I have no quarrel about it. But in this matter I do not see how this Government is to blame for anything. We have issued no directions whatsoever; we cannot issue directions in this matter, and we will not issue any directions in this matter. Even now if they want me to say, 'Expedite it', I cannot do that. But if the Governor acts wrongly, then certainly I can take action, but I cannot force him to do anything. That must be understood by the hon. friends. But they cannot forget their habits they have acquired. That is the